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## PREFACE

This is a translation of "Zoo Schaken Zij" ("They play chess like this") in which Dr. Euwe introduced the Dutch chess-playing public to the seven grand masters who were to participate with him in the famous A.V.R.O. tournament.

From the first we tried to keep close to his text, because it is so highly personal. Fate helped by losing our MS., which was addressed to us in Buenos Aires (where we were playing in the International Team Tournament) a few days before war broke out and has never been seen since. In correcting the proofs, we had consequently to refer back to the Dutch original throughout.

Herr Hans Kmoch rounded off "Zoo Schaken Zij" with a few paragraphs about Dr. Euwe himself, and this part of the book we have completely rewritten and greatly extended. It was almost impossible for Herr Kmoch to furnish anything his Dutch public did not already know; but we were in a very different position, and our British and American readers will be grateful for anything we can tell about Dr. Euwe. Our only further departure from the original is the addition of a few remarks about events subsequent to its publication.

Dr. Euwe has co-operated in the kind and warmhearted manner typical of him. We also owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. J. Creevey for ungrudging help in the correction of the proofs, to which labour Messrs. R. Blow, W. Ritson Morry, T. C. M. Olsen, and G. P. Smith have also contributed a noble part.
L. PRINS
B. H. WOOD

## PREFACE <br> TO THE SECOND EDITION

Cut off, as a result of the war, from both the author and my co-translater, I have taken the liberty of preserving the essential topicality of this work by adding a few more paragraphs at the end of each of the individual biographies.
B. H. WOOD
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## MEET THE MASTERS

## CHAPTER I <br> WHAT DO THEY LIKE?

Before passing under review, one by one, the masters considered nowadays as leading challengers for the world's championship, let us make a general survey of the outstanding features of their individual styles of play. We intend to focus on the most noteworthy element in the style of each in turn and thus give a picture of the divergent methods which they adopt to attain their end.
By our question we really mean "What sort of position is the particular forte of each?" Here are the answers.

## Alekhine: Favourable Positions

"Why," you might exclaim, "that is what every chess player desires. What is characteristic in this? You might as well say somebody has a weakness for wealth."

All the same, this is Alekhine's great characteristic. We shall show how he tries from the very outset to obtain, and knows how to obtain, a favourable position, and only when he has gained it gives his other powers full rein. Not without reason is he famed as a connoisseur of opening theory. To gain some advantage from the opening is vital to him, and he is willing to risk any difficulty or even hazard to attain, as quickly as possible, a position in which he feels at home. How often it happens that other masters miss opportunities
through a faulty appraisal of the ratio of strength to weakness in their position! This ratio is rarely so exaggerated as one to nought; it may be five to four or eleven to ten, or even closer to equality. In this appraisal and judgment of almost incalculable situations Alekhine is unsurpassable. The ratio can be one hundred to ninety-nine and he will steer as confidently as ever for the more favourable of the positions offered him.

To profit from such minimal advantages, an extraordinary flair is required for conceiving and carrying through an attack. Alekhine has this indeed. His greatness is thus based on two foundations: genius in the creating, and virtuosity in the exploitation of, attacking chances.

He is the greatest attacking player of all time. Morphy has usually been given this title, but his task was much easier; in his time, about eighty years ago, people had naïve ideas about opening strategy. Morphy was the first great positional player; none of his opponents could approach him in this respect. Alekhine's can; and the fact that his attacking skill still triumphs again and again amply justifies our description of him as unchallenged champion of the art of attack.

To understand Alekhine's greatness properly, one must-in view of the higher standard of play to-day give the phrase "attacking skill" a wider interpretation than has been customary. How do we, and how used we to, recognize an attacking player, and on what basis do we assess his skill? Naturally on the way in which he decides his games; that is to say, on his technical ability. We admire his beautiful
combinations, especially when they are prefaced by some sacrifice; the more frequent and striking the sacrifice, the greater our appreciation. This is an essentially old-fashioned criterion, for it confines itself to visible results, ignoring the mighty effort which must precede them. This latter is the most important, and nowadays is the decisive part. Ordinary mortals can envy Alekhine's genius in the discovery of charming and startling combinations; the more skilful player who feels himself quite capable of executing such combinations has a different feeling on the subject. To quote Spielmann, who is surely competent to pass an opinion on combinative skill: "I can comprehend Alekhine's combinations well enough; but where he gets his attacking chances from and how he infuses such life into the very opening-that is beyond me. Give me the positions he obtains, and I should seldom falter. Yet I continually get drawn games, even out of the King's gambit."

Well said, Master Spielmann! Alekhine's real genius is in the preparation and construction of a position, long before combinations or mating attacks come into consideration at all.

## Capablanca: Clear Positions

The essence of Capablanca's greatness is his rare talent for avoiding all that can complicate or confuse the conflict. He is a realist who has banished the romantic and the experimental completely. In the attainment of positions which suit his style, or rather temperament, he exhibits almost mystical insight; as soon as the least cloud appears on the horizon, he alters
his course so as to remain in clear water. He follows the sun, likes an easy life, is not sparing in offers to agree to a draw. To spectators this policy is not very attractive; he certainly draws an extremely high percentage of his games, the quickest often in unmistakably "grand master style," peace being signed before ever hostilities begin.
How, then, has he achieved such positive results? Wherein lies his power? Firstly, in the ability to perceive the remotest danger or the smallest opportunity far in advance; secondly, in the almost faultless technical perfection which enables him to hold on to an advantage once acquired with inexorable efficiency and convert it into a win. When he has to cope with opponents of equal stamp, he gets less frequent opportunities for this, since he does not set them too difficult tasks as a rule.
He can be regarded as the great master of simplification. The art of resolving the tension at the critical moment and in the most efficacious way so as to clarify the position as desired is Capablanca's own.

## Flohr: Quiet Positions

Flohr's style recalls Capablanca's, but he lets the conflict become sharper. This reveals itself in his choice of opening, especially as Black. Like Capablanca, he tries to avoid complications; but, unlike him, he does not simplify at almost every opportunity. He is more patient and hard-working, and, whilst he likes quiet positions, does not go to extreme lengths to make them absolutely clear. Whereas Capablanca, if anything, is prone to simplify too soon, Flohr may
simplify rather too late. His operations are slow as a rule. He is a specialist in jockeying for position, and in defence-eminent tactician as he is, he can permit himself this style. Only very rarely does he miss a favourable opportunity or fail to make the best of a difficult position. The opening is not his strongest point: he treats it quietly and solidly without setting such problems as Alekhine, but at the same time without Capablanca's covert fear of difficulties. He is no theorist, putting his faith in sound common sense. Psychologically, he is not so tense as Alekhine and not so fierce as Capablanca. He has repeatedly accepted an offer of a draw when in a decidedly better position, for instance, three times against Capablanca, at Hastings in 1934 and at Margate in 1936 and 1939, and against Reshevsky in the A.V.R.O. tournament-a thing which the world champions we have mentioned would never have done. You get the impression that, mere ability apart, he is quite content to demonstrate not his superiority over but his equality with the other leading masters. This explains why he draws practically all his games against the great masters, whereas he beats slightly inferior players with almost mechanical regularity.

## Botvinnik: Difficult Positions

Every player has, sooner or later, to put ap with a difficult position; Alekhine, for instance, very often. Botvinnik almost makes you feel that difficulty attracts him and stimulates him to the full unfolding of his powers. Most players feel uncomfortable in difficult positions, but Botvinnik seems to enjoy them.

Where dangers threaten from every side and the smallest slackening of attention might be fatal; in a position which requires a nerve of steel and intense concentration-Botvinnik is in his element. His style is anything but defensive; it is a mistake to assume that he accepts difficult positions so as to hold on to some small material advantage, as did Steinitz so often. On the contrary, his thoughts are always of attack. His method of preparing an attack is very characteristic; when he seems to be completely on the defensive he will be striving hard for a break-through, often through some deep combination. With devastating suddenness he is attacking-and like a master. Surprising switches like this are characteristic of his games, the whole situation changing in a flash. The preparations are made in secret; the explosion comes without warning. Flohr also often camouflages his real intentions so as suddenly to take the initiative, but the transition is never so dramatic as with Botvinnik. He often bases his plans on an advantage gained in the opening; he is an expert on opening theory, in which department he can be compared only with Alekhine, though his repertoire is smaller. It may be remarked that he is one of the few modern masters who cares to open with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, a thing one can risk only if one knows the openings well, so varied are the ramifications which can begin with Black's first move.

## Reshevsky: "Boring" Positions

Theory and practice, duly moulded by a player's temperament, combine to form the basis of his success. There may be little interplay between these factors.

Even leading masters have chinks in their armour; one may build up excellent openings but weaken in the middle-game, another may feel none too comfortable in the opening and consequently try to get away from well-trodden paths as early as possible; every player must allow for his own temperament, which will often force him to decisions quite indefensible on purely logical grounds. This is because practically every player has a penchant for a certain kind of position which he is only too happy to attain, and a distaste for some other type or types which he would like to avoid at all costs. This often leads to over-forcing of positions, with occasionally unexpected results.
Reshevsky is the exception-he is an all-round player with an all-round temperament. He has no partiality for any special type of position; he likes and plays every sort of game equally well; it is this which distinguishes him from his fellow-masters. Even positions which bore the others because there is-or seems to be-nothing at all in them he handles with as much keenness as another would devote to his special predilection. To Reshevsky, boring positions simply do not exist; in fact, our slogan for him might well have been corrected to "Positions which his opponents find boring."

He is above all a practical man, his play being simple and solid. His games give the impression that he does not seek for absolutely the best move, but is content if he finds a good one: that is, perhaps, unless the circumstances necessitate otherwise. He is an excellent tactician, seeing "stock" combinations at lightning speed, especially in defence, which brings out
his combinative skill to the utmost. He does not originate sharp attacks or complications from choice. His inexhaustible patience enables him to hang on for hours and hours, his games often passing into lengthy endings. He has been called a specialist in the endgame, but this is hardly correct; his admittedly numerous successes there must be ascribed to tenacity and endurance rather than sheer talent. Naturally, the longer the game lasts, the greater the chance that his persistency and his equal partiality for any sort of position will bear fruit. Reshevsky knows this well, and consequently goes over into the end-game at every opportunity, even if he gets the worse of the position to begin with. Like his fellow-Americans, Capablanca and Fine, he has had plenty of experience of lightning chess. Of this he makes great use, often leaving himself fifteen or more moves to make within a few minutes, in a complicated and difficult position, whilst his opponent may have oceans of time; and yet he wins. The explanation is partly psychological. His opponent thinks-even though subconsciously-that it is impossible for Reshevsky not to make some blunder in such terrible time-trouble, and consequently he relaxes his own attention. Reshevsky was in time-trouble in twelve of his fourteen games in the A.V.R.O. tournament!

On the whole, Reshevsky's play is less deep than clever; less safe than diligent; less pretty than strong. His place among the foremost masters is fully deserved.

## Fine: Sharp Positions

Fine is extremely gifted in the solving of technical problems such as the preservation of a small advantage;
but this is a characteristic of the younger players which he shares with Flohr and Reshevsky, not his own special perquisite. More typical is his readiness to go in for "chancey" positions, often enough in the very opening. He is not a combinative player like Alckhine, and his fondness for critical play is not so great as to make him take risks. No, he never takes risks! such is not in his style, though his straightforward, downright methods often force him to make moves which appear risky on the surface and give his play a keen edge. Unlike Capablanca, Flohr, and Reshevsky, he likes to confront his opponents with tricky problems from the very first move; not, like Alekhine, so as to get an attack, or, like Botvinnik, to produce the opportunity for a surprise counter-attack, but merely with an eye to position. Able technician that he is, he can exploit incidental chances as efficiently as he can carry through a routine attack. Above all, his play is logical. There was a striking instance of this in a tournament at Amsterdam, 1936, where he unexpectedly lost to one of the less fancied players in the first round. The tournament was a small one, so that he had little opportunity to make up his leeway. Another player might have played riskily, striving to wrest a little more out of his subsequent games-and very probably have overplayed his hand. Not so Fine; his play continued to exhibit just the same crystalclear logic. He dropped a draw here and there, but by the last day he had reached top place.

Like Reshevsky, Fine is a highly experienced lightning player, and can achieve real marvels of efficacious play in the most severe time-trouble. One thing which z-(G, 226 )
does play him tricks now and then is his none too cool temperament, which bothers him more than the other masters; but if we are to make a considered decision, we must admit that his instinct for logic enables him to overcome this failing.

## Keres: Wild Positions

Positions in which it is almost impossible to get one's bearings-there Keres is in his element. The wilder the better! This is a remarkable choice, for grand masters usually choose to avoid positions in which unexpected factors may enter to sway the conflict. They rely on skill rather than luck, and take a chance only when their game can no longer be held in the ordinary way. They leave the good, familiar path only as a last expedient. Keres, however, seems to prefer the desperate expedient to the safe path, quite apart from the question of necessity. So his methods contrast sharply with those of his fellow-masters. He is an attacking player of the first water, approaching Alekhine himself in this respect, with the great difference that Alekhine is consistently rational, whereas Keres is more irrational than not. He plays extremely well in wild positions, his penchant for combinations making him thoroughly comfortable in them.

Our remarks about "risks" must not be taken too literally, and we certainly should not like to give the impression that Keres is lost in anything but a scrappy game. He is a perfect grand master, equipped with every quality essential to a player of world repute. He knows the opening as thoroughly as the ending, and can treat any position on its merits. This
distinguishes him from the wild attacking players of last century, but not from his contemporaries. The real hall-marks of his style are his preference for wild positions and the genius with which he handles them. It is an extremely attractive but also a risky style and carries with it the danger of unexpected setbacks. He will probably begin to play more sedately in the future, and when that happens his style will approach Alekhine's; if his development does take this trend, he may surpass all his contemporaries. At the moment, however, he merely plays differently, not more strongly. As he is the youngest of all the masters under review, his potentialities for the future must be regarded as the greatest.

## Euwe: Methodical Positions

Napier once described Euwe as "an efficient maneating tiger." Alekhine contributed a far more searching analysis of his style in an article in the Manchester Guardian soon after the conclusion of the last world's championship match:
"Euwe's chess talent is in origin purely tactical-unlike that of such masters as Steinitz, Rubinstein, Capablanca, and Niemtsovitch. But he is a tactician who is determined at all costs to become a good strategist, and by dint of a great deal of hard work he has had some measure of success. The infallible criterion by which to distinguish the true from the would-be strategist is the degree of originality of his conceptions. It makes little difference whether this originality is carried to excess, as was the case with Steinitz and Niemtsovitch. In most of Euwe's games we find one and the same picture-a plan based on the formal
data of the position, such as a majority of Pawns on the Queen's wing, an isolated Pawn on the opponent's side, combined action of the two Bishops, and so on. Generally the plan is good; but there are exceptions due to the tactical possibilities of particular positions, and these exceptions are by no means rare. Consequently Euwe as strategist stands at the opposite pole from where Reti stood. Reti declared in his famous book, New Ideas in Chess, that he was interested only in the exceptions; Euwe believes, perhaps a little too much, in the immutability of laws.
"What, then, in compensation for this slight shortcoming, are the assets which have made Euwe one of the most redoubtable players of our day? In the first place, his gift of combination. Does the general public, do even our friends the critics, realize that Euwe has virtually never made an unsound combination? He may, of course, occasionally fail to take account, or to take sufficient account, of an opponent's combination; but when he has the initiative in a tactical operation his calculation is to all intents impeccable.
"His other, and his principal, asset is undoubtedly his profound knowledge of the openings."

Much of this is very searching analysis indeed, as is of course to be expected from a man who, by his own confession, had studied Euwe's games and writings to exhaustion over a period of several months. It epitomizes the strengths and weaknesses in Euwe's play that the match revealed.
Why did Euwe lose that match? Simply and solely because Alekhine managed, frequently enough for his purpose, to bring about positions in which Euwe did not feel at home. What sort of positions are those? Unmethodical positions !

Euwe will go down to chess history as the apostle of method. He is a Doctor of Mathematics, a qualified actuary, licensed to teach book-keeping, an accomplished boxer, swimmer, and aviator. He has written more books than any three other living masters put together. How does he do it? By ordering his whole existence like a railway time-table, dividing it neatly into water-tight compartments, applying to his life the same sort of disinterested logical analysis that another teacher of mathematics might reserve for his theorems alone.

Many a chess player collects game scores in a desultory sort of way; many a master studies the openings more or less intensively; but Euwe's wonderful fileindex leaves all these efforts in the shade-it is the eighth wonder of the modern chess world. It was understating the case to talk of Euwe's "profound knowledge" of the openings; Alekhine was consistently outplayed in the openings throughout the match he won. So Euwe's application of method starts long before his games begin. Method rules his training, which blends the physical with the mental. How many chess masters put in, prior to an important match, an allotted time daily to bicycling and shadow-boxing, followed by a cold douche and a brisk rub down?

Method extends to his treatment of the middle-game; he has catalogued combinational possibilities to the depths, as his writings show. He has every standard sort of combination at his finger-tips, and rarely misses a chance to carry out the manœuvre which fits the position. This is far from saying that his style is mechanical;
he is brilliant in discernment of the precise chances that the situation offers, and he shows the greatest originality in the application of combinative ideas, even if those ideas are seldom original in themselves. His is the Q.E.D., not of a pedant, but of an Einstein. The weakness of this system, and indeed of his whole approach to chess, is manifested on those extremely rare occasions when another genius, such as Alekhine, manages to confuse the issue beyond measure. As a result of his perhaps too versatile life, Euwe has been able to build up no reserve of habit, no ability to judge a position almost by second nature. For every game of chess, serious or "skittles," that he has played in the whole of his life, Flohr or Fine or Capablanca or Reshevsky. must have played a dozen. So that he is immediately handicapped as soon as a position begins to escape the orbit of exact analysis. He cannot fall back on instinct, because he has supplanted instinct by reason. He probes into the position as methodically as ever; given unlimited time, he could work out the theorem; but alas, his clock is ticking against him and he blunders-he has committed more blunders in good positions than any other chess master who ever lived. Or else, methodical even in misfortune, he realizes that he has not time to analyse the position in his own way, and deliberately makes a superficial move. This weakness was evidenced again and again in the course of the match.

He also suffers, like Tarrasch, from being such a great teacher. He is too willing to pour forth his richness to a greedy world and share with others the knowledge of his own discoveries.

Still short of forty, and taking care of himself as few people do, he has already evidenced his recovery from the blow to his self-confidence of losing the world's championship. His method-and his methods -will explore many another universe yet.

## CHAPTER II

## ALEXANDER ALEXANDROVITCH ALEKHINE

As lively and eventful as his play has been Alekhine's career. Did he shape his life, or did his life shape him? A question for the philosopher. He was born in Moscow on November 1st, 1892. His mother taught him the elements of chess, with obvious success, for he was attracted to the game from the first. Scion of a wealthy house, he was able to devote himself to his hobby intensively. Journeys abroad with his family advanced his education, his self-confidence, and his discernment. At the age of eighteen he had already participated in a strong international tournament at Hamburg, scoring a very reasonable degree of success with five wins, four losses, and seven draws. A year later at Carlsbad he did just as well (eleven wins, nine losses, five draws). Two years later, in Stockholm, he won his first international tournament, and in $19{ }^{13}$ he topped the strong Scheveningen international tournament, from which time onward Holland began to play a big role in his career. In 1914 he tied with Niemtsovitch for first place in the championship of Russia; then immediately followed the greatmaster tournament of St. Petersburg, which ended with Lasker in first place, Capablanca second, and Alekhine third. These successes, and particularly the


Dr. Alexander Alekhine wheld Champion attractive manner in which they were gained, aroused the acclaim of the whole chess world. His genius was
revealing itself at Mannheim in the same year; but, before the tournament came to an end, war broke out. The concluding rounds were suspended, and Alekhine, who was already practically certain of first place (he was actually given the first prize) was interned in Germany, together with some other Russian players, among them Bogolyubov. Thus his career was interrupted for the time being.

Towards the end of the year he was allowed to return to Russia, where he served with the Red Cross. For seven years nobody heard any more about him, but in 1921 he suddenly turned up in Berlin, not as a nobleman but on holiday as a poor refugee. Poor? Not really, for his most precious treasure, his genius for chess, was with him still; and, despite his vicissitudes, a richer genius than ever.
With his return to the arena after the war, his progress towards the world's championship began. It is hardly possible to catalogue here all the successes of the brilliant period which ensued from 1921 to 1927. Wherever he played he was backed to gain first place, and he achieved the expected practically every time. Only the then world champion Capablanca and the ex-champion Lasker could hold him. In London (1922) he finished second to Capablanca; in New York (1924) third behind Lasker and Capablanca (exactly as in St. Petersburg, 1914) ; and once again in New York in 1927 he had to relinquish first place to Capablanca. It is difficult to understand even this relative measure of ill-success, for his play was certainly not inferior to that of his two great rivals. Possibly psychological causes prevented his giving of his best
when Lasker or Capablanca were among his competitors. Playing over his games, one is forced to the conclusion that he never rose to quite his best form in these particular events.

Alekhine's match with Capablanca, held in Buenos Aires in 1927, put an end to all uncertainty. After an epoch-making struggle, conducted with the utmost stubbornness on both sides, Alekhine gained the victory by six wins to three, with 25 draws, and assumed the title of world champion. So came the second phase in Alekhine's career to a close . . . as first phase one must regard his early days up to the outbreak of the war.

The next phase was one of inactivity, and inactivity again. Alekhine took part in no big tournament, and the only occasion on which his powers were really tested was in the match against Bogolyubov at the end of 1929, which he won convincingly by eleven wins to five, with nine draws. A few months later, at the beginning of 1930, he registered the most imposing success of his life from the point of view of technique, scoring an overwhelming victory in the very strong tournament of San Remo. He drew two games only, winning every other game against opponents who included the best players at that time, and finishing far ahead of the rest of the field. His wins in this tournament exhibited, one and all, the art of chess at its most perfect yet. A year later at Bled he scored a hardly less imposing success-from the point of view of figures alone. But here the luck was with him, and his won games were by no means so convincing as at San Remo. An even more evident
decline was revealed by his games in the Berne Tournament of 1932; nevertheless he won first prize there too. This obvious fading of his powers induced Bogolyubov to challenge him for the world's championship a second time. The match took place in 1934, but Alekhine again won brilliantly (eight to three, with fifteen draws). A few weeks later he obtained another "first" at Zurich, and this in a style which dissipated all further rumours of declining powers.

Alekhine did none too well in the A.V.R.O. tournament; his partial lack of success might be ascribed to the excessive travelling involved.

In the great International Team Tournament at Buenos Aires during which the war broke out, he led the French team with distinction, though his percentage score at top board was bettered by Capablanca. After winning a minor tournament at Montevideo, he returned to Europe to serve as interpreter-lieutenant in the French Army (as a linguist, too, he is the chess players' champion, speaking Russian, French, German, English, Spanish and Dutch fluently, and being able to make himself understood in several other languages). His chateau near Dieppe fell into the hands of the Germans, with his wife in residence. He fled to Lisbon and could possibly have escaped, but returned to her, and has since remained in France under Nazi domination.

His subsequent feats, whilst falling a little short of his brilliant best, have been more than adequate in face of the best opposition that Nazi-organized Europe has been able to muster. Munich, in 1941, saw him tie with the Swede Lundin a point-and-a-half behind another Swede, Stoltz; Bogolyubov and others
following behind. With bombs falling around during the event, the atmosphere must have been strange. Amid a hostile populace at Cracow the same year, he tied for first place with Schmidt, Keres's Esthonian rival, a point ahead of Bogolyubov. At Salzburg a year later he scored a great triumph over his young rival Keres, beating him twice and taking first place a point-and-a-half ahead of him, and later at Munich scored another first place, once again above Keres.

## ALEKHINE AT HIS BEST

## First Illustration

The criterion of a good move is its efficiency. There are hard-and-fast principles to teach us which moves are, and which are not, efficient in the openings; likewise, which can and which cannot be efficient. For instance, an early sortie of the Queen is usually condemned; only to be justified, in fact, when the opponent has made a gross mistake.
In the following game Alekhine brings his Queen into play early; seems to lose a lot of time moving her about and yet, although his opponent commits no definite error, gets a very good game. How is this? The explanation lies in his rare gift of judging every move, in every position, with perfect detachment. Even if there are a thousand general reasons for rejecting a move, Alekhine is always ready to consider it, and consequently often gets a chance to gain an advantage in a totally unexpected way. Here an obtrusive white centre Pawn exerts such pressure on Black's position that the white Queen can go safely into the very thick of the fight.

## Dr. A. Alekhine <br> White <br> H. Wolf <br> Black

(Played in the tournament at Pistyan, 1922.)
IRREGULAR QUEEN'S PAWN

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |

This symmetrical variation, though unpretentious enough on Black's part, makes it extremely difficult for White to extract any real advantage out of the opening.

$$
\text { 5. Kt } \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}
$$

An apparently harmless divergence from the symmetry which enables Alekhine to steer the game into quite a different channel.

## 6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$ !

Willingly accepting the opportunity-he hates symmetry for its drawing tendencies. This move is not without risk. White sacrifices his King's Pawn so as to retain his Queen's Pawn, which then, however, becomes isolated and could become weak. As compensation, the striking power of White's pieces is for the time being much superior to that of Black's, for various reasons: the King's Knight is well posted, the King's Bishop is free to come out, and the Queen's Pawn exerts pressure against the black position. For a player of Alekhine's style it is a congenial task to exploit this greater striking power of his pieces. This can be achieved only by combinative means, a circumstance which gives the game a most unusual flavour.

```
6. ...
Kt}\times\mathbf{KP
7. Q-R44ch!
```

Forces Black to block the Queen's file so that the isolated Pawn is temporarily shielded from attack. Interposing the Queen (7. . . , Q-Q2) would be fatal, because of $8 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QK}_{\mathrm{t}}$.
7. . .
8. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{3}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2} \\
& \mathrm{~K} t-\mathrm{B}_{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Black could alternatively have played any of the following moves: $8 \ldots \mathrm{P}_{-} \mathrm{QKt}_{4}$; $8 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$, or $8 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$. There is little point in examining the various consequences, for the same sort of game would have eventuated from each: violent attempts by White to hinder the normal development of his opponent's pieces. The text move has the recommendation that Black gains a "tempo" and at the same time guards his $\mathrm{K}_{3}$, a square vital for the sound development of his King's Bishop. However, there is a drawback too: the Knight on $\mathrm{B}_{4}$ is exposed to various threats.


Tempting was $9 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$, to prevent Black's $9 \ldots$
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ through the concealed threat to his QKt Pawn. But this very move would have allowed Black to free his game by a little combination: 9. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ !; го. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (e.p.), $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; ir. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 12 . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$, and White will have to sacrifice a piece to save his Queen.
By the move he chooses, White maintains the pressure on K 6 and in addition indirectly attacks the Knight on Black's QB4.

## 9. . . $\quad$ - $-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$ ?

Compromising his game fatally. He should certainly have tried $9 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; for instance after 1о. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; in. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 12. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, and Black could defend himself by 12 . . . B-Kt5ch; 13. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Bch}$; 14. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; ${ }^{1} 5 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; whilst the keener continuation 1 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{5} ;$ ir. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KtPch} ; 12$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Bch}$; 13. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 14. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, secures no clear advantage either. So White must reply to $9 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ with 1 . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ or 1o. B-B4, after which he would have only a slight pull.

## го. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ !

Alekhine employs his early developed Queen with incredible efficiency. This piece first of all cut off the attack on the Queen's Pawn (7. Q-R4ch); then threatened Black's QKtP (8. Q-Kt3), and finally checked the advance of the King's Pawn (9. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ ). With this move she attacks the unprotected black Knight and eventually renders it impossible for Black to castle on the King's side ( i i. $Q-Q B 3$ ).

[^0]After Black's preceding move, io . . . P- $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ is out of the question.

$$
\text { 11. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{3}!
$$

Threatening not only $12 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ but also 12 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} t_{4}$ and consequently forcing Black to renounce all idea of castling on the King's side.
II. . . .

## R-Kti

Necessary in order to reply to 12. P-QKt4 with 12 . . . B-Kt2.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 12. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{3} \\
& \text { 13. } \mathbf{Q K t} \mathbf{Q} \text { ! }
\end{aligned}
$$

## P-Kt3

13. P-QKt4 would still get nowhere, because of 13... B-Kt2! I4. Kt-Q4, Q-R2! I5. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; and Black regains his piece with a good position. I3. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} t_{2}$ ! I4. B-Q44 would ${ }^{3}$ be met by $\mathrm{I}_{4} \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} ; \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{4} \mathrm{ch}$.


The skirmishes are over. There are no more acute threats in the position, and both players can turn their
attention once again to developing their pieces. But what a contrast there is between White's position and Black's, for this purpose! White can complete his development in two moves $\left(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}\right)$ and thereafter, having a perfectly secure position, begin to manceuvre on the open King's file or QB file, or both. Black, on the other hand, cannot castle on the King's side and cannot consider castling on the other. The white centre Pawn impedes the most elementary mobilization of Black's pieces. One can thus well understand why Black fails to execute anything in his next few moves but a hardly logical and perfectly fruitless solo action by his Queen's Rook.

I5....
B-Kt4
To open up the Queen's Rook's file.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 16. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B c h} & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} \\
\text { 17. } \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{5}
\end{array}
$$

White would have gone in for the forceful advance of his Q KtP which follows, even had not his opponent obliged with this attack on his Queen.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 18. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{4}} \\
& \text { 19. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R} \mathbf{3}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{Q - Q i}
$$

White has a positionally won game, and this insignificant move does not alter the situation. "Insignificant" technically, such little moves have often a high psychological value. They show the opponent how powerless he is and undermine his morale. What follows now is no fight; White commands a wellorganized army, whereas Black has merely a few detachments scattered about at random.

Alekhine provides us with a little trimming: he finishes off the game combinatively by sacrificing the exchange.
19. ...
20. KR-KI
$\mathbf{Q K t - Q 2}^{2}$
21. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} 6$ ! $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}$

A powerful break-through, with the ensuing sacrifice of the exchange already in mind.

> 2I. . . .

## $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$

On 2I ... P-K 3 , White could win at least the Pawn on Black's QKt4: 22. Q-K3 (attacks the Knight) $22 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; 23. Q-Q3, R-QRI (so as to counter 24. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QKtP}$ with $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ) ; 24. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, followed by $25 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$.
22. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}$ !


A lesser light might have discovered this sacrificebut only Alekhine could have so brilliantly created the opportunity for it.

| 22..$\cdots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{t} \mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t r}$ |

There is nothing better: if $23 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; then 24. Q-Q5, Q-Ki; 25. Kt-K6ch, K-B2; 26. Kt-B7ch, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ; 27 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$, winning the Queen.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 24. Kt } \times \mathbf{K P c h}^{\prime} & \mathrm{K}-\mathbb{B}_{\mathbf{2}} \\
{ }^{25} . \mathrm{K} t-\mathbf{K}_{5} \mathbf{c h} & \mathrm{~K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{I}}
\end{array}
$$

Or $25 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 26. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$.
26. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}$
27. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{6 c h}$

So White regains the material sacrificed and remains a Pawn to the good with an even more crushing positional advantage than before. There followed-
27 ... K-Ktr ; 28. Kt $\times \mathbf{R}$ dis $\mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} ; 29$. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ; 30 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{2} ; 31, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{3} ;$ 32. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} 8(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}) \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} ; 33 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \boldsymbol{;} 34$. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}} ;{ }_{35} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 36 . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{8} \mathbf{c h}$,
 39. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{5} \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{5}$; 4 o. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{c h}$.

Black resigns.
The value of this game lies not in the moves but in the ideas. The combinations are not particularly deep or unusual, but Alekhine's general strategy cuts right across all conventional lines. Who else would have realized that here existed the rare and exceptional case where very early mobilization of the Queen was strong?

## Second Illustration

Curious is Alekhine's knack of developing a seemingly harmless attack, within a few moves, into a hurricane which smashes down all resistance. His methods are
simple; it is not so much any particular move which is important, as the whole series of moves-and the move after that! He is a poet who creates a work of art out of something which would hardly inspire another man to send home a picture postcard.

(Played at Zurich, 1934.)
ORTHODOX QUEEN'S GAMBIT

| 1. $P-Q_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | P-K3 |
| 3. $\mathbf{K t - Q B} 3$ | Kt -KB3 |
| 4. Kt-B3 | B-K2 |
| 5. B-Kt5 | QKt-Q2 |
| 6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ | O-O |
| 7. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B r}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{-\mathrm{B}_{3}}$ |
| 8. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 9. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K t - Q 4}$ |
| 1.. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| 11. $\mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{4}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ |
| 12. $\mathbf{K t - K t 3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ |
| 13. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 14. Kt-B5 | Q-QI |
| ${ }_{15} . \mathbf{K t}\left(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}\right) \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K t - K} 4$ |
| 16. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| ${ }_{17}$. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$ | Q-Kı3 |

Up to and including White's seventeenth move this game has been identical with several other games, including Euwe $v$. Flohr (Nottingham, 1936), after
which it was demonstrated that Black can obtain a perfectly equal game by 17 . . . P-KKt3.


Now the real struggle starts. Alekhine has a little more freedom of movement, and his pieces, especially Bishop and Knight, are somewhat better placed than his opponent's. It requires the greatest skill to make anything of this slight advantage, but Alekhine succeeds. One would hardly expect Black to be checkmated within ten moves.
18. Q-Q6!

Attacking the Knight on Black's $\mathrm{K}_{4}$ and threatening, in some eventualities, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$, which would force a serious weakening of Black's King's wing if the Knight had to be captured.

$$
\text { 18. .. } \quad \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}}\left(\mathbf{K}_{4}\right)-\mathbf{Q}_{2}
$$

18 . . . Kt-Kt3 would be answered by 19. Kt-R6ch $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (now forced); 20. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, but Lasker might have considered $18 \ldots \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$, e.g. 19. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$,
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$, or 19. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{7} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{K}_{5}\right)$, Kt-Kti! (not 20 . . . Q-QI, because of 2 I . $K t \times P$ ).

$$
\text { 19. } \mathbf{K R}-\mathbf{Q r}
$$

Simple methods indeed; with every move-as is obvious-Alekhine is improving his position, every piece doing its bit.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 19. } \dot{\mathbf{Q}}-\dot{K}_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

QR-Qr

Threatening not only 2 i. $Q \times P$ mate but also 21 . Kt-R6ch followed by $22 . \mathrm{Kt} \times$ Pch and consequently forcing Black to weaken his King's wing.

```
20. . . 
21. Q-Kt5!
```

Another strong move: among the threats is 22. R-Q6.

| 21. . . | K-RI |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22. $\mathbf{K t - Q 6}$ | K-Kt2 |
| 23. P-K4! |  |

White's invasion forms a beautifully co-ordinated whole. He plans to advance the King's Pawn to K6 and bring his Rooks into the direct attack on the King's wing, via the third rank.
23. . . -

## Kt-KKtr

Hoping to dislodge the white Queen from her dominating position by $24 \ldots \mathrm{P}_{3}$. $\mathrm{B}_{3}$ or 24 . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$.
24. R-Q3

Frustrating Black's intentions, as soon becomes evident.

$$
24 . \cdots \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

24 . . P-KR3 would be as useless: ${ }^{25}$. Kt-B5ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{2} ; 26 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $27 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$, etc., or $26 \ldots$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3} ;{ }_{27} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ! $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 28. R-R3ch and mate.

Instead of the text move, Black would best have tried 24. . QKt-B3, with the following possibilities: 25. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 26. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $27 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, etc. Even then the passed QP should ensure an easy win.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25. } \mathbf{K t} \text { - } \mathbf{B}_{5} \mathbf{c h} \\
& \text { 26. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K t P}!!
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R I} \quad .
$$



The miracle has been achieved. Black cannot avert mate. White's moves $18 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ ! to 26 . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ! form one magnificent unified conception. Only nine moves-and the race is run! Everything unfolds harmoniously, everything goes equally simply; there is nothing diabolical, nothing smacking of sorcery. A good position always offers a choice of good continuations, and Alekhine might well have won in some other
way; but had he diverged at any one move, then the combination could not possibly have formed such a splendid whole, or been so characteristically Alekhine's.

Let us now examine a few passages from Alekhine's games which aptly illustrate his combinative ability.

Firstly, two exactly calculated finales (GrünfeldAlekhine and Alekhine-Rubinstein). In each there is already a win in the position, and it is "only" a question of driving this home. Any player knows very well how difficult a job this can prove in practice. To begin with, a plan has to be evolved quickly, for the critical phase of the game usually comes just when time is running short. There is no time for a detailed analysis of the position, taking everything into consideration. Intuition has to play a big part at such a time, which explains why great masters often let slip good opportunities. With Alekhine such a lapse is extremely rare; his talent for combination functions like a machine, and hardly ever lets him down. It is as if he heard a hidden voice: "Now is the time; now the combinations must start !" No sooner has he been warned than the combination is prepared.

It is still more difficult where the win is not yet forced, but the signs exist-it is "in the offing." Here, not moves must be found, but ideas, plans, inspira-tions-and here Alekhine rises to even greater heights. The Bogolyubov-Alekhine and Reti-Alekhine finales show how he handles situations like this. The wilder and more involved a position, the more beautiful the conceptions he can evolve. His game against Bogolyubov contains perhaps the most beautiful promotion
combination in the whole of chess literature, whilst against Reti he first creates complications in rare style and then resolves them to his advantage.

## Third Illustration

E. Grünfeld
White
Dr. A. Alekhine
(Played in the Carlsbad tournament of 1923.)
Alekhine has just brought his Knight to the important square Q6, and his pieces are momentarily at their maximum of effectiveness. But White is ready to undermine the strongly posted Knight, so he must act immediately.


Alekhine sees his chance and wins by a neatly calculated combination-
30. . . .

## $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}$ !

The simple $30 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 31 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 32 . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5} ; 33 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ would not effect anything worth while.

$$
\text { 31. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

The alternative would have been 3 I. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Pch}$; 32. K-BI (32. $K-R_{\mathrm{I}}$ ? $\left.K t-\mathrm{B}_{7} c h\right), 32 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ! 33. Q-Q2 (33. $Q \times K P, Q-B 5 c h ; 34 . K-K 1, K t \times P c h$; 35. $\left.K-Q_{2}, B-K 6 c h\right) ; 33 \ldots Q-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 34 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$, P-K6!, etc. The text move seems to do all that is necessary, the Rook remaining en prise and the Knight being attacked now as well.
31. . . Kt-B

A surprise-

$$
\text { 32. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \quad \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{5}!!
$$

The whole point of the combination, and a magnificent idea very difficult to conceive beforehand. Black must win at least a piece.

$$
\text { 33. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}
$$

33. Kt--B3 would be hopeless, on account of $33 \cdots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 34 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch. If $33 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, not $33 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; 34. K-Br, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ but-far more crushing- $33 \cdots \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$

By 33. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, White would "only" have lost a piece; now it goes still worse with him.

$$
\text { 34. } \ddot{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{K B \mathbf { B }}
$$

Otherwise a whole Rook goes.

$$
34 \cdots \quad B-\mathbf{Q}^{\mathrm{ch}}
$$

and mates next move.
This famous ending may be familiar to many of our readers but possesses an evergreen charm.

## Fourth Illustration

Dr. A. Alekhine
White
A. Rubinstein Black
(Played in the Carlsbad tournament, I923.)


Alekhine's advantage in this position is different from that in the last. Black's position exhibits weaknesses on both wings: on the Queen's, the important square B6 is open to occupation, so that from it Black's QKtP, which can soon be rendered defencelcss, can be menaced; and on the King's, the absence of the Rook's Pawn invites a mating attack. The latter is the more serious weakness, but to exploit it White must transport two picces, one of them the Queen, across the board-not an casy task, because the black Queen is well posted to impede the process.

The plan Alekhine conceives is very simple in principle; he opens up the road to the King's side by means of a demonstration on the opposite wing, which draws away Black's active pieces (Queen and Rook). The fulfilment of this plan involves-typically of Alekhine-several surprising turns and neat finesses.

It is about ten moves deep, and of a remarkably forcing character-

$$
\text { 21. P-QKt } 4 \quad \text { B-BI }
$$

Not $21 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, because of $22 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 23. $\mathrm{R} \times$ Rch and mate.
22. Q-B6

Threatening Rook and Pawn. If Black replies at random, e.g. by $22 \ldots$ B- $\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, there follows 23 . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, attacking the other Rook so that Black has no time to capture the Bishop. Therefore-

$$
\text { 22. . . } \quad \text { R-Q2 }
$$

So as to save both the attacked units.

$$
\text { 23. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{3}
$$

This is really an attack on the QKtP, for, as soon as the black Queen ceases to threaten the Bishop, White's Queen is free to capture the Pawn. The text move has a rather remarkable second significance, as the sequel shows.
23. . . .

## Q-Ktr

Black himself adds lustre to the game here by making the very best move and rejecting the simplifying $23 .$. Q-Q3. That also would lose, but the game would not then follow the main lines of White's plan. In My Best Games of Chess Alekhine gives two winning continuations against this alternative move, the simpler being: (23... Q-Q3); 24. KR-Q1, $Q \times$ Rch; (34... $Q \times Q$ ? $25 . B \times Q, R \times R c h ; 26 . R \times R$, $\left.R-K_{2} ; 27 . R-Q 8\right) ; 25 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch} ; 26 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; 27. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ;$ 28. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$;
29. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Ktr}_{1}$; 30. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, with a double threat of 3 I. $Q-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ and 3 I. $Q \times R$, which is unanswerable.
${ }^{24}$. Kt-Kt5
Another sharp threat: 25. Kt $\times$ BPch ( $25 \ldots$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 26. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ).


This astonishing move reveals White's plan in its entirety. See how White, with his last three moves, has cleared the way from QB 6 to $\mathrm{KKt2}$, from which latter square the Queen clinches the win. Had not this clearance been linked with a continuous series of threats, Black would have had time to evolve a satisfactory defence. For instance, 25. B-Kti would have been satisfactorily countered by $25 \ldots$ Q-K4. The text move is immediately decisive. Black is threatened with loss of the exchange and a Pawn; if he captures the desperado on his $\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$, he is elegantly mated: 25 . . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 26 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{1} ; 27 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ (the only move) ; 28. Q-R7ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{1}$; 29. Q-R8ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$;
30. $\mathrm{Q} \times$ Pch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{1}$; 31. Q-Kt8ch, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{BI}$ (31 ... $K-K 2$; 32. $Q-B 7 c h) ; 32 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ and mate.

$$
25 . . .
$$

$$
\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{4}
$$

Black submits to the loss of material. White now wins simply and speedily: 26 . Kt $\times \mathbf{B P} \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$; 27. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K B}_{\mathbf{4}} ;$ 28. KR-Qr, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c h} ; 29 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B} ; 30 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R} \mathbf{2} ; 3$ 1. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B} 6 ; 32$. Q-Q3ch, Resigns.

## Fifth Mlustration

## E. D. Bogolyubov <br> White <br> Dr. A. Alekhine <br> Black

(Played at Hastings in 1922.)
Position after ${ }^{25} . \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{1}$.


Black is a useful pawn to the good, and his pieces are, on the whole, more effectively posted; his Queen's Knight commands the strong square Q6, and the other can come to $Q_{4}$ when the QBP is exchanged off. White has not a lot of counter-chances: his best is the possibility of advancing his Knight to $K_{5}$ via $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$,
after which he might make something of the breakthrough by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$.

A stolid player might now concentrate on two things: preserving his passed Pawn and keeping the Knight on White's $Q_{2}$ under keen observation. This plan would necessitate a series of laborious manœuvres not at all in the style of Alekhine, who solves the problem of the position in a vastly different way. His extra Pawn means little to him; perceiving how awkwardly, for the moment, White's pieces are placed for defence (the Rook at Kt2, the Bishop and both Knights), he asks himself only one question: "How can I break through into my opponent's position?"

He succeeds remarkably: it is neither his Queen nor a Rook which cracks up White's game, but the Queen's Knight's Pawn, which, aided by the sacrifice of all three heavy black pieces, advances to promote to a Queen in five moves or so and decide the game. The whole conception is a magnificent example of keen and exact calculation, in which the least inaccuracy would have led to disaster.

These remarks give a good clue to Black's first move-
28. . . Kt-Q6

Now White can win back his Pawn in any of three different ways-
(a) 29. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 30. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$;
(b) 29. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 30. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$;
(c) $29 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$

The line $(c)$, which was actually adopted, looks best because Black's Knight cannot make use of his $Q_{4}$;
and yet (a) would actually have been better, e.g. 29. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 30. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$; 31. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt7}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 32. Q-Ktr, and White might again make something of mancuvring his Knight from $Q_{2}$ to $\mathrm{K}_{5}$, though Black would still have the better of it, quite apart from the fact that he might have improved on his earlier play, e.g. $30 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$, instead of $30 \ldots$ $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$.
(b) is definitely inadequate: 29. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 30 . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4} ; 3 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 32 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, followed sooner or later by . . R-R $\mathrm{R}_{1}$, with Black's pieces filtering into White's weakly defended position.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

The move on which Alekhine had based his plans.

| 29. $\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}!$ |
| 31. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{7}!$ |

A brilliant climax: Black gives up, in turn, every one of his three strongest pieces-the last with a check !--to get his passed Pawn home.


A difficult situation for White. Materially, even after the promotion of the black Pawn to Queen, he is not badly off; but his pieces are hopelessly misplaced for defence, and this is what Alekhine so clearly envisaged from the first.
33. Kt-B2

The only move.

```
33.... P-B8(Q)ch
34. Kt-Br Kt-K8
```

Threatening mate on the move.

$$
\text { 35. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}
$$

Again forced.

```
35. ••
\(\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B P}\)
```

To follow up with 35 . . B-Kt4. White cannot play 36. Kt-Q2, because of $36 \ldots$ Q-QB8; 37. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{BI}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$.
36. R-QKt8

The only way to hold up Black's attack is to give up the exchange.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 36. } \mathbf{M} \cdot & \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{4}} \\
\text { 37. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}
\end{array}
$$

Here the combination can be regarded as having reached its conclusion: Black remains with Queen for Rook and Bishop, with an overwhelming position into the bargain. The win can only be a matter of time. Alekhine played the ending no less elegantly and compelled his opponent's resignation after the following moves-

4-(G.226)
38. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}}, \mathbf{K t - B 6 c h}$; 39. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K t}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$; 40. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{7}}$ ! ; 41. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t I}} ; 4^{2} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}$; 43. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{P} ; 44 . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} ; 45 . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{6}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 4^{6} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B} 6, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 47 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{7}}$ ! (the promotion theme again); 48. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} ; 49$. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}(\mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{c h} ; 50 . \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2} ; 5^{\text {1 }} . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B} 2$, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{2} ;{ }_{52} . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{3} ; \quad 53 . \mathrm{K}-\mathbf{K}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} \mathbf{c h}$.

An extremely deep complication; yet in depth and complexity it is surpassed by the next, which has a psychological flavour in addition.

## Sixth Illustration

One of Alekhine's outstanding characteristics is his determination. He may lose a game through overplaying his hand, but never through hesitancy or timidity. Yet his judgment of a situation is impartial, and he embarks on an attack only when he believes the position to justify it. There is only one exception to this rule: when he finds himself getting the worst of it, he immediately counter-attacks at all costs.

A beautiful instance of this, and also of the psychological aspect of his play, is provided by the following passage-

Position after $16 \ldots \mathrm{~B}\left(\mathrm{~K}_{5}\right)$-R6:


## R. Reti White <br> Dr. A. A. Alekhine Black

(Played in the tournament at Baden-Baden in 1925.)

There followed-

| 17. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ | B-Kt5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K t 2}$ | B-R6 |
| 19. | B-B3 |

And Alekhine claimed a draw by repetition of moves. Reti protested, and the tournament director ruled that the automatic draw by repetition had not yet come about.

The reporters wrote nothing about this; and some, in reproducing the game, omitted the repetition completely, publishing scores reading $16 \ldots$ B-R6; 17 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 18. B-Ri. Yet the precise circumstances contribute useful evidence towards a correct judgment of the situation.

Reti now went-

## 20. B-RI

and now Alekhine knew that, if he were to get a draw, he would have to fight for it. He could see that White had in mind an attack on the Queen's side, based on the break-through $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt}_{4}-\mathrm{QK}_{5}$; the best chance, in such a case, lies in counter-attack, as Alekhine is the very man to realize.

There follows one of the most beautiful achievements of his whole career-

| 20. . . | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$ ! |
| :---: | :---: |
| 21. P-Kt4 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{3}$ |
| 22. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QBI}$ |  |

White could not go straight on with his plan, as his Queen's Rook was undefended: 22. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$; 23. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ ? $\mathrm{QRP} \times \mathrm{P}$; and wins.

| ${ }^{22}$. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ ! |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23. |  |
| 24. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
|  |  |

By this exchange Black has weakened the position of White's castled King: the fact that the KKtP is only once protected soon gives Black combinative chances.

$$
24 \cdots \quad \text { Q-B2 }
$$

Putting the weak point in White's position under fire at once.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 25. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 5}_{5} & \mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 26. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} 6!
\end{array}
$$

An offer which reveals the significance of his previous move. $27 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ is threatened: 28. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times$ Pch; 29. B-Kt2, Kt-K6 and mate. 27. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ would be no defence. White is already thrown onto the defensive.

## 27. Kt-B3

Not the best; preferable was $27 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, which Alekhine intended to answer by $27 \ldots \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}\right)-\mathrm{R} 6$, followed by . . . R(K6)-QB6 in some eventualities. The textmove reduces the Bishop to inactivity and also removes the Knight to a less effective square.

$$
27 \cdots \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$



Now the real combination begins; we soon have an almost fantastic number of pieces on each side en prise.

| 28. $\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B} \mathbf{6}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29. $\times \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |  |
| 30. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c h}$ |
| 31. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R} \mathbf{2}$ |  |

31. K-Bi, Kt $\times$ Pch; 32. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would leave Black a Pawn up with much the better position. What harm can befall White now? If Black captures the Rook, White takes the Rook on $\mathrm{K}_{3}$, and there is nothing in it.
3I. . . .
$\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ !!
A marvellous and far from obvious move. Three of the four Rooks are now en prise; White must play very carefully not to lose the exchange at once. For example, 32. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{K}_{5}\right) \times \mathrm{R}$ and both $33 \ldots$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ and $33 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ are in the air.

$$
\text { 32. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

Best, in the circumstances. $32 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would now allow 33. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{K}_{4}\right)$ !
$32 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 33. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would be just as useless in view of the simultaneous threat against Rook and Bishop.

$$
\text { 32. . . } \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B P}!
$$

Looks prosaic-Black wins a Pawn, and all the threats suddenly disappear; but the most striking passages are still to come. A single extra Pawn would hardly carry the day in such a position, but Black has worked out quite a distinct winning method.

## 33. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t 2}$

Black threatened to win a second Pawn as well by $33 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ followed by . . Kt $\times \mathrm{B}$.

$$
\text { 34. } \dot{\mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{B}_{4}\right)-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}}
$$

The best place for the Rook, as analysis confirms; the attack on the Knights restricts Black's choice of replies.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 34. } \cdot \boldsymbol{K}-\dot{R}_{\mathbf{3}} \\
& \text { 35. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$K_{t-K}^{t}{ }_{5} \mathbf{c h}$

Not 35. K-Ri because of $35 \ldots$ R-R8ch.

35. $\quad$| 36. |
| :--- |
| 37. |
| $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K}$ |

$\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{K}_{4}$ dis ch $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$
37. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}$

Forced; $37 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ would cost him a piece.
37....
Kt-Kt5ch

A little repetition of the same theme.
38. $. \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$
39. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}$
40. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$

## Kt-K6 dis ch <br> $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{R}$ <br> $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}$ !

It is all over. If $4 \mathrm{r} . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ or 4 I . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$, then $4^{\mathrm{I}} \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Bch} ; 42 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ winning a piece. White resigned.

A peerless example of Alekhine's attacking skill, remarkable for the many problem moves that followed the exchange of Queens. The position is incredibly complicated, and everything is suspended in mid-air; but Alekhine dominates the proceedings. He pulls the wires, and it is to his bidding that the marionettes dance.

## Seventh Illustration

The last example showed a fine, complicated, and very deeply calculated combination which only began after the Queens had disappeared from the board. Such cases are rare, for a combination is, in its essence, a violent disturbance of the dynamical equilibrium, the chances of which are greatly reduced when the most powerful pieces are absent. One must not forget that the exchange of Queens started the complications off, so that these pieces played an important, even though preliminary, part.

Here follows an example of quite another stamp. Queens are exchanged off on the sixth move, when there can be no question of attack or combination. Nevertheless, it is not long before Alekhine's attacking
skill shows itself, and though combinations are absent, the fight is tense enough for anybody's taste.
Dr. A. Alekhine
R. Fine
Black
(Played in the Kemeri tournament, 1937.)

| QUEEN'S GAMBIT | ACCEPTED |
| :---: | :---: |
| I. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{4} \mathbf{c h}$ |  |

One of the newer forms of this opening.
4. . . .

Q-Q2
This and the next move force exchange of Queens, leading to a drawn position, apparently-but it is not quite so simple.
5. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$
Q-B3
6. $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{- R} \mathbf{3}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$

This brings the Knight to a very strong position. 6. . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ was to be considered.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 7. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{Q}, \\
& \text { 8. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}!
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}
$$

Played with insight. This move not only forestalls the check by the Bishop, which would force further simplification, but it threatens $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt}_{4}$, which would cramp Black by preventing . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, his freeing move. If Black is to get in . . P P-QB4 at all, he
must therefore play it at once; but this, as we shall see, puts him in trouble otherwise.
8. $\quad$ B-
P-B4
9. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$

Black cannot well avert the threatened io. Kt-Q6ch, which will force off one of his Bishops.

$$
\text { 10. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Before playing Kt-Q6, White takes the opportunity to gain several moves on his opponent.

| 1о. . . | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 1. P-QKt4 | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$ |
| 12. P-Kt5! |  |

Alekhine extracts every ounce of advantage from the position.


The opening is over, and Alekhine, once again, has achieved his primary aim-a favourable position.

Again it was not any particular move, but a coherent series of moves, each simple in itself, which brought this about.

The apparently innocent 8. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ forced, as we have seen, the immediate advance of the black QBP, creating a weakness at Black's $Q_{3}$ which was shown up by 9 . B-B4. Now White has the small advantage of two Bishops against Bishop and Knight, but we shall see that this is not easily retained.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
{ }^{1} 4 . & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{5} \\
{ }_{5} 5 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{7} & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}
\end{array}
$$

${ }^{15}$. . . P-QR3, fighting for counter-play along the Queen's Rook's file, was the correct move. White could hardly reply $16 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ to much advantage, because it would give Black's Knight a free entry to his $Q_{3}$.

## 16. $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}$

Extremely strong; White intends to place his Pawns on $\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{4}$, denying Black the use of his white squares $Q_{4}$ and $K_{5}$ for his pieces. He already has a little advantage on the black squares (White's $\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and Q4) through possessing the only remaining blacksquare Bishop.

| 16. | Kt-Kt3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 17. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{K t - Q 4}$ |
| 18. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ |  |

If $18 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, then $18 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$.

$$
\text { 18. . . } \quad \mathbf{K} t\left(\mathbf{K}_{5}\right)-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

18.... Kt-Q3; 19. P-K 4 , Kt-K6; 20. B-Kt4! would also leave White well on top.

$$
\text { 19. } \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}
$$

The final preparation for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, preventing the reply . . Kt-K6.

| 19. . | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{R - Q B I}$ |
| 21. K-Q2 | $\mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{t}_{3}$ |
| 22. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ |  |

Otherwise comes 22 . . . Kt-B5 ch . The movements of this Knight have been most remarkable; first it went to $Q_{4}$ to prepare $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; then it went to $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ to prepare $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; and now it goes to $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ to prevent Black's winning back the minor exchange by 22 . . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$.
22. . . .


22 . . Kt-R 5 , followed by 22 . . Kt-B4 would have been a little better: compare with our note to Black's fifteenth. Alekhine contrasts with other great masters in the great rarity of such little lapses. After the text move White never permits . . . Kt-R5 again.


White, after 23 moves, has now only two pieces in play, and yet they are ideally positioned. The beautifully central post of the Knight on $\mathrm{K}_{3}$, the solid centre, the attacking formation on the Queen's side, the mobility of the Bishop on $\mathrm{R}_{5}$-these things make it impossible for Black to find good squares for his pieces, whereas White's pieces can develop their maximum combined effect within a few moves.

Situations like this are common in Alekhine's games. They draw one's attention to the distinction between "quantitative" and "qualitative" development. Alekhine always follows qualitative precepts, that is to say, he studies the effectiveness far more than the numerical strength of the forces at his command.
24. $\dot{\text { B-Q }} 3$

> KR-QI
> $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$

To free his Bishop.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B I} \\
& \text { 26. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}
\end{aligned}
$$

Not 26. B-Kt4 at once, because of $26 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; ${ }_{27}$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{RP}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 26. ... } \\
& { }_{\text {27 }} \text {. } \text {-Kt }_{4}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}
$$

Preparing to push still further on the Queen's side.

```
27. . . 
\(\mathbf{K t - K I}\)
28. \(\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}\)
\(\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q 2}_{2}\)
```

Not 28 ... Kt-B5ch, because of 29. Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 30. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QBI}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; 3I. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 32 .
$\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$; 33. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 34. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ and Black will soon lose his QRP.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{5}
$$

29. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB}$ I might perhaps have been simpler, but Alekhine avoids exchange of Rooks because end-games with only the lighter pieces give many more drawing chances. The text move gains White a passed Pawn which, in connexion with his two Bishops, soon becomes a powerful force. There is one slight flaw in White's tactics: Black obtains control-even though only temporarily-of his $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, a factor which undoubtedly gives him some opportunities.

| 29. $\mathbf{~}-\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30. $\times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 3I. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{I}$ |

A neat indirect protection of the Knight on his $\mathrm{B}_{4}$, and certainly better than simplifying by $31 \ldots$ $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 32. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 33. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$. The best drawing chance lay in a fusion of these two ideas by $3 \mathrm{I} \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 32. K-Q3; and now $32 \ldots$ R-QI with the idea of continuing, after the attacked Rook has moved, with $33 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$. Even then, White could maintain his advantage by $33 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{7}$ !
32. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$

Indirectly protecting the Queen's Pawn.

| 32. $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K t} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33. | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 34. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ ! |  |

As is well known, the force of the Bishop-pair often lies in the possibility of exchanging back one of them for a Knight at the appropriate moment. By the text move, White obtains a second passed Pawn, which carries the day.

| 34. | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 35. P-Kt6 | Kt-Q3 |
| 36. B-Q7! |  |

A beautiful finish. Black is completely helpless against the menace of $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} 7$. . . and $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8$.

| 36. . . | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}$ 8ch | $\mathbf{K t - K I}$ |
| 38. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}$ mate |  |

The whole game is a beautiful example of Alekhine's great versatility in attack. Many other attacking players would have more or less lost interest when Queens disappeared so early, but not Alekhine! He kceps up the fight right into the end-game, creating initiatives anew all the time.

## Eighth Illustration

Now finally the game worthy of being considered the most important of Alekhine's whole career, and at the same time one of his best achievements in itself. It is the thirty-fourth and last game in his match for the world's championship with Capablanca at Buenos Aires in 1927. In winning this game he became world champion. To assess his victory in this match at its true value, one must recall that Capablanca was then considered absolutely unbeatable. Four times in
succession, that is to say on every occasion when they had competed in together the same tournament (St. Petersburg, 1914; London, 1922; New York, 1924; and New York, 1927), the Cuban had finished above Alekhine, and there was not the slightest reason for considering Alekhine the stronger player. When this game began, Alekhine had a margin of two games $(5-3)$ in his favour, but not everybody backed him to win even then. According to the conditions of the match, Capablanca required to win only two games to achieve an even score ( $5-5$ ) and remain champion. It was at this critical stage of the match that Alekhine won game and title.
Not only for this was the game important; its technical execution was of the grandest. Alekhine obtains -as so often-a small advantage in the opening and then promptly confronts his opponent with a diabolical Queen move 21. Q-Q2! Capablanca misses the one and only obscure defence which would have held the balance of the position, and parts with a Pawn.

With the speedy disappearance of all but the heavy pieces from the board, it becomes most difficult for Alekhine to exploit his slight advantage: he has to be on the alert against all sorts of developments in which an odd Pawn would count for nothing. He solves his task with concentration, patience, and efficiency. Only in the very end, when he has an easily won game, does he relax a little and miss a chance of clinching victory a little more quickly-but this slight blemish we can well condone under the circumstances.
The most admirable feature of this game is the
superb technique by which a small advantage is converted into a win, a process which extends over nearly seventy moves against an opponent whose efforts, fraught with the energy of desperation, continually threaten to thwart him.

Having admired Alekhine for his combinative genius, let us conclude this chapter with this tribute to his inspired technique.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { Dr. A. Alekhine } & \text { J. R. Capablanga } \\
\text { White } & \text { Black }
\end{array}
$$

(Final match game, Buenos Aires, 1927.)

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;$ 2. $^{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ; 3 \text {. Kt } \mathbf{Q B}_{3} \text {, }}$
 6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2} ; 7 . \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O} ; 8 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 3, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; 9. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B P}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;$ 1о. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$; іл. $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$,
 14. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{2}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; ${ }_{15}$. Kt $\times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{3}$; 16. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2} ;$ 17. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathbf{Q R}-\mathrm{Br}_{1} ; \mathbf{1 8} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4} ; 19$. $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t 2} ;{ }_{2} 20 . \mathbb{P}-\mathbf{R}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3} .}$
2. Q-Q2!


A typical Alekhine move which employs the Queen to her maximum of effectiveness. Black's position shows three weaknesses: on the Queen's side the unprotected QRP; in the centre the King's Pawn, and on the King's side the bad formation of Pawns at $\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{KR}_{3}$. The text move strikes directly or indirectly at every one of these, as the following analyses demonstrate.
$21 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 22 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{BI} ; 23 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 24. Q-B3 and Black's King's Pawn falls.
$21 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 22 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{1} ; 23 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 24. Q-R 5 forking Black's Rook's Pawn and King's Pawn.

21 . . B-B3; 22. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{4}!\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 23 . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ winning a piece, since the black Bishop, in view of the possibility of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$, has to keep an eye on this square, so that $23 \ldots$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ fails through $24 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$.
$21 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 22. Kt-R4! Kt $\times \mathrm{P}$; 23. $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{R}_{4}\right)-$ $\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 24. Kt $\times$ Pch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; 25. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 26. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ mate.
This last variation in particular has a rare beauty and shows what subtle twists Alekhine can weave into a position.

> 21. . . B-K3

Subsequent analysis has revealed that only by the move $21 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ ! (recommended by Lasker) could Black have maintained equilibrium. Now he simply loses a Pawn.
 $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t P} ;{ }_{25} . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} ;{ }_{2} 6 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$; ${ }_{27}$. Q-Kt4, R-QRI; 28. R-Rı, Q-B3; 29. P-QR4!

```
29. . . .
```

$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$


Tension again. White seems to get his Pawn back, but Alekhine has a surprise up his sleeve.

$$
\text { 30. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}!
$$

Certainly not 30 . Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 31. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QBI}$, because of $31 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QBi}_{1}$ !, e.g. $3^{2}$. Kt-Q2, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ or $32 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6!!$; 33. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}$; 34 . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{2}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B8ch}$; 35. K-Kti, Kt-Kt6dis ch and wins.

Alekhine is as adroit in avoiding his opponent's surprising attacking resources as in creating his own.

$$
\text { 3о. . . } \quad \mathbf{Q} Q_{3}!
$$

Best, in the circumstances. After $30 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{5}\right)$ $\times \mathrm{Kt}$; 3I. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 32. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ the end-game would be easily won for White.

$$
\text { 31. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

It is remarkable how everything fits in; Black could not play $3 \mathrm{I} \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, because of $\mathrm{3}^{2}$. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{RI}_{\mathrm{I}} ; 33$. Kt $\times$ Pch winning the Queen.

## 32. R-KI

Kt-Q3

The only way to save the piece.


A very difficult end-game ensues, in which Alekhine converts his material advantage into a win in a most instructive way. When heavy pieces alone remain, it is very difficult to force a win. We shall present the remainder of the game in a series of snapshots, which best illustrate how Alekhine wends his way, through a series of end-game finesses, to victory.
$35 \cdots$-. $\mathbf{R}$-QKti ; 36. R-K2, R-QRi ; 37. R-R2, $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}} ;$ 38. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{7}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}} ;$ 39. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{c h}$.


White has gained command of the long diagonal, and soon begins to operate with mating threats.
$39 \ldots \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R 2}_{2} ; 4$. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} 2, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t 3}_{3} ; 4 \mathrm{I} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} 7$, Q-Kt8ch; 42.K-R2, Q-Ktich; 43. P-Kt3, R-KB4; 44. Q-Q4, Q-KI; $45 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} 5, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B 6}$.


And now White must not be over-hasty in his attack. For instance, 46. K-Kt2, R-R6; 47. R-Q8, which seems strong, would fail through $47 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ !
$4^{6 .} \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K R I} ; 47 . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 6}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R 8} ; 48 . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2}$, $\mathbf{R - B} \mathbf{3}$; 49. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ !


Forcing the Queens off in circumstances all to his advantage (Black's Rook cannot now take up its most effective position-behind the white Pawn).
$49 \cdots \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 50 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2}$; 5 I. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}$, R-R3.


When the Queens leave the board, the passed Pawn becomes a personage of importance.
52. R-Q $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{5}}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K B}_{3} ;{ }_{53} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{3} ;{ }_{54} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$,
 $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ; 5^{8 .} \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$.


The Kings are fighting for space.
59. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R 2}_{\mathbf{2}}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{4}}$; $60 . \mathbf{K}_{-\mathbf{K t}_{3}}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$.

Sad! the Pawn is too hot to touch; for if 60 . . . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, then 6 r. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 62. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; 63. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B}_{2} ; 64 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; $65 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 6$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}} ; 66 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}} ; 67 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ and wins.
61. K-B3, $\mathbf{K - K} t_{4} ; \mathbf{6 2}_{2}$ K-Q4.


The white King swings off towards the other side; obviously Black is still worse off if he captures the Pawn now.
$62 \ldots \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} \mathbf{c h} ; 6_{3} . \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{K}_{5}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{c h} ;{ }_{4} . \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$,



Now comes a rare event-Alekhine misses the strongest line. As he has stated himself, he could have
won by exhausting his opponent's good moves, as follows: 67. K-Kt7, R-B6; 68. K-Kt8, R-B3; 69. K-B8! R-B6 (69 . . $R-B_{4}$; 70. $P-B_{4}$ ); 70. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{7}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{4} ; 7 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ and Black can resign.
67. P-B4 $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ ! 68. R-R $\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$; 69. K-Kt7, $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{2} ; 70 . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 71$. K-R6, $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5} ; 72 . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$, R-Q4; 73 . K-Kt7, R-KB4; 74. R-R $\mathbf{4}, \mathrm{K}-\mathbf{K t}_{4}$; ${ }_{75} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$; 76. K-R6.


White sacrifices his Queen's Rook's Pawn to gain Black's KRP.
$76 . . . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R P}$; 77. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R 8} \mathbf{;}$ 78. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}$, R-KKt8; 79. R-KKt5, R-KR8; 8o. R-KB5, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{3}}$; 81. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ;$ 82. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{7}$.

Capablanca resigns and Alekhine becomes world champion!

## CHAPTER III

## JOSE RAOUL CAPABLANCA Y GRAUPERA

J. R. Capablanca was born in Havana on 19th November, 1888. A curious analogy to Alekine's birth is presented by the fact that a match for the world's championship had been played there the year before. Steinitz played his return match against Lasker in Moscow; in Havana he had encountered Tchigorin. Again like Alekhine, Capablanca learnt chess at a very youthful age.

In 1900, when only twelve years old, he beat J. Corzo by four games to nil, with six draws, in a match for the chamionship of Cuba. This achievement is by no means to be minimized, for the standard of play in Cuba, as a result of the activity of the Havana Chess Club, was high.

Graduating from a secondary school, Capablanca went to New York to study engineering technique-and chess technique, although he had not originally intended it. He became a member and soon champion of the Manhattan Chess Club. In 1909 he defeated the American champion Marshall by eight wins to one, with fourteen draws, and thenceforth was accepted as the strongest player in the New World. This title has of course been challenged recently by Reshevsky and Fine, neither of whom, incidentally, he has met in a match.

Capablanca showed talent from the start, but more than this was needed to carry him into the foremost rank of chess greatness; he worked hard, especially in

the very beginning, to develop this talent. As with other great masters, his training blended study with practice. But there was a great contrast with Alekhine; Capablanca did not apply himself to opening theory (in which he never therefore achieved much), but delved deeply into the study of end-games and other simple positions which respond to technique rather than to imagination. It is said that he studied exhaustively more than a thousand Rook and Pawn end-games, a colossal undertaking for which he has been well repaid. His practical experience also followed a different course from that of the other masters of his generation. He participated in various tournaments in America, but the real measure of his theoretical knowledge was not the tournament game but the "skittle" game. Whilst a student in New York, he played thousands of rapid games, all for money stakes so that he was forced to concentrate; and this developed in him, in course of time, the superior positional judgment which later, in international tournaments, revealed itself as such a redoubtable weapon. Firstly, he learnt to play quickly without blundering; secondly, he developed the essential proficiency in wresting the clear positions he likes from every sort of situation. For years and years he never once got into time-trouble or into a position not under his rigid control. Only just recently has he deteriorated in this connexion; the time-devil does play him tricks sometimes, and altogether he makes harder going of it than of old.

Returning to the story of his career. His sparkling victory over Marshall speedily brought him international renown. In igII he came to Europe for the
first time, to win first prize in the very strongly contested tournament of San Sebastian with six wins, seven draws, and but a single loss. Immediately after this he sounded Dr. Lasker, then world champion, with the idea of their playing a match for the world's championship, but matters never reached the stage of definite negotiation. When Lasker won the St. Petersburg tournament above him in 1914, beating him in their individual encounter, his aspirations for the title abated a little. Moreover, the war paralysed chess for a while. Capablanca participated in three tournaments only during the war (in New York, 19 ${ }^{1} 5$, 1916, and 1918), winning first prize each time. Returning to Europe after the Armistice, he redoubled his efforts to obtain a title match with Lasker. After several setbacks, among others the fact that Lasker voluntarily relinquished his title, a state of affairs Capablanca refused to accept, the match took place in Havana in 1921, concluding with a victory for the Cuban, who thus succeeded to the title. With the score four to none in Capablanca's favour, ten games having been drawn, Lasker adjudged the situation hopeless and gave up the struggle.

The new world champion well knew how to confirm his standing by winning the great international tournament in London in 1922 with the shattering score of eleven wins, no defeats, four draws. It was now that he began to attract the description "unbeatable," yet within two years, at New York, his reputation suffered a sad blow: just as at St. Petersburg in 1914, he had to be satisfied with second place behind Lasker. Some consolation was afforded him by his surpassing
all the younger masters, and especially the "coming man," Alekhine. In the Moscow tournament he suffered another blow: Bogolyubov was first, Lasker second, Capablanca third; Alekhine did not compete. His only opportunity of crossing swords with the latter came in 1927 in the four-round tournament of six masters at New York; and here he scored an unchallenged first place, in front of Alekhine once again. Now his position as world champion seemed unassailable, the more so since Lasker had retired from active chess, and he could look forward to the title match with Alekhine, for which preparations were going forward, with supreme confidence. But, "vanity of vanities," the very first game brought the Cuban a cruel disillusionment. He was beaten-and as White!

This game was crucial for the match, as subsequently became evident, for Capablanca had been dislodged from his psychological throne and never once looked like recovering it throughout all the thirty-three games which followed. It is true he put up a mighty resistance, but he found himself on the defensive, and in chess-as in any conflict-success lies in attack. The "chess machine," by which admiring title he had been known, revealed the great drawback of a machine: it had not sufficient flexibility to adapt itself to altered circumstances.

Of the endless negotiations for a return match against Alekhine we have already written.
As ex-world champion Capablanca registered various successes; he came first at Berlin in 1928 and Budapest in 1929; second at Kissingen in 1928 behind

Bogolyubov; and, in company with Spielmann, behind Niemtsovitch at Carlsbad in 1929. He defeated Euwe by two games to none with eight draws in a match in 1931. After this he withdrew from the international arena for some time. His reappearance in the Hastings congress of Christmas, 1934, was none too successful, for he had to content himself with fourth place. In Moscow a year later he finished fourth (to Flohr and Botvinnik, equal first, with Lasker third). Only in 1936, at Moscow, was he at last to know the pleasure of surpassing Lasker in an international tournament. He was easily first, and soon afterwards in the strong Nottingham tournament he shared first prize with Botvinnik. This really was a resounding success. Then came the double-round tournament of eight leading masters at Semmering-Baden, 1937, where Keres won first place, followed by Fine, Capablanca tying with Reshevsky for fourth place.

Even after his disappointing showing in the A.V.R.O. tournament, in which he finished seventh out of the eight participants, and his not very convincing second place at Margate a few months later, he remained one of the best players in the world, though he was obviously experiencing more and more difficulty in maintaining his outstanding position. One must not forget that he was the oldest competitor in the Dutch tournament, and hence presumably the most affected by the arduous travelling. He seemed too inclined to seize material at the expense of position, relying on his defensive skill to achieve the miraculous-but his defensive skill could no longer always achieve the miraculous.

## CAPABLANCA HITS OUT

## First Illustration

First of all, a game in the style that earned for Capablanca the description "chess machine." We see him obtain a small but definite advantage from the opening, far from sufficient to produce a win of itself but enough to enable him to cause his opponent difficulties. The position is just to his taste: slightly to his advantage, simple, straightforward. It is splendid to observe how he holds his advantage and systematically increases it, exploiting each inaccuracy on the part of his opponent. His unsurpassable efficiency produces a game which is a model of modern objectivity.

## E. D. Bogolyubov White <br> J. R. Capablanca <br> Black

(From the New York tournament, i924.)

| QUEEN'S | GAME |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K t - K B 3}$ |
| 2. $\mathbf{K t - K B} 3$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ |

It is not in Capablanca's nature to seek intricacies in the opening. This explains his choice of the quiet $3 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ instead of the keener $3 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ or 3 ... B-B4.

| 4. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}$ | P-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} t_{3}$ | Kt-B3 |
| 6. O-O | B-Q3 |
| 7. B-Kt2 | O-O |
| 8. QKt-Q2 |  |

8. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ is preferable: $8 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; $9 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$. This is soon apparent.
9. . . -
Q-K2!

With the double threat $9 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ and $9 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ followed by . . . B-R6. We see why 8. QKt-Q2 was premature.

| 9. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{5}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 10. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R} 6$ |
| I I. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ |

After the exchange of his Queen's Bishop, White's attacking chances on the King's side disappear and he has to be careful that Black does not take over the initiative with the help of the open QB file. All this, however, was common knowledge at the time. Bogolyubov presumably chose this variation to avoid risks: a good policy in itself, for White has certainly not got the worse game. But it soon becomes obvious that Capablanca is far more at home in this clear sort of position than his opponent.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 12. } \mathbf{K t}(\mathbf{Q})-\mathbf{B}_{3} & \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2} \\
\text { 13. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K t} & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \\
\text { 14. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{2} &
\end{array}
$$

14. Q-Bi was the correct continuation, according to Alekhine. White must make an effort to drive the black Queen from her strong position.
```
14. . . QR-BI
I5. P-\mp@subsup{B}{3}{}
```

Weakens his Bishop's Pawn, which was well protected on the second rank. Better $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ at once.

$$
{ }_{15} \ldots \text { P-QR3! }
$$

Beginning the real struggle. Black goes for the exchange of Bishops, which is to his advantage, as he has the "bad" Bishop (moving on squares of the same colour as his Pawns and therefore hampered by them) and White the "good" one.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 16. } \mathbf{K} t-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}} & \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{4} \\
\text { 17. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
\end{array}
$$

Relatively best. 17. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ would leave White with two weak backward Pawns, his QRP and his QBP. Nor would $17 . \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{QB}_{4}$ be satisfactory, for 17 . . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ would leave him the choice only between an isolated QP (if he recaptures on $\mathrm{B}_{4}$, with a piece) or "hanging Pawns" (two Pawns united with each other but isolated from their fellows-a dubious configuration) if he recaptures with the Pawn. The text move robs the black Knight of the use of his $\mathrm{K}_{5}$, to which square it threatened to advance, attacking the QBP.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 17. } . \dot{\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}} & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} \\
\text { 18. } & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{2}
\end{array}
$$



Black is now well placed, in view of the weaknesses in White's Pawn position, particularly the QBP, which can be attacked along the open file. White can easily protect the Pawn, but this implies other drawbacks and dangers inherent in positions in which one's opponent can continually threaten something or other. Experience teaches that in situations like this it is almost impossible for the defending party to find the best moves for ever if the attacker makes the most of his chances.

| 19. $\mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{B I}_{1}$ | KR-BI |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B} \mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K I I}^{2}$ |

The Knight is aiming for $Q_{3}$, from which square it threatens to push on to $\mathrm{QK}_{4}$ or $\mathrm{KB}_{4}$.
21. KR-BI
22. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$

In the book of the tournament, Alekhine-whose excellent notes we are following here-shows that White could have put up a much more stubborn resistance by 22. Kt-B5, followed if necessary by Kt-R4.

$$
\text { 22. } \dot{\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}}
$$

## Q-R4

Here again White should have tried the manœeuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$. The text move, presumably aimed against $23 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$, produces a new weakening in White's Pawn position which is fatal.

Q-Kt3!


This simple move finally wins material as the outcome of a scries of beautiful manœuvres, based mainly on the weaknesses in White's King's side. White's Queen's Knight's Pawn is attacked, and if he protects it then the weaknesses of his QBP. and QP, one backward and the other pinned, are at once made apparent, e.g.-
(a) 24. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ ! 25. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$; winning either the QRP or the QBP;
(b) 24. P-QKt4, P-QR4! $25 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$; 26. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 27. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ !; winning the QP;
(c) $24 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt2}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ (threatening $25 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ !); 25. $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt} 2)-\mathrm{Ktr}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 26. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$ (26. Kt-Q 3 , $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! $27 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times$ QPch, etc.) ; $26 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; again winning the QP.

Capablanca is no combinative player, but operations like this-"executive" combinations (in which an already existing positional advantage is exploited in the most mathematical way)-are his speciality.
24. Kt-Q3

Bogolyubov realizes he must lose a Pawn and gives up all idea of cutting across his opponent's plans. "Better late than never," he at last proceeds to transfer his Knight to $\mathrm{QB}_{5}$ but it is too late to save the game now.
$24 . . . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K t P} ;{ }_{25} . \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{5}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t}_{3}$; 26. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K t 2}$, Q-R2; 27. Q-Kı, P-QKt3; 28. Kt-Q3, R-B5;


Threatening 32. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; but the text move allows Black to crystallize out the position to a pretty win.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 31. } \cdots & \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 32. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} & \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{B I}) \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
\end{array}
$$

White resigns, for $33 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ would lose the Queen (otherwise he is mated). Anything else would lose the QP.

Playing over this game, one gets the involuntary impression that chess is a deadly simple and easy game. This is true, after all-when you know how!

## Second Illustration

The next game is of the same genre, but Queens are exchanged off in the opening, so that we have an unusually good opportunity of admiring Capablanca's skill in the end-game.
E. Kahn
White
J. R. Capablanca Black
(Played in the Moscow tournament, 1936.)
VIENNA GAME

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathbf{Q B} \mathbf{3}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

According to theory, $2 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ is the best move here; but it leads to some most complex variations. Capablanca, never a connoisseur of the opening, prefers a modest line which produces the type of position he likes.

```
3. Kt-B3
    P-Q3
4. Kt-QR4
```

To win the "minor exchange" (Bishop for Knight). The sequel reveals, however, that this advantage is completely discounted by the opening of the QR file for Black.

| 4. $\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| 6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 7. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbb{B}_{\mathbf{3}}!$ |

$7 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ would yield White a clear opening advantage through 8 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KK} \mathrm{t}_{5}$.

```
8. B-KK \(\mathbf{t}_{5}\)
\(\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}\)
9. \(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{Q}\)
```



White has a respectable position, thanks to his two Bishops and his centre Pawn, which ensures for him a little more terrain. Black's task is now, above all, to prevent his opponent's posting his pieces aggressively, and Capablanca is just the man for this.

| 9. . | B-Q2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1.. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K t - K 2}$ |
| II. O-O | $\mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{3}$ |

This little move is important, preventing 12. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, which would now be answered by $12 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$; 13. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ winning a piece. Capablanca thus utilizes the incidental circumstance that his opponent's Bishop on $\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$ is more or less exposed, to post his King's Knight on a better square and prepare to castle, without wasting time with moves like $\ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ or . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{P}-Q R_{3}
$$

The first effect of the open Rook's file. White has to waste a move with his QRP so as to free his QR and KB for action.


```
\(\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}\) \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{3} \text { ! }, ~}^{\text {! }}\)
```

Once again, Capablanca seizes his chances in masterly fashion-chances, for the time being, merely of preventing White from taking the initiative. 14 . . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ ! threatens, after which White would have to say good-bye to his Bishop pair, e.g. I5. Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (still more enterprising is $15 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ), and White must play 16 . B- $Q_{5}$, as 16 . B- $Q_{3}$ would succumb to $16 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, and so on.

Another point of the text move is that $\mathrm{I}_{4} . \mathrm{Kt}_{\mathrm{t}}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ would achieve nothing because of $14 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ !; ${ }^{15}$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; ${ }^{16 .} \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$; 17. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; $18 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$. This last variation illustrates prettily the significance of the factors we have mentioned, the open Rook's file and the exposed position of the white QB .

$$
{ }^{1} 4 . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

Missing the best continuation. He should have played 14. B-BI, posting this piece securely and providing extra protection for his QRP. 14 . . . R-R 5 could then be answered by $1_{5}$. P-QKt3, with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ to follow. The text move only strengthens Black's Pawn position because it brings his QKtP to $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$, where it commands his Q44 $_{4}$, an important centre square.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }_{14} \cdot \dot{\text { 15 }} \\
& { }_{15} . \mathbf{Q Q}_{2}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}
$$

Here again $\mathrm{I}_{5}$. B-BI should have been given the preference.

$$
\mathrm{I}_{5} \ldots \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{5}!
$$

Eradicating one of White's two Bishops ultimately, the reply being forced.

| 16. | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17. | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ |
| 18. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ |$\quad \mathbf{K t - \mathbf { K } _ { 4 }}$

Never lose patience! Capablanca perceives well that his opponent can no longer maintain his pair of

Bishops in any case, and therefore he is in no great hurry to exchange off his well-placed Knight.

$$
\text { 19. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}
$$

One might ask why White does not try to preserve his Bishop by 19. B-K2. The sequel supplies the answer.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I9. . . - } \\
& \text { 20. B-BI }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B I}
$$

A useless move which, however, does not give anything away.

$$
20 . \cdots \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}
$$

Now we see the point of Black's last few moves: White's KB is still exchanged off, but without leaving Bishops on opposite colours.

Black is obviously not playing for a draw.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 21. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} \\
\text { 22. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} &
\end{array}
$$

Improving Black's Pawn position still further; but it is the best of a bad job. The Knight was strongly posted and a continual menace.


Now undoubtedly Black has the better of it. His Pawns command more squares in the central zone, and his Rooks can make more effective use of the open files than White's. In addition, there is the possibility of a break-through on the King's side by . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} \mathrm{t}_{4}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$, whilst White is condemned to passivity. Indeed, his only chance of a break-through is by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$, and this promises little, because his King's Pawn, after the reply . . . KP $\times \mathrm{P}$, would become very weak.

In the next part of the game Capablanca exploits his chances very finely, but his opponent too knows the ropes and makes a good fight of it.

| 23. R-Q3 | P-QKt4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24. $\mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{B}_{2}\right)-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ |
| ${ }_{25}$. K-B2 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ |
| 26. $\mathbf{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ |
| 27. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q r}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ |
| 28. K-Q2 | R-QKtI |

Both players have brought their Kings well into the game. Black has posted his Queen's side Pawns aggressively, preparing to break through on that side.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

Preventing $29 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 30. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ through the concealed threat to the hinder black QBP.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 29. } . \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{4} \\
\text { 30. } & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}
\end{array}
$$

Black sees that he can achieve nothing decisive on the Queen's side, so prepares for the break-through by
... P-KKt5, the most logical plan under the circumstances.

$$
\text { 3 }{ }^{\text {I. }} \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{R I}
$$

A good move. 32. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ ! threatens, after which Black would have either to remain with a weak Pawn on the Rook's file ( $32 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ or $33 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ) or to concede his opponent a strong passed Pawn on the same file (32. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK}_{5}$; 33. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 34 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ ).

| 31. $-\dot{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | R-Q |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3^{2} . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{C h}$ |  |
| R-KtI |  |

Preventing the advance $33 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$, which would be countered by 33 . . P-KKt ${ }_{5}$, to Black's benefit, since 34. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ can now be answered by $34 \cdots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 33. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}} \\
\text { 34. } \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{R I})-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{I}
\end{array}
$$

Black could try a break-through with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ and P-Q4, were this Rook to remain on the KR file.

$$
\text { 34. } \cdot \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K}_{\mathbf{t} 5}
$$

The break-through succeeds, and the game now becomes critical, one of Black's Rooks filtering right through into White's position.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 35. } \begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 36. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}
\end{array} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

Not 36. R-KRi, because of $36 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Pch}$; 37 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (If $37 . K \times P$, then $37 \ldots R-K B 1 c h$; $38 . K-K_{3}$,
$R-K B_{5}$, winning the King's Pawn) $37 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch}$; and the Rooks become fatally effective.
36. . .
$\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{KRI}_{\mathbf{I}}$ !
$36 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 37. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$; 38. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ would achieve nothing at all. Now White cannot capture the KtP because of $37 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Ktı}$, leaving White helpless against $. . . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ with $\ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$ to follow. Black has made real progress with his last few moves, having gained the open Rook's file for his Rook. All the same, White is not yet lost.

$$
\text { 37. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}^{3} \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{7}
$$

White's KKtP is far more important than Black's QKtP. $37 \ldots$. . P-B3 would give White ample counterplay by $38 . \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$.

$$
\text { 38. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{2} \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}!
$$

Now White may neither exchange Rooks himself nor allow Black to do so. The text move enables Black to protect his QKtP without having to reckon with an attack on his QP.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 39. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{2} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} \\
\text { 4o. R-B3 } & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t} 6}
\end{array}
$$

By sound manœuvring Capablanca has systematically strengthened his position and now threatens to gain a decisive advantage by 4 I $\ldots$ R-R8. But momentarily his KKtP is weak, a circumstance which (as Capablanca himself pointed out later) gives White a chance to save the game by 4 I. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ ! This threatens
42. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, winning the KKtP , and Black would therefore have to wind up the game summarily as follows: 4I. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ ! $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KR}_{5}$; 42. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{5}\right) \times \mathrm{Pch} ; 43$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{R}_{5}\right)-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 44 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 45 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 46. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{2}\right), \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Pch}$; 47. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{7}$; 48. K-Kt3! (so as to prevent $48 \ldots R-R 6 c h$ followed by ... $R \times R) ; 4^{8} \ldots \mathrm{R}$ anywhere; 49. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$. Drawn game.

Having missed this one chance, White is definitely lost. . . .


For the white King never gets another opportunity to attack Black's KKtP.

$$
\text { 42. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

Too late; this only hastens the end now.

```
42. . . -
43. P-B5
```

Or $43 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$, and the King's Pawn will soon go.

| 43. $-\cdots$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| 45. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c h}$ |
| P | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}!$ |

Gaining material. He threatens to exchange on his $\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and capture on $\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ or, alternatively, to play $46 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$ and $47 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$.

$$
\text { 46. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5} \mathbf{c h}
$$

$46 \ldots$ R-QR8 was another winning line.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 47. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
& \text { 4. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t P} \times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c h}
$$

One last fling. White gambles on $48 \ldots \mathrm{R}$ - B8; 49. R-R2, followed by the advance of the passed Rook's Pawn. Not 48. K-B2, P-Q5; or 48 . K-Q2, R-QR8.
48. . . .

R-QR8!
Banishing all hope for White.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 49. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} \\
& \text { 50. } \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Or $50 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ and White is at a loss for moves (5I. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ ).

| 50. $\dot{\text { 5 } . ~}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ ! |

Black must not let the Pawn reach Kt5 supported.
52. P-Kt4, R-KR8ch; 53. K-Kt3, P-Q $\mathbf{5}$; 54. R-QR2, P-Q6; 55. K-Kt2, R-K8; 56. K-B2, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} ;{ }_{57} . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ and resigns, for he must lose both his remaining Pawns by $57 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$; $5^{8}$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{3}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{4}$.

An excellent game, highly characteristic of the winner's play.

## Third Illustration

The last two games revealed Capablanca as a positional player, firstly in the middle-game, secondly in the end-game. Here is a game in which he employed his positional advantage to build up slowly a decisive King's side attack.
J. R. Capablanca White
Dr. E. Lasker Black
(The eleventh world's championship match game, Havana, 192 i.)

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;{ }_{2} \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ;$ 3. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B} 4$,
 6. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O} ; 7 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{r}}$; 8. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$; 9. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 3, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; iо. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B P}, \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;$ iл. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$.

Illustrating Lasker's preference for complicated positions. II . . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ would have been better, to continue, after 12. O-O, with $12 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 13. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$. Black chooses a line in which he experiences great difficulty in developing his Bishop..

| 12. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathrm{Br}_{\mathbf{I}}}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 13. KR-QI | B-Q2 |
| 14. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$ | Kt-QKt3 |
| I5. B-BI |  |

Most players would have continued 15 . B-Q3, ${ }^{1} 5$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$, or ${ }^{15}$. B-K2 here. Capablanca has seen well that there is no better square for the Bishop than BI, where, incidentally, it waits patiently for 22 moves
before advancing into the battle. On any other square it would have impeded the other white pieces.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 15. . . . } \\
& \text { R-BI } \\
& \text { 16. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K t}_{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Stopping . . . P-QB4. This move would not have been playable had the Bishop retired to $\mathrm{K}_{3}$.

| 16. | B-KI |
| :---: | :---: |
| 17. Q-Kt3 | $\mathbf{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ |
| 18. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ |  |

Before playing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, White dislodges the Knight from his Kt6 so as to prevent its moving straight to Q4.

| 18.. $\mathbf{M}_{5}$ | $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t - K} \mathbf{t}_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ |
| 20. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{K t - \mathbf { Q } _ { 2 }}$ |

An advance whose consequences are very difficult to assess. Capablanca demonstrates that giving up control of his $\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ does little harm.

| 20. . | P-Kt3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢1. $\mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{K}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{KtI}$ |



As Capablanca remarks, this position is extremely interesting. Black threatens two things, mainly 22 ... $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$. The best way of maintaining the pressure against Black's position would now have been 22. Q-R3. White's next move enables Black to post a Knight on his $Q_{4}$; an operation, however, of little significance.

| 22. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{Q}^{6}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| 24. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |

Forcing White to exchange off Black's Bishop, which was threatening to come into good play via Kt 3 or $\mathrm{R}_{4}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 25. } \mathbf{K} t \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \\
\text { 26. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{K K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{array}
$$

Giving White more trouble than $26 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{2}\right) \times \mathrm{P}$ which would have allowed him easily to strengthen his position through his command of $\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and the weakness of Black's $\mathrm{K}_{3}$. Lasker makes the most of his difficult position, but does not succeed in equalizing.

$$
\text { 27. } \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}
$$



Capablanca's remark here is typical: "White's exposed King's position invites an attack but, before embarking on this, White must exchange off his Queen's side Pawns to avoid possible subsequent weaknesses."
This is real Capablanca: he wants a clear position and would not think of starting to attack as long as his opponent has any sort of counter-chance. The question whether White's attack will be ultimately decisive or not is of less moment. The great thing is that he should be completely master of the situation.
27. . . .
$\mathbf{R}\left(K_{t I}\right)-\mathbf{B r}_{1}$
Black can hardly interfere with his opponent's plan. If he plays $27 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, then he is saddled, after 28. $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 29. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, for instance, with a bad weakness on his $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$.

| 28. $\mathbf{K} t \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 30. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

White has now attained his end; he has no longer anything to worry about on the Queen's side and can concentrate on the King's side attack. The passed black QKtP is harmless here, since Black cannot support its advance.

## 3 1. R-KI

3I. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$ would also have been good.

| 31 | Q-QBI |
| :---: | :---: |
| 32. Kt-Q2 | Kt-Br |
| 33. Kt-K4 | Q-Qi |
| 34. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$ ! |  |



With his last four moves, White has built up a splendid attacking position. Nothing is directly threatened as yet, but one gets a feeling that a position so full of weaknesses as Black's here, with no prospect of rendering the King safer by exchange of Queens, must be untenable in the long run. According to Capablanca, Black should now have made an effort to save the game by $34 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$, followed by . . P-B4; but this does not seem to me to offer much hope. If $34 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ at once, $35 \cdot \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; 36. Kt-Kt5, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; 37. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ puts White well on top.

$$
\text { 34. . . } \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{2}
$$

After this, Black is definitely lost, though the win for White is anything but easy.

$$
\text { 35. Q-QK } \mathbf{t}_{3}
$$

Threatening 36. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, which in turn threatens 37. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 38 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 39 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Pch}$; and $40 . K t \times Q$, winning two Pawns.

```
35. . . .
36. P-Kt3
37. B-B4
```


## R-KKt2

```
R-R2
```

With the same threat.

```
37. . . .
38. Kt-B3
R-R4
```

Among the perils confronting Black now is 39 . $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; 40. R-Kti winning a Pawn. Black is consequently forced to exchange on his B 6 , a process which reveals the weaknesses of his position in a still clearer light.


Here begins the final phase in which White attacks the black King directly at last.

| 39. | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ | Q-Q3 |
| 41. Q-K ${ }_{4}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ |

7-(G.226)

4I ...R-R2 could have been answered by 42. P-Q ${ }_{5}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; 43. B-Br, with $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ to follow. Now the invasion of the white Queen decides the issue.

| 42. Q-Kt7ch | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K t r}_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 43. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B} 8$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t}_{5}$ |
| 44. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B I}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |

There is nothing better. 44 . . Q-R6 would have been refuted, as Capablanca shows, by 45 . B- $Q_{3}$ ch, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}(45 \ldots Q \times B$; then $46 . Q-K 8 \mathrm{ch}$, and $47 . Q \times R$; or $45 \cdots K-R_{3} ; 46 . R-B 7$, threatening $47 . Q \times$ Ktch and mate); 46. Q-K8ch, K-R3; 47. R-Kı, R-Ri; 48. $\mathrm{R} \times$ Pch, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 49. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Ktch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; 50. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$ with mate in a few moves.

| 45. B-Q3ch | K-R3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 46. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{7}$ | R-R8ch |
| 47. K-Kt2 | Q-Q3 |
| 48. $\mathbf{Q} \times$ Ktch! |  |

Black resigns, for he is mated in two moves.
This game too is most typical of Capablanca, for it shows how, even when conducting a King's side attack, he insists on getting a clear position.

## Fourth Illustration

Up to now, we have seen only positional games by Capablanca even though the last ended in a King's side attack. So-called "attacking games," in which a player goes, more or less riskily, for an attack from the very opening moves, are not in Capablanca's line. That he can also handle this sort of game excellently
too, if the occasion demands it, the following example shows.

## J. R. Capablanca White <br> V. V. Ragozin <br> Black

(Played in the Moscow tournament, 1935.)

## NIEMTSOVITCH-INDIAN DEFENCE

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{5}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R} \mathbf{H}_{3}$ |  |

The Sämisch variation, a vigorous line whose merits and demerits are difficult to assess and which Capablanca employs here because he happened to be standing none too well in the list. White gains the "minor exchange" at the expense of a doubled Pawn. In order to deny Black the chance to exploit the doubled Pawn, White must play energetically for attack, and experience shows that he has fair chances. Not a variation in Capablanca's normal style: he dislikes having to assume obligations in the opening.
4. . -
B $\times$ Ktch
5. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$
P-Q3

5 . . P- $\mathrm{B}_{4}$ is considered best.

| 6. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| 7. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$ |
| 8. | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 3$ |

But now 8 . . . Kt-B3 would be stronger. Black
must try to provoke the advance $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ without obstructing his $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ square with one of his own Pawns.
9. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$
Kt-QB3
10. P-Q5
Kt-K2
io . . . Kt-QR 4 followed by . . . P-QKt3 and . . . B-R $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ would have been stronger.

$$
\text { II. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3} \quad \text { Kt- } \mathbf{Q}_{2}
$$

II . . Kt-Ki, threatening 12 . . . P-B4, would have been much superior. White could not prevent this last move by $12 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$, because of $12 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$ ! gaining full control for Black of his $\mathrm{KB}_{5}$, an important square. So White would have had to continue with 12. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$, which seriously diminishes his prospects of carrying out a pawn-storm on the King's side.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K R}_{4} \text { ! }
$$

Since there is no threat of . . . P-KB4 , White is in no hurry over $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$, but first seizes control of $\mathrm{KR}_{4}$. 12. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$ at once would have been unsatisfactory, because of 12 . . Kt-KKt3. Now, however, 12 . .

$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$ can be comfortably countered by 13. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ ( $13 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$; $14 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ threatening $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$ ).

| 12. | $\mathbf{K t - Q K t 3}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 13. P-Kt4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ ? |

This should have been avoided at all costs, for it ets White open a file for his Rooks on the King's lwing with ease. $13 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ was indicated; for instance $1_{4} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$, followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ and P-QKt4. This would have offered some counterchances, although White's King's side attack would be more dangerous than Black's counter-measures on the opposite wing, anyway.

## 14. Kt-Kt3 <br> K-B2

The black King takes to flight, for his position at Kti was untenable.

$$
{ }_{15} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{5} \text { ! }
$$

Demonstrating the badness of I3 ... P-B3 ? ${ }_{15} \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ would now be followed by $16 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, and the black King could not return to Kti (desirable in itself, since Black has now an open KB file for his Rook) because of ${ }_{17}$. Q-KR2 winning the KRP.

```
I5. . . .
16. P-B
```

Kt-Kti

Permissible because of the insecure situation of the black King. After $16 \ldots \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 17. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ the game would be opened up without Black's being given any opportunity to make use of his good square $\mathrm{K}_{4}$.

```
I6. . . .
17. P-B5!
```

$\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K I}$


A position so curious that it deserves a diagram. It is a remarkable thing that White should have gained a decisive positional advantage after but seventeen moves of this keenly attacking game, although his King's side attack has come temporarily to a full stop.
${ }_{17} \ldots$. . Q-K2; 18. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K K t 2}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q r}$; 19. Kt-R $\mathbf{5}$, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{2} ;{ }_{2}$ 20. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ;$ 21. Kt-Kt7, $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 2 ; 22$. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ !

To protect his Knight at its outpost and keep Black occupied with the threat of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ for as long as possible. If Black were to advance his KRP, he would soon lose it.

| 22. | QR-BI |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23. | QR-BI |
| K-KtI |  |

Black has virtually castled twice over; this time on the Queen's wing. His King is safe for the time being, but there is no chance whatever of any counterplay for him. He cannot attack White's weakened Queen's side by . . . P-Kt4 without running risks through exposing his own King.
 K-R1; 27. B-R $\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{R - K _ { 2 }}$; 28. Q QR2, Q-Q1; 29. B-Q2, Kt-R $\mathbf{R}_{5}$; 30. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t}_{3}, \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{K t}_{3}$.

After $30 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kti}$ (planning $3 \mathrm{I} \ldots P-$ Kt 4 ) 3 I . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ would decide the game prettily. There is threatened not only $32 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$, but also $32 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $33 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7$ mate. $3^{\mathrm{I}} \ldots \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would be no defence, because of $32 . \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; 33. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ and wins. $31 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ fails in face of $32 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and the only remaining move $31 \ldots Q-K t_{3}$ is smashed by 32. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ! $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ (forced); 33. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{2}$; 34. Kt-Ktsch. Black must now leave his QP to its fate since $34 \cdots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 35 \cdot \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ leaves an unanswerable threat of gaining a piece by 36 . B-Qi. The fact that, in two different variations, each of his Knights is stalemated and caught, reveals remarkably how helpless Black is.
31. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$ !


With this beautiful tactical finesse White returns to direct attack. He threatens to win a piece by $32 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$, and the Pawn is inviolate: $31 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$ ? 32. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 2$
(threatening 33. $R \times K t$; if $32 \cdots Q-Q_{2}, 33 . R \times K t$, $P \times R$; 34. $B-Q_{\mathrm{I}}$ and wins) $32 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2} ; 33 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (forced); 34. $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}$ and there is nothing to be done against $35 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 31. } . \overbrace{\mathbf{R}} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K t r} \\
\text { 32. } & \mathbf{K t - B \mathbf { R }}
\end{array}
$$

Or $32 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$; 33. Kt-K6, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (33 ... $Q \times P$; 34. $R \times K t) ; 34 . Q P \times \mathrm{B}$ and the simultaneous threats of $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{7}$ decide the issue.
33. Q-R2, Q-BI; 34. B-K 3, P-Kt3; 35. P-R6, Q-Qı; 36. K-Q2, Q-Bi ; 37.R-QKt2, Q-Qi.

The Queen's shuffling repetitions are revealing. Black can do nothing but await the inevitable end.
38. Q-Ktr

Intending 39. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KBI}$ followed by 4 . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 4 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B}$; and $42 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$.

$$
\text { 38. . . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

Fighting desperately for manœuvring room.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 39. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{3}} \\
\text { 4o. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}}
\end{array}
$$

To prevent $4^{1} \ldots \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{Q}} \mathrm{B}_{4}$.

| 4I. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4$^{2} . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K B I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ |
| 43. $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2})-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2}$ |  |

Again threatening a decision by 44. Kt-K6. We now see how superb was Capablanca's judgment when
he left his Knight at KKt 7 and went to protect it with a Pawn, instead of playing it to K6 immediately.

| 43. .-. | $\mathbf{Q - K t I}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44. Q-Kt4 | R-Qr |
| 45. R-Kt3 | $\mathbf{R - K B I}$ |
| 46. Kt-K6 |  |

At last! And now it is crushing. Black must capture.

| 46. $. \dot{\mathbf{P}} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 47. | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B} \mathbf{2}$ |

So as to answer $48 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ with $4^{8} \ldots \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{B}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{Br}$.

$$
\text { 48. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}
$$

Or $4^{8} \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Qr} ; 49 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{I}), \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 5^{0}$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, etc.

$$
\text { 49. R-Qr } \quad \text { Resigns }
$$

Although the initial construction of this game was hardly in Capablanca's usual style, it was not long before he was sailing in familiar waters. The leisurely way in which he pushed home his advantage, without permitting his opponent a shadow of counterplay, is typical of Capablanca. The positions remain crystalclear; from the brilliant combinations everything is excluded that cannot be kept under strict control.

## Fifth Illustration

We shall conclude with a game which reveals that Capablanca can also produce brilliant combinations, when they can be calculated out to the very end. Many other masters combine less exactly. They trust
to general judgment of positions; sacrifice, for instance, without going any too decply into the consequences. Capablanca does not trust-he calculates out. His extraordinary experience avails him well here: he works out a long combination in a flash, and can thus apply mathematical methods much more deeply than other masters. This is not to say that he does not occasionally make a move whose consequences are not exactly calculated; but this occurs rarely indeed.

## J. R. Capablanca <br> N. N. <br> White <br> Black

## STONEWALL DEFENCE

(Played in Havana, 1912.)

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;{ }_{2} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3} ; 3 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}$; 4. Kt-KB3, B-Q $\mathbf{K}_{3}$; 5. $\mathbf{Q K t - Q _ { 2 } , ~ P - \mathbf { K B } _ { 4 } ; ~ 6 . ~} \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$, $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3} ;{ }_{7} \cdot \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} \mathbf{t}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{KR}_{\mathbf{3}}$.

The Stonewall opening is not particularly unfavourable for Black as long as he developes his Knights on $Q_{2}$ and $K B_{3}$, his $K B$ on $K_{2}$, and his Queen, perhaps, on KI. The way in which he handles it here is not so good.
6. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$
9. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$
เо. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$

Threatening in. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{4}$ (II ... $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 12 . $\mathrm{B} \times$ Pch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$; iз. $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ ).

Now he can reply to in. P-KKt4 by either II . . . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ or II $\ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$.

```
II. O-O-O
```

White, who already has the better of it, is aiming for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{4}$ at the earliest possible moment, e.g. after 12. $Q R-K t i$.

$$
\text { I I. . . . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4} \text { ? }
$$

Black has a terrible game, but this practically loses by force at once.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 12. } \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 13. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 14. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}!! &
\end{array}
$$



Introducing a deeply calculated combination, based on all kinds of mating threats along the long diagonal. A series of surprises follows.

$$
14 \cdots \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

Black has no good choice. If 14 . . . Kt $\times$ Bch; 15. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; 16. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; and then 17. Q-Q4 finishes the game. Black might have put up a better resistance with $14 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{R}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{B}_{2}$, for instance $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $16 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{B}_{3}$ ( 17 . $B-B_{4}, P \times B$; 18. $K t \times K t, Q-B_{3}$ ); though he would still be positionally lost in view of his weak Queen's Pawn and White's two fine Bishops. Incidentally, not through I7. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ because of $17 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Bch}$; but through ${ }_{17} . \mathrm{B}^{2}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ or possibly ${ }_{17}$. B-Kt5!

$$
{ }^{15} . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q B P c h} \quad \mathbf{K t}\left(\mathbf{R}_{3}\right)-\mathbf{B}_{2}
$$

Forced, for otherwise $16 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ is still more deadly.

$$
\text { 16. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} \text { ! }
$$

The natural continuation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 16. } . . \mathrm{K} \mathbf{K} \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} \\
& \text { 17. } \times \mathbf{K}
\end{aligned}
$$

White has not sacrificed so much after all-only the exchange, and it has yielded him an attack. The combination extends much farther, however.

$$
17 \cdots \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{3}
$$

Forced.

$$
\text { 18. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q I}_{\mathbf{I}} \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}
$$

The Queen must continue to guard the Bishop. If she goes to $\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathrm{t}}$, then White would win by 19. Kt-Q7 followed by $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$.
19. R-Q7!!


The point of the whole magnificent combination. Black must take the Rook, as 19... Q-KI is refuted by $20 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, threatening mate.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 19. } \cdots \quad B \times \mathbf{R} \\
& \text { 20. } \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

The main threat now is 2 I. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, which would win at once after, say, $20 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. The other threat is 21 . Kt-B6ch, mating or winning the Queen. (21 . . . K-Kt2; 22. Kt-Kt4dis ch, K-KtI; 23. Kt-R6 mate).
20. . . .

## KR-Br

Black's only hope of continuing the game-but it only serves to reveal the third link in White's combination.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 21. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} \\
\text { 22. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} &
\end{array}
$$

Black resigns, finding that $22 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ would lose the Queen by 23. Q-R8ch, K-B2; 24. Q-Kt7ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ (24...K-KI; 25. Kt-B6ch) ; 25. Kt-B8ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{3} ; 26 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$; and that $22 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ would lose a piece by $23 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{2} ; 24 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$; and 25. $Q \times R$.

Such an achievement in the realm of combinative chess can only be described as superb.

After all I have written about Capablanca, perhaps you wonder how he ever came to lose his invincibility.

To my mind, this is the explanation: he perceives and calculates with incredible speed, but he became so accustomed to this that his ability to investigate a position with thoroughness diminished. "What he doesn't see at once, he doesn't see at all," a critic said once, and although this may have been said in jest, it has certainly a kernel of truth. Capablanca plays very superficially sometimes, in a way that can only be ascribed to lack of concentration. This is an integral weakness of his make-up and can only be partially compensated by his employing his time allowance to the full. But this leads to time-trouble and thence to other dangers, so that this inspired and speedy thinker is gradually involved in a vicious circle-superficiality, blunders in time-trouble, superficiality. . . . Now and then he succeeds in releasing himself from this vicious circle, and then he shows his old invincibility once again.

Playing for Cuba in the International Team Tournament at Buenos Aires, he had the satisfaction of making a better score than any other top-board playerincluding Alekhine and Keres. That was to be his swan-song. He appeared in no more leading events, and at New York on 7th March, 1942, at the early age of fifty-five, he succumbed within a matter of minutes to a cerebral hæmorrhage. His body was conveyed to Cuba where under the aegis of the President of the Republic, Cuba's "good-will delegate to the world" was given a funeral with full military honours.

## CHAPTER IV

## SALO FLOHR

Salo Flohr was born on the 21 st of November, 1908, at Horodenka in Russian Poland. About 1916 he came to Bohemia as an orphan refugee of the war, and this country adopted him as its own; a few years later he became a naturalized Czech. As a result of Germany's annexation of Czechoslovakia, he is now a refugee once again.
He grew up in the neighbourhood of Beneschau and settled down subsequently in neighbouring Prague. Various efforts to find a "civil" profession for him failed, but he gradually acquired a big reputation as a chess player in Prague circles. He learnt in a hard school, being condemned for many years to playing "skittle" games in small cafés for money stakes. To an even greater degree than in the case of Capablanca skittles formed the foundation of his play.

In 1928 he watched a big international tournament for the first time. It was at Kissingen, where a Czech chess journalist had brought him as an assistant. Few of the competitors in this tournament will recollect Flohr's presence, for the quiet little man kept very much to the background. However, it often happened that when the masters were analysing some game, this same quiet little man would come up and suggest a move which would make the great ones think. A few weeks later a big tournament was held at Berlin; again Flohr was present as an assistant journalist, but this time he was no longer unknown. In the Café König, where the tournament was held, there was
another room in which chess players regularly assembled. Every day, after lunch, a busy chess life developed, which only petered out, after strenuous struggles with the waiters, at about 3 a.m. Mainly skittles were played, for money stakes. Here was something just to Flohr's taste! He came, he saw, he conquered; and within a few days everybody in the place, not excepting three or four of the competing masters, was in his debt. He was well known to all the masters by now, but another year elapsed before the international public got to know of him.

After gloriously vindicating his private reputation in the Carlsbad tournament of 1929 , he was invited to take part in the international tournament at RogaskaSlatina held towards the end of the year. Here he won second prize behind Rubinstein and quickly gained the international limelight.

He did not score a really crashing success in the international field for some time. For instance, he could only finish equal third with Rellstab and Rejfir in the reserve tournament at Hastings in 1929-30. In the international team tournament at Hamburg in 1930 he scored a very promising result, being fourth with ${ }^{1} 4 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of 17 ( 85 per cent) on the list of best individual achievements. In the Christmas congress at Hastings which followed, he topped the Premier Reserves with eight points out of nine. A year later (1931-2), he won the Premier section with the same score. Notable also was his good result in the team tournament at Prague in 1931. In the biggest tournament of the year (Bled, 1931) he did little, however, tying for fourth place with Kashdan, Stoltz, and


Salo Flohr
One of the ablest of the younger grand masters

Vidmar whilst against the three leading prizewinners, Alekhine, Bogolyubov, and Niemtsovitch, he could only score half a point out of six games.

As he gained more and more experience in the routine of international master play his results improved and became more consistent, and since 1932 he has registered one success after another. For instance, second prize at London (Alekhine first); equal first with Vidmar in the strong tournament at Sliac, and equal second with Euwe in Bern, behind Alekhine again. A match against Euwe finished in a tie, each player winning three games with ten drawn. In the master tournament at Hastings (1932-3) he "naturally" won first prize again, and he played brilliantly for his country in the team tournament of Folkestone (1933). He participated in a number of smaller tournaments; for instance, at Scheveningen, where he won first prize; in Hastings (1933-4) we see him once again at the top of the list, with seven points out of nine; at Zurich (1934) he came, just as at Berne, equal second with Euwe behind Alekhine. In the latter part of 1933 he had been playing an interesting match at Moscow and Leningrad against Botvinnik, which ended in a draw at two wins each, with eight draws. Then again in the Hastings Christmas tournament of $1934-5$ he tied for first place with Sir George Thomas and Euwe, in front of Capablanca, Botvinnik, and Lilienthal. Striking was his success at Moscow in 1935, where he tied for first prize with Botvinnik in front of Capablanca, Lasker, and a batch of other stars. It gradually became impossible to broach the subject "world championship" without Flohr coming tomind. Curiously
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enough, as his reputation went forward, his playing standard seemed to go back. At Christmas in Hastings (1935-6) he had to satisfy himself with second place behind the American Fine. It is true that he won the Easter tournament at Margate in 1936 in front of Capablanca, but the ensuing tournament of the élite at Moscow was a big disillusionment. He was only third, a long way behind the first two prizewinners (Capablanca 13, Botvinnik 12, Flohr 92). From this blow he re-established himself at Podebrady, where he finished first above Alekhine; but in a top-rank tournament at Nottingham in 1936 he experienced another severe check. His $8 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of a possible 14 only earned him seventh place, equal with Lasker. It is only fair to add that he had a lot of bad luck in this tournament, giving away two and a half points to weaker opponents when he had built up overwhelming if not winning advantages. It is very curious that he should have lost, in the course of 1936, more tournament games than in the three previous years put together. One hardly knows how to explain this. All that is certain is that his opponents were not playing unusually well, but that he himself did not seem quite able, on these important occasions, to rise to his best.

His reputation as a candidate for the world's championship grew, and indecd it was soon given an official standing. The summer of 1937 found Flohr playing in the big Kemeri tournament, where he finished in a triple tie for first place with Reshevsky and Petrov, leaving other grand masters such as Alekhine, Fine, and Keres behind. A few weeks later came the International Team Tournament at Stockholm, and at the meeting
of the International Chess Federation held there he was elected official candidate for the world's championship. Soon after, however, there came yet another disappointing result: in the tournament at SemmeringBaden advertised by the organizers as a "tournament for world championship candidates," he failed to vindicate his front-rank position. Out of the eight participants, he was fifth only (Keres 9, Fine 8, Capablanca and Reshevsky $7 \frac{1}{2}$ each, Flohr 7 , Eliskases and Ragosin each 6, Petrov 5). Nor did he succeed in adding another to his series of first prizes in the next Christmas tournament at Hastings, Reshevsky being first with 7 points, Alexander and Keres equal second with $6 \frac{1}{2}$, and only then Flohr equal with Fine at 6 points.

Meanwhile the arrangements for his world championship match with Alekhine were going through, when suddenly the German annexation of Czechoslovakia ended everything. It must have been a sad blow, and might go to explain his bad showing in the A.V.R.O. tournament; but we must also recall that he has never scored great successes against his fellow grand masters. His speciality is beating masters who are not quite in the very top rank, and in this he is supreme. Even when scoring his greatest successes his record has been, almost monotonously, a series of wins against lower players but draws against fellow grand masters. Out of the 59 tournament games in which he has encountered the other masters who form the subject of this book, he has won but two! Thus it was hardly surprising, when he went on to the Leningrad-Moscow tournament a few weeks later, that he staged a "come-back," finishing first, above

Reshevsky and Keres, but in a field lacking any other grand master of their stamp.
Flohr has acquired Soviet citizenship during the last few years, but has played little first-class chess and his results have not been impressive.

## HOW FLOHR PLAYS

## First Illustration

The game below shows that Flohr's style had already shaped itself when he first emerged into the international limelight.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { S. Flohr } & \text { E. Canal } \\
\text { White } & \text { Black }
\end{array}
$$

(Played in the tournament at Rogaska-Slatina, 1929.)

## RUY LOPEZ

## 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$

Flohr likes close, or nearly close, positions, so generally avoids the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ openings. As White he normally plays i. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}, \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, or $1 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$; and as Black he answers $1 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ by $1 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}, \mathrm{I} \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, I $\ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$, or $\mathrm{I} \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$. (He has lately taken to $\mathrm{I} . . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, and admitted in one article that he had handicapped himself to some extent through his limited opening repertoire.) If he opens with $1 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, it is a mere formality, for even then he manages to block the game more or less.

| 1. . . | P-K4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ |
| 3. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ |
| 4. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ | Kt - $\mathbf{B}_{3}$ |
| 5. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |  |

An out-of-the-way ramification of the exchange variation of the Ruy Lopez ( $4 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ). White exchanges only after having lost a move through 4 . B-R 4 . At first sight this appears very illogical, but in reality it is based on a well-considered plan. In the exchange variation (4. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B})_{5 .} \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 6 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 7 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ is considered the strongest continuation: but this is not to Flohr's taste, because the position is too open, and because Black is left with the two Bishops for Bishop and Knight. This latter is a factor on which Flohr sets a very high valuation-he would rather play the exchange variation (that is to say, the normal line $4 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ) as Black than as White.

All this does not explain the text move. Flohr knows, of course, that the Bishops are less effective in a closed position than in an open, and therefore would not permit himself to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ or his opponent to play . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ in this opening, these being the very moves which would open up the position. If White, in the normal variation 4. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}$, keeps the position closed by $5 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ (or $5 \ldots$ $\left.\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)$; 6. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$, Black by $6 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ and an early . . P- KB 4 can ensure that his Bishops come into their own. Now, however, Black has already played . . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$, so that the advance . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ will be difficult to negotiate. Flohr has thus a reason for going over into the exchange variation, once it is certain that the position will remain, at any rate temporarily, closed.

It is worthy of note that this adapted exchange variation of Flohr's devising came into general use only five years afterwards, when Alekhine employed
it successfully in the sixteenth game of his match with Bogolyubov in 1934.

| 5. . | $\mathbf{Q P} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6. $\mathbf{K t - B} \mathbf{3}$ | B-QKt5 |
| 7. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} 3$ | Q-K2 |
| 8. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ |
| 9. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | B $\times$ Bch |

This move, by which Black relinquishes the advantage of his Bishops without a struggle, is inferior. Better 9 . . B-Q3 followed by . . . P-B4.

$$
\text { io. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbb{B}
$$

Threatening to win a Pawn by ir. Q-B3.
Io. . . .
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
го . . . B-Kt 5 would have been better.

$$
\text { if. } \mathbb{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}
$$

Forestalling . . . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$ once for all.

$$
\text { II. . . . } \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{I}}
$$

Again missing the best line, 11 . . . P-B44.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{5} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

12 . . . P-QB4 was still the best.
${ }_{13}$. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} t_{4}$ !
Yielding White a clear positional advantage. Black's counter-thrust . . . P-QB4 is now prevented, so that White has a free hand in the centre. At the same time the fixing of Black's QRP and QBP on their third rank

carries with it the permanent danger of a breakthrough by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{5}$ (preceded by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$, of course). Moves like this, which aim mainly at limiting the mobility of the opposing pieces, are characteristic of Flohr. It is to be noted that, after the text move, White has difficulty in bringing his Queen back into play. Flohr has seen clearly that he can safely permit himself to lose a little time in this position, as his opponent has no opportunity of opening up the game.

| 13. $\cdots$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K t I}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14. $\mathbf{K t - \mathbf { Q } _ { 2 }}$ | $\mathbf{K t - \mathbf { Q } _ { 3 }}$ |
| 15. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$ | $\mathbf{K t - B I}$ |
| 16. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |  |

Exchanging Queens would equalize the game completely.

```
I6. . . .
B-K3
17. P-QR4
```

18. P-Kt5, which Black cannot afford to allow, is threatened already.

$$
\text { 17. } \dot{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}!}
$$

$\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R 2}_{2}$

Strengthening his position in the centre. The ensuing exchange is practically forced.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 18. } . \mathbf{P} \\
& \text { 19. } \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Note how the preventive move 13. P-QKt4 linked up with the attacking move $18 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ to eliminate all control of White's important $\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ square by a black Pawn.
19. . . . B-B2

The more enterprising 19 . . P-KB4 was to be considered, especially as $20 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 21. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ would be far too risky for White; but it would not have attained much because of $20 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, for instance 20 ... $K R-K_{I} ; 2$ I. $Q \times B, Q \times Q ;$ 22. $K t \times Q$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 23 . \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 24 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, after which White would have the better of it through his command of the open KB file.

$$
\text { 20. } \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}
$$

Flohr knows little theory; he relies on experience in the main, so judges every position on its merits. This is often shown in his attitude towards castling. He does not stick to the general principle of castling as early as possible, but investigates impartially and disinterestedly whether or not it is the right move, with the result that he often gives right of way to all sorts of manœuvres before "bringing his King into safety." Only a tactician tried and tested, and immune from imaginary dangers, could attempt strategy like this.

```
20. . . .
R-Q2
```



Now White has suddenly obtained an excellent attacking position; the decisive break-through $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ is already on the way. Truly amazing-for White has not played for attack at all! He has chosen a particularly peaceful variation, sacrificed nothing, and not even gone for speedy development; on the contrary, the mobilization of his pieces has proceeded with almost painful slowness. A critic imbued with classical notions of attacking play would undoubtedly disapprove of his conduct of the game; he would perhaps attempt to explain the paradox of White's obtaining the better position by some mistake on Black's part. Such a diagnosis could not content a player with modern conceptions of strategy. Between classical and modern there is here an essential difference. Formerly, people chose to employ moves aiming directly at the goal, but this method is too simple to offer real chances of success nowadays. To-day we try to camouflage our intentions as much as possible. The more we succeed in this, the more correct the strategy. It is just in this, the art of tacking about to reach one's destination, that Flohr excels. He employs moves,
ostensibly quite harmless, threatening nothing, wasting time even, but in reality serving unobservedly and very gradually to create the opportunity for taking the initiative. In this game these tactics come to marvellous fruition. Admittedly Black has made one or two slightly inferior moves, but they were certainly not real mistakes.
2I. . . .

$$
Q-\mathbf{K}_{4}
$$

By forking the white Queen and Knight, Black forces the exchange of Queens, certainly a sensible decision in view of the menacing disposition of White's pieces. As the sequel shows, however, this move has its drawbacks.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 22. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \\
& \text { 23. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}
$$



In this position White has a lot of small advantages. Firstly, the black Pawn skeleton shows weaknesses: the "doubleton" on the Bishop's file and the "singleton'" on the King's. Secondly, the white pieces are
the more effectively posted-this too as a consequence of the Pawn situation.

In the sequel, Flohr demonstrates how excellently he can exploit such small advantages.

| 23. $\cdot$. | R-KI |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24. K-B2 | P-QKt3 |
| 25. K-K $\mathbf{3}$ |  |

White's King comes into the game without difficulty, whereas Black's must stay at home. This is the first factor in White's advantage.

| 25. . | Kt - $\mathrm{Br}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 26. R-KBI | Kt-Q3 |
| 27. Kt-KB3 | K-Kt2 |
| 28. P-K $\mathbf{t}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B I}^{\text {I }}$ |
| 29. Kt-Kt3 |  |

Now White threatens to inaugurate a very dangerous attack on the King's side, utilizing the open KB file. What makes this attack so dangerous is the weakness of the isolated King's Pawn, which cannot be guarded by the Knight for the moment, so that at least one of the black Rooks is tied down on the King's file. Correctly estimating that passive play will achieve nothing in the long run, Black decides to counter-attack on the opposite side.

$$
29 . \cdots \quad P-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

Black can allow his Pawns to be doubled and isolated because, as he has correctly foreseen, he will be able to dissolve them again.

$$
\text { 30. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Now the point of Black's preceding move becomes evident; if White fixes the doubled Pawns by 3 I. P-B4, the black Knight would travel to $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ (via Kt2 and $\mathrm{R}_{4}$ or $\mathrm{Q}_{1}$ ), creating various counter-chances, among them the threat to White's Queen's Pawn. Moreover, by 31. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, White would relinquish for ever the chance of playing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$.

$$
3^{1} \cdot \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}
$$

White ignores Black's counter-action and goes straight on with his own attack. Hence Black is practically forced to make the ensuing advance and exchange on his Q6; but after this it is not he, but his opponent, who is able to profit from the open files.

```
31. ... 
```

32 . . B-Kti was to be considered. White could have answered this by 33 . R-QKti threatening 34 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 35 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 36$. R-B8ch, R-Qı; 37. R-Kt8ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 38. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; 39. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$. With the text move, Black blocks the open Bishop's file; but this means nothing, as White now obtains other open files for his Rooks.

| 33. $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| 35. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |  |

Threatening to win a Pawn by $36 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{5}, \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{2}\right)$ $-\mathrm{K}_{2} ; 37 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{5}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; 38. R-Ktich, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{2}$; 39. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{KtI}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$, and $40 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$. Black was more or less
compelled to attempt something, but his countermeasures on the Queen's side have only redounded to White's advantage.

$$
35 \cdots \quad \text { B-R } \mathbf{4}
$$

In order to drive away the Knight and thus, indirectly, protect the King's Pawn; but the relief is momentary only.


Forcing the win of Black's KP. Black cannot, with his Bishop, simultaneously parry the threats to the KP by the Knight from both $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{KB}_{3}$. Nor can he prepare to protect the Pawn further by 37 . . R-Q2, because 38 . Kt-B4 then threatens both 39 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ and 39. Kt-Kt6ch (if $38 \ldots \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; 39. Kt-Q6ch, winning the exchange). If $37 \cdots$ $R\left(K_{I}\right)-Q_{I}$, then $38 . R-R_{3}$.
$37 \ldots \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{3}}$; $\mathbf{3}^{8}$. QR-QBI, R-K2; 39. Kt-B4, R-KB3; 4o. $^{\mathbf{R}}$ R-Br!

White sticks to his advantage relentlessly. The text move needed exact calculation.
40... R-Kt2; 4i. Kt $\times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; 42. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$, R-Kt6ch ; 43. K-B4.

The point of White's last move is that now 43 . . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ would fail through 44. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{B}_{1}\right)-\mathrm{BI}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ ch; 45. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$. So White maintains his material plus. It is no longer difficult to win, but it is instructive to observe how quietly and solidly Flohr winds up the affair.
 R-Q3; 46. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3} \mathbf{c h} ; 47 . \mathrm{K}-\mathbf{B}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t}_{4}$; 48. Kt-B2, R-K $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{7}}$; 49. K-B $\mathbf{3}, \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$; 50.
 $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R c h} ; 53 . \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{r}$.
$53 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ is refuted by $54 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QI}$; for instance, 54 . . B-Kt4; $55 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Rch}$; 56 . $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$, or even 56 . K-B6 followed by 57 . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$.
54. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ;{ }_{55} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{5}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{7}$; $56 . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$,

 62. Kt-Kt2, B-B6; 63. Kt-B4, K-Kı ; 64 . R-B6.

Winning a second Pawn. Both $65 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ and $65 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ are threatened.
$64 \ldots \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}} ;{ }_{6} . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{I} ; 66 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B 6}$.
Black resigns.
An uncommonly good example of Flohr's style. Since his debut at Rogaska-Slatina he has won hundreds of tournament games, but few characterize his play so strikingly as this.

## Second Illustration

Flohr's opponent makes a strategic mistake in the opening which might have been exploited in any of
various ways, according to style and temperament. Let us see how Flohr goes to work to refute a strategic error.
S. Flohr

White
F. D. Yates

Black
(Played in the team tournament at Hamburg, 1930.)

|  | QUEEN'S GAMBIT |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}-\mathbf{K B}_{3}$ |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{Q K t} \mathbf{B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$ |
| 5. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{Q K t} \mathbf{Q}_{2}$ |
| 6. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |  |

Flohr was one of the first masters to make regular use of this variation of the Queen's Gambit, and he succeeded in making it a redoubtable weapon. The text move leads to a quict game in which White is yet able to preserve the advantage of the move. Something just to Flohr's taste.

| 6. . | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ | O-O |
| 8. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$ | P-B3 |
| 9. $\mathbf{K t - B} \mathbf{B}_{3}$ | R-Kı |
| 10. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathbf{K t - B r}$ |
| I. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R} \mathbf{R}_{3}$ |  |

The signal for an attack on the Queen's wing.

White is going to prepare the break-through $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} t_{4}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$.

| I .. $\mathbf{~}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| 13. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| 14. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

This is the mistake we mentioned. The advanced Pawn now becomes weak. I4 . . P-KB4 should have been played. It is most interesting to see how Flohr makes full use of this opportunity and slowly gains the upper hand.

$$
{ }^{15} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

White might have tried ${ }_{55} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, but with the text move he gains an important " tempo."

$$
1_{5} \cdots \quad \text { Q-Kt4 }
$$

Avoiding loss of a Pawn by counter-attacking White's $K P$. The combination $15 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 16 . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times$ Pch would not have been sound, because the reply 17. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ would leave him with nothing more to play for.
16. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$
Q-K2.

The same position would have arisen from $1_{5}$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ at once, but with Black to move instead of White.

## 17. Kt-K2

Very well played. White brings his Queen's Knight to $\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$, from whence it commands both his $\mathrm{K}_{4}$ and his $\mathrm{KB}_{5}$. Black has no opportunity to carry out the manœuvre . . . B-Q2 followed by . . . P-KB4 ,
because, as soon as the Bishop moves, White would play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$. Note that Black could offer a much stronger resistance if White permitted him time for . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$ and . . . P-KR5.

| 17. . . | $\mathbf{K t - Q 2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18. Kt-KKt3 | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ |
| 19. Kt-B4 |  |

White cannot capture the Pawn, of course, because of 19 . . . Q-Kt3.

| 19. | Kt-Kt3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ | $\mathbf{K t - Q 4}$ |
| 21. QR-KI |  |

Here 21. Kt $\times$ KP would be a mistake, because of $21 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ with the double threat of $22 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ and $22 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$. Nor could White capture the Pawn on the next move.

| 21 | Q-K3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ | QR-QI |
| 23. Kt-RI! |  |



9-(G.226)

The decisive phase begins. There threatens 24 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK}_{4}$ and ${ }_{25} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$, winning a piece. $23 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$ would allow 24. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5} ; 25 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 26. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} t_{4}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 27. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, and Black has no defence against the threat of $28 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$ followed by $\mathrm{Q} \times$ RP. Flohr's manœuvring is superb. Note how Black has been continually faced with the choice between two evils: losing his King's Pawn, or leaving his Bishop in its precarious situation.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 23. } \cdots & \text { P-B3 } \\
\text { 24. Kt-B4 } & \text { B-Kt3 }
\end{array}
$$

Or $24 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$; ${ }^{25}$. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ (25 . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$; 26. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$, or $25 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$; 26. P-KKt4).

$$
{ }_{25} \text { P-KKt }{ }_{4}
$$

## $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$

After $25 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ White would continue his attack by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, etc. Nevertheless, Black would better have tried this line.

## 26. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$

Compare the note to $17 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$. The isolation of the black KP is now complete.

| 26. $-\quad$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27. $\mathbf{K t - \mathbf { Q } _ { 2 }}$ | Kt-Kt3 |
| 28. Kt-KKt3 | B-Q4 |
| 29. R-B4 | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 30. K-B2! |  |

White could have played $30 . \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{2}\right) \times \mathrm{P}$; but the text move is much stronger, demonstrating peculiarly well the weakness of the KP. Black can hardly leave
this Pawn in the lurch, and has to throw several pieces into the battle for a lost cause.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 30. } . \underset{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}!}{ } & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{2} \\
\text { 31. } & \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{Q r})-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}} \\
\text { 32. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{5}!
\end{array}
$$

An unusual kind of Pawn storm. After making a long series of purely positional moves, White suddenly develops an irresistible King's side attack. Surprising turns like this occur frequently in Flohr's games.


The Pawn falls at last. White has now an overwhelming position, and wins easily. It is the attack, however, which decides the issue, and not the extra Pawn.

| 34.. $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35. $\times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t I}$ |
| 36. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 3}$ | $\mathbf{R - K B I}$ |
| 37. $\mathbf{K t - Q B} \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{K t - K t 3}$ |


| 38. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B 6}$ ! | $\mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)-\mathbf{K B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |  |

So as to force $40 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}$ t , giving White a protected passed Pawn.

$$
40 . \ldots \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} \text { ? }
$$

A blunder in a desperate situation. Black completely overlooks the fact that White can capture twice on his KB6, thanks to his Rook on KKt3.

$$
\text { 41. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} \quad \text { Resigns }
$$

This game shows that Flohr is no materialist. Notwithstanding the quietness of his style, which aims rather at gain of material than neat attack, he always thinks more of position than material, which latter he goes for only when mere positional means can carry him no farther.

## Third Illustration

It is usually advantageous to retain both Bishops when your opponent has exchanged off one or both of his. Experience shows, however, that this advantage is insufficient to decide the issuc in itself, as a rule. In fact it is often very far from sufficient. The ability to exploit the Bishop pair has always earned-even among famous masters-a special reputation. Of old it was Steinitz, Janovsky, and Rubinstein who possessed this reputation; nowadays Flohr is the two-Bishop king.

Here is one of his best achievements in this field-

| Flohr | Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |

(Played in the match at Moscow, 1933.)

## Q.P., NIEMTSO-INDIAN DEFENCE

 B-Kt5; 4. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4} ;{ }_{5} . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{R}_{3} ; 6$. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R} 3, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t c h} ; 7 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}$; 8. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ ! $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} ; 9 . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4} ;$ го. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2} ;$ i $1 . \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{t}}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$,
 $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{3}$; ${ }_{15} . \mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{B r}_{1}, \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}}\left(\mathbf{B}_{4}\right)-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{2}$; 16 . $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} 2$,
 18. $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R c h} ; 19 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q r} ; 20 . \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$, $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B I I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ 21. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q 2}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2} ;$ 22. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R c h} ;$ 23. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q c h} ; 24 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$.


The first part of this game does not concern us here. We reach an end-game in which White's two Bishops signify little, because the Pawns are split into two equal groups, so that neither player can force a passed

Pawn. This last factor is important: the player with the two Bishops has often good winning chances if he can create a passed Pawn, whereas otherwise the most probable result is a draw. White has a little the better of the diagrammed position, for, as a result of the situation in the centre, he commands rather more of the board. Flohr avails himself of this circumstance and of his possession of the Bishop pair in impeccable fashion.

```
    24... K-B1'; 25. K-B2,K-K2; 26. B-K
K-Q1; 27. K-Kr, K-B2.
```

Both players strive, first of all, to post their Kings as well as possible.
28. $K-\mathbf{Q}_{2}, \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{Q B}_{\mathbf{4}} ;{ }_{29} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$.

Well calculated. $29 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ could now be met by $30 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4}$ (or $30 \ldots K-K t_{3} ; 3$ 1. $K-B_{3}$, followed by $32 . P-Q R_{4}$ ); 31. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 32 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{2}$; 33. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; 34. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ ! 35. P-Kt6, K-R ${ }_{3}$ ! 36. P-Kt7! Kt-Kti (36 ... $K \times P$; 37. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ winning both Black's Queen's Rook's Pawns); 37. P- $\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 38. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ and Black cannot prevent the break-through by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$, as a result of which, his Pawns soon become vulnerable from the rear.

One of the chief advantages of the pair of Bishops is that their possessor can choose when to exchange.
 $K-B_{2}, K t\left(K t_{3}\right)-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$.

3 r $\ldots \mathrm{Kt}^{2} \mathrm{R}_{5}$, followed possibly by . . . P-QKt 4 , came rather into consideration.

## 32. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{3}}$; 33. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}$.

White has decidedly strengthened his position; he
has increased his advantage in terrain, and now he can open up the Queen's side by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$ just when he likes. He wants to open up the position so as to use his Bishops actively.

With the next few moves, White goes to strengthen his position in the centre and on the Queen's wing.
$33 \ldots \mathbf{K t}(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 3})-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{2} ; 34 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q B I}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q r} ; 35$.

 40. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}, \mathrm{~K}_{\mathbf{t}}-\mathrm{K}_{1}$; $4^{1}$. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}!\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 42. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$.

Forcing a slight weakening in Black's Pawn formation.

## $4^{2} \ldots \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K t}_{\mathbf{3}}$; $43 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K R}_{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$.

So as to meet 44. P-B5 with 44 . . . P-KKt 4 , without allowing White to force a passed Pawn by exchanging on his $\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$. Note that this advance would have been most dangerous for Black in view of the threat of 45 . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; ~ 46 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, and White obtains a passed Pawn on the King's Rook's file. Incidentally, the text move betokens a further weakening of Black's position.
44. B-QBI, Kt-Kt2; $45 . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ !


Pretty play. This gives White a protected passed Pawn, since 45 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ would fail against 46 . B-B8 whilst $45 . \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ is refuted by 46 . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; if Black then tries to avoid loss of a Pawn he loses a piece: $46 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$; 47. B-Kt5ch, K-KI (47 . . . Kt $t-B_{3}$; 48. $B-B 8$ ) ; 48. B-R6!! The Knight on $\mathrm{K}_{7} 7$ has no move, whilst the King is unable to protect both the Knights at once. Black's next is thus forced.

A problem-like position!
$45 \ldots \mathbf{Q P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 46 . \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{-}} \mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}} ; ~ 47 . \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$,


White progresses another little step. The disappearance of two more Pawns enhances the activity of his pieces.
$49 \cdots \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P c h} ; 50 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{2} ; 5^{1} . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$, $\mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{4}$; $\mathbf{5 2}^{2}$ K-K2, Kt-B2; 53. K-Q3.

Threatening 54. K-B4 followed by 55 . B-QB5ch. Now Black has no longer any satisfactory defence. For instance, 53 . . Kt-Kt4; 54. B-K6 (54. $K-B 4$, $K t-R 6 c h)$, threatening 55 . B-B7.

$$
\text { 53. . . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

The only hope. Black obtains more freedom for his pieces and eliminates the passed Pawn. Not that this improves the situation a lot, for White obtains a new passed Pawn on the King's Rook's file.
54. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 55 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P} ; 56 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 2$, $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{2})-\mathbf{B}_{3} ;{ }_{57} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ; \mathbf{5}^{8}$. B-Kt6.

Already the passed Pawn is threatening to advance irresistibly.

58 ...P-Kt4ch; 59. K-Q33, Kt-K2; 60. B-K $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}} \mathbf{c h}$ !

The Bishop pair is no longer the important factor. After $60 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; 6I. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, White would win all the remaining black Pawns in exchange for his KRP. The Pawn end-game after exchange of all the pieces would be a win for him.
The remaining moves are interesting, all the same; clearly Flohr is in no hurry to force the issue, and plays, first of all, to win the King's Pawn.
6о ... Kt(K2)-Q4; 6ı. B-Kt5! Kt-R $\mathbf{4}$.
After 61 ... Kt $\times$ B; 62. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; 63. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ the passed Pawn would run straight through.
62. B-KB3, Kt-Kt6; 63. B-Q2! K-Q3; 64. B-Kt4, Kt-B3; 65. B-B8, K-B3; 66. B-Kı, $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{c h}$; 67. K-Q4, $\mathbf{K t}\left(\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}}\right)-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$; 68. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} ; 69$. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$ !
Black resigns, as further resistance would be hopeless ( 69 ... Kt-Kt6; 70. B-B4ch).

A model achievement in this type of end-game, worthy of inclusion in every textbook.

## Fourth Illustration

Flohr is first and foremost a position player, but the next game reveals that he can also achieve excellence in the realm of combination and attack. The essence of his style is revealed here too: the carrying out of preparations in an almost mysterious way. He is like an artist roughing-in, to begin with, odd strokes and points which seem to signify nothing; finally he links up these random strokes - and you gaze amazed at a perfect portrait.

FLOHR
Rellstab
Black
(Played in the Premier Reserves at Hastings, 1930-1.)

## ENGLISH OPENING

| I. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \mathbf{- K B} 3$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K}_{\mathbf{t} 3}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{K} \boldsymbol{t} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 5. B-Kt2 | $\mathbf{K t - Q B 2}$ |

The continuation $5 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and $6 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ is more usual and better.
6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{3}}$
$\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$

A formation considered particularly strong at the time of this game. If Black can succeed in completing his development undisturbed, then he obtains a positional advantage, thanks to his pressure against White's $Q_{4}$.
7. B-Kt2
$\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$
8. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B I}$

The beginning of a series of deeply conceived moves, by which White aims, through threats on Black's BP and KP, at destroying Black's influence in the centre. It is to be noted that, just as in his game against Canal, Flohr completely ignores the routine formula "Castle early!"
8. . . .
O-O
9. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ !

Nor does he pay much heed to the other old maxim, "Never move a piece twice before you have moved every piece once." He fecls that the problem of this position is not to be solved along traditional lines.

This protection of the King's Pawn is quite in the line of Black's plans.

$$
\text { II. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}
$$

$\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$
II . . . R-Kti was to be preferred, so as to be able to play . . . P-QKt3 if necessary.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

Compare the note to $9 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$.

```
12. .. Kt-Kt3
13. Kt-KB_
```

Excellently played. White permits a serious weakening of his Pawn formation so as to keep his attack on the go. After i3. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, Black's QBP would be sufficiently protected, whereas his own QRP would be under fire. The text move threatens i4. Kt $\times \mathrm{Bch}$, followed by ${ }_{5} 5 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 13. } . \cdots & \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \\
\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t r}
\end{array}
$$

Preparing for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{3}$.

$$
{ }_{15} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}!
$$

The way in which Flohr handles this game exhibits an originality and energy which leave nothing to be
desired. The one supporting pillar in Black's position (his QBP) is far from secure even yet, and now his other centre Pawn is also under fire.

The positional text move is based on a little combination: $15 \ldots . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ;$ 16. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; 17. Q-B4ch, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; 18. B-Q $5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ (forced), and White has now two alternative ways of regaining the sacrificed Pawn (19. Kt $\times$ P or 19. Kt $\times$ Bch). Even better chances are offered by continuing with the attack, e.g. 19. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KK} \mathrm{tI}_{1}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ !, and so on.

$$
1_{5} . . .
$$

$$
\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Black cannot maintain his King's Pawn, for instance ${ }_{15} . . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$; $16 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 17. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 18. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5} ; 1$ 19. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$; and White wins either the BP or the KP.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 16. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K r} \\
\text { i7. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K K t r}! &
\end{array}
$$



The result of White's last ten moves leaps to the eye. Black's centre has been undermined. What is still more important, White has better play for his
pieces-a remarkable fact when we consider how repeatedly he has made moves directly contrary to classical rules of development. His command of the open KKt file offers him excellent attacking chances, and his superiority is really almost overwhelming. Note how safe is White's King on its original square, and how he has saved himself valuable time by foregoing castling.

$$
17 \ldots \quad \text { B-BI }
$$

Clearly $17 . . . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ was no longer possible (i8. Q-B4ch, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; 19. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; 20. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ or 19... B-Bi; 20. Kt-R6ch, K-RI; 21. Kt-B7ch and wins). But the text move too leads to forced loss. Black should have tried I7...K-Ri.
18. B QB6!

Decisive, threatening to win the exchange and also to win the Queen by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{7} \mathrm{ch}$.

| 18. | $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 19. Kt-R6ch | $\mathbf{K}-\mathrm{RI}$ |
| 20. Kt-B7ch | K-KtI |
| 21. Kt-R6ch |  |

Repetition of moves to gain time.

| 21. $-\quad$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R I I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22. $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{7}} \mathbf{c h}}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t I}$ |
| 23. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}!$ |  |

This pretty move, which threatens mate in two, required exact calculation.

| 23. | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c h}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24. | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}!$ |
| ${ }_{25} . \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \boldsymbol{8})$ |

Losing a piece; however 25 . . P $\times \mathrm{B}$, would likewise not have sufficed to put up serious resistance, e.g. 26. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 27. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Ktr}!\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ (after exchange of Rooks, White would win easily); 28. R-Kt8, B-R3ch; 29. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 30. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ (otherwise 31. $K t-K 6$ wins); 31. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}!\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 32. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 33. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 34. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$ and wins. What follows now is simple.

| 26. B-Q ${ }_{5} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Rr}_{\mathbf{I}}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 27. Kt-B77 ${ }^{\text {ch }}$ | K-Ktr |
| 28. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$ | Kt-R6ch |
| 29. K-Kt3 | P-QKt4 |
| 30. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | B-Kt2 |
| 31. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ |
| 32. $\boldsymbol{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 33. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{B P}$ |
| 34. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K t}$ | P-R4 |
| 35. R-KKtr | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| 36. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ ! |  |

Black resigns, for, after $36 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, he would be mated by $37 . \mathrm{B}-Q_{3}$, etc.

This magnificent game shows that Flohr's play is anything but mechanical.

## Fifth Illustration

Finally, an example in which Flohr works for complications right from the beginning so as to prevent the game from becoming drawish. He reveals himself as fully up to this task, too.
M. Feigin
White
S. Flohr
Black
(Played in the tournament at Kemeri, 1937.)

## GRÜNFELD DEFENCE

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K B}_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K t}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{- Q \mathbf { Q B } _ { 3 }}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 5. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B P}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ |
| 6. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t}_{5} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ |
| 7. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ |  |

So far exactly as the second game in the EuweAlekhine match of 1935 . 7. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? here would allow $7 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, threatening mate on the move.
7. . . Kt-Q4!


A most interesting continuation, better than the 7 . . R-QKtı which Alekhine played in the game cited. It has a double motive, protection (indirect) of the QKtP and prevention of White's 8. P-K 4 .
8. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? would be answered by $8 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$, threatening both $9 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKtI}$, winning the Queen, and $9 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, winning a Rook. The advance 8. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ would likewise be answered by $8 \ldots$ $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}$ putting White into difficulties, e.g. 9 . Q-R4 (9. $P-Q_{5}, K t-B 7 c h$ or $\left.9 . Q \times P ? R-Q K t \mathrm{I}\right), 9 \cdots$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, 1 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QKt}_{5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$; iл. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; 12. Q-Qi, B-Kt2, and Black's two Bishops more than compensate for White's centre Pawns. One could not call $8 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ a mistake, for its consequences are almost incalculable. Flohr relies mainly on getting his bearings better than his opponent in the complicated situations which would arise.

## 8. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$

White wants to avoid all complications, but for this very reason concedes his opponent a most satisfactory game.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 8. } . . \dot{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \\
\text { 9. } & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}
\end{array}
$$

Demonstrating the impartiality of Flohr's judgment once again, Black has played . . . P-KKt3, the logical implication of which, as every master would agree, is the development of the KB at Kt2. Flohr sees deeper; he plays with apparent inconsistency, but it soon becomes obvious that the Bishop does better work on the diagonal $\mathrm{KBI}-\mathrm{QR} 6$ than from Kt2.

A further advantage of the text move is that Black gains more influence in the centre, whilst White must take into account the possibility of . . . B $\times \mathrm{Kt}$ followed
by . . . B-Kt5ch. This last consideration accounts for his next move.

$$
\text { 10. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q 2}_{2} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}
$$

Putting an end, once for all, to the threat against his QKtP . It is obvious that in. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ would fail in face of Black's II . . R-R2, winning the Queen.

$$
\text { I. } Q-R_{4} \quad B-Q_{3}
$$

Black has already obtained a very respectable position, and he proceeds to strengthen it steadily.

| 12. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$ | Kt-Kt5 |
| 14. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t r}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

Preventing $\mathrm{I}_{5}$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$. White's preponderance in the centre has been definitely nullified now.
15. O-O
16. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$
17.

White wants to prevent or at least delay . . . P-K4. The text move cannot be good, because White's heavy pieces are now posted inharmoniously and hardly efficiently. The Queen should have moved, then the Queen's Rook. One great drawback to the text move is that it leaves the white King inadequately protected.

I7. . .

## Kt-KtI

Initiating a fine cavalry manœuvre. Flohr's great strategic abilities are exhibited markedly in this game.

```
18. Kt-Q2
Kt-Q2
19. B-B3
```

10-(G.226)

Leading speedily to an exchange of the whitesquare Bishops, which does not improve things for White, as he is left with the "worse" Bishop (the one impeded by his own Pawns). 19. Kt-B4 would certainly have been better.


White cannot play to win a Pawn now, e.g. 21 . $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; 22. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KRPch}$; 23. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 2^{2} . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{KtI}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, with a winning attack. Or 21. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 22. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RPch} ; 23$. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 24 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kti}, \mathrm{Q} \times \operatorname{Pch} ; 25 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{2}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$, followed by $26 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, etc.

## 21. Q-K2 <br> Kt-Kt4!

Compelling White to exchange off the white-square Bishops (disadvantageous, as already explained), for otherwise comes . . . Kt $\times$ Bch, even less pleasant.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 22. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} \\
\text { 23. } & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
\end{array}
$$

White ought to have made some attempt to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ followed by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$. 23. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ at once would fail against $23 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$. Superior to the text move, which takes the Knight to an inferior square, would have been $23 . Q-Q_{3}$.

| 23. | Kt - $\mathrm{K}_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24. QR-BI | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ |
| 25. B-KI | QR-KI |
| 26. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KKH}_{3}$ |  |

White tries to prevent . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}-\mathrm{in}$ vain.

$$
\text { 26. . . } \mathbf{Q}-Q_{2}
$$

Threatening $27 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ already (28. $\mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$; 29. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bi}$ or $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{RI}_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 30. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, Kt-Kt6ch, etc.).

```
27. Q-BI
    P-KKt4
28. R-Q3
P-B5
```

Black's preparations have been masterly, and with the text move he embarks on the decisive attack. White is in an untenable situation.

| 29. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30. $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathbf{R}_{4}}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 31. $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{3}$ |

As in the last game, a repetition of moves to gain time.

| 32. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R r}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 34. $\mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 35. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |  |

Producing weaknesses, but no other move would save the situation. For instance, $35 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ would be refuted by $35 \cdots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ with $36 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ in prospect.

$$
\text { 35. . } \mathrm{K}-\dot{\mathrm{Rx}}^{x}
$$

$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$

Not to $\mathrm{R}_{2}$, because of $36 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ! ; 37. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ and wins.

$$
\text { 36. . . } \quad \text { B- } \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \text { ! }
$$



The white Knight having no square of retreat, a new weakening of the castled position is inevitable; further resistance is then out of the question. It should be noted that $37 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{2}$ is useless on account of 37 . . $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 38 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ? $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, winning the Queen.

| 37. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 39. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t r}$ |
| 4o. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R} \mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| 4i. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B r}$ |  |

## B $\times$ Kt <br> Q-B4 <br> R-K3

Enabling Black to clinch the issue outright, the Rook's station at BI being accidentally unfortunate.
41. . . .

Kt-B7ch!
A pretty concluding stroke. The Knight must be taken, and after either $42 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} t 8 \mathrm{ch}$ or 42. $Q \times K t, Q-R 6 c h$, White is mated. With this beautiful game we say good-bye to Flohr and pass on to the leading representative in master chess of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

## CHAPTER V

## MICHAEL MOISIAYOVITCH BOTVINNIK

M. Botvinnik was born on ith April, igif, somewhere in Russia; to judge by his name, probably in the Ukraine. For as long as he has been known as a chess player, he has lived in Leningrad. He studied physics and graduated as an electrical engineer. It was in 1924 that he learnt chess, and his rare gift became immediately apparent. As early as 1926 he was permitted to compete in the championship of Leningrad, finishing second. In 1927 he was recognized officially as a Soviet master, after having attained fifth place in the national championship and won first prize in a Leningrad tournament. He repeated this latter success in 1930, and has regularly competed in all the important Russian events ever since. He became a professional player-a career which in Russia implies a Civil Service status. A year later, in 193I, he won the championships not only of Leningrad (winning 12 games, losing I and drawing 4) but also of the whole Soviet Union (I8 wins, 4 losses, 4 draws), and since then has remained the unchallenged leader of Soviet chess. That Levenfish held the actual title for a while was a mere formality: Botvinnik did not take part in the championship tournament of 1937, but it was arranged that whoever won this tournament should play a match against him to decide the championship for that year. Thus there came about a match between Botvinnik and Levenfish in which, to the surprise of the whole world, Levenfish succeeded in
holding his own (the match being drawn) and consequently remained in possession of the title. Whilst cordially congratulating Levenfish on his achievement, one must regard as purely formal an arrangement through which Botvinnik was deprived of his title without being defeated. So much for the domestic side of Botvinnik's career.

In the inter-city match Stockholm-Leningrad, held in the Swedish capital in 1929, he defeated Stoltz. His second encounter with a foreigner of any consequence came towards the end of 1933, when by drawing his match against Flohr (2 wins, 8 draws 2 losses), he qualified as an international great master with honours.

Now the whole chess world was anxious to see him playing in a tournament with leading non-Russian masters, preferably outside the U.S.S.R. The tournament of twelve in Leningrad (August, 1934), which he won, hardly satisfied these desires, for only two foreigners, Euwe and Kmoch, took part. His participation in the Hastings tournament of 1934-5 aroused eager anticipation, the more so as this tournament was particularly strongly contested, the four other visiting masters being none other than Capablanca, Flohr, Lilienthal, and Euwe. The result of this first excursion into the outer world was a bitter disappointment-he came fifth. Had "Europa" (as the Soviets call Europe outside of their own land) overvalued him? The cognoscenti could not believe it, and events justified them. On 14th February, only a few weeks later, there started an international tournament at Moscow, comprising eight visiting grand masters and twelve of the strongest Russians. Botvinnik forged ahead, to tie
for ultimate first place with Flohr. The quality of this success can be gauged through a survey of the results of the other visiting great masters. Lasker came third, Capablanca fourth, Spielmann fifth, Lilienthal eighth; Stahlberg sixteenth, Pirc eighteenth, and Miss Menchik in last place. This result impelled the Russian chess organizers (an official body) to announce a double-round tournament of ten players a year later, the five best Russian players matching their prowess with five leading foreign masters. In this tournament, which commenced on 14 th May, 1936, Botvinnik fully upheld his reputation, as the score card shows: Capablanca i3, Botvinnik 12, Flohr 92, Lilienthal 9, Ragozin 81 2 , Lasker 8, Eliskases, Kahn, Levenfish and Riumin all equal $7 \frac{1}{2}$.

The fact that Botvinnik had scored all his great successes in his own country, whereas his only appearance abroad had been a disappointment, rendered it highly desirable for his reputation that he should, at any rate on one occasion, attain his best overseas. The Nottingham tournament gave him this opportunity, which he seizcd with both hands. His victory, in company with Capablanca, was gained in handsome style.

In the A.V.R.O. tournament he played superbly steady chess; after losing in the first round to Fine he climbed, by the eleventh round to second place. Then he relaxed, blundering badly in a perfectly innocuous position against Euwe and frittering away an overpowering advantage against Flohr. Third to Keres and Fine in the final table, he could yet look back on his performance not without satisfaction.

Afew months later heretained his Soviet championship at Moscow, making no mistake in a crucial final round.

Botvinnik's chess since 1940 has been practically confined to two bursts of activity. In a so-called U.S.S.R. Championship in 1941, the field being a large one, and uniformly strong as usually in Russia, he disappointed by finishing equal fifth and sixth with Boleslavsky behind Bondarevsky and Lilienthal first, Smyslov third and Keres fourth. It is of significance that not one of these six was over thirty-five years of age, and that Bondarevsky, Boleslavsky and Smyslov were in their teens! By a curious dispensation, these six players were now matched in a quadruple-round tournament for the "Absolute Championship of the Sovient Unions," and now the original order was almost exactly reversed, Botvinnik setting a deadly pace from the first and finishing two and a half points ahead of the field.

For two years more urgent activity engrossed him. Then at Sverdlovsk in June, r943, he scored a convincing victory in another U.S.S.R. Championship, above Makagonov, Smyslov, Boleslavsky and others.

By all these magnificent achievements Botvinnik has gained an assured place within the small circle of grand masters who may be regarded as serious contenders for the world-championship throne.

## BOTVINNIK MAKES HIS BOW

## First Illustration

One of the openings which Botvinnik likes to adopt is the Sicilian Defence. This is one of the most difficult of openings, there being little chance of its leading to a drawn position at any early stage. White gets more terrain and various attacking possibilities. Black, on
the other hand, entrenches himself behind a sort of "Maginot Line," ready at any time for a sudden counter-attack; for this he needs the utmost selfreliance, otherwise the chances may turn definitely against him. An opening which allows Botvinnik to exploit his curious abilities to the full. Here is a beautiful example-

V. A. Rouzer<br>White<br>M. M. Botvinnik<br>Black

(Played in the Leningrad tournament, 1933.)

## SICILIAN DEFENCE

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4} ; \mathbf{2 . ~}_{\mathbf{K t}}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{B}_{3} ; 3_{3} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$,
 6. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathbb{P}-\mathrm{KK}_{\mathbf{t}}$; 7. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathbb{B}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{t}}$; 8. Kt-Kt3, $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ; 9 . \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B}_{4}, \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$; 1о. $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$.

For some time the lively $10 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4} 4$ was regarded as strongest; the game we give next, Alekhine $v$. Botvinnik, modified this opinion, however.

```
IO. . . .
Kt-QR4
11. Kt }\times\mp@subsup{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{t}}{
```

According to current ideas, which are based on study of numerous games opened like this, the most promising continuation here is $11 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$; 12. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$.

II ... $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}$; 12. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$; 13. R-Ki, KR-Q1; i4. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}, \mathbf{Q}-B_{2}$.

Black retires his Queen so as not to have continually to reckon with the possibility of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$. This manouvre might be very troublesome, though there would be nothing in it at the moment ( $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$, $Q \times Q ;$ i6. $B \times Q, K t \times K t ;$ i $7 . P \times K t, B \times K t P$, etc.).

The position we have reached is characteristic of the Sicilian. White commands more of the board and must strive to post his Knight on $Q_{5}$; should he succeed, then he would have much the better game. In practice, he rarely does.

## ${ }^{15}$. $\mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{B I}_{1}$

White wants to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt}_{3}$, preparing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$.

$$
15 \cdots \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}!
$$

A strong and, as soon appears, deeply calculated move.

## 16. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} \mathrm{t}_{3}$

White plays to a consistent plan. This move safeguards his QKtP and envisages an eventual $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$.
16. Kt-Q5 at once would lose a Pawn through $16 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 17. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 18. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ or $18 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$.
16. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ was playable: $16 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; but then Black would have a thoroughly satisfactory game.

$$
16 . \cdots \quad \mathbf{P}-Q_{4}!!
$$



A splendid and totally unexpected continuation, Black making a sudden sharp attack. Pure Botvinnik !

$$
\text { 17. } \mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

White was faced with an unpleasant choice, as the following analyses reveal-
(a) 17. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ recovering the piece with a fine game;
(b) $17 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 18. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 19. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, $\mathrm{K} t \times \mathrm{P}$ with a clear advantage;
(c) i7. $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; 18. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad$ 19. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KP}$, and Black wins White's KRP. This last variation yields White plenty of counter-chances, all the same; e.g. 20. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Pch}$; 21. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{RI}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ; 22$. Kt-B6ch (22.P-Kt3, $\left.B-Q 4!\right), 22 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{RI}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 23. B-Q4, and now it is White who has the best of it. But Black need not go for the Pawn. (19 . . . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{K}$ P looks a stronger alternative.-Translators.)

After the text move White is up against a much more difficult task, the manifold ingenuities of Botvinnik's combination being fully revealed.

$$
17 \ldots \quad P-K_{5}!
$$

By this Pawn offer Black secures maximum freedom for his pieces without wasting any time. To retire his attacked Bishop to $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ would lose valuable time, and he is at particular pains to avoid that.

$$
\text { 18. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

White submits unwillingly to the indirect exchange of his KB for Black's exposed QB. What else could he do? On $18 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KP}$ follows $18 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $19 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$,
$B \times Q P$, threatening $20 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ or (if the attacked Knight should move away) 20 . . B-B6 winning the exchange, so that White is forced to play 20. Q-Q3; then his KKtP is lost: $20 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ ! $21 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, etc.
Another possibility was $18 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ (threatening $19 \ldots K t \times B$ followed by $20 \ldots B-Q 5$ winning the Queen); 19. K-RI, Kt $\times$ B; 20. $Q \times K \mathrm{t}$, and Black has a fine game; though whether he could play to win the exchange by $20 \ldots B-Q_{5}$; 21. $Q-Q_{2}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ is doubtful; for instance 22. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 23. Kt-B6ch, K-RI; 24. Q-B3, B-Q7; 25. Q-Kt2, $\mathrm{B}_{-} \mathrm{K}_{3}$ (25... Q-Q3?; 26. $R-\Pi 8 \mathrm{ch}$ ! and wins); 26. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}{ }_{5} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6$; 27. Kt $\times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{KtI}$; 28. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KBP} ; 29 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bi}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 30. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ and the win (for Black) is problematical.

Finally, 18. B-K 2 would lead (after $18 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{QP}$ ) to the same sorts of position as arise from $17 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ (see the note to $17 . \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ ).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 18. } . \dot{Q B}_{5} \\
& \text { 19. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

White's two advanced Pawns look dangerous, but the other side of the picture is soon seen. His position is too loose; his Pawns and pieces co-operate awkwardly, consequently Black continually finds new points to attack. Notice the important part played by the black Pawn on B6.
19. . . .

Q-R4!
A very strong move. The main threat is 20 . .

Kt-Kt5, after which 21. B-Q4 would fail in face of $21 \ldots$. P-B7ch or $21 \ldots$ B $\times$ Bch followed by $22 \ldots$ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{7}$ ch, winning a Rook. Any move of the attacked Knight would lose likewise, e.g. 21. Kt-Kti, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 22. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}(22 . B \times Q, P-B 7 c h), 22 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 23$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$, and so on. The refutation of $2 \mathrm{r} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ (after $20 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}^{2} \mathrm{~K}_{5}$ ) is also pretty: $2 \mathrm{I} \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 22. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{7} \mathrm{ch}$; 23. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ winning the exchange and several Pawns.

Apart from 20 . . Kt-Kt5 there threatens 20 . . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; 21. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 22 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and White is lost in view of the innumerable weaknesses in his Pawn position. Nevertheless, White could have put up a more extended resistance in this way, and therefore $20 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ would have been best on the whole, getting rid of "public enemy No. B3."

Yet another move worth considering was $20 . Q-Q_{3}$, e.g. $20 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}^{2} \mathrm{~K}_{5}$; 21. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$. But then 21 . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ would be extremely strong (22. Kt-Q6? P-B7ch; 23. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; 24. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BPch}$, winning a piece).

## 20. KR-QI

With the idea of further protecting the Queen's Pawn, and also ruling out all eventualities in which Black threatened the Rook by . . . P-B7ch. Black's attack, however, is becoming irresistible, thanks to the pin on White's Knight and the co-operation of the advanced KBP. Some beautiful operations follow.
20. . . .

Kt-Kt5


There is no adequate defence to this move. The best of a bad job would be $2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 22$. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 23 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$ (forced), $23 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Pch} ; 24$. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; but this would lead to an end-game in which White has no fewer than five isolated Pawns.

## 21. B-Q4

This is the move which White had in mind when he played 20. $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{I}}$; now he need not capture the KBP when it advances.

| 21. $-\mathbf{~} 22 . \mathrm{BI}$ |
| :--- |$\quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{7} \mathbf{c h}!$

Forced; the King cannot go to Ri because of $22 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ (or 23. Kt $-K_{2}$ ) $23 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8$ (Queens) ch! $24 . R \times Q, Q \times Q$ and wins. Apparently White overlooked this pretty finesse until too late, otherwise he would have captured the Pawn. On BI the white King is very unsafe, as Botvinnik reveals by a series of powerful strokes.

Q-R3ch!

Again forced. There was no interposing the Knight, e.g. 23. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 24. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{1}$; or 24 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ (threatening mate) ; $25 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{QI}$; 26. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ (threatening mate again); 27. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ (or $27 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ ), 27. . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! and Black has a won game, in view of the chances of promoting his Pawn. 23. Q-Q3 would also lose by force, through $23 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 24. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 25. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8$ (Queens) ch! 26. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ and Black has won a piece.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 23. } \cdots \cdots \\
& \text { 24. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

Exchanging Qucens would again lose a piece by 24 . . Kt-K6ch.

$$
24 \cdots \quad \mathbf{Q}^{-K B_{3}}
$$

The black Queen suddenly takes over a decisive role on the King's wing, gaining valuable time by attacking the undefended Rook.

$$
\text { 25. } \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{B I})-\mathbf{Q r}
$$

25. Q-Q2 would be just as hopeless: $25 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$; or ${ }_{25}$. Q-Q3, R-KI; 26. P-KR3, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$.
26. . .
Q-R $\mathbf{R}_{5}$
27. Q-Q3
R-KI

With two mating threats, viz. $27 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ and 27 . . . R-K8.
${ }_{27}$. $\mathbb{R}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$
P-B4!
28. R-K6

Exchanging Rooks would rob the white King of its only remaining flight square, and allow 28 . ( $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}$ )
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 29. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Pch}$; 30. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{t}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$; 3I. K-B3, R-K6 mate.


And now Black threatens to win a whole Rook by queening the Pawn. The only plausible reply, 30 . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KBI}$, would allow Black to appropriate the exchange by $30 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times$ Rch and 3 I . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$, and he would then have enough for a win. He has an even stronger resource, $30 \cdots$ QR-Qi!, and against the threat of winning a whole Rook (by 3r. . . R $\times$ R) which this introduces there is no resource whatever, e.g. 31. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KK}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$, etc. Or 3I. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}$, etc. Or finally $31 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$.

So White resigns.
A grand achievement which gained a well-deserved brilliancy prize.

## Second Illustration

Next, a game with the same opening but in which White selects the most violent treatment; moreover, it is Alekhine who plays White, a guarantee that every 11-(G.226)
chance of attack will be energetically seized. Nevertheless, Botvinnik manages to keep the balance; the more vigorously he is attacked, the sharper are his counter-measures. The outcome is a superb draw.

## Dr. A. Alekhine M. M. Botvinnik White <br> Black

(Played in the Nottingham tournament, 1936.)

## SICILIAN DEFENCE

 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 4 . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K B}_{3} ; 5 . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{;} ; 6$.
 9. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$; 1о. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{4}$.

Threatening ir. P-K $\mathrm{t}_{5}$, which would drive away Black's KKt and diminish his influence in the centre. Unless he is to be hemmed in, Black must engineer a counter-action immediately. A very difficult task here, which, however, Botvinnik fulfils immaculately.


This thrust is positionally justified in every way, but
it is extraordinarily difficult to work out all its thorny tactical consequences. Brilliancies ensue.

$$
\text { II. } P-B_{5}
$$

If in. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, then II . . Kt-K $\mathrm{K}_{\text {I }}$ or (certainly keener) II ... P-Q 5 ! 12 . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ !, regaining the piece with a good game; or II ... P-Q5; 12. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad$ 13. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}($ (13. $P \times K t, B \times B P!)$ I3... $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! (14. $\left.\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ;{ }^{15} . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}\right)$ with the same result.

```
II. . . .
B-BI!
```

In such an involved position it is curious that Black should be able to permit himself such a meek retreat, but any other move would lead him into serious trouble. Botvinnik has foreseen well that the loss of time involved does not impair the effectiveness of his counter-attack. II. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ has weakened White's position in the centre; he can no longer play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Clearly enough, White has nothing better.

## 12. . . Kt-Kt5

Threatening to capture the Queen's Pawn with either Knight, or alternatively $13 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; for instance, $1_{3} . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 14. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, etc.
i3. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$; i4. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ would now set Black a difficult problem. White's plus Pawn on Q5 is now adequately protected, whilst $1_{5} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ threatens. If the black Knight be then forced to withdraw to $Q_{3} 3$, White has a won game at once. It would therefore be up to Black to find some way of keeping his action on the go; a passive move would spell certain downfall.

Such a continuation indeed exists, namely ( $13 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $R P \times P$; 14. $\left.B-B_{3}\right), \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP!!} \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 16. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{K} t c h ;{ }_{17} . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ BPch; $18 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 19. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ and, White's position is torn to shreds, apart from the fact that, with a Rook and two Pawns for two minor pieces, Black might consider himself materially to the good as well.

## 13. $\mathbf{P}$ - $\mathbf{Q} 6$ !

Very strongly played. The main threat is $14 . P-Q R_{3}$, the secondary i4. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$. Black must not now play 13 ... KP $\times \mathrm{P}$ because of 14 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ followed by $1_{5} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and 16 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$. So the next move is forced.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 13. } . \dot{B}_{5} \\
\text { 4. } & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{array}
$$

The point of White's counter-sacrifice. After 14 . .
 $K-Q_{2}, P-K t_{3}$; 17. $B \times K P$ and wins) White would definitely take the lead. Note that $14 . Q \times Q$ would be weak because Black, after recapturing, would have the threats $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BPch}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{5} \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ at his disposal.

$$
14 \cdots \quad Q-B_{5}!
$$

Based on the consideration that, if the exchange of Queens can be avoided, the exposed situation of the white King must become the crucial factor. Black has a drawing line up his sleeve, too, in the event of his opponent's going for the win of a piece.

## ${ }^{15}$. $\mathbf{K R}$ - $\mathbf{B I}_{\text {I }}$

White, realizing that the exposed situation of his King would compromise any attempt to intensify the
struggle, lets Black go through with his drawing combination.

| ${ }^{15} . \cdots$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| ${ }_{16} . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}!$ |  |



The whole point! ! $7 \ldots$ Q-Kt6ch is now threatened; 18. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$, with mate to follow. White must accept the second sacrifice.

```
17. B}\times\mathbf{K}\mathbf{t
18. R-B2
```

Once again forced, for $18 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ ?, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Bch}$; or 18 . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ ch would lose quickly.

```
18. .. -
19. R-Bi
```

White can never move his King. The text move reveals the significance of $16 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ !, for White cannot interpose his Bishop on $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{I}}$ now. Thus perpetual check, by $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt6-Kt8}$, is inescapable.
A most pleasant drawn game, brief yet rich in combination. It is characteristic of both adversaries, each a connoisseur in the creative, efficient, and
aggressive handling of the openings, that the struggle was sharp from the very outset.

## Third Illustration

One of Botvinnik's principal characteristics, which he shares with some of the other prominent masters of the younger generation, is great patience. If there are neither possible combinations nor objects of immediate attack, he knows how to manœuvre, tack about, and slowly improve his position, utilizing every little opportunity.

Here is an example.

## M. M. Botvinnik <br> White <br> S. Flohr <br> Black

(Played in the tournament at Moscow, 1936.)

## ALEKHINE'S DEFENCE

 $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} ;{ }_{4} . \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{5} ; ~ 5 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3} ; 6$. $\mathbf{O - O}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$.

Another game, played between the same opponents three months later in Nottingham, went as follows: $6 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}!$; 7. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 8 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ; 9$. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; го. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ !; ir. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; 12. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$; $1_{3} . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; 14. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$; $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $\quad$. $6 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB}_{2}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$; perfectly satisfactorily for Black. ( $17 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}+3$ !)

The move played here is not so good.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 7. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}! \\
& \text { 8. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

The distinction between the two continuations $6 \ldots$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}!$ and $6 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ lies in the resulting central
formation of White's Pawns: in the one case his QP goes to $\mathrm{K}_{5}$, in the other it remains on $\mathrm{Q}_{4}$. The latter formation provides the better chances, since it is more dynamic, the square $\mathrm{K}_{5}$ remaining open for the use of the white pieces.

$$
8 \ldots \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{Q}_{2} ; \text { 9. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K B}_{4}, \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3} ; \text { 1о. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$ $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathbf{Q}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{Kt}_{3} ;$ in. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; $12 . \mathrm{Kt} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q B}_{3}, \mathrm{O}-\mathbf{O}$.

Black commands much too little of the board, and must defend carefully-a task which Flohr tackles very well indeed. A hard fight ensues in which Botvinnik manages to turn his superior mobility to account.

## 13. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$

The "natural" continuation was i3. QR-Qr, but the text move is stronger, threatening r4. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ followed by $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$, and compelling Black to take immediate counter-mcasures.

$$
13 . \cdots \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K I}
$$

So as to answer 14. R-R3 with $14 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ and nip White's King's side attack in the bud.
14. R-QI

I4. $R-R_{3}$ would now be mere waste of time.

| ${ }^{14}$. | R-QI |
| :--- | :--- |
| ${ }_{15}$. | P-QKt3 |$\quad$| $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K B}_{4}$ |
| :--- |

Now necessary; Black has to strive for some grip on the centre so as to be able to manœuvre more easily. The text move creates a backward Pawn on his $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ which, whilst it has no immediate significance, makes its presence felt: throughout all possible simplifications Flohr must take care to insure against its suddenly becoming weak, as would happen, for
instance, if he were to advance his QBP and permit $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{QBP}$. The text move makes Black's position more rigid and robs it of some of its flexibility.

## 16. $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{Q}$

The first of a series of moves by which White does nothing but emphasizc his superior mobility. Above all, to achieve this, he avoids exchanges.
16. ... B-B3; 17. B-B2, Q-B2; 18. Kt-Kı, $\mathbf{K R}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}}$; 19. $\mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{B}_{3}\right) \mathbf{Q} 3, \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{- K B r} ;$ 20. Kt-B3, Q-B2;21. Kt-K5.
According to Botvinnik, 21. P-Kt3 was preferable, protecting the KBP and still further facilitating White's manœuvring.

| 21. $\cdots \mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{K t ( K t _ { 3 } ) - \mathbf { Q } _ { \mathbf { 2 } }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22. |  |
| 23. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |

Compare the note to White's sixteenth move. This moving to and fro of the Knight seems bad, but we can hardly speak here of loss of time. The essential criterion of a loss of time, that the other side should be able to profit by it, is missing. Botvinnik manœuvres profoundly, strengthening his position bit by bit; for instance the doubling of his Rooks was a step forward.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 23. } \cdot \dot{B}_{\mathbf{I}!} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3} \\
& \text { 24. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Prudent play. Black threatened $24 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} t_{5}$ followed by $25 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, or by $25 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and $26 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, after which the Knight could be dislodged from its advanced post only with difficulty. White by the text move avoids this simplification.

Botvinnik plans to reply to ${ }^{2} 4$. . . B-Kt5 with 25. Kt-Kti !, subsequently driving away the Bishop. Then his Queen's Knight could return to $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ and carry out its duty of keeping an eye on $\mathrm{K}_{4}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 24. } \cdots & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{5} \\
{ }_{25} . \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}} & \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{array}
$$

$25 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would have been a little better. The removal of the Knight on White's $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ would have given Black the chance to establish his second Knight on $\mathrm{K}_{5}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 26. } \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} & \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{2}} \\
27 . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
\end{array}
$$

This exchange serves to close the King's file for White and bring Black's backward King's Pawn into safety, but it carries another danger in its trail; White's central formation is strengthened and Black has a positional weakness at his Q3, whose significance is speedily revealed.
28. $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$
Q-R4

Aiming to exchange off the white Knight by 29 . . . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$. This move would not have been possible without the preceding exchange, because of the reply $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, followed by $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R} 4
$$

Safeguarding the QRP so that $29 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$ could now be met simply by moving away the attacked Knight.
$29 . . . R-\mathbf{Q L}_{2}$; 30. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 3}, \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q 1}$; 31. K-Kt2, $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K t}_{4} ; 3^{2} . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{2} ; 33 . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$ !


After this advance, White suddenly has a positional superiority. Whereas, up to now, the position has been in White's favour only in a general way, his advantage now takes tangible form. There is a direct threat of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktr}_{1}-\mathrm{R}_{3}-\mathrm{B}_{4}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, against which Black can do little.

$$
33 \ldots \quad P-Q_{4}
$$

Black cannot prevent the Knight manœuvre, but he can stop the Pawn push. If the white QKtP advances now, Black will exchange it off.

This resource is not completely satisfactory, as White can, sooner or later, employ $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}$ to open up the QKt file for his own benefit.
 B-B2; 37. Kt-Q6, R-Ktr ; 38. R-QKtr.
Another very attractive possibility was the sacrificial line $3^{8}$. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, 39 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QBP}$ followed by $40 . \mathrm{Q} \times$ Pch. But Botvinnik is not keen on combinations without a clear aim. If he has the better of it, then he tries to avoid complications.

| 38. $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q r}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 40. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |

White could attack the QKtP four times over, whereas Black can defend it only thrice. Consequently the exchange in the text is quite unavoidable, and might have had to be carried out under even more unfavourable circumstances if postponed. White has now a very strong passed Pawn, whilst the King's file is opened up once again.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 4. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}} \\
4^{2 .} \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{3})-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{I}
\end{array}
$$

So as to get chances of perpetual check after 43 . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 44. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$; the white King being somewhat insecurely situated. But White fights shy of all double-edged possibilities.

| 43. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R 1}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 44. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 45. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |  |

45. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Ktr}$ would have been more solid. The text allows Black to stage an apparent surprise, but White is well prepared.

$$
45 \cdots \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K}_{4}!
$$

A pretty stroke. White cannot capture the courageous Pawn, for $46 . \operatorname{RP} \times P$ ? ? would lose the Queen ( $46 \ldots$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ ), whilst it is doubtful whether White's two passed Pawns would be a lot of use after $46 . \mathrm{P} \times$ Pe.p., $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{ch} ; 47 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 7, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP} ; 48$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Rch}$; 49. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$.
46. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$

Holding on to his advantage; he now threatens 47. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$.

$$
\text { 46. } \cdot \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} \text { ? }
$$

This violent attempt to profit from the momentarily unsheltered situation of the white King loses by force. $4^{6} \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ would have been better; it is doubtful whether Black could hold out indefinitely in any case, however.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 47. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}} \mathbf{c h} \\
\text { 48. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R} 3 & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} \\
\text { 49. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{7} \mathbf{c h} & \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t r} \\
\text { 50. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} 7 &
\end{array}
$$



The move $46 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ smashed the position completely open, allowing White to penetrate with his Queen and capitalize his passed Queen's Pawn. The win is no longer difficult.
50. . . .

## R-KBr

If $50 \ldots$ - Q , then $5^{1} . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ (threatening $Q \times R!$ ), $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; 52. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ and wins.

$$
\text { 51. } \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q} 6
$$

Another winning line was 5 I . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$. The text move threatens to finish the game at once by $52 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{RI}$; 53. Q-K8.

| 5 I . | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 52. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P c h}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathbf{R 2}_{2}$ |
| 53. Q-K8 | P-Kı6 |

Black tries a little trap. Now $54 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 55. R-K8 would be answered by $55 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 ; 56$. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt8}(\mathrm{Q})$, 57. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ (Q)? (57. R-R8ch is correct), $57 \ldots$ Q-KB8ch; 58. K-R4, P-Kt4ch mating or winning the Queen.

| 54. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 55. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{I}$ |
| 56. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 57. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 6} 6$ | $\cdots$ |

The game was adjourned here, and Black resigned without further play.
No spectacular, but yet a very good, achievement. Botvinnik held fast to his opening advantage and increased it so remorselessly that his opponent was finally driven to a despairing counter-attack which only precipitated the end.

## Fourth Illustration

Finally, a brilliant example of Botvinnik's attacking power.

M. M. Botvinnik<br>White<br>V. A. Chekover<br>Black

(Played in the Moscow tournament, 1935.)

## RETI SYSTEM

1. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;{ }_{2} . \mathrm{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}} ; ~ 3 . \mathrm{P}-\mathbf{Q K} \mathbf{t}_{3}$,


## B-K2.

Niemtzovitsch used to handle this opening rather differently, postponing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ or omitting it altogether and playing $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ as early as possible. A downright plan like this is not to Botvinnik's taste. He prefers to adopt a more reserved attitude, consistently with his predilection for attacks which savour rather of counter-thrusts.

$$
\text { 6. . . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

$6 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, followed by . . Kt-B33, was to be preferred.

| 7. $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$ | $\mathbf{Q K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8. $K t-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}$ |
| 9. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |  |

A characteristic move. White does not want to transpose into the Queen's Gambit by 9. P-Q4, for this would make the position less complicated. So he plans to go through with Niemtsovitch's idea (by P-B4, followed by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ ). At the same time he tempts Black to weaken his centre by ... P-K 4 (which would be answered by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ) or . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, which, though objectively not unfavourable for Black, would set him some difficult problems after the reply $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ (or even $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ ), producing a position of a type that suits Botvinnik particularly well.

$$
9 \cdots \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

This surrender of the centre is bad. Black wants to play . . . P-K $\mathrm{K}_{4}$ with gain of time; the plan goes wrong, however, with the result that White obtains a clear superiority in the centre.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 1о. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
& \text { i. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Parrying the positional threat of II . . P-K ${ }_{4}$, 12. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

| 11. | Q-B2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12. $\mathrm{K} t-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ | R-Qi |
| 13. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$ |  |

The final preparation for the advance of the QP. If $I_{3} . \mathrm{P}-Q_{4}$ at once, 13 . . QKt-K ${ }_{5}$ forces off one minor piece on each side, to lighten Black's task slightly.

I3 .... Kt( $\left.\mathbf{B}_{4}\right)-\mathbf{Q R}_{2} ;$ I $_{4} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4} ;$ I $_{5} . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{5}$, $\mathbf{P}$-QKt3; 16. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 3, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; 17. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K t 2}$; 18. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}, \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B I}$.


A very familiar type of position has been reached. White has "hanging" Pawns at $\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ and is more or less compelled to play for a King's side attack, which has, however, under the circumstances, every chance of succeeding. White usually works for P-Q5 or $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{5}$ in such positions. Botvinnik tackles the problem in an altogether different way: he brings his QKt over to the King's wing, where it decisively strengthens the attack. Each of his next few moves deserves an exclamation mark.

| 19. $\mathbf{K}_{\boldsymbol{t}-\mathbf{Q r}}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R 2}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20. Kt-B2 | Q-Ktr |
| 21. Kt-R ${ }_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{3}$ |
| 22. Kt-Kt5! |  |



The piano of the opening passed into a crescendo in the middle-game and now becomes a fortissimo of attack. Throughout the next ten moves sacrificial combinations are always in the air; the black King's stronghold is smashed open with titanic power.

$$
\text { 22. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

There is no choice; any other move would lose to 23. $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Kt}_{5}\right) \times \mathrm{BP}$.

$$
\text { 23. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \text { Kt }(\mathbf{B r})-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{2}}
$$

If $23 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, then $24 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ wins.

$$
\text { 24. } \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P} \text { ! }
$$

Beautifully played. There were other good continuations here, but White consistently finds the strongest.

| 24. | 25. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K t}$ |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K t r}$ |  |

25 ... K-KI or $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bi}_{\text {I }}$ would permit White an ample choice of winning continuation, e.g.-
(a) $25 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{BI} ; 26 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4} ; 27 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ or more prettily $27 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Ktch}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}\left(27 \ldots B \times R_{\text {, }}\right.$ 28. $\left.B-R_{3} c h\right)$; 28. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K}_{1}$; 29. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$, etc.
(b) $25 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 26. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$ (26 $\ldots$ $R-B_{\mathrm{I}}$, 27. $Q R-K_{\mathrm{I}}$; 27. Q-B7ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; 28. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$ or 28. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 29. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; 30. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{7}$, etc.

| 26. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P c h}$ | K-RI |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{c h}$ | K-KtI |
| 28. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B r}^{2}$ |

The threat was, of course, 29. B-K6ch and mate. 28 . . B-Kt5 would lose to (e.g.) 29 . P-Q5.

| 29. $\mathbf{B - K 6 c h}$ | Kt $\times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30. Q $\times$ Ktch | K-RI |
| 31. Q-R3ch | K-Kti |

31. Q-R3ch

K-Kti

12-(G.226)

The final sacrifice. Black's reply is forced.

| 32. $\ddot{Q}_{\text {P }}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 33. | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B} \mathbf{I}$ |
| 34. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{I}$ |  |

And this is the finishing touch. To forestall mate Black must play $35 \ldots$ B-K $\mathrm{K}_{4}$ or $35 \ldots$ Q-K4, either of which is equivalent to resigning the game.

| 34. $-\dot{\mathbf{R}} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35. | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 36. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c h}!$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| 37. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B c h}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 38. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |

On $38 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ would follow $39 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$. Black must soon be checkmated, anyhow; and Chekover gallantly gives his adversary this pleasure, otherwise he would surely have resigned long before.
39. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$; $40 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P} ; 4{ }^{\mathrm{I}}$.
 mate.

Though Botvinnik is primarily a position player, and though his construction of the game differs vastly from Alckhine's, his play reveals, in his discernment of attacking chances, the greatest possible resemblance to the brilliant style of the world champion.

## CHAPTER VI

## SAMUEL RESHEVSKY

Samuel Reshevsky (originally "Rzeszewski") was born on 26th November, IgII, at Ozorkov in Russian Poland. He learned chess before the alphabet, and quickly displayed great talent for it. As a little boy of eight he played such a strong game that he was allowed to perform as an infant prodigy. Together with a member of his family, who played the part of business manager, he made big tours through Central and Western Europe, creating an immense sensation. In I919 he gave some simultaneous displays in Holland, in one of which Euwe, then a youth of eighteen, was one of the two players amongst twenty participants who managed to beat him. The same year, at Vienna, he played a serious game against Professor Vidmar, a master of international reputation. The onlookers hardly treated the occasion seriously to begin with, but as Vidmar gradually began to get the worse of it, their attitude changed. In the end the infant prodigy blundered and lost-but it was an honourable defeat.
An invitation to America brought his peregrinations to an end; little Sammy began to settle down, assimilated a normal upbringing and education, and grew up into a normal American citizen. Automatically the name "infant prodigy" was forgotten, and when, years afterwards, he participated in an American tournament, all sensationalism was relegated to the background. Nor were his results of a kind to arouse more than moderate interest. In Pasadena (1932), for instance,
he finished behind Alekhine and Kashdan, sharing third place with Dake and Steiner.

His first great success came in the tournament at Syracuse (New York, 1934), which included the best American players, with one or two foreign masters. Reshevsky topped the list with 12 points, followed by Kashdan at io $\frac{1}{2}$, with Dake, Fine, and Kupchik down the list. With his visit to Margate for the Easter congress of 1935 his career as an international grand master began. His one scrious competitor, Capablanca, he managed to defeat in a beautiful game which we give later, and his first place in the final list was well earned with $7 \frac{1}{2}$ points from nine games.

In the spring of i936, Reshevsky acquired the title of champion of the United States of America, after a terrible start in which he lost two of his first three games (one newspaper published the score of one of these games, with the caption "The game which lost Reshevsky his chance of the U.S. championship'"). This success aroused keen interest in his doings in the grand master tournament at Nottingham in August of the same year. Reshevsky did not disappoint; he shared third to fifth places with Fine and Euwe behind Capablanca and Botvinnik, but in front of Alekhine, Flohr, Lasker, and others. It is curious that the characteristic way in which he forges ahead in individual games is so often mirrored in the progress of his score. Here again an inauspicious start (5 out of 9) was followed by a powerful finish ( $4 \frac{1}{2}$ out of 5 ) -a triumph of tenacity. He has been accepted as a member of the select group of candidates for world's championship honours ever since.


Reshevsky devoted the second half of 1937 exclusively to chess. In July he played in the tournament at Kemeri, Latvia, sharing first place with Flohr and Petrov above Alekhine, Keres, Fine, and others. For a long time it looked as if he would win first prize unchallenged, but a setback in the last round (he lost to the Finn, Böök) spoilt his chance.
At first board in the International Team Tournament at Stockholm that August, he led his team to victory.
September 1937 brought new battles. In the exceptionally strong double-round tournament at Semmering-Baden he shared third and fourth places with Capablanca, behind Keres and Fine but in front of Flohr.
After attending the return match Alekhine $v$. Euwe in a journalistic capacity, he participated in the traditional Hastings Christmas tournament, which brought him a resounding victory over Keres, Flohr, Fine, and Mikenas.

Then he returned to America, to confirm his supremacy in U.S. chess with a half-point margin over Fine in the championship tournament, making no mistake in the critical last round.

In the A.V.R.O. tournament he repeated his Nottingham and U.S.A. exploits all over again. A draw from a lost position, then a defeat, a second defeat, a third defeat, then a draw-this was the melancholy tale of his progress in the first five rounds. He seemed condemned to last place. Could anybody recover from such a shocking start-in such company? Reshevsky could-and did. Continually in time-trouble, battling
on stubbornly into lengthy end-games, he overhauled Flohr and Capablanca and finally drew abreast of Alekhine and Euwe for an honourable fourth place.
About this time he was very ambitious of a world championship match with Alekhine; dissatisfied with his A.V.R.O. result, he went on to Russia, where, as we have seen, he finished a good second in a fairly strong gathering.
He has three times since consolidated his tenure of the U.S. title, but in only one case has he really convinced. In the last round of the ig40 tournament, he drifted into a dead lost position against Fine, and could only thank his opponent's nerves for the draw which safeguarded his title. He defeated Horowitz pretty easily in a match, but on meeting the same opponent in the last round of the 1942 Championship tournament, he jeopardized his title in almost exactly the same way as two years previously; and now it was Horowitz's turn to obtain a clearly-won position, and blunder it away. This enabled Reshevsky to tie with Kashdan for first place, and in the play-off match he made no mistake, crushing his opponent by $7 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$. Fine had not participated in this 1942 event.
A possible explanation of Reshevsky's unevenness is that he has been concentrating more and more on his work as an accountant.

## RESHEVSKY AT WORK

## First Illustration

Here is the game in which Reshevsky laid the foundation-stone for his speedily attained renown as
grand master, on the occasion of his very first appearance in an international master tournament outside America.

## S. Reshevsky White <br> J. R. Capablanca Black

(From the Margate Easter Congress, 1935.)

| QUEEN'S GAMBIT |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | Kt-KB3 |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | P-K3 |
| 3. $\mathbf{K t - Q B 3}$ | P-Q4 |
| 4. B-Kt5 | QKt-Q2 |
| 5. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |  |

Reshevsky, like Flohr, is partial to this variation, so as firstly to avoid difficult opening problems and secondly to be able to count on a quiet but lasting initiative.

| 5. .- | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 7. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$ |
| 8. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

8... P-B3 is sounder. Black hopes to profit by the circumstance that White exchanged on his $Q_{4}$ without waiting for . . . P-QB3.

$$
\text { 9. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{5}}
$$

More or less forced; otherwise White will soon play $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ and eventually concentrate his forces on the isolated black QP. To make the capture on the ninth
move would have been unwise, as it would concede Black too great an advantage in development.

| io. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ | R-KI |
| :--- | :--- |
| i i. $\mathbf{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | P-KKt3 |

An important preamble to his next move. II . . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{I}}$ ? would be a blunder because of 12 . $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; ${ }_{13} . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 14. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ !, winning the black QP.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{3}
$$

## Kt-BI

I2 . . . P-QR 3, followed as soon as possible by . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}$, would have been stronger.

| 13. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{t}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| 15. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K} t_{3}$ ! |

A strong continuation which puts White on top. I5 . . P $\times$ P? 16. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QK}$ tP would now cost a Pawn. Consequently Black must resign himself to the exchange on his $\mathrm{QB}_{5}$, which may have most unpleasant consequences. How is he to recapture? . . . R $\times \mathrm{P}$ would leave his QP weak, whilst after . . . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ White's preponderance in the centre would count for far more than Black's majority on the Queen's wing.

$$
\text { I } 5 . . .
$$

Q-R4

Holding up i6. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, which would allow Black to reply $16 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ and make deadly use of the pin on the Knight. As the sequel shows, the text move is not wholly satisfactory.
16. P-QKt4!


A fine tactical coup which serves to produce a pseudo-isolation of Black's QBP and QP and eventually trouble Black with persistent threats to his QP.

$$
\text { 16. . . } \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q r}
$$

The only move. After $16 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$; $17 . \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Ktr}$ (stronger than 17. $K t \times P, Q-Q_{3}$ ), Q-Q3; 18. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ with the three threats $19 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QRP}, 19 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and 19. KR-Ktr, Black's position would specdily become untenable.

$$
{ }_{\text {17 }} . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{4}
$$

With threats of $18 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ and 18 . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ which force Black's reply.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17. . . } \\
& \text { 18. } \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}!
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}
$$

The strategical point of 16 . P-QKt4. White gains possession of the square $\mathrm{QKt}_{5}$ and this makes the isolation of the Black QBP and QP an accomplished fact.
18. . . .

R-K3

The threat was ig. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{RI}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$. Exchanging on his QKt4 would cost Black a Pawn likewise.

## 19. QR-Ktr!

Threatening 20. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}(20 \ldots P \times P, 21$. $\left.R-K_{t}\right)$; 21. Q-K $t_{5}$ winning a Pawn. 19. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ at once would not be so good, on account of 19 . . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ !, White being unable now to capture the QKtP because of 21 . . R-Kti, 22. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; and the Queen is trapped.

Apart from this, the text move robs Black of all possibility of blocking the Queen's side by . . . P-QR4 followed by . . . P-Kt3. Let us try: 19 . . . P-QR4; 20. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} t 6!, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 2$ I. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ (the object is to win the QP without giving up the blockade of the QBP; consequently not 21 . Fit $\times P, R \times R, 22$. K $t \times B c h$. $Q \times K t$, ctc.), $21 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; 22. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} t \mathrm{t}$ and White picks up the black Queen's side Pawns one by one.

## 19. . . <br> R-Kti <br> 20. R-Kt2

Threatening 21. KR-Kti followed by 22. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ $(\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 23 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R})$.

$$
20 . \cdots \quad \text { B- } \mathbf{K}_{2}
$$

Black is still aiming at $21 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ and is now ready to reply to 22 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} t 6$ with $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} 5$ (gaining time by attacking the undefended Knight) followed by $23 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ or $23 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, e.g. 23 . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Br}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 24. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$. If White postpones 22 . P-Kt6, then Black plays a Pawn on to that square himself, bringing his opponent's attack to a full stop.
21. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

Naturally White does not allow the Queen's side to be blocked.


Concluding, for the moment, the operations he inaugurated with $16 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} t_{4}$. The black Pawn complex (QP and QBP) is demonstrably isolated; Black must put up with protracted pressure along the open QKt file. Reshevsky has gained a clear positional advantage through splendid tactics. Now the game enters on a new phase: White gradually strengthens his position.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{24} \cdots \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}{ }^{25} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}} \quad \mathbf{K t - B _ { 2 }}
\end{aligned}
$$

Threatening to win the exchange by $26 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25. }-\dot{B}_{4} \\
& \text { 26. } \quad \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Reshevsky foresees well that Black will not be able
to make anything out of the backward KP which this produces. The threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$, starting a strong attack on the King's side, is now in the air. First, however, come a few moves which do not alter the situation to any considerable extent. (One might surmise that Reshevsky would normally be in time-trouble about here!)
$26 \ldots \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ;{ }_{2}$ 27. Kt-Kt4, Q-Q2; 28. P-R3, K-Kt2; 29. Kt-B2, B-R6; 3о. R-R2, B-Q3; 3 I. $\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{t}}\left(\mathrm{B}_{2}\right)-\mathbf{Q r}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$.

So as not to have continually to reckon with the possibility of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ or $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$.

| 32. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}}!$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| 34. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}!$ |  |

The manœuvre with the white Knight was very fine, exchanging off the hostile Knight without yielding up the blockade of the black QBP. Note that the blockading Knight simultaneously attacks the QP. The disappearance of the black Knight opens up the square $\mathrm{QKt}_{5}$ for the use of the white Rooks.

| 34. | Q-K3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 35. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2}$ | P-Kı3 |
| 36. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$ | R-QI |
| 37. $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{R z})-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2}$ |  |

Though it seems now that Black can no longer prevent the fall of his Queen's Pawn, Capablanca defends as well as possible and finds a pretty resource against the threat of $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$.

So as to reply to $38 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$ with $38 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 39. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$, after which the passed Pawn would suddenly become strong, e.g. 40 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B6}$; 4 I . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{7}$; 42. Kt-K6ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$, and the Pawn will queen.

| 38. R-Kt4 | R-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39. K-RI | B-QI |
| 40. P-Kt4 |  |

The Queen's Pawn cannot be won directly, so White goes to improve his position by a demonstration on the King's side. This move threatens 4 I . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, which after the reply $4^{1} \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ would saddle Black with yet another weak Pawn, at his $\mathrm{KB}_{4}$; apart from this, the open KKt file would spell danger for the black King.

$$
\text { 40. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

The best.

$$
\text { 4I. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q 3}_{3}
$$

41. . . Q-R ${ }_{5}$ ch would be merely waste of time: 42. K-Kt2.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 42. } & \text { K-Ktr } \\
\text { 43. K-B2 } & \text { B }-B_{2} \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

The white King is heading for $\mathrm{QB}_{2}$, where it supports the Knight. This would rob Black's . . . Q-R6 of its sting, so that White could safely go to win the QP by $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}$.
43. . . .

## R-B2!

Capablanca finds a defence once again. He threatens to counter-attack dangerously, commencing with

44 . . . P-KKt ${ }_{4}$, e.g. 44. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} t_{4}$; 45. P-B5, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, and White has no adequate parry against the threat of $46 \ldots$ R-KR 3 , since 46 . R-KRI would leave the Rook on Kt4 unprotected. Hence White's next is practically forced, though it frees the important square $\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ for the black Queen.

| 44. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 45. | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |$\quad$| $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{I}$ |
| :--- |
| $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

Here Black misses the best continuation and soon gets into a hopeless situation. $45 \cdots$ Q-K 3 would have given White much more trouble, threatening $4^{6} \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, with an invasion to $\mathrm{B}_{7}$ or Q 6 in the air.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 46. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t P} \quad \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R} 6 \\
& \text { 47. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}!
\end{aligned}
$$

See the note to 43 . K-B2. Everything is adequately protected on the Queen's side; the black Queen can do nothing from QR6, and White returns immediately to the attack, which, thanks to his possession of the open QKt file, speedily clinches the issue.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 47. } \mathrm{M}_{1} \dot{\mathbf{K}}_{\text {t }} & \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2} \\
\text { 48. } & \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}
\end{array}
$$

One last despairing attempt. Passive play would be useless, e.g. 48 . . Q-Q ${ }_{3}$; 49. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{7}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 50. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}!, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{4} ; 5$ I. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ and wins.

$$
\text { 49. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

To capture the Rook would be a bad blunder: 49. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ ? ? Q-Q6ch; 50. K-BI (50. $K-K_{\mathrm{I}}, B-R_{5} c h$ ), $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; $5^{1} . \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{7}\right)-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ and wins. With the
text move, on the other hand, White wins the QBP as well, since there is nothing to be done against the threat of $50 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$.


The race is run. Reshevsky's strategy has been crowned with complete success. He has won both the Pawns he isolated.
The white King is, rather remarkably, safer in the centre of the board than the black in his castled domain. Incidentally, an illustration of the significance of a strong centre.

| 50. $-\mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 51. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q} 3$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R r}$ |
| 52. $\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{K} 6$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R} 6$ |

Costs a piece and precipitates the end.

$$
\text { 53. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{7}
$$

There is now no parrying the simultaneous threats of $54 . \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Ktr}_{1}\right)-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ and $54 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$.
$\mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{R}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$

Countering the first threat (if $54 . \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Ktr}^{2}\right)-\mathrm{Kt} 7$, the Bishop simply moves away), but not the second.

| 54. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R 8}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 55. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K B 8} \mathbf{c h}$ |
| $56 . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$ | Resigns |

This game gives us a very good picture of Reshevsky's style. Quiet construction of the game ( $5 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ) masks enterprising plans (the intention to castle on the Queen's side), and if provoked ( $8 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ ), he is quite willing to "mix it," and knows how to seize his chances in supreme fashion ( $15 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}$ t3!, 16. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}$ !, and $18 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ !). In the middle-game he is daring, and often enough decides on seemingly risky manœuvres which not even Flohr and Botvinnik would voluntarily undertake. (40. P-Kt4 followed by the march of the King.) Fortified by strong nerves, devout optimism, great self-confidence, a philosophical temperament and a tremendous weight of experience, he feels confident in any position that is even remotely presentable, and up to any task the world of his opponents may present him.

## Second Illustration

As second game we print one of somewhat the same genre but with Reshevsky as Black.
I. Kashdan White
S. Reshevsky
Black
(Played in the U.S. Championship, 1938)

\section*{QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACCEPTED, NOTTINGHAM VARIATION <br> | 1. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KKt3}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 5. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{4} \mathbf{c h}$ |  |}

This move, in connexion with the fianchetto of the King's Bishop, is the hall-mark of the Nottingham variation. The first six or seven moves can be transposed in various ways.

| 5. | QKt-Q2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6. B-Kt2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ |
| 7. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B P}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ |

Black could also play 7 . . P-QKt4 at once, for 8. Q-B6 merely wastes time: $8 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{2}$ ! ; 9. B-B4, B-Kt2! (Capablanca-Reshevsky, Nottingham, 1936.) 10. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ would fail through $10 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 1I. $B \times Q, B \times K t$.

> 8. $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$
> 9. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} 3$

P-QK $\mathbf{t}_{4}$
9. Q-B2 was preferable. Through the manouvre $Q-R_{4} \mathrm{ch}$ and $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ in this variation, the white Queen comes to be somewhat exposed, hence it is advisable to retire her to a safe square as soon as possible.

## B-Kt2

## 1.. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{4}$

The well-known way of smashing up the formation of Pawns on $\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{~K}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}_{4}$; but here it fails to obtain ${ }^{13}$-(G. $\mathrm{G}, 26$ )
the result desired. White could have secured a drawish position by го. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$.
I I. $\dot{Q K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$
P-Kt5

Apparently coming into fine play via $\mathrm{QKt}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$.
II. . . .

$$
\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}!
$$

Far from a mere simple exchange, but a pretty combination by which Black gains important time. The point is that the natural reply 12 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ would lose: 12 . . Kt-K4! i3. Q-K ${ }_{3}$ (forced), $13 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)-$ $\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$; $14 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ !, and the white Queen has no move. Consequently White must recapture on $Q_{4}$ with the Queen, which enables Black to gain time in developing his King's Bishop.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 12. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{P} \\
& \text { I3. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

The white Queen leads a fugitive existence. 13. Q-Q3 would have been just as unsatisfactory.

$$
\text { 4 } 4 . \dot{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 3}}
$$

Weakening his $Q_{3}$. 14. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$ would have offered better prospects for the respectable development of his pieces.

$$
\text { 14. } \ldots \quad K_{t-Q_{4}!}
$$

Very good. After the practically forced exchange of Queens, Black's pieces work well together.

$$
{ }_{15} . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \quad \mathbf{K R} \times \mathbf{Q}
$$

Black is ahead in development and can also make capital out of the weakness of White's $Q^{2} 3$. These
factors are not decisive in themselves, especially as Kashdan defends very well; but Reshevsky manages not only to maintain his advantage but gradually to increase it.

| 16. B-Kt2 | Kt-B6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 17. KR-KI | QR-Br |
| 18. $\mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{B I}$ | $\mathbf{K t - B 3}$ |

The Knight on B 6 is indirectly protected, $\mathrm{I} 9 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ? $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? , $\mathrm{B} \times$ Pch losing the exchange.

$$
\text { 19. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}
$$

Now White threatens $20 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ in earnest.

```
19. . . B-R2
20. Kt-B4
```

White seems to have evaded his difficulties already, since Black cannot consolidate the situation of his advanced Knight any further. If $20 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, then $2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} t_{5}$ would be a very strong reply; whilst $20 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ can hardly be correct, since Black would then have continually to reckon with the possibility of . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$.

|  | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B6})-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 21. Kt-Kt5 | B-Q4 |
| 22. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$ | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$ |
| 23. $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{K I})$-QI | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ |

Black must be on the alert against premature simplification, e.g. $23 \cdots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $24 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 25. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$; 26. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{BI}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Bch}$; $27 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$; 28. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{2}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 29. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and White has a beautiful game; he threatens to isolate Black's

QKtP by $30 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ and then win it, whilst Black cannot play $29 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ himself because of 30 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ (threatening 31. B-B7), $30 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$; 31. B-Q6 and White wins by advancing his passed Pawn.

$$
{ }^{24} \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B I}
$$

## $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B I}$

24 . . B $\times \mathrm{Ktch}$ would still achieve nothing: 25 . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$; 26. B-Q4 followed by $27 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and the game would be drawn, through the Bishops being on squares of opposite colour.

$$
{ }_{25} \cdot \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 4
$$

With every move White is gaining command of more of the board, but Reshevsky now takes care to put an end to the process.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25. } \because \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} \\
& 26 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{aligned}
$$

Not $26 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, which would lose at least a Pawn by $26 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$.


A painful surprise for White, who apparently had reckoned only with $26 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times$ Ktch, which would
yield Black the advantage by $27 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 28 . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$; 29. K-K2, Kt-Kt6!; 30. R-Kti, Kt $\times$ Pch; 3I. K-Q3, R-QI! But White has better: 27. $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{BI}) \times \mathrm{B}$, and this move even gives him the upper hand, as $27 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{7}$ ch fails against $28 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, whilst both $27 \ldots \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Br}) \times \mathrm{R}$ and $27 \ldots \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Qr}) \times \mathrm{R}$ lose.

The text move produces a far-reaching simplification which gives Black's advantage concrete form.

```
27. R}\times\mathbf{K}\mathbf{t
```

Forced.

$$
{ }_{\text {28. }}^{\text {27. }} \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K I}_{I}
$$

Not $28 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$ ?, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ and wins.
28. . . .
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$
29. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$
B-Q4

Threatening $30 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, after which the protected passed Pawn would be extremely dangerous, e.g. 31. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ (31. $R \times B$ ?, $R \times R$; 32. $P \times R, P-Q R 4$, and wins easily), $31 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ followed by $32 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$.

| 30. $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| 32. R-B2 | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{2}$ |
| 33. Kt-Q2 |  |

Naturally White must get rid of the pin on the file as soon as possible.

| 33. | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 34. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ | K-Q3 |
| 35. K-Q3 | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ |



Now see what the simplification started by 26 . . Kt-Q7 has produced. White's position exhibits two serious weaknesses, one material (on $\mathrm{QK}_{3}$ ) and one positional (on Q4). White's Knight cannot move, owing to the threat on the QKtP; his King must keep an eye on the square $Q_{4}$, lest the black King invade it. Consequently the white pieces are almost completely immobilized. The Bishop is vastly superior to the Knight; for instance, it can move at will along the diagonal (Black's) KKti to $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ without giving up the pressure on White's QKtP, and this circumstance confronts White with the danger of becoming movebound.

In the ensuing technical phase of the game Reshevsky contrives to resolve his advantage into an efficient win.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 36. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{3} & \text { P-Kt3 } \\
\text { 37. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{3} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
\end{array}
$$

The only chance of putting up serious resistance lay in 38. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, e.g. $38 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 39. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$;
40. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch} ; 4$ i. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Pch} ; 4^{2} . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ !, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4} ; 43 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3} ; 44 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, etc.

The text move allows the black King access to $\mathrm{K}_{3}$ without gaining $\mathrm{K}_{4}$ for the Knight.

| 38. $\mathbf{.}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5}!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

Black has acquired two more advantages, the majority of Pawns on the King's side and the certainty of his King's being able to penetrate to Q5-this latter through his being able to exhaust White of moves.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 4o. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}} \\
& \text { 4i. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{5}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}
$$

In vain White struggles against the surrender of his Q4.

$$
\text { 4I. . . } \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}!
$$

Threatening the unmeetable $42 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4} \mathrm{ch} ; 43$. $K-B_{2}, K-Q_{5}$.
42. K-B2

If 42 . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, then $4^{2} \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$ would be even worse.

$$
4^{2} \ldots \quad K-Q_{5}
$$

The rest is easy.
43. Kt-B4, B-K 3; 44. Kt-Q2, K-K6; 45 . K-Qı, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{7} ; 46, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{7} ; 47 . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{1}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ !

Threatening $48 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4} ; 49 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$, etc. There is now no preventing the promotion of Black's KRP.
 $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R} 6!{ }_{51}$. Kt $\times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{7} ;{ }^{2}$. Kt $\times \mathbf{P c h}, \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}$.

White resigns.
An outstanding positional game, characterized by the various tactical niceties through which Reshevsky strengthened his hold on the game and by the cleverness with which he managed to retain his advantage, in a variety of forms, through all sorts of simplifications.

## Third Illustration

Reshevsky often wins with Black. He prefers defences which encourage his opponent to attack; there arise lively positions in which his tactical preparedness counts for a lot. The next two games illustrate this well.
Dr. E. Lasker
White
S. Reshevsky
Black
(Played in the tournament at Nottingham, 1936.)

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACCEPTED

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;$ 2. $^{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 3 . \mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3} \text {, }}$ $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K B}_{3} ;{ }_{4} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}} ;{ }_{5} . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}} ; 6$. Kt-B3.

Of late, 6. O-O followed by $7 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ has been almost exclusively played. It is not certain which is the better system.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 6. } \cdots \mathrm{O} \\
& \text { 7. }
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}
$$

The "classical" continuation 7. P-QR4 has gone completely out of favour.
7. . .
P-QKt4
8. B-Q3

Once he has played 6. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}$, it is preferable to retire this Bishop to $\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$. White must go for the breakthrough by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ in this variation.

$$
\text { 8. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

This exchange is important, to fix the centre formation. White's KP disappears, and his QP can neither capture nor march forward.

| 9. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | B-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10. $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{t}}$ | B-K2 |
| 11. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | O-O |
| 12. $\mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{Q r}$ |  |

White is aiming at building up a strong attacking position by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, but Reshevsky manages to thwart this plan by a few simple moves.

| 12..$\cdots$ | $\mathbf{Q K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q 4}_{4}$ ! |

Very troublesome for White. After 14. B $\times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ (14 . . . Kt $\times K t$ ?? ; $\mathrm{I}_{5} . B \times R P c h!$ ) $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ (or $\mathrm{I}_{5}$. $K t \times K t, B \times K t), \mathrm{I}_{5} \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 6) ; \mathrm{r}_{6} . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{I}}$ Black has the better Pawn formation, whilst White's attacking chances are somewhat problematical.

$$
\text { 14. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B I}
$$

To avoid exchanges, a good plan for the attacker as a rule; but the move loses time and allows Black to saddle White with a backward Pawn on his $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$.

| 14. | $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15. | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}_{t} \times \mathbf{K t}(\mathbf{B 6})$ |
| 16. $. \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ |

A pretty Pawn sacrifice which White had apparently had in mind when making his preceding move. After 16 . . P $\times \mathrm{P}$; $17 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ or $17 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ followed by 18. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$, White really would get good attacking chances, his command of the important central square $\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ insuring him against all possibility of counterattack.

There is one serious drawback-that Black need not accept the sacrifice.

$$
\text { 16. . . } \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}!
$$

17. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ would, as things stand, only mean creating new weaknesses, so White's Knight has to go back again.

## 17. Kt-B3

## KR-BI

Black has now an excellent game. The best for White is now i8. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 19. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, but he would still have inadequate compensation for the isolation of his Queen's Pawn.

## 18. B-Kt2

$\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ !
Very strongly played, again. Equally after 19. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, and after 19. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 20. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$; 21. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, Black would have an overwhelming position. Yet White should have chosen one of these continuations.

## 19. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}$

## $\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t} \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$ !

Black employs simple methods, yet clarifies his advantage with every move. Lasker does not get a
single opportunity to exploit his redoubtable ability in involved positions.

$$
\text { 20. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Not $20 . . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$; 21. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and White would suddenly have good counter-chances.

$$
\text { 21. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K t P}
$$

Losing outright. 21. Kt-KI was necessary, although White's position would hardly have been tenable after $21 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 22. K-RI, Kt-B5 , followed by . . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$.

```
21. ...
22. \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}\)
```

$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t c h}$

As a consequence of his preceding move, White cannot recapture with the $Q u e e n(22 . Q \times K t, Q \times B)$, and this proves fatal.


With the threat of $24 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, against which nothing can be done. White resigns.

## Fourth Illustration

S. Landau
White
S. Reshevsky Black
(Played in the Kemeri, Latvia, tournament, 1937.)

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACCEPTED

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} ;$ 2. $^{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \text {; 3. } \mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3} \text {, }}$
 6. O-O, P-B4; 7. Q-K2, P-QKt4; 8. B-Q3.

Concerning the opening, see the last game.
White has omitted $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ here. He now wants to attack Black's Queen's wing by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$; in this connexion, his $K B$ is better placed on $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ than Kt 3 .

$$
\text { 8. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Selecting the same construction as in the preceding game, but in the changed circumstances it does not yield him a wholly satisfactory game.

| 9. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | B-Kt2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1.. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{4}$ ! | P-Kt5 |
| 11. $\mathbf{Q K t - Q 2}$ | B-K2 |
| 12. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ |

Black could not permit $1_{3}$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$.

| 13.. | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. | KR-Qr |
| 15. | B-K |
|  | O-O |
|  | Kt-B3 |
|  | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |

With the same idea as in the last game: Black wants
to ease his task by exchanges, but this time he meets with more difficulty.

| 16. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{4}$ | P-Kı3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 17. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t} \mathbf{4}^{4}$ | Kt-B3 |
| 18. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{K t - R} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

Reshevsky manœuvres quite cleverly, keeping his opponent occupied all the time so that he cannot easily develop his attack. The situation, however, remains difficult for Black.

$$
\text { 19. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{3}
$$

Sagely played. After 19. Q-R6, Kt $\times \mathrm{B}$; 20. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}\left(2 \mathrm{I} . P \times B, B-\mathrm{K}_{4}\right.$ and wins $), 21 \ldots$ $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B}$; 22. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{QR} \times \mathrm{R}$; 23. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ (threatening $24 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4}$ ! $25 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ or $24 \ldots$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ and . . R-R4) White, in spite of his extra material, would be in a very awkward corner, as his Queen is in peril of her life.


This and the two following moves are very deep. Reshevsky, although still in difficulties, sets his opponent a diabolic trap.

| 21. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R} \mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 23. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{t}}$ ? |  |

This is just the move Black was hoping for. 23. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ? would also have been bad, because of $23 \ldots$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 24. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{2}$ attacking the Knight and
the KBP simultaneously; but $23 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ would have left White excellently placed.

The text move loses.

```
23. . . .
P-B3
24. }\mathbf{P}\times\mathbf{P
```

It goes without saying that White would have rejected $23 . \mathrm{Kt-K} t_{5}$ if he had realized what was coming now, for it is already too late to save the situation; $24 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ or ${ }_{2} 4 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ would be answered by 24 . . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, while $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ would give a piece away, not for an attack but for nothing.

$$
24 . \cdots \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P c h}
$$



A thunderbolt out of a clear sky. Lulled by roseate dreams a moment ago, White is rudely awakened by elemental violence.

$$
\text { 25. } \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

25. K-Ri would have been just as useless, for instance $25 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $26 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QRP}$ (otherwise White remains a Pawn behind in a bad position), 26 . .
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 27. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 6$; 28. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 29. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ ch winning the Queen. After the text move White has no more choice at all.
```
26. Kt-B3
```

A King move would allow mate in one move or two.

| 26. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27. | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B P c h}$ |
| 28. K-Kti | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{5}!$ |

The threat of 29 . . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$ is crushing.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}
$$

Brings only momentary relief.

$$
29 \cdots \quad \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{Q}
$$

Threatening mate in two distinct ways.

$$
\text { 30. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B I} \quad \text { R- } \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

The same little idea as before, but now White has no Queen to throw herself gallantly on to the flames.

```
31. R-Q8ch
32. R-Q7ch
K-Kt2
\(\mathrm{K}-\mathbf{R}_{3}\)
```

White resigns.
We see that the American champion can institute splendid combinations. His talent is, as we have observed, truly many-sided.

## CHAPTER VII

## REUBEN FINE

R. Fine was born in New York on inth October, 1914, and became acquainted with chess at an early age without taking it very seriously. In his fifteenth year he suddenly began to progress, and specdily developed into a strong player. In 1932 he took part in the tournament at Pasadena (see the chapter on Reshevsky), but without success; he shared last place with J. Bernstein, Factor, and Reinfeld. A year later, however, he had acquired such a reputation through local successes that he was elected a member of the U.S. team for the Folkestone Team Tournament. This was his first appearance on the European stage, and he assisted his country to victory in promising style. In the tournament at Syracuse (New York, 1934) he shared third and fourth places with Dake behind Reshevsky and Kashdan, and a year later (July, 1935) he scored a brilliant success at the American Chess Federation's thirty-sixth congress at Milwaukee, winning the top tournament with eight points out of ten games, above Dake (second) and Kashdan (third) -a remarkable feat, since Kashdan was then considered the strongest player in America. Reshevsky did not participate in this tournament.

On the strength of this achicvement he was selected to play at the U.S.A.'s top board in the International Team Tournament at Warsaw (August 1935). He started rather badly (it is said he had a thoroughly seasick crossing), but pulled up towards the end and

played a worthy part in his team's victory. As a sequel to the "Olympiad," a tournament of ten was organized at Lodz, and there Fine came second, together with Kolski, behind Tartakover. This was his first individual tournament in Europe. A few months later he scored a sensational success in the Christmas congress at Hastings, beating Flohr and taking first prize. Now he suddenly began to be considered a candidate for the world's championship-as Alekhine, incidentally, had predicted he would many years before.

1936 began with a little disappointment. Marshall, still titular champion of the U.S.A. as there had been no championship tournaments for a long time, relinquished his title voluntarily, and thus the American Chess Federation found themselves with the task of organizing a tournament for the title. A series of qualifying tournaments produced a final tourney of sixteen. Fine started favourite but could finish no higher than third, equal with Treysman. Reshevsky was the new champion, with Simonson second and Kashdan fifth. It was about here that Reshevsky was suddenly revealed as Fine's "bogey-man"; another three years were to elapse before Fine could score his first win against him.

In 1936 he returned to stay more than a year and a half in Europe, during which time he played in one tournament after another, registering a series of fine successes. Towards the end his results-evidently through staleness-began to deteriorate. The first tournament in this period was at Amsterdam, where he took first place with $8 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of II (Euwe $7 \frac{1}{2}$, Keres and Dr. Tartakover each $6 \frac{1}{2}$, Bogolyubov and

[^1]Maroczy each 6). The Nottingham (1936) tournament followed which we have already mentioned more than once (see, for instance, under Reshevsky).

Fine settled awhile in Amsterdam. In October he competed in a tournament of eight organized by a socialist newspaper company and finished first, together with Euwe, Alekhine being half a point behind in third place. In the Hastings Christmas tournament he came second to Alekhine, who beat him in their individual encounter after Fine had rushed away with a sequence of seven straight wins. Fine made a bee-line from Hastings direct to Sweden, where he took part in several tournaments, the most outstanding result of this trip being his beating Stahlberg in a match by $5^{-3}$.

Then came a trip to Russia, where he won two small events in which Botvinnik did not compete. The Margate Easter tournament enabled him to revenge himself over Alekhine for the defeat at Hastings. He and Keres both beat the world champion in their individual encounters, and finished together in first place. This tournament represented the culmination, for the time being, of his success; months of play without a moment's respite had begun to sap his powers, and in the tournament at Ostend which immediately followed Margate he received a serious warning. In the middle of this tournament he rushed over to London to give a simultaneous display, returning to complete his schedule of games at high pressure. In the circumstances he did well to share the final first place with Grob and Keres; but in doing so he lost no fewer than three games, a result the more
perturbing as the chess world had become accustomed to secing him lose only on the rarest occasions. A twomonths' rest ensued, apparently not long enough, for his performance in the strong tournament at Kemeri in June 1937 was a débâcle; he finished ninth out of eighteen, and-what was even more painful-could only amass a single point against the seven leaders, Flohr, Petrov, Reshevsky, Alekhine, Keres, A. Steiner, and Tartakover. Was staleness alone to blame for this setback? The historian gropes in the dark; he can only record that a month afterwards Fine announced his engagement to Miss Keesing. Within another month he was married and had gone off to take part in the very strong tournament at Semmering-Baden, where he really threw himself into the fray. He came second to Keres in front of Capablanca, Reshevsky, Flohr, Eliskases, Ragozin, and Petrov. It was here that he had one of the most annoying experiences of his career: two Pawns up in a Bishop v. Knight ending against Reshevsky, he could not win! His score, in an event of level results, made a curious showing: two wins, no losses, twelve draws!

From October till December he acted as "second" to Euwe in the return match for the world's title, and we need make no secret of the fact that - in spite of his principal's disappointing result-he discharged this task nobly. That after these weeks of exertion and tension he could only tie for fourth and fifth places with Flohr in the Christmas tournament at Hastings was hardly surprising.

In January, i938, he sailed with his wife for New York. Our young grand master had had enough of chess for
the time being, and returned to complete his mathematical studies; but in the meantime he competed in the American championship tournament in March, with the result already reported: Reshevsky 13, Fine 12 $\frac{1}{2}$, Simonson II, Horowitz 10, Kashdan $9 \frac{1}{2}$, etc. In their last-round game, though playing White, he could make no impression on Reshevsky and was glad in the end to accept a draw.

Then came scveral months of rest and quiet research on the openings for his revision of Modern Chess Openings, until October, when he returned to Holland to score the success of his life. In the first six rounds of the A.V.R.O. tournament he beat Botvinnik, Reshevsky, Euwe, Flohr, and Alekhine and drew with Capablanca-surely one of the most brilliant bursts in chess history. And he missed a win against Capablanca!

Then came a landslide, and he could only snatch three points out of his remaining eight games; but he had done enough to assure himself of first place.

In the 1940 U.S. championship tournament, he finished once again "half-a-point behind Reshevsky; this time he had the title in his grasp, but the occasion proved too much for him, and he let slip a won game. With curious regularity, he has since beaten Reshevsky in lesser events such as "Lightning Chess" championships, the New York State championship, etc., and has ridden roughshod over all other U.S. opposition. On the whole, he can be said to be a slightly more polished and skilful player, but he cannot win that U.S. championship! He did not enter the contest in I942, having taken up a post as translator in a Government department in Washington. In 1944, with Reshevsky absent, he managed to take second place again to

Denker, who had been almost unknown outside the States. Worthy of mention is his extended tour of the U.S.A. and Canada in 1940; of a total of 418 games, many played simultaneously blindfold, he lost only three!

He has recently produced a superb book on the endings which will keep its place as a classic for many decades to come.

## FINE IN ACTION

## First Illustration

The game which follows took a fairly quiet course. Queens came off early, and there were no combinations of note. Fine played pretty keenly withal: in the very beginning he conceded the "minor exchange" and the Pawn majority on the Queen's wing, convinced that his superior mobility on other fronts would count for more. Keen and efficient play is required, in a case like this, to make the abstract advantage turn the scale against the concrete. Fine succeeds convincingly.
R. Fine
White
G. Maroczy
Black
(Played in the Zandvoort tournament, 1936.)

## ORTHODOX QUEEN'S GAMBIT

 $\mathrm{P}_{-\mathrm{Q}_{4} ;}$ 4. Kt-B3, B-K2; 5. B-Kt5, QKt-Q2; 6. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O} ; 7 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B r}_{1}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ; 8 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 3, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K R}_{3}$; 9. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{4}$.
9. $\mathrm{B}^{-} \mathrm{R}_{4}$ is more usual; the text move is "sharper" in so far as it permits Black to exchange off White's QB for a Knight. The resulting situation is difficult to
assess, White's command of greater terrain being balanced against Black's retention of his two Bishops.

Fine often makes moves in the opening which sharpen, or rather could sharpen, the conflict. He does not go in for direct attack, but strives after some positional aim in a more or less provocative way. If his opponent takes up the gauntlet, a lively game quickly ensues, in which it usually becomes evident that Fine has seen far more decply into the position than his opponent.

$$
\text { 9. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Black would better have played $9 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ at once if he is going to play it at all, e.g. 1o. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; in. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3} ;$ I2. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2} ; \mathrm{I}_{3}$. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ;{ }_{14} . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2} ; \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q}$; 16. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Br}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 17. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ !, with good play for Black (Thomas $v$. Lasker, Nottingham, 1936).

$$
\text { ㅇ. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B P}
$$

## $\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$

Once Black has given up the centre, 10 . . . Kt-Q4 deserves preference. The point is that then, after the attacked Bishop moves, II . . . Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}$ can be played, White having to recapture with the Pawn, since otherwise he would lose the exchange by . . . B-Kt5. The blocking of the QB file thus produced would ease Black's task considerably, and for this reason White does best, after $10 \times \mathrm{Kt}$ - ${ }_{4}$, to allow Black to capture his QB by continuing in. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{5}! \\
& \text { 12. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}
\end{aligned}
$$

Threatening to win a piece by 13 . P-KKt4. We
now perceive the important distinction between the continuations 1 о . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ and 10 . . . Kt-R4; the first allows Black to play iI . . . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ and concentrate unhindered on the task of bringing his $Q B$ into play, whilst the second, adopted here, leaves his Knight most awkwardly placed, so that he has to postpone the important job of getting out the Bishop until he has attended to its security.

```
I2. . . .
\(\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q c h}\)
```

Black exchanges Queens to eliminate the danger of a direct attack, at any rate.
${ }^{13}$. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q} \quad$ P-KKt 3


Black has the two Bishops and the better Pawn position. His preponderence on the Queen's side is a clear advantage in itself, since one of White's Pawns on the other wing is doubled; whilst the Bishop pair is a certain guarantee for the future. All these factors are not quite enough to counterbalance his difficulties in developing, however, as Fine has foreseen.
14. P-KKt4

Kt-Kt2

Not a beautiful square for the Knight. The consequences of the inferior 10 . . Kt-R4 are becoming more and more clearly apparent.

```
I5. Kt-K4
```

Cancelling out one of Black's advantages already; White can now play Kt -B6ch whenever he chooses, as good as forcing the reply $\ldots \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, so that Black's better Bishop disappears.

|  | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 16. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K R}_{4}$ | P-QKt |
| 17. B-K2 |  |

It is just as well to retire this piece to a square on which it is quite immune from further chivvying by Pawns.

```
I7. . . .
P-QB4
18. O-O
```

Very well played. Superficially it might seem good to forego castling, leaving the Rook at Ri and playing for a King's side attack, e.g. with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ in mind (which would induce Black to play . . . P-KKt4 so that White could then break through by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ ). Fine does the job more simply and safely. He prefers to base his operations on the Queen's file, and his judgment is speedily vindicated.
18. .
B-Kt2
19. Kt-B6ch

Accurately timed. Black must capture, otherwise $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ decides.
19. $\mathbf{\text { 20. }} \times \mathbf{B}$
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$
$\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}}$
21. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t}_{5}$
B-Q4

Black has nothing better in face of the threat of 22. R-Q7.

## 22. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$

Threatening to win the exchange by ${ }_{23} \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{7}$ !

```
22. . . .
                                    Kt-Q3
23. P-B3!
```

Threatening to win a piece by 24 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$. If 23 . . $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q}_{1} ; 24 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ (24 . . $B \times R P$ ?; 25 . $K t-B 6, R-Q_{2} ; 26 . P-K_{5}$ and wins); 25. R-Q ${ }_{2}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 26. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{I}}\right)-\mathrm{QI}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 27. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ and wins easily through his possession of the Queen's file. Black is at a loss for a satisfactory reply. [We have a feeling 23. Kt-Q7 would have been even stronger: 23 . . $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 24. Kt-Kt6.-Translators.]

$$
23 \ldots \quad K t-\mathbf{B}_{5}
$$

Black has already had to give back the minor exchange, and now he sees his Pawn majority on the Queen's side disappear. The ensuing exchanges leave his Pawns badly scattered, and soon one of them must go. 24. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} ;{ }_{25} . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} ;{ }_{2} 6 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B} \mathbf{I}$, QR-Kti; ${ }^{27}$. R-KB2, R-Kt5; $28 . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{3}$ !

Driving the Rook to an inferior square.
$28 \ldots \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{5} ; \quad 29 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q 1} ; 30 . \mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{B}_{2}\right)-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$. Winning the Pawn on $\mathrm{B}_{4}$.
30. . R-Q4.
$30 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kti}$ or $30 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$; 31. K-Kt2, R-QKt8 would be no better. White would not capture the Pawn at once, but would first bring his King to $\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$.
31. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}} ; ~ 32 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} ;$ 33. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$,
$\mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 34 . \mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 35 . \mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{7} ; 36$. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} ; 37 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B} 8 \mathbf{c h}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R} 2 ; 38 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B 8}$.


White's efforts are crowned by his sudden ability to profit by the bad position of his opponent's King.

Black now played $38 \ldots$ R-Kt2, and immediately resigned, realizing the hopelessness of further resistance. White need only keep an eye on stalemate possibilities, e.g. 39. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$; 40. R-QR8?, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch}$; $4 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 8 \mathrm{ch}$, etc. There is better: 39. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{2}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$; 40. R-QR8, R-Kt4; 4I. R-R7, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{KtI} ; 42 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ (42. . . R-Kt6ch; 43. $K-K_{4}, R \times P$; 44. $R-R 8 c h, K-R 2$; 45. $R-K B 8$ and wins); 43. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$; 44. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt}_{7}$, and the threat of 45 . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, winning the Rook's Pawn, cannot be parried.

A typical Fine game. Simple methods, no direct attack, no involved combinations or complications, and yet keen motifs.

## Second Illustration

Fine provides a magnificent specimen of positional play in the following game, which differs from the last
in that it is his opponent who first seizes the initiative. The way in which Fine not only parries but punishes these attempts, gains the upper hand, and eventually consolidates the win is indeed memorable.
R. Fine
White
Dr. A. Alekhine
Black
(Played in the Margate Easter Congress, 1937.)

## DUTCH DEFENCE

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ;{ }_{2} . \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{Q B}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4} ; ~ 3 . \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KK}_{3}$, $\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{KB}_{3}$; 4. B-Kt2, B-Kt5ch ; 5. B-Q2, B-K2; 6. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$.

According to the "books," the Dutch Defence is inferior, only the Stonewall formation, which Black could now set up by $6 \ldots$ P-Q4, offering prospects of equality. Experience teaches, however, that it is not easy for White to maintain an opening advantage in practice, since the play usually becomes very involved and Black can threaten all sorts of dangerous attacks; the play suits Alekhine's style, and he has indeed won many beautiful games with this opening.

Alckhine typically rejects the quiet $6 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ in favour of the complications implied by the text move. This time he learns a little lesson!

| 7. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}!$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8. Q-Kt3 | $\mathbf{O - O}$ |
| 9. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |

To continue with . . . P-K $\mathrm{K}_{4}$, a most important advance for Black in this opening.

$$
\text { 10. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}!
$$

Simple, but strong. White simultaneously opens the Queen's file and the long diagonal, with the result that his pieces are able to co-operate harmoniously. Experience shows that in this opening it is to Black's benefit entirely for the centre to remain closed.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Io. . . } \\
& \text { I I. } \dot{\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q r}} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

If in. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$, Black would play for attack by II ... $B \times B$; 12. $Q \times B, R-K t i ; ~ 13 . Q \times R P, R \times P$. This is stronger than II ... $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kti}$; $12 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 13 . $B \times$ Pch, etc., with $R, B$, and two Pawns for the Queen.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 11. . . } & \text { P-B3 } \\
\text { 12. } \mathbf{O}
\end{array}
$$

To move the QB would achieve nothing.

$$
\text { 12. . . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}
$$

Far too risky. Black should have played 12 . . . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$ or 12 . . Q-B2, after which, though he does have the worse of it, he retains chances of equalizing. Alekhine thinks he can permit himself aggressive tactics and thus gives Fine the opportunity of displaying his skill in positional play and defence.

$$
\text { 13. } \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \text { dis } \mathbf{c h}
$$

An attacking move with positional aims, which necessitated accurate reckoning of its consequences.

| 13. | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R I}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 14. Kt-KKt5 | Q-Ki |

Forced, as is his next move likewise.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 15. } \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K} 6 & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \\
\text { 16. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{array}
$$

Black has no satisfactory means of protecting his KBP , for both $16 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Bi}^{2}$; 17. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{QR} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 18. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; 19. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}$ (threatening 20. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ ), and $\mathrm{I} 6 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; $17 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$; 18. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$ would have given White an overwhelming game.

## 17. $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K B P}$



This is the position White envisaged when playing I3. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ dis ch. He has two Bishops and the better Pawn formation (his Pawns are in two groups, his opponent's in three). The isolated Pawn is not weak in itself, but cannot be employed for attack, and consequently Black is denied his normal chances in this opening, which consist in direct attacks on the King's side. As compensation, he has the Pawn majority on the Queen's wing, but the sequel shows he cannot exploit this owing to the power of the white Bishops.

R-Q1
Q-K3
19. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ was also to be considered, but White does not want to exchange off either of the black Knights-they are not very mobile, anyway.
19. . . .
B-K2
20. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}$

Safeguarding this Pawn and threatening 21. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$.

$$
\text { 20. . . } \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{5}
$$

Averting White's threat fincly. Now, if $2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{Kt}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{B}_{5}$ ?, then $21 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 22. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q}$; 23. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, Q-Q2, and Black wins a piece.

$$
\text { 21. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{3} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}
$$

Since 22. $\mathrm{K} t-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ? would still lose a piece and the Knight must therefore return to $\mathrm{QB}_{3}$, Black considers the time ripe to start evaluating his majority on the Queen's side; but this advance, as becomes apparent later, only weakens his position still further. One or other of the quieter continuations such as $21 \ldots$. $-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ or 21. . . KR-Qi would have been better.

| 22. $. \mathbf{K t}^{2}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R} \mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 24. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |

Black persists in his aggressive tactics, and quickly succumbs as a result. The less pretentious 24 . . . R-Qi merited preference, but in any case White has now the better of the game.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 25. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 26. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}} & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}
\end{array}
$$

The two Bishops no longer mean a lot.

| 27. 28. $^{\text {2 }}-\dot{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Q-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R-BI |  |

Losing a pawn; but Black was already at a loss for a satisfactory continuation. If, for instance, $28 \ldots$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{I}}$, then 29. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ winning material just the same (29 . . $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Kt}_{3}\right) \times \mathrm{B}$; 30. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; or $29 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 30. $Q \times P)$. Black's position is full of holes-this must prove fatal in the long run.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{4}!
$$



Threatening principally $30 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, winning a piece. Several black Pawns are in danger, too.

$$
29 \ldots \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B I}
$$

Nothing is much good by now, e.g. $29 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 30. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Bi}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 31. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ and Black must lose a Pawn; or $29 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 30. R-Q2, etc.

$$
30 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

$\mathbf{K t}\left(\mathbf{K t z}_{\mathbf{t}}\right) \times \mathbf{B}$

Not $30 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, because of 3 I. $\mathrm{B} \times$ Kt. $30 \ldots$ $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{4}\right) \times \mathrm{B}$ would be answered by $3 \mathrm{r} . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 31. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{4}! \\
& \text { 32. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}
$$

White has picked up a Pawn and still has an overwhelming position into the bargain. The job of pushing home these big advantages we can leave to Fine. There ensued-
$32 \ldots \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q r} ; 33 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$; 34. $\mathbf{K t - \mathbf { B } _ { 5 } ,}$ $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} ;{ }_{35} . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}} ;{ }_{3} 6 . \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{\mathbf { Q } _ { 2 }} ; 37$.


 44. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{8 c h} ; 45 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P} ; 46$. Q-K2! $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 47 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 3}_{3} ; 4^{8}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K t} \mathbf{- B 6} ; 49$.
 K-B3; ${ }^{2}$. K-B2, Kt-Kt3; ${ }_{53} . \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{K}}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{R}_{5}$; 54.

 59. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{7}}, \mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{t}}\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}\right)-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}} \mathbf{c h}$; 6о. K-B8.

Black resigns.
A model performance in the realm of logical positional play. After acquiring a small advantage in the opening, White continually exhausted his opponent of good moves. There are few direct threats, but, in spite of all Black's efforts, his situation steadily deteriorates. He missed the best line once or twice, but he was never permitted the least chance to get back on level terms.

## Third Illustration

Now follows a game which illustrates above all Fine's combinative intrepidity.
R. Fine
White
W. Winter Black
(Played in the Nottingham tournament, 1936.)

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K B}_{3}$ |
| 4. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ |  |

White wants to make it as difficult for his opponent as he can, hence avoids $4 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, which is strongest according to theory but has also been most analysed.

| 4. $\cdots$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| 6. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |  |

To avoid all chance of the game becoming drawish and to produce a difficult game, White submits to a slight delay in development to win the "minor exchange."

$$
\text { 6. . . } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{5}
$$

$6 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ was a playable alternative.

| 7. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| 9. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{3}}$ ! |  |

Because he is so strong in defence, Fine can permit himself the luxury of many variations which are superficially risky and only produce a satisfactory game with the most accurate handling. With this hardly obvious move, White forestalls all dangers along the open KR
file; after 9 . B-Q3, for instance, the reply $9 \ldots$ Kt-R 4 would have been rather troublesome.

$$
\underset{\text { 10. } \underset{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}}{ } \quad \text { B-Q }}{1}
$$

The logical consequence of his preceding move. The threat was io . . B $\times$ Pch, and ro. B-Kt2? would be faulty owing to io ...R $\times \mathrm{P} ;$ i $1 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, etc.
Io. . . .

## $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$

 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ followed by in . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ and $\ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ was also worth considering.

## II. Kt $\times \mathbf{K t}$

An important exchange. Any other move would allow Black to get a very strong position by 1 I . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$.

$$
\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

White has now got a mobile centre-the Queen's Pawn being blocked no longer-and this circumstance enhances the significance of his two Bishops. The ensuing operations on each side are dictated by the Pawn situation: White must work in the centre and on the Queen's wing, Black on the King's wingwhich incidentally offers him few chances, as White naturally does not castle on that side.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2} \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{2}
$$

Probably so as to play I 3 . . . B-Kt5 and exchange off one of the white Bishops. 12 . . . Kt-Q2 would have been better, however.

$$
{ }_{\text {I3 }} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3} \text { ! }
$$

One of those little moves which mark a great master. White prevents both $13 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$ and $13 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, which latter would now be very strongly met by $14 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{QBP}$; 15 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4}$. In answer to the more obvious 13. Q-Kt3, Black would have been able to play $13 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$, and continue possibly with . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ with much better chances.

```
I3.... Kt-Q2
14.Q-Kt3
```

Now this move is made with gain of time.

```
I4. . . -
```

```
R-QKtI
```

The Pawn was difficult to protect. Obviously $14 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ would be too dangerous. $14 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ was not quite satisfactory either, since Black could then only with difficulty play . . . P-KB4 , a move which is required to protect the Pawn on $\mathrm{K}_{5}$.
Black's Qucen's Rook is not very beautifully placed now.

| ${ }^{15}$. | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| ${ }_{1} 6$. | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K t}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

This attempt to open up the King's side is, to say the least, premature. Black should have castled.

$$
\text { 17. } \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K B}_{4}
$$

Black persists in his risky tactics, advancing his Pawns before completing his development.

$$
\text { 18. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

The precursor to some pretty little combinations.

$$
\text { 18. . . } \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Yet again, i8. O-O would have been better.

$$
\text { I9. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5}
$$

B-B2
Had Black divined his opponent's intentions, he would certainly have retreated to $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ instead, e.g. (19 . . . B-K 2 ) ; 20. Q-Kt3, Q-B3; 21. B-B4, K-B2 (21 . .Kt-Br? 22. $B \times R P!$ ); but even then his situation would not have been pleasant.


A fine and surprising move. White gets several Pawns for his piece, together with a strong King's side attack.

$$
\text { 20. } \ldots \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

The real beauty of White's combination would have been disclosed by $20 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{RI}$; 21. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ !, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ (21 ... $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 22. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, regaining the piece); 22. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KPch}(22 . Q-K i 7, Q-Q \mathrm{I})$ followed by 23 . $Q \times Q B P$.

$$
\text { 21. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B P}
$$

Attacking the Bishop, so that Black is compelled to leave his KP in the lurch.

$$
\text { 21. . } \quad \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q i}
$$

There is no better continuation. In this way Black at any rate avoids the Pawn's being captured with a check.

$$
\text { 22. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{P}
$$

White has already got three Pawns for his piece, among them two united passed Pawns. Another of Black's Pawns is in the air at his $\mathrm{QR}_{3}$, and his King is badly placed. Clearly White has an overwhelming game.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 22. } \cdot \dot{Q}_{5} & \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
\end{array}
$$

Even exchange of Queens would have been good; but the text move is much stronger, as it keeps the King's side attack going. The main threat now is 24. P-B6, regaining the piece sacrificed.

```
23. . . K-K2
24. B-Kt4!
```

Threatening 25. P-B6 dis ch (25 . . R $\times \mathrm{B}$; 26. Q $\times$ Ktch) .

## 24. ••• <br> KR-QBI

25. P-B6 dis ch would now be answered, rather neatly, by $25 \ldots$ B-Q3!, with a promising game.
26. K-Ktr

Threatening $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ once again.

White continually finds the strongest line.

$$
\text { 26. . . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{4}
$$

Not $26 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ?; $27 . \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$ with crushing effect, e.g. 27 . . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; 28. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 27. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 3} \\
\text { 28. } & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{array}
$$

Or $28 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 29. QR-KBi, etc.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$
Black is up against an impossible task, and it already matters little how he plays.

| 30. $\mathbf{K R}-\mathbf{B I}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 32. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{6 c h}!$ |  |

A pretty finish. Black resigns; mate in a few moves is inevitable ( $32 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 33. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, etc.).

A charming little game. Here again Fine lays his foundations in the very opening, but by methods quite different from Alekhine's. Not attack, but some concrete advantage-a pair of Bishops-is his primary aim. To achieve this he even submits to being placed on the defensive, relying on being able to hold his own until he is able to pass over to the attack himself-and his confidence is vindicated.

## Fourth Illustration

Fine excels in defence. He is almost unbeatable when he gets into his stride. He has gone through many tournaments, among them the exceptionally
strong tournaments at Nottingham in 1936 and Semmering-Baden in 1937, without losing a game. Flohr also scores a characteristically small proportion of lost games, but he does not play so aggressively as Fine and consequently does not so often have to perform miracles of defence. The preceding game has already revealed Fine's skill in defence. Here is a game in which he is on the defensive throughout.
M. M. Botvinnik
White
R. Fine Black
(Played in the Nottingham tournament, 1936.)

| RETI'S OPENING |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

The motif of the Queen's Gambit accepted, to which opening Flohr, Reshevsky, and Fine are partial.

## 3. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$

3. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$; 4. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; 5. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$ would transpose into the normal Queen's Gambit accepted, but Botvinnik prefers modern lines.
 $\mathbf{P}_{-\mathbf{B}_{3}} ; \mathbf{6}$. B-Kt2, $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$.

Black has now gained the upper hand in the centre, but on the other hand White is the better developed. It promises to become a difficult, lively struggle.
7. P-Kt3, KKt-K2 ; 8. B-Kt2, Kt-Q4; 9. O-O, B-K2; io. Kt-R4, O-O; it. Q-Kti.

A strong move. The main threat is $12 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, which would put Black into grave difficulties since 12 ...
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$ would lose to $\mathrm{I}_{3} . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{7} \mathrm{ch}$, and $12 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$ to $13 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad$ 14. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{RI} ; \quad \mathrm{I} 5$. Q-R6ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{KtI}$; $16 . \mathrm{Kt-Kt6} ,\mathrm{followed} \mathrm{by} \mathrm{P-B4}, \mathrm{etc}$.
II. . . .

## R-B2

Now the sacrifice on Kt 6 (after 12. $^{2}$ B-K 4 , $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK}_{\mathrm{t}}$ ! ) would not be quite sound.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathbf{K t}-\mathbb{B}_{5}
$$

This was the second idea behind II. Q-Ktr.

> I2. . . .

B-K3
Many a player would have played 12 . . . B-BI more or less automatically here, but this would have lost the exchange ( $13 . \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ !, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $14 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ).

$$
\text { 13. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}
$$

Much stronger than exchanging on $\mathrm{K}_{7}$; eliminates Black's KP and re-establishes equality in the centre. It now becomes very difficult for Black, but Fine defends coolly and painstakingly.


Excellently played. He threatens to win a Pawn on his QB5 or $Q_{7}$. White cannot play 15. P-Q3, because that would leave the KKt unprotected; to exchange on QKt6 or $\mathrm{K}_{7}$ would weaken his attack.

$$
{ }^{15} \cdot \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}!
$$

With this fine move White sustains his attack.
15. . . .
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q K t}$ !
Again the best. After ${ }^{1} 5 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KKt}$ or $\mathrm{I}_{5}$. . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$ Black would soon go downhill. Nor would ${ }^{15} \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ be very good, because of $16 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; i7. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ ! recovering the Pawn in favourable circumstances, since $17 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KP}$ would fail against 18. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; 19. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Br}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 16. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} \\
& \text { 17. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q B} B_{3}!
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Protecting the QP and threatening i8. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$. Black cannot continue with $17 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ on account of 18. $\mathrm{QB} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 19. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ and wins. 17 ... $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$ is also unsatisfactory, e.g. 18 . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ !, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (18. . . $K t \times P$; 19. $B \times P c h, K-R_{1}$; 20. Q-KKt6!, threatening $\left.2 \mathrm{I} . Q-R_{5}\right) ;$ ig. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Pch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}} ; 20 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and White's attack should win; 21. Q-KKt6 and 21 . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ are among the immediate threats.
17. . . Kt-Q5!

Both sides play fincly. Whereas White can continually choose from among all sorts of safe continuations, Black is fighting for the draw all the time, and repeatedly has to find the one and only good move, which
makes his task much more difficult than his opponent's and his achievement in this game a greater one.

## 18. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$

After i8. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; 19. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Bch}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 20. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RPch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}\left(20 \ldots . \mathrm{R}^{2}-R_{\mathrm{I}}\right.$; 21. $\left.Q-B_{5}!\right) ; 21$. Q-Kt3, Q-Q4; 22. B-Kt6 (threatening 23. Q-KR3), White's attack could hardly be stopped. But Black has better, namely $18 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! Now the white Queen is en prise, and 19. Kt $\times \mathrm{Bch}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 20. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RPch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{RI}$ would not essentially alter the situation. Hence the text move which, however, allows Black to capture the QP with gain of time.

```
18. . . P
19. B}\times\mathbf{RPch
K-BI !
```

Not 19 . . . K-Ri, because of 20 . B-Kt6 (20 . . . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; 21. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ and wins).


The magnificent idea behind Black's last few moves. Black threatens to check from QKt3 and win the

Bishop, so that White has no time to go for the exchange by 21 . B-Kt6.
Black thus forces a simplification in which he sheds a Pawn but gets a dead drawn position.

$$
\text { 21. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B c h}
$$

There is nothing better; let us examine, for instance, the consequences of $21 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}+3 \mathrm{ch}$ !-
(a) 22. K-Kt2? or 22. K-RI?, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $23 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, Q-B3ch; followed by $24 \cdots \mathrm{Q} \times$ B and Black has won a piece;
(b) 22. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 23 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 24 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $R-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; and White cannot save his QP , since 25 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ is refuted by $25 \ldots$ B-B4;
(c) 22. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $23 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $24 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ ! ; 25. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{2}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}_{1}$; 26. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$; 27. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}$ with a drawn game.

```
22. M}\times\mathbf{QPP
```

The Pawn cannot be captured in any other way, because of 22 . . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 22. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q} \\
& \text { 23. } \times \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}
\end{aligned}
$$

Or $23 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ with an equal game. The text move gains a Pawn (since 23 . . Kt $\times$ P ? would lose the Knight through $24 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ ) ; but what a Pawn it is! Black's position amply counterbalances such a small material advantage.
${ }^{2} 3 \ldots$ Kt-Kt3; 24. B-K4, R-Qr; 25. QR-BI,
 P-QKt3; 28. K-B3, Kt-B2.

So as to bring the Knight to the beautiful square $\mathrm{QB}_{4}$. White must now play carefully himself so as not to fall behind.
29. $K-K_{3}, K t-R_{3} ;$ 3о. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}, K_{t}-\mathbf{B}_{4} ; 31$. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K B}_{2}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{5}}$; 32. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}$; 33. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 2}_{\mathbf{2}}$, $\mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{R}_{5}\right)-\mathbf{Q}_{5}$.
34. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K B} \mathbf{2}$

The game has come to a dead end. Neither player can undertake anything effective.

[^2]
## CHAPTER VIII

## PAUL KERES

Keres was born on 7th January, 1916, at Narva; like Alekhine, Botvinnik, Flohr, and Reshevsky, he thus came from the old Russia. He is of Estonian nationality and now lives in Tartu.
The former Russian Baltic provinces are famous centres of chess activity and have produced a number of masters of renown-Niemtsovitch of Riga, for instance. Hence Keres grew up in surroundings which afforded plenty of chess contacts.

He was a strong player at fifteen, and only needed international experience to develop his powers. Estonia's geographical situation implies great expense to anybody who might wish to journey to other chessplaying countries, so Keres had to content himself, in the international sphere, with correspondence chess. In this he soon acquired a big reputation, his lively style attracting universal attention even in those early days. He was ready to chance any kind of gambit or bizarre opening; we even know of one correspondence game in which he opened with I. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK}_{4}$. In spite of his risky style, he earned successes both in correspondence play and also in a few small tournaments on the Baltic. His career as an international tournament player began in 1935. Having won the championship of Estonia in January of that year (as the youngest of the eleven competitors) he led the national team in the International Team Tournament in Warsaw in August. He scored a pretty good result (beating

Grünfeld and Stahlberg amongst others), and the newspapers were soon talking of a rising new star.

In 1936 he participated in his first strongly contested international tournament (Bad Nauheim) with astounding success, for he tied for first place with Alekhine ahead of Bogolyubov, Stahlberg, Vidmar, van den Bosch, and four German masters. He and Alekhine each scored $6 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of 9 and went through the tournament unbeaten. The twenty-year-old became famous overnight. Things could not continue in this tempo. In a tournament of the same sort at Dresden a few weeks later he failed dismally, as the tournament table reveals: Alckhine $6 \frac{1}{2}$, Engels 6, Maroczy and Stahlberg $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Bogolyubov 5, Rödl and Sämisch $4 \frac{1}{2}$ each, Helling and Keres $3 \frac{1}{2}$ each, Grob $\frac{1}{2}$.

In the meantime he had received an invitation to the Zandvoort tournament, and the Dutch public waited anxiously to know what he would do there. Should we see the Keres of Nauheim or the Keres of Dresden? If anything, he justified all that had been predicted of him, coming third with $6 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of II, equal with Tartakover but ahead of Bogolyubov, Grünfeld, Maroczy, Spielmann, and others. He had recovered from his Dresden setback and established his reputation as an international master.

For several months little was heard of him, but when he returned in 1937, it was to make furious progress. In Margate's Easter tournament he shared first place with Fine with the good score of $7 \frac{1}{2}$ out of 9, each defeating Alekhine. Another tournament of ten followed immediately at Ostend. Fine and Keres started as favourites, but neither did too well; although


Paul Keres
A brilliant challenger for the Championship
they managed to tie for first place in the end with Grob, each totalled only 6 points. From Ostend Keres went to Prague, where he took first place in a tournament of twelve, with io points (Zinner 8, Eliskases and Foltys 7 each, etc.). After that he went on to win a double-round tournament of four, with prescribed openings, in Vienna; so that he returned to Estonia on 3oth May loaded with fame. He left himself little time for recuperation, for only a fortnight later the great tournament at Kemeri in Latvia began. In this things went none too propitiously at first, but all ended fairly well: he shared fourth and fifth places with Alekhine, only half a point behind Flohr, Petrov, and Reshevsky. Three days later another tournament of eight strong players started at Parnu in his own country. How he would have liked to top this tournament! But in this he was disappointed, as the score shows: Schmidt $5 \frac{1}{2}$, Flohr, Keres, and Stahlberg $4 \frac{1}{2}$ each, Tartakover 4, Opocensky $3 \frac{1}{2}$, Raud $1 \frac{1}{2}$, Villard o. A prophet is not without honour . . .? Well, Schmidt, though German (he returned to his country after the outbreak of the war) lived in Estonia for years and is an "ancient" rival of Keres, whom he had already played to a drawn match in 1935. From Parnu the trail led to Stockholm for another International Team Tournament, where Keres, with in points out of ${ }^{5} 5$, made one of the best of all the scores by topboard players. He had now been engaged in continuous tournament play for four months, but was ready a few days later to embark on the hardest tournament of the year. This was the double-round tournament of eight leading masters at Semmering-Baden, where the
result was: Keres 9, Fine 8, Capablanca and Reshevsky $7 \frac{1}{2}$ each, Flohr 7 , Eliskases and Ragozin 6 each, Petrov 5. Keres registered in this tournament, both qualitatively and quantitatively, an achievement which can only be described as grand. He won game after game, drawing farther and farther away from the field. With three rounds to go, he had scored $8 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of 11 and stood two points ahead of his nearest rival. Perhaps this made him a little over-confident; anyway he lost to Eliskases and Reshevsky quite unnecessarily. As the final result shows, he could even have allowed himself to lose his last game to Capablanca as well, without endangering his first prize.

He then played relatively seldom for a while. He participated in only three events prior to the A.V.R.O., namely the Hastings Christmas tournament (Reshevsky 7, Keres and Alexander $6 \frac{1}{2}$, Fine and Flohr 6 each, Mikenas 5, etc.); a match against Stahlberg (drawn by $2-2$, with four draws); and the tournament at Noordwijk (Eliskases 7, Keres 6, Pirc 5 $\frac{1}{2}$, Euwe 5, etc.). All excellent results which, however, cannot be considered on a par with his matchless achievement in the Semmering-Baden tournament. Stahlberg held him in their match by consistently going into the end-game, so cramping his combinative powers.

The A.V.R.O. tournament provided him with yet another resounding success, probably the greatest of his life. From the moment he splendidly beat the then leader Fine, at the end of the first half of the tournament, he never looked back. He had his ups and downs-he might have lost to Euwe, to Capablanca, to Alekhine; he threw away an easy win in his return
encounter with the last named. But he always seemed able to disconcert his opponents, at a pinch, by giving the game some combinatively aggressive twist.
At Margate (Easter 1939) he collected the leading honours, ahead of Capablanca and Flohr, quite comfortably. Two of his games showed all his old brilliance, the rest he played quietly and soundly.

At the end of 1939 Keres defeated Dr. Euwe by a narrow margin in a match of fourteen games; all were wild affairs of the type he revels in. This achievement finally sets the seal on his reputation.

As an Esthonian, Keres has witnessed the successive overrunning of his native land by Soviet and German armies, and has played in chess tournaments under the two opposing regimes. In the two great U.S.S.R. tournaments of 1941 which we have mentioned when writing of Botvinnik, his record was more consistent than that of his rival (he took fourth and second places respectively). His results in Nazi-organized events have already been referred to (page 20). He has not been able to shake Alekhine's supremacy, but with the return of more settled times, frecing him from constant anxicty, his youth will undoubtedly begin to tell.

## KERES IN HIS ELEMENT

In the game which follows, Keres revives the old idea of lightning-quick, devil-may-care development, in original style.
P. Keres
W. Winter
Black
(Played in the team tournament at Warsaw, 1935.) 16-(G.226)

## SICILIAN DEFENCE

 Kt-Q4; 4. Kt-B3, P-K $\mathbf{3}$; 5. Kt $\times \mathbf{K t}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t} ; 6$. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q 4}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} 3$.

A well-known position in the Niemtsovitch variation ( $2 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ ) of this opening. White can now isolate Black's Queen's Pawn by 7. KP $\times \mathrm{P}$, followed by 8. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, and this would give him a small positional pull; but this is a much too placid line for Keres!

## 7. B-KKt5 !

The introduction to a kind of development combination, by which White, at the expense of several Pawns, brings his pieces into play with lightning rapidity.

$$
7 . . . \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{4} \mathbf{c h}
$$

If $7 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$, then $8 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ and Black must recapture with the King, otherwise a Pawn goes: 8 . . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 9 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}$, followed by $10 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, as for example, in the game Cortlever-de Groot, Dutch championship, 1938. Equally unsatisfactory for Black is 7... $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2} ; 8 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; 9. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ (9... $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; го. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; ir. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}$ ), which leads to the isolation of Black's Queen's Pawn in circumstances very unfavourable for him.

## 8. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$

Consistent with his preceding move. 8. B-Q2, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$; or $8 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Qch}$; 9. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ would achieve little.

$$
\text { 8. . . } \quad \mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Apparently strong, for Black would obtain a perfectly satisfactory game after either 9 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$;
10. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; iा. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$; or $9 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, Kt - $\mathrm{B}_{3}$.

$$
\text { 9. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} \text { ! }
$$

The first link in White's plan.

$$
\text { 9. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B P}
$$

9 . . . Kt-B3 would have been more prudent. Black possibly had not yet realized the gambit flavour the game would assume, but believed that he was merely winning material.

1о. $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$ !
After this the stately Sicilian begins to take on the character of a Danish Gambit. White has already "lost" two Pawns, and leaves a third en prise.

$$
\text { 10. . . } \quad \mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Can Black still believe he is making all the running? Much more prudent would be io ... Kt-B3; ir. R-Ki, B-K3.
if. R-Kti


The result of the opening skirmishes is now clear. White has developed every one of his pieces, Black only his Queen. Into the bargain, there are plenty of open files, so that the attack can start at once. All this for a mere three Pawns! The chance of Black's being able to consolidate his position before some catastrophe occurs is remote.

$$
\text { II. . . } \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

It would, of course, be foolish to chew up the QRP as well. The text move, by which Black plans to castle as soon as possible, is also inadequate, as the white Knight gets to a powerful outpost. The only move to hold the game, even for a while, was II . . . Kt-B3.

$$
\text { 12. } \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \text { B-Q3 }
$$

Naturally not 12 . . P-B3, because of $\mathrm{I}_{3}$. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$. Black counts on $13 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{1}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; 14 . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, with good chances of salvation. But things go very differently.

$$
\text { 13. } \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}!\quad \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

Black has no choice.

$$
\text { 14. Q-R5ch } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{3}
$$

Some other possibilities were 14 . . K-Kti; 15 . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Br} ; 16 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QB}$ and wins; or $14 \ldots$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ;{ }_{15} . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} ; 16$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ dis ch winning the Queen; or $14 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Bi}_{1}$; $\mathrm{I}_{5}$. KR-Ki, B- $\mathrm{Q}_{2}$; 16. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ with the unmeetable threat of 17 . $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 15. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \text { ch } \\
& \text { 16. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

Threatening simultaneously $17 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ and 17. Q-B6ch.
16. $\mathbf{1 7 .}$ KR-K

B-KB4
17. KR-KI

Stronger than 17. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6$ and $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{Q} 6)$. 18 . $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ and 19. B-R6 mate is now threatened.

| 17. $\mathbf{~} \cdot$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18. $\times \mathbf{R} \times$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 19. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B} 6 \mathbf{c h}$ |  |

Black resigns, for he is mated in a few moves, e.g. 19 ... K-Ki; 20. Q-K6ch, K-Bi ; 21. B-R6 mate; or 19 ...K-Kti; 20. $\mathrm{Q} \times$ Pch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bi}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 21. $\mathrm{Q} \times$ Bch, etc.

A pleasing win, meritorious not for the way in which the attack is carried through, but for White's original construction of his game.

## Second Illustration

A still better picture of Keres's very individual talent is presented by the following wild-west game, which opens rather irregularly, so that it is quite impossible for Keres to have analysed in advance the complications which soon come about. In the last game he may possibly have come prepared.
A. Dunkelblum
White
P. Keres
Black
(From the Ostend tournament, 1937.)

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE


 P-Q4.

Both sides treat the opening irregularly, getting right away from the books. The only thing that recalls any theory to us is the fianchetto of Black's KB, which is why we called the opening a King's Indian.

Obviously White is playing for a draw, but Black wants a fight and makes for complications.
7. $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{P}$
Kt $\times \mathbf{P}$
8. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ !?!

Inaugurating some horrible intricacies.

$$
\text { 9. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}
$$

This exchange, which not only spoils Black's Pawn formation but also safeguards the QBP for the time being, was too tempting to forego. Needless to say, it cannot be bad; but Keres is now in his element.

$$
\underset{\text { 9. ... }}{\text { Kt-Q4 }} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

Not io. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$, after which White would get into serious trouble because of the weakness of his $\mathrm{QB}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{Q}_{3}$.
10. $\cdot \cdots$
i1. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} t_{3}$
12. Q-K2
$\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$
$\mathrm{R}-\mathbf{Q r}_{1}$
$\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{4}$

Looks strong. 13 . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ is threatened, and
parrying this by $\mathrm{I}_{3}$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ would offer Black targets on the QKt file ( $13 \ldots$. . R-Kti).

$$
\text { 13. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 2!
$$



But this is apparently a complete refutation. If Black wants to save the exchange he must leave his Pawn on $\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ in the lurch, for $13 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; ${ }^{1} 4$. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; $\mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $16 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; ${ }_{1} 7$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ would not do at all, whilst $13 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ (so as to meet 14. $B \times P$ with $B-Q R_{3}$ ) would likewise be insufficient in view of $I_{4} . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} ; \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$, leaving White a Pawn up in a sound position.
The spectators were unanimous in thinking that Keres was going to lose this game.

$$
\text { 13. . } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}
$$

Keres reveals that his position offers astounding resources. There follow the tensest complications, and nowhere can it be demonstrated that White should have got definitely the better of it.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I4. } . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}} \\
& \text { I5. }
\end{aligned}
$$

15. Kt-Q4 would be a mistake, because of $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, 16. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ !; 17. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 18. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 19. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, and Black has an overwhelming game.

I5. . .
B- $\mathbf{Q R}_{3}$ !
Hitting back-but it is not all over yet.
16. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ !
16. Q-Q2, $\times R$ would be good for Black.

I6. . .
Q-K3!


Compare $16 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; i7. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 18 . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, and White has got the better of it. The text move makes matters much more difficult for him. Immediately after the game Keres declared that he had expected $\mathrm{I}_{7} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ as the best move and intended to continue with $17 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ! (not $17 \ldots \mathrm{~F} . . . \mathrm{B}$; 18. QKt-R3, and Black has not sufficient compensation for the exchange); 18. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{3}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! ; 19. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, B-Q4!; 20. Q-Kt8!, Kt-K7ch; (the problem-like move 20. Q-R6 fails to 21. $B \times P$ dis $c h), 21$. K-RI, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Pch} ; 22 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 23 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{3}$ (forced),
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$; ${ }_{2}$ 2. $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 25. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 26 . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Bi}!$; 27. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}!, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \mathrm{ch} ; 28$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6!$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 29. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB}_{1}$. According to Keres, the game should end in a draw then, although it is rather dangerous for Black.

Missing this intricate salvation, White now loses quickly.
17. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q 2}_{2}$ ?
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$
18. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}$

Hastening his own defeat. 18. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$ would have been best, though White would not have been at all enviably placed then, after $18 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$.
18. . . .
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ !
19. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{B}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$

Threatening to win the Queen.

$$
\text { 20. K-RI } \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R} 6!
$$

A pretty finish. Black's "weak" Pawn goes on to win the game!

| 21. $\mathbf{R - Q \mathbf { Q }}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22. | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$ |$\quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$

White resigns, as he practically cannot stop the Pawn from queening, e.g. 23. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B}_{2}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch} ; 24$. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$, etc.
"It is true that White need not have lost this game," Keres remarked in the Wiener Schachzeitung, "but it would be unjust to a combinative player if the defending side were to see everything in the limited time allowed for reflection."

Well does this little note reveal Keres's psychology:
he considers attacking or combining a definite achievement in itself, fully worthy of a reward. There is indeed some truth in this.

## Third Illustration

Keres does not shrink from treating front-rank international masters "au gambit," as the following game shows.
P. Keres
White
E. Eliskases Black
(From the tournament of eight at Semmering-Baden, 1937.)

## WING GAMBIT DEFERRED

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. Kt-KB3 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}$ |
| 3. P-QKt4 |  |

This development of the ordinary Wing Gambit (I. P-K44, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{4}$; 2. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}$ ) was introduced by Keres.

| 3. $-\dot{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. | $\mathbf{K t - K B _ { 3 }}$ |
| 5. $\mathbf{B} \mathbf{Q}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| 6. $\mathbf{Q K t - Q 2}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

$6 \ldots$. P-K3 was perhaps preferable.

$$
\text { 7. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

QKt-Q2
Preparing for . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$, which would not have been so good at this stage, because of $8 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ and Black must retake with the pawn, since $8 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would lose the Queen through 9 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KK}_{5}$.

More exact than the text move would have been $7 \cdots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 8 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, 8 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$.
8. $\mathbf{K t}\left(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}\right)-\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{5}}$ !


Although this move results in the loss of several "tempi," it is strong because it confronts Black with all sorts of difficulties in development, e.g. $8 \ldots$. P-K3 (the most natural continuation), 9 . Q-K2 ! (threatening 1о. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; ir. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$, etc.), $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$; 1о. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; if. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{tr}_{\text {, }}$, with a winning attack. It is therefore plausible to prepare $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$, but this would give White the opportunity of playing 9. Kt-K6! Actually, Black need not be so very much afraid of that move ( $9 \ldots$ Q-Kt3!, not $9 \ldots P \times K t$ ??; $10 . B-K t 6$ mate), but Eliskases prefers to rule it out.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 8. } . \mathcal{B}_{4}! & \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{2} \\
\text { 9. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}
\end{array}
$$

This surprising advance of the backward QBP, based on a tactical finesse, improves White's position a lot. It goes without saying that the Pawn phalanx $Q_{4}-Q_{4}$
is strong, and Black can hardly capture en passant, e.g. $9 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ;$ го. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}$ !, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ;$ ir. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}!$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 12. Kt-Kt5ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{1}$; 13. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KPch}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; $\mathrm{I}_{4}$. Q-B7ch, K-Qi ; I5. Kt-K6 mate.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 9. ..- } \\
& \text { 1o. Kt-R3 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Not io. $\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathrm{t}}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; in. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$.

$$
\text { 1о. . . . } \quad \text {-KKt4 }
$$

Gaining time (. . . P-Kt5 is threatened), but also producing weaknesses: Black's position is now compromised on both wings.

$$
\text { i } 1 . K_{t}\left(\mathbf{R}_{3}\right)-K_{t r}
$$

Sometimes a retreat requires more courage than a sacrifice.
II. . . .
B-Kt2

## 12. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$

White is a Pawn down, and half of his twelve moves have been made with the $\mathrm{QKt}\left(\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2} ; \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{K}_{4}\right.$; Kt-Kt5; Kt-R 3 ; Kt-Ktı; Kt-K2). Nevertheless he has a good game, thanks to his preponderance in the centre and the enfeeblement of Black's King's wing.
12. . . .

## $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$

Energetic. With the text move Black achieves a little success in the centre. The drawback is that the weaknesses in his position become more marked than ever.

12 . . . P-Kt3, followed by . . . B-Kt2 might have been considered.
${ }_{1}$ 3. Kt-Kt3!

Yet another move with the QKt, and an effective one, too, for it parries . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ and at the same time presses on Black's weakness at his $\mathrm{KB}_{4}$.

$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$
Neither of the alternatives $14 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ or $14 \ldots$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$ would get Black out of his trouble.

$$
{ }^{15} . \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K P}
$$

$\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{K}$
The peripatetic Knight has disappeared at last.

| 16. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K t}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 18. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |

This advance would be justified only if it were to culminate in the capture of the QP. Since this is not the case it only means a further and very serious weakening of Black's castled position. 18 . . . Kt-Kt3, followed, if possible, by . . . B-B4, was indicated.

## 19. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$

## $\mathbf{K t - K t} \mathbf{3}$

Black recognizes that $19 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ would be sheer joy to White because of 20. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KtI}$ threatening 2 I . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ or $2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ or $2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, and above all 2 I . $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RP}$ (21. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ ?, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, winning the Queen).

```
20. R-KtI
21. R-K4
22. \(\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}_{4}\)
\(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}\)
\(\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K}_{1}\)
\(\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q}^{2}\)
```

Protecting the QKtP and threatening 22 . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$, which would give Black quite a satisfactory game.
23. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}$

Apparently attacking the QKtP again; but it immediately becomes obvious that the main idea was to provide an extra guard for the square $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$.


White's attack on the King's side becomes irresistible. The weaknesses in Black's castled position become painfully apparent; $18 . \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{K}_{5}$ in particular proves to have been a fatal move.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{24 .} \cdot \cdots \times \mathbf{B} \\
& { }^{25} \cdot \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}
\end{aligned}
$$

Threatening 26. $\mathbf{Q} \times \operatorname{Bch}\left(\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q}, 27 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}\right)$. We see why White played 23. B-Q2: 25 . . R-K8ch had to be prevented, otherwise the immediate sacrifice of the exchange would have been still stronger.

| 25 | Q-B3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 26. Kt-B5 | K-Br |
| 27. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| 28. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$ | Kt-B3 |

Black's moves are forced all the time.

| 29. $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}$ |
| 3I. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| 32. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |

Loses at once, but Black was hopelessly placed anyway, since he had no compensation whatever for the very bad position of his King. Tarrasch has pointed out that a Rook and two Bishops are usually stronger than two Rooks and a Knight. Here White possesses a strong extra Pawn and all sorts of positional advantages as well.

$$
\text { 33. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R P} \text { ! }
$$

Black resigned, for $33 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ would be answered by 34. Q-Q8ch, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 35. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{4} \mathrm{ch}$ and mate in three. A pretty finish. When we recall how very strong is Eliskases in defence (as, for instance, the great attacking player Spielmann discovered to his sorrow in no fewer than three matches), then we get an idea how tremendous was Keres's achievement in this game.

## Fourth Illustration

Here is an encounter in which Keres attacks violently by purely positional means.

P. Keres White

S. Flohr Black
(From the tournament of eight at Semmering-Baden, 1937.)

## KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE

1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$; 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$; 3 . $\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathbf{t}} \mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{2}$; 4. P-KKt3, P-B $\mathbf{B}_{3}$; 5. B-Kt2, $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q 4}_{4} ; 6 . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$.
$6 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is safer, producing a symmetrical position in which White has gained practically no opening advantage.

$$
\text { 7. } \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}!
$$

7. P-K4 turned out very badly in the game FineReshevsky, Kemeri, 1937: 7. P-K4, Kt-Kt3; 8. O-O, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 9. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ !, and White got into great difficulties.
$7 \ldots \mathbf{O - O} ; 8 . \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{B}_{3}, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t} \boldsymbol{;} 9 . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B} \mathbf{4} ;$ io. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$.
го $. . \mathrm{Kt}^{2}-\mathrm{R}_{3}$ or $10 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ would have been better.

$$
\text { II. } \mathbf{K} t \times \mathbf{P}!
$$

Much stronger than II. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$. White allows his Pawn position to be weakened, but every one of his pieces develops the fullest activity-and exploiting this sort of advantage is just what Keres likes.
II. . . .

Q-B2
In this open position Black dare not go for the majority of Pawns on the Queen's side by II . . . B $\times$ Kt, of course, because it would leave White with two dangerous Bishops. White's game is as overwhelming after 12. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ as after 12. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$.

$$
\text { 12. Q-Kt3 } \quad \text { B-B3 }
$$

Preparing . . . Kt-Q2. Black wants to maintain the better Pawn formation, so avoids 12 . . Kt-B3, after which White would acquire a small but definite opening advantage by $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 13. } \mathbf{K R}-\mathbf{Q 1} \\
& \text { 14. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4} \text { ! }
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q 2}_{2}
$$

The "weak" Pawn is going to join in the attack, and shows plenty of healthiness. Black has to reckon with the possibility of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$.

| 14. | Kt- $\mathbf{B}_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{15}$. Q-Kt4 | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathrm{K}_{3}}$ |
| 16. $\mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{t 5}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | Q-K ${ }_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 17. QR-BI |  |

White's last moves have been nicely calculated, the point being that the KP cannot now be captured: ${ }_{17} \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 18 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}!, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ (or $18 \ldots B \times K t$; 19. $Q \times B$, with an irresistible attack); 19. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 20. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$, and White has a big pull positionally: Black is in trouble.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I7. } . \dot{Q}_{5} \quad \text { R-Qı } \\
& \text { 18. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Magnificently played. If Black now captures the King's Pawn, there would follow: ig. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$; 20. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Rch}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; 21. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ !, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 22. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, Q-R8ch; 23. B-KBi, Kt-K3; 24. Kt-B7, R-Kti; 25. Q-K8ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; 26. Kt $\times \mathrm{Ktch}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 27. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3} ; 28 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ and wins $(28 \ldots B \times P$; 29. Q-B4ch or $28 \ldots B-R 6$; 29. $Q-Q 6 c h, K-B_{4} ; 30$. Q-Q7ch).
${ }^{17}$-(G.226)

Since 18 . . Q-Kti would be powerfully countered by 19. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{I}}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{I}}$ Blacks finds himself compelled to dissolve White's Pawn-position weakness after all by exchanging on $Q_{4}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 18. } . . . & \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \\
\text { 19. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{3}
\end{array}
$$

Bad execution of a sound idea. Black should have attacked the Knight, not with the Pawn but with the Bishop. After 19 ... B-Q2 ; 20. Kt-B3 (20. $P \times K$, $B \times K t)$, Kt-QI, the position, whilst admittedly very difficult for Black, would have been far from lost.
The text move finds a charming refutation.

$$
\text { 20. } \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{7}}!!
$$



An astonishing continuation, with which White forces the win of a piece. If Black captures the Knight, he loses a Rook after 21. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Bch}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 22. Q-Kt6, whilst 20 . . B- Q2 fails to $21 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and 20 . . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ to $2 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 22. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$. It is "all over bar shouting."
$20 \ldots \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{5} ;{ }_{2}$ 1. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B c h}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} ; 22 . \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{R}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K P} ;{ }_{23} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}} ;{ }_{24} . \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$.
Black resigns, for neither exchange of Queens nor $24 . . . Q \times R P, 25 . K t \times$ Pch offers any hope.

It has been a clash between two widely diverging conceptions, Keres representing the strategy of the middle-game, Flohr that of the end-game. The man who lives in the present beats the one who lives for he future-it is nothing new!

## Fifth Illustration

Finally, a game which presents Keres as an end-game artist.

## S. Reshevsiy White

P. Keres Black
(From the Semmering-Baden tournament, 1937.)

## QUEEN'S INDIAN DEFENCE

1. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}, \mathbf{K t - K B} 3$; 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ;{ }_{3} . \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$, P-QKt3; 4. P-KKt3, B-Kt2; 5. B-Kt2, B-Kt 5 ch ; 6. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{2}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} \mathbf{c h} ; 7 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O} ; 8 . \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} ;$ 9. Q-B2, QKt-Q2; io. Kt-B3, Q-K2; in. P-K $\mathbf{4}$.

White has slightly the better of it. In this opening it is most important for Black to impede or nullify White's $\mathrm{P}_{-} \mathrm{K}_{4}$. Keres has neglected this, probably on purpose, so as to confuse the struggle.

| 11 | QR-BI |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12. KR-KI | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ |
| 13. $\mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{Q r}$ |  |

13. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ would be answered by $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ followed. by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}$-this explains II . . . R-BI

$$
{ }^{13} \cdot \dot{Q}-\dot{R}_{4}
$$

$$
\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}
$$

White fails to produce a useful plan. It was correct to move the Queen, as she was unsatisfactorily posted on the same file as Black's Rook; but 14. Q-Q2 (perhaps preceded by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KR}_{4}$ ) was to be preferred.

| 14 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{15}$. Q-R3 | R-KI |
| 16. $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | P-Kı3 |
| 17. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |  |

White over-estimates the importance of the square Q6. The text move, which leads to an exchange of Queens, produces an end-game in which White's present advantage, his command of a little more space, slowly disappears; consequently the weakness on his Q4 becomes of more moment than the one on Black's Q3.
17... $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $18 . \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q} ;$ i9. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R}_{3}, \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B I} ;$ 20. $\mathbf{P}$-QKt4, Kt-BI; 2 1. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$; 22. R-Q6,
 ${ }_{25}$. P-QR4.

A vain attempt to obtain some tangible target, but this rushing forward the Pawns on the Queen's wing only enfeebles White's position.
25 ...K-K3; 26. R-Q8, R(K2)-QB2 ! ; 27 . K-Br, K-K2.

Black's weaknesses on the $Q$ file have disappeared,
and Keres soon succeeds in fully re-establishing the equilibrium on this file.
28. $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{8})-\mathbf{Q}_{3}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q}_{2} ; 29 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R c h}, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{R} ; 30$.


Aiming for $\mathbf{Q}_{5}$. Black now takes the lead.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 32. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q R \mathbf { R }} \\
& \text { 33. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{K t - \mathbf { K } _ { \mathbf { 3 } }}
$$

White can hardly remain completely passive; yet his efforts to attack on the Queen's wing have no satisfactory outcome and Black's advantage becomes clearer and clearer.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 33. } \mathbf{\cdots} \times \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q K t} \mathbf{t}! \\
& \text { 34. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

After 34. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{5}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$; 35. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{2}$; followed by . . . R-Qi and possibly . . . Kt-Kt4 and $\ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{K}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{3}$, it is Black who invades along the Queen's file. The text move too has its drawbacks (it opens the file of Black's Rook), but White at least obtains some prospects of counter-play along the QB or Q file.
$34 .$. Kt-Q $\mathbf{5 c h}$; $35 . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; 36. R-BI, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$; 37. Kt-K2.

White's intention with $34 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is now evident: simplification and a draw.
37. . . .

## Kt-B3!

Forcing the white Rook to leave the QB file. See how the enfeeblement of White's Queen's wing is helping Black to get the upper hand.

$$
\text { 38. R-QKtI } \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q r}!
$$

Preparing to push forward in the centre. Black wants to force the white King to make up his mind: if $38 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$, then after $39 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$ ch the Queen's file becomes a most important base of operations. Hence White's reply.

$$
\text { 39. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}} \text { ! }
$$

Black is gaining more and more ground. The text move leaves White no choice, for 40 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ would be answered by $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, 4 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB}_{\mathrm{I}}$ (42. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KBI}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KPch})$; or if $4 \mathrm{I} . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch} ; 42 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB}$; and the Rook penetrates into White's position.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 4o. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c h} & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 4i. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B I}_{\mathbf{I}} \\
\text { 42. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{3} & \mathbf{K} t-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{I}}:
\end{array}
$$

The effect of his operations in the centre: the square Q4 $_{4}$ is now available for a Knight.

$$
\text { 43. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}} \quad \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{3}}!
$$

If now $44 . \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, then $44 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$, and both White's Queen's-side Pawns soon fall.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
44 . & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{2} \\
45 . & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{4}
\end{array}
$$

White has a bad game, and he can hardly make anything of passive defence in the long run. His Queen's wing is weak, he is cramped in the centre, and finally he is threatened with an action on the King's wing, commencing with a break-through by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$ and sustained by the invasion of the

Rook along the Knight's or Rook's file. The text move, dictated by necessity, is an endeavour to confuse the issue, e.g. $45 \cdots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 46. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KKtP}$; 47. $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{2}\right)-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, R-Qich; 48. K-B2 threatening 49 . $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$ or $49 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$. The loss of his QRP might cause serious trouble for Black.

$$
45 \cdots \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathbf{c h}!
$$



A beautiful break-through, with which Black refutes the counter-action and increases his advantage decisively.

The point of this move is revealed in the subsequent course of the game: Black can always get a passed Pawn out of the majority he now obtains on the King's wing, and the advance of this Pawn finally proves irresistible.

$$
\text { 46. } \mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Forced, for 46 . K-B2 or 46 . K-K2 would fail against $46 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$, whilst 46 . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ can be met by $4^{6} \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QKtP}$ or even $4^{6} \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ !
$4^{6} \ldots \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t - K} \mathbf{4 c h}!; 47 . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B} 2, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t P} ; 48$. K-Kt3 ${ }_{\mathbf{3}}$, $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$ ! ; $49 . \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$.

Again forced; e.g. 49. R-B2, Kt $\times$ Ktch; 50 . $\times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}!$; $5^{\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \text { Pch, etc. }}$
$49 \cdots \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t} ; 5^{0} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}, \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}$; ${ }_{51} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K r}$, $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{4}$ !

Much stronger than capturing the KP at once. Black gets a passed Pawn on the King's Knight's file, and the win is then easy.
52. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q r}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{5}$; 53. R-Q8, $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t 6}$; $54 . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ;{ }_{55}$. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} 3, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{7}$ !

Now 56. R-Kt3 is out of the question, because of $\mathrm{R} \times$ Ktch!, etc.

White resigns, since 58 . Kt-B3ch is of no avail.
A first-rate achievement in the realm of end-play.

## CHAPTER IX

## DR. MACHGIELIS EUWE

Dr. M. Euwe was born at Watergraafsmeer on 20th May, 190I. It was his mother who instructed him in the first rudiments of chess. At the early age of ten he participated in a one-day Christmas congress at Amsterdam and won every game; but he was never launched forth as an infant prodigy.
His chess talents gradually developed, albeit at no expense to his studies, and by 1920 he had already become the leading figure in Dutch chess. A year later he opened his annual subscription to the title of Dutch champion and played Maroczy to a draw in a private match ( 2 wins each, with 8 draws). He subsequently made several successful incursions into foreign chess congresses.

He gained his Doctorate in 1926, and in DecemberJanuary 1926-7 achieved his first sensational success, losing a match to Alekhine by the extremely small margin of 2 games to 3 (with 5 draws). In 1928 he was twice defeated by Bogolyubov, though again by the narrowest of margins ( $2-3$ with 5 draws; and I-3 with 7 draws). These were great achievements for a pure amateur, and the world rightly acclaimed them as such.

In 1930 he scored a resounding success at Hastings, topping the Premier section ahead of Capablanca, who, however, defeated him in a subsequent match by 2-0 with 8 draws. 1932 was a good year. He beat Spielmann by $2-0$ with 2 draws and drew two
matches with Flohr, with whom he shared second place in a tournament at Berne behind Alekhine.

Then came a break in his chess career through his devoting himself to his mathematical studies for a while. Alekhine's slight lapse in the Christmas tournament at Hastings 1933-4 suddenly gave him the idea of challenging the now world champion to another match, and by the summer of 1935 the great event had been arranged.

In the meantime he scored two more successes, sharing second place with Flohr behind Alekhine once again, this time at Zurich, and winning the Christmas tournament at Hastings, in company with Sir George Thomas and Flohr, ahead of Capablanca, Lilienthal, and Botvinnik.

The dramatic result of his first match against Alekhine is old history. Three points down after seven games, he pulled up to equality, only to see his redoubtable opponent draw away again. Battling gamely, he was still two down at the two-thirds stage, but won the twentieth, twenty-first, twenty-fifth, and twenty-sixth games and retained his grip on a now desperate adversary to the end.

Euwe's great characteristic is economy of force. He is logic personified, a genius of law and order. His play is accurate and aggressive. One would hardly call him an attacking player, yet when his genius is functioning at its smoothest he strides confidently into some extraordinarily complex positions: he is no disciple of simplicity.

His great weakness is a tendency to blunder. Kmoch asks: "Has he some psychological antipathy to real-


Dr. "Max" Euwe
World Champion 1935-7
ism? I am no psychologist, and cannot say. The fact remains that Euwe commits the most inexplicable mistakes in thoroughly favourable positions, and that this weakness has consistently tarnished his record."

His winning the world title stimulated him to some brilliant results during 1936, results which, even though blemished by blunders, bear comparison with those of any world champion before or since. Blunders alone cost him first place at Zandvoort and Nottingham and a better standing among the first-board masters in the Stockholm Olympiad.

However, in two very strongly contested tournaments played at various localities in Holland and Germany respectively, he topped the list, above Alekhine on each occasion. When the return match for the world championship began, he could look back with satisfaction on two wins and a draw as the outcome of their last three encounters, and he added a further win in the first game of the match.

Then the tide gradually began to turn against him; we have gone into some of the possible reasons. The temporary loss of his "second," Reuben Fine, through appendicitis, was a sad blow, for Fine collaborated in opening and adjournment analysis, and it is an undeniable fact that a great part of Alekhine's success was due to the almost miraculous analysis that he put into several positions on adjournment in co-operation with his second, Eliskases. Adding this factor to Euwe's commission of even more serious blunders than usual, one is bound to regard the final margin of five points against him as a tremendous exaggeration of the real difference between the players.

He could only reach fourth place in one subsequent Dutch tournament, but was terribly handicapped through carrying on with his teaching duties throughout, working all day and playing in the evenings. For the A.V.R.O. tournament he had inadequate preparation, and only received leave of absence at the very last moment. This probably went far to account for his depressing start; in the second half of the tournament, however, he staged a "come-back" which delighted his supporters and must have restored all his self-confidence, beating Fine, Botvinnik, and Capablanca (the latter for the first time in his life), and drawing his remaining four games. He faltered a little in the 1938-9 Christmas congress at Hastings, losing to Landau and finishing behind Szabo, but he has since scored a fine "first" in a Dutch tournament above Flohr, Szabo, and Landau, and has annexed the Dutch championship repeatedly since. For instance, he crushed the strong player Landau mercilessly by 5-0 with 5 draws in a match for the championship in 1939.

In 1939 he finished first above Vidmar in a tournament at Buda-Pesth.
In 1941 he beat Bogolyubov in a match by $6 \frac{1}{2}-3 \frac{1}{2}$ -a very fine achievement. Apart from this, however, he has-so far as we can trace-played in no tournament in Nazi Europe, but has consistently overwhelmed all opposition in Holland, his latest victim to prove unable to score one win over him in a match for the Dutch championship being a youthful newcomer named van den Hoek.

The foundation of Euwe's success is undoubtedly his
deep knowledge of opening theory. Here are two games which illustrate this.

## ENGAGES THE ENEMY

## First Illustration

Dr. M. Euwe
White
S. Flohr
Black
(From the tournament of six, Amsterdam, 1939.)
QUEEN'S GAMBIT, SLAV DEFENCE

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{4} \mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ |
| 4. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}$ |

An unusual "modulation" from the Slav Defence to the Grünfeld, which, by the way, is not too favourable, since the passive move $\ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB}_{3}$ is, as a rule, only satisfactory when White has shut in his QB by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$.

$$
\text { 5. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

B-Kt2
In a match game between the same adversaries (1932) $5 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 6. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$; 7. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ was played, and Black got the better of it. Subsequent analysis showed that it should be White who obtains the best prospects after 6. P-K. 3 (instead of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}$ ), e.g. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4} ; 7$ 7. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{4}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4} ; 8 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 9 . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 10. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Ktı}$ ! regaining the Pawn.

$$
\text { 6. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}} \quad \mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}
$$

The drawback to Black's method is apparent: if he
wants to make the natural riposte to $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KB}_{4}$ in the Grünfeld Defence, namely . . . P-QB4, his second move would turn out to have been a mere waste of time.

$$
\text { 7. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K t}_{3} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

He can hardly continue his development otherwise.
8. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$
QKt-Q2
9. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$
Q-KI

Useless, as soon becomes clear. 9...Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}$ at

A scarcely natural move, with which Black wastes more valuable time. With I4 . . . P-QR 4 , followed by
once was to be preferred.

## 10. B-K2

Preventing . . . Kt-R4.

| 10. | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 I. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ | Q-QI |
| 12. $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |

Partly as a result of Black's weak ninth move, White has now by far the better prospects.
12. . . Q-Kt3

So as to develop his $Q B$, which has been tied down to the defence of the QKtP.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 13. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{3} & \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K I}_{\mathbf{I}} \\
\text { i4. } \mathbf{Q R}-\mathbf{B I}_{1} & \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B r}
\end{array}
$$

. . Q-Kt5, he could still have got a reasonable game. Not, however, $14 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{3} ; \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{5}$.

```
\mp@subsup{}{5}{5}. Kt-R44 Q-Qx
16. KR-QI
```

White has played the opening in his characteristically clean-cut way, to obtain a tremendous advantage in development.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 16. } . \dot{\mathbf{P}}_{4} & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q}_{4} \\
\text { 17. } & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}
\end{array}
$$

He must get in this move at once, since 17 ... $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$ could have been very strongly met by 18 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}_{5}$. But now the luckless QB is imprisoned behind its own Pawns.

$$
\text { 18. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{K B}_{3}
$$

Probably better than $18 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KKt}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, etc.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 18. . . } & \mathbf{K t - K} \mathbf{t}_{3} \\
\text { 19. } \mathbf{K t - B _ { 5 }} & \mathbf{K t - Q _ { 2 }}
\end{array}
$$

A rather neat little manœuvre which forces off a couple of pieces without wasting time, but also without improving Black's situation a lot.
20. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$
21. B-B6

Note the remorseless logic: White methodically completes his development before making any offensive overtures, but the moment the time is ripe he moves to the attack.
21. . . Q-R4


With 21 . . . B-K2; 22. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$ Black would have left himself fatally weak on the black squares round his King.

$$
\text { 22. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{5} \text { ! }
$$

The Rook is untouchable, since Black would lose two Bishops for it; $22 \ldots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 23. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, and Black must leave the $Q B$ en prise in view of the threat Q-K ${ }_{3}-\mathrm{R} 6$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 22. } . \mathbf{K}_{5}! & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 23. } & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}
\end{array}
$$

Black must hold up $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$ at all costs. Another way of doing this was $23 \cdots \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, which would have transposed back to the actual game. On the other hand, $23 \ldots$ B-Kt2 would lose: $24 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} ; 25$. $\mathrm{R} \times$ Pch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 26. $\mathrm{Q} \times$ Pch, K moves; 27. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 28 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{BI}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; 29. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, etc.

$$
\text { 24. } \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}
$$

Black has to waste a move with his attacked Bishop, but he has more defensive resources than appear on the surface.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25. } \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}} \\
& \text { 26. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B I}_{\mathbf{I}}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

26. B-B3 would have been better. Now Flohr manages to confuse the issue a little.

$$
\text { 26. . . } \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2}
$$

Not 26 . . B-Kt2; $27 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ and wins as before.

$$
{ }_{27} \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{R}_{4}
$$

If 27. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$, then $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 28. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{B}_{3}\right)$. The Queen is doing quite useful work-so White might well have tried to undermine her position on $\mathrm{QK}_{7}{ }_{7}$ by 27. R-Kti!, Q-Q5 (27 . . Q $\times R$ ?; 28. $Q-R 6$, etc.); 28. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ !!, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8$; 29. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$ !, and White wins, since Black's occupation of the seventh rank, which proved so valuable in the actual game, is eliminated.

$$
27 \cdots \quad B-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}!
$$

Very well played. 28. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ is prevented because of $28 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times$ BPch, and if $29 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt8}$ mate. Had the white Bishop gone to $\mathrm{B}_{3}$ on the twenty-sixth move, this variation would not have been possible.

$$
\text { 28. } \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R} 6 \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

It suddenly looks as if Black might-win!

$$
\text { 29. R-Q3 } \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P c h}
$$

Forced, for $30 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ (protecting $\mathrm{KB}_{2}$ ) followed by $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ was threatened. 29 . . B- $\mathrm{B}_{5}$ would be no defence: 3 . $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times$ BPch; 3 I. $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Qch}$; 32. $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 33. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KR}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$, and mate next move.

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\text { 30. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{c h} \\
3 \text { I. } \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}
\end{array}
$$



How is White going to neutralize the menacing onrush of the Pawns?
32. B-K2!

This beautifully quiet move is the solution. White is going to screen his $\mathrm{KR}_{3}$ for use by a Rook, by 33 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{4}$. This leaves Black no time to queen his Rook's Pawn, the whole point being that White threatens not 33. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, 34. $\mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{Q}_{3}\right)-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$, and $35 \cdot \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, but 33. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} t_{4}$ and $34 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ at once, which saves a vital move. It seems a matter of touch and go but is not so in reality as Euwe has every eventuality neatly docketed.

```
32. ...M
    R-R4
R}\times\mathbf{P
```

Desperation; otherwise $34 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ would finish the game at once.

| 34. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35. $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{3})-\mathbf{K R}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| 36. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B} \mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |

If $36 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 37 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 38 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 39. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ and mate.

| 37. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} \mathbf{c h}$ |
| 39. | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |

Black resigns, for his passed Pawns can now be easily stopped: $39 \cdots \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 40. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4} ; 4 \mathrm{r}$. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} t_{5}$; $4^{2} . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} t 6$; 43. R-Kt6, etc., or $40 . . . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4} ; 4 \mathrm{I}$. R-QB3, P-Kt3; 42. R-B4, P-R6; 43. R-QR4.

A game like a detective novel, with an unexpected denouement on the thirty-second move.

## Second Illustration

Dr. M. Euwe
White
L. Szabo

Black
Q.G.D., HALF-SLAV DEFENCE
(From the tournament of six, Amsterdam, 1939.)

| 1. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q B}_{3}$ |
| 3. $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{KB}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ |
| 4. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ |

A much keener variation than it appears to be. In the first place White has to shut in his QB, since 5 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$ would force him to give up the minor exchange by $6 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, not $6 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{4}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 7 . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$,

B-Kt5; followed by . . . P-QKt ${ }_{4}$, and White cannot recover the Pawn.

$$
\text { 5. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{3} \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{2}
$$

Avoiding the Meran defence ( $5 \ldots \mathrm{QK}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Q}_{2} ; 6$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{3}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 7_{7} \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t}_{4} ; 8 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$; followed by . . P $-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ ) in favour of an old and rather passive line.
6. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}$
$\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

It would be better to stick to his original plan and complete his development by $7 . . . \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt}_{3}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$, etc., before thinking of complications. The text move could still lead to a Meran defence position but Black has wasted valuable time, through playing 5 . . B-K2 instead of $5 \ldots \mathrm{QKt}^{2}$, as would be evident if the following variation were adopted-
8. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}_{4}$; 9. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR}_{3}$; го. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4} ;$ Iı. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}!, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 12. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q}_{4}$; 13. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$; 14 . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{5}$, etc.

However, Black has quite other intentions.
8. $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$
P-QKt 4
9. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} 3$
P-Kt5 ?

Indeed a naïve mistake for a master of this class. The QBP now becomes permanently weak, and White can put it under fire in a variety of ways. The fact that Black now decides to complicate the game proves that the combination of $5 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$ and $6 \ldots \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ with $7 . \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is doubtful.

This whole scheme is an invention of A. Steiner. It
is not easy to refute a prepared variation, even a bad one! But it is very doubtful whether the variation is new to Euwe and he knows just what to do.

$$
\text { г. } \mathbf{K t - Q R _ { 4 }} \quad \text { B-R } \mathbf{3}
$$

Neither 1o ... Kt-R3; 11. Q-B2, Q-B2; 12. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ (12 ... $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$; 13. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; and $14 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{BI}$ ) nor 1о ... QKt-Q2; in. Q-B2, Q-R4; 12. B-Q2! would cnable Black to get in the so essential . . . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$, in the latter case because of (12 ...P-B4) I3. P-QR3 (threatening 14. $K t \times P$ and $\left.1_{5} . ~ P \times P\right), B P \times P$; 14 . $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt}_{2} ; \mathrm{I}_{5} . \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{KB} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 . \mathrm{Kt-Kt} 3!$, etc.

$$
\text { ı. } \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{K}_{5}
$$

Threatening $\mathrm{Kt} \times$ QBP. If Black wants to develop his Queen's wing he has nothing better than to exchange the Bishops, enabling White to strengthen the pressure on $\mathrm{QB}_{5}$.

| II. . | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12. $\mathrm{Kt} \times$ B | QKt-Q2 |
| 13. B-Q2 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q R}_{4}$ |
| 14. R-BI |  |

Crystal-clear strategy!

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 14. } \cdot \dot{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{3}} \\
&
\end{aligned}
$$

## R-BI

15. Q-B3 looks attractive; but is not so good, because of $\mathrm{I}_{5}$... $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ !; 16 . $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! With the text move White plans $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$, after which his position would not be far from ideal.

Kt-Kt3


## 16. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ !

Refuting Black's whole plan; even stronger than 16. $\mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{R}_{4}\right)-\mathrm{B}_{5}$. The QBP is lost, for the black Queen cannot guard both the Knight and the attacked Pawn, whilst $16 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ fails against 18. Kt-B6, Q moves; 19. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Bch}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 20$. $Q \times R P$, etc.

| 16. $\mathbf{~}$. | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17. $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{Q B P}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| 18. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |

$18 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}\left(\mathrm{Kt}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ would have been a little better; 19. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ !, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktr}$; 20. Q-B2, but any attempt to regain the Pawn by 20 . . Q-Q4 (threatening R-Qi) would fail through $21 . \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ ! (21 . . $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$; 22 . $R-R_{I}$, etc.).

| 19. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 21. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q r}$ |

Or 21 . . . R-Kti; 22. Q-Bi!, P-R3; 23. P-K4, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; 24. Q-B6, followed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R}_{7}$.

$$
\text { 22. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}} \text { ? }
$$

At this critical stage White succumbs to a characteristic lapse and manages to give back his Pawn for nothing, in the simplest way. After 22. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$, the game would have been over in a few moves.
(i) $22 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3} ; 23 . \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 8, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KtI}$; 24. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{BI}$, K-R2; 25. Q-B7!, etc.
(ii) $22 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Ktr}$; 23. $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6!, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ (otherwise White retains the Pawn); 24. R-BI (threatening 25. $Q-B 8 c h, R-Q \mathrm{I}$; 26. $Q \times Q, R \times Q$; 27. $R-B 8 c h)$, R-QI; 25. Q-R6! and wins through the threat of $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$, since $25 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$ fails against 26. R-B8, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KPch} ; 27 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{BI}_{\mathrm{I}}$, and Black cannot check again.


Now a very difficult game develops. White commands more of the board, a circumstance which makes
his Bishop stronger than Black's Knight. Black's advanced Pawns on the Queen's side deter him from exchanging Queens, since their weakness would then become fatal; this very inability to allow exchange of Queens causes him a lot of trouble in view of White's possession of the QB file. Euwe handles this part of the game with splendid accuracy.

| 25. . . | P-R |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26. B-K |  |
| 27. | K-Kti |
| 28. | Q-B $-\mathbf{B t}_{2}$ |$\quad$ R-Q6

Promoting the very exchange he should have avoided. He could have put up a better resistance by a waiting move such as $28 \ldots$ R-Qi (29. Q-B5, Q-R 5 or 29 . Q-B6, Q-R4).

Dr. Euwe now forces an end-game, which is, rather curiously, a clear-cut win.

| 29. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}!$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{6}$ |
| 31. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t})$ |
| 32. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B} \mathbf{8} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R} \mathbf{2}$ |
| 33. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{4}$ |  |

The threats of $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 8$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ now cost Black the game.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 33. } . \ddot{B}_{7} \\
& \text { 34. }-\mathbf{B}_{7}
\end{aligned} \quad \text { Kt-Q2 }
$$

If 34 . R-QR8 at once, then $34 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4} ; 35 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{5}$, etc.
${ }^{\text {34. }} \cdot \overrightarrow{\mathbf{K}}-\mathrm{K}_{2}$

## $\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$

Not, of course, 35. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 36. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, R-QK $t_{4}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 35. } \cdot \stackrel{-}{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{4}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## K-Kt3

Eradicating the possibility of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ (e.g. after 36. R-R7?).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 36. . . } \\
& 37 . \text { B- B }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Kt-K $\mathbf{t}_{5}$

Simply 37. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$; 38. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K}_{3}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 39. $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q}_{7}$, followed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R}_{7}$ would have been good enough.

Or $37 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{4}$; 38. B-B3, Kt-B3; 39. K-B3, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 40 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ followed by $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7$.

In another master this move would have been dismissed as a mere flourish, but such a gesture is quite foreign to Euwe. It is merely that he sees he can force a distant passed Pawn which, with the far-striding Bishop against Knight, must, according to his beloved principles, win. So he marches for this theoretically won position by the most direct way.

| 37. $\cdot \dot{R}_{\mathbf{7}}$ | $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{7}}$ | $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| 39. $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |

If he leaves the Rooks on, the procedure will be P-Kt4, P-Kt5, B-Q4, P-Kt6, R-R7, etc.

$$
\text { 40. } \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}
$$

The King could not march along the rank at once,
since 40 . . K-B3 would be answered simply by 4 r . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$; or $4 \mathrm{O} . \mathrm{P}^{2}-\mathrm{K}_{4} ; 4 \mathrm{I}$. P-B5 $\mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ ??; 42. B-Q8 mate!!

White's passed Pawn dominates the rest of the game.
41. P-Kt4, Kt-B3; 42. P-Kt5, Kt $\times \mathbf{P}$; 43.

B-Kt4, momentarily stalemating the Knight. 43 . . Kt-B3; 44. P-Kt6, Kt-Q2; 45. P-Kt7, K-R4; 46. B-Q6, K-K $\mathbf{t}_{5}$; $47 . \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{Q}_{3}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{- R}}^{\mathbf{4}}$; 48. K- $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$, K-Kt3; 49. K-Kt5, K-B2; $50 . K-\mathbf{B 6}, \mathbf{K}-K \mathbf{I}$.

51. B-B8!, P-Kt4; $52 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $\quad 53 . \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$, P-K4; 54. B-Kt5, Kt-Ktich; 55. K-Q6, P-K $\mathbf{5}$;
 P-K6; 59. P-Kt8(Q).

Black resigns.

## Third Illustration

E. Klein
White
Dr. M. Euwe Black
(From the Congress at Hastings, 1938-9.)


The Bishops on oppositely coloured squares make the draw almost inescapable.

Black decides this very difficult ending by means of a most striking combination about twelve moves deep. The leitmotifs of the position are-
(I) Black wins if he can get two connected passed Pawns.
(2) Black wins if he can get a Pawn majority on each wing.
30. . . .
B-B3

Threatening 3 I . . . R-K7ch and practically forcing White's reply.

| 31. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K I ~}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}_{7}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q I}^{2}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| 33. $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |  |

White is repeatedly denied all choice of moves. After $33 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ White would lose either the QRP or the KtP as well.

| 33. . . | R-R |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34. B-Q6 | R-Q5 |
| 35. B-B5 |  |

White had to attack the Rook, since $35 \ldots$. . B-R 5 was threatened, and after $35 . \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ the QRP falls.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 35. . . } \\
& \text { 36. } \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{3}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P c h}
$$

If $36 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, then $36 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 37. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{4}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR}_{3}$; 38. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{5}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q}_{2}$, and White is mated.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 36. } \mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{P} \\
& 37 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now it seems as if White draws easily, since the QP goes; but we have not seen half of the combination yet.

```
37. ...
R-KR(
```

The only way to save both Pawns.

| 38. $-\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R} 6 \mathbf{c h}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39. B-K $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}$ |
| 40. K $\times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| 41. B-Q |  |

- And now the Bishop is on a "focus" square, where it is loaded with the task of guarding both White's Pawns, so cannot move without loss.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4^{1} . \ddot{\mathbf{K}} \cdot \underset{\mathbf{B}}{4^{2} .}
\end{aligned}
$$

K-K3

At last! White must lose a second Pawn and the game. Play went $43 . \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K t 8}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Q R} \mathbf{6})$; 44. $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{c h}$, $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B}_{2} ; 45 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B r c h}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B} 6 ; 46 . \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R} ; 47$. $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{-}} \mathbf{2}, \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K t}_{4} ; \quad 48 . \quad \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{3} ; 49 . \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{B}_{7}$,

 ${ }_{55}$. K-K44, K-R4; $56 . \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}}-\mathbf{K}_{3}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K K}_{t_{5}} ;{ }_{57}$. K-B2, $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathbf{t 6 c h} ; 58 . \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R 6} ; \quad 59 . \mathrm{B}-\mathbf{Q} 6, \mathbf{K}-\mathrm{K}_{5}$; 6o. B-Kt4, B-Kt2; 6r. K-Ktı, $K \times P$; and White resigned.

## Fourth Illustration

In the same tournament Euwe reached the following position against Milner-Barry after 45 moves-


$$
\text { 46. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}
$$

A malicious trap.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 46. } \cdots \dot{B}_{2} \\
& \text { 47. } \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \text { ? }
\end{aligned}
$$

Threatening both $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$ and $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}$.

$$
47 \cdots \quad \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}_{4}
$$

With or without check, 48. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}_{3}$ wins the game. If $47 \ldots$ B-Kt3ch, then $48 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} ; 49$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t}_{3} \mathrm{ch}$. There followed 48. $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} ; 49$.

K-Kt2, R-R 4 ; 50. R-R6, B-Kt3; $5^{\text {1. }}$ B-Kt6, and Black resigned.

## Fifth Illustration

Dr. M. Euwe White
S. Flohr Black

(From the A.V.R.O. tourney.)

$$
\text { 24. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B}_{5}!!
$$

Threatening $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}_{4}$ and also $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ in some eventualities.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
24 . \cdots & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
25 . \mathbf{K t}_{\mathbf{t}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}} & \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{I}
\end{array}
$$

Neither $25 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ (26. Kt-Kt6, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 27. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q}$; 28. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 29. P-Q6 followed by R-Qi and possibly $B-R_{3}$ ) nor $25 \ldots$ Q-B2 (26. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, followed by $\mathrm{K} t \times \mathrm{P}$ and $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ) would be any improvement.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 26. } \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{P} \\
\text { 27. } \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q}^{\mathbf{6}} & \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}
\end{array}
$$

If 27 . . Q-BI, then 28. QR-QI, threatening 29. $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ or 29 . Kt-Kt6-K7ch or 29 . $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.

$$
\text { 28. } \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P c h} \quad \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{2}
$$

The alternative was $28 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 29. $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $Q \times P$; 30. Kt-Kt6ch, K-R2; 31. Kt-K7, R-Qi (if $31 \cdots R-B_{2}$, then $32 . Q-K t 6 c h$ and $\left.R-R 8 c h\right) ; 32$. B-R 3 with the deadly threat 33 . B-B5ch. $32 \ldots$ Q-Q 5 would allow a thrilling finish. 33. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{5} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{I}}$; 34 . R-Ki, Q-Q7; 35.Kt-Kt6ch, K-R2; $36 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KKtPch}!$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 37 . \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kti} ; 38$. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 6$ mate.

$$
\text { 29. } \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

The threat was $30 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKtr}$; 31. $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}_{3}$ followed by R-R7. And 29 . . . Q-KI would succumb to 30 . . P-Q7. White's next move makes a crash.

$$
\text { 30. } \mathbf{B}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{4}} \mathbf{c h}: \quad \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{I}}
$$

Or $30 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, 3$ 1. Q-B5ch, etc.

| 31. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t} \mathbf{c h}$ | $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32. $\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}-\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{7}} \mathbf{c h}$ | Black resigned |

A combination in Euwe's very best style. The initial sacrifice was perfectly sound, and the whole combination went through with murderous exactitude.


[^0]:    Io. . . .
    Q-B2

[^1]:    14-(G.226)

[^2]:    $34 \ldots \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}} ; \mathbf{3 5} . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{R}\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}\right)-\mathbf{Q}_{5} ; 36 . \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{4}}$, R(Q5)-Q3.

    Draw agreed.
    A splendid example of intrepid defence and at the same time a new illustration of Fine's skill in the handling of critical positions.

