THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER

XII 5, 1963

EVANS WINS AT WESTCHESTER

FROM: 244 Kearny St. San Francisco 8

David Lawson 111 Montague Street Brooklyn 2, New York

THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER

Vol. XII, No. 5 \$2 per year February, 1963

THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER, 244 Kearny Street, San Francisco 8

Monthly except January, March, August, and October
Official Organ of the California State Chess Federation
Editor: Guthrie McClain

Associate Editors: Gordon S. Barrett, Los Angeles; Dr. Mark W. Eudey, Berkeley;
Neil T. Austin, Sacramento; Irving Rivise, Los Angeles
Games Editor: Robert E. Burger
Guest Annotator: Intl. Master Imre Konig

Second-class postage paid at San Francisco, California

CONTENTS

N-S Team Match 1963 Proposals 69
Larry Evans Wins Westchester 70-72
Bay Area Team Matches..... 72-73
Addison Wins Sta. Monica Open... 74
L. Johnson, So. Bay Champ.... 75
S. Parker, Van Nuys Champ.... 75
Game of the Month...... 76-77
Editorial, Neil T. Austin... 78-80
Games....... 81-83
Tasks...... 84

THE 1963 NORTH-SOUTH TEAM MATCH

Herbert T. Abel of Santa Monica made the suggestion, reported on page 60 of last month's issue, that the annual North-South team match be held on a day which is not part of a three-day week end; in other words, save Memorial Day for a tournament and schedule the North-South match for an ordinary Sunday.

Opinions from widely-separated parts of California concur with this suggestion. Therefore, the 1963 match will be held earlier in May. The proponent of the change, Herb Abel, suggests May 12th because May 19th is Morphy Day in southern California.

It would seem that either May 12th or May 26th would be acceptable.

Now that the date is narrowed down, it seems appropriate to raise the old question of location. For a number of years the Californian Hotel at Fresno has held the North-South match. Every year the old timers on the North team have asked why not San Luis Obispo, and every year received the answer "because the accommodations were not satisfactory to the South." Since the South has lost five straight years, it might be that Southerners now would prefer San Luis Obispo to Fresno. Certainly, accommodations in San Luis Obispo have improved since our last match there, in 1955. What do our readers think?

LARRY EVANS WINS WESTCHESTER FIESTA

Larry Evans, who recently tied for third in the U. S. Championship, won the third annual Westchester Fiesta, held at Loyola University February 15-17, by the score $5\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$. Evans allowed one draw to Emil Bersbach on the way to the title, the \$150 first prize and the trophy. Tied for second were four players: Irving Rivise, Bersbach, Walt Cunningham, and Rex Wilcox - all with 5-1.

In addition to the first prize of \$150 there were other prizes ranging from \$75 to \$15 including awards to the highest expert, Class A, Class B, Class C, and to the highest unrated player. The tournament was a sixround Swiss with one round on Friday, three rounds on Saturday and two rounds on Sunday. The director was Herbert T. Abel, who was assisted by Joe Kalivoda and Ray Snow.

	WESTCHESTER	FIEST	A, FE	BRUA	RY 15	-16-17	, 1963	
		1.	2	3	4	5	6	Score
	Evans, L.	W54	W15	W11	D3	W6	W8	$5\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$
	Rivise I.	W21	W 28	D12	D12	W22	W19	5 ~ 1
4.	Bersbach, E. Cunningham, W.	W20 W74	W69 D10	W46 W19	D1 W27	W10 D7	D6 W11	5 - 1 5 - 1
5.	Wilcox, R.	W45	L24	W26	W56	W13	W15	5 ~ 1
6. I	Henin, C.	W59	W35	W13	W33	L1	D3	$4\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$
7. 8	Smith, P.	W4 8	W61	D8	W14	D4	D16	$4\frac{1}{2} - 1\frac{1}{2}$
8. 1	Weinberger, T.	W38	W78*	D7	W25	W12	L1	$4\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$
9. I	Hanken J.	W42	L13	W38	W35	D24	W25	$4\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$
10. I	Kennedy, E.	W55	D4	W17	W53	L3	D12	4 - 2
11.	Jaffray, J.	W47	W34	L1	W43	W20	L4	4 - 2
12. 8	Standers, L.	W66	W36	D2	W16	L8	D10	4 - 2
13. I	Kupersmith, L.	W72	W 9	L6	W55	L5	W24	4 - 2
14. 1	Lessing, N.	W71	D18	W29	L7	W39	D17	4 - 2
15. 8	Straus	W50	L1	W59	W42	W33	L5	4 - 2
16. 4	Addison, W.	W43	W56	D25	L12	W27	D7	4 - 2
17. V	Warner, E.	W76	D29	L10	W46	W30	D14	4 - 2
18. 1	Freeman, R.	W5 8	D14	L4	D26	W36	W41	4 - 2
19. (Quillen, P.	W52	W57	L33	W2 8	W23	L2	4 - 2
20. I	McCartney, W.	L3	W60	W67	W31	L11	W34	4 - 2
21. V	Warner, I.	L2	D32	W50	D62	W40	W38	4 - 2
22. /	Almgren, S.	L57	W41	W76	W34	L2	W42	4 - 2
23. 1	Bliss, R.	W68	L25	W58	W44	L19	W37	4 - 2
24.]	Leidner, M.	W40	W5	D53	D2	D9	L13	$3\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$

TIVO	tohogton Fingto							
	tchester Fiesta	1	2	3	4	5	6	Score
25.	Rubin, G.	W49	W23	D16	L8	W53*	L9	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
26.	Jester, T.	W30	D27	L5	D18	W43	D28	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
27.	Binns, P.	W37	D26	W51	L4	L16	W52	$3\frac{1}{2}$ - $2\frac{1}{2}$
28.	O'Neill, H.	W64	L2	W69	L19	W47	D26	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
29.	Sheridan, G.	W63	D17	L14	W48	L44	W62*	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
30.	Castle	L26	W66	D39	W51	L17	W33	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
31.	Stani, K.	L33	W65	W37	L20	D52	W51	$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
$\frac{32.}{22}$	Maillard, W.	L35	D21	W45	L39	W75*		$3\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
33.	Rader, H.	W31	W44	W19	L6	L15	L30	3 - 3
34.	Johnson, L.	W60	L11	W61	L22	W62	L20	3 - 3
35.	Zwerdling, H.	W32	L6	W57	L9	L41	W55	3 - 3
36.	Geller, S.	W41	L12	L44	W75	L18	W61*	3 - 3
37.	Swett, C.	L27	W40	L31	W60	W56	L23	3 - 3
38.	Cooper, M.	L8	W75	L9	W73	W61	L21	3 - 3
39.	Parker, S.	L53	W70	D30	W32	L14	D45	3 - 3
40.	Teal, W.	L24	L37	W65	W49	L21	W46	3 - 3
41.	Detrich, J.	L36	L22	W72	W58	W35	L18	3 - 3
42.	Haley, C.	L9	W72	W77	L15	W55	L22	3 - 3
43.	Rogosin, H.	L16	W79	W63	L11	L26	W60	3 - 3
44.	Hunnex, G.	W65	L33	W36	L23	W29		3 - 3
45.	Stumbrs, O.	L5	D50	L32	W80*	W69	D39	3 - 3
46.	U z galis, W.	W73	W80	L3	L17	W67	L40	3 - 3
47.	Guilaroff, J.	L11	W68	L56	W64	L28	W58	3 - 3
48.	Sikes, H.	L7	D54	W81*	L29	D57	W63	3 - 3
49.	Manderson, E.	L25	L67	W79	L40	W64*	W69*	3 - 3
50.	Pease, R.	L15	D45	L21	W70	W59	L32	$2\frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{1}{2}$
51.	Oster, R.	D81	W62	L27	L30	W54	L31	$2\frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{1}{2}$
52.	Kluz, R.	L19	L55	W70	W63	D31	L27	$2\frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{1}{2}$
53.	Jacobs, R.	W39	W77	D24	L10	L25*		$2\frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{1}{2}$
54.	Rogosin, D.	L1	D48	L62	W81*	L51	D59	$2\frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{1}{2}$
55.	Kotz, R.	L10	W52	W80	L13	L42	L35	2 - 4
56.	Larsen, R.	W79	L16	W47	L5	L37	L57	2 - 4
57.	Schlosser, M.	W22	L19	L35	D67	D48	W56	2 - 4
58.	Rosenthal, S.	L18	W71	L23	L41	W72	L47	2 - 4
59.	Walker, D.	L6	W64	L3	D69	L5)	D54	2 - 4
60.	Maedia, A.	L34	L20	W66	L37	W73	L43	2 - 4
61.	Berres, R.	W67	L7	L34	W76	L33	L36*	3 - 4
62.	Thomas, G.	D80	L51	W54	D21	L34	L29*	2 - 4

Wes	tchester Fiesta	1	2	3	4	5	6	Score
63.	Cesare, A.	L29	W74	L43	L52	W71*	L48	2 - 4
64.	Kleinick, A.	L28	L59	W74	L47	L49*	W71	2 - 4
65.	Rains, S.	L44	L31	L40	L71	W79	W72	2 - 4
66.	Snow, R.	L12	L30	L60	D79	D70	W74	2 - 4
67.	Geyer	L61	W49	L20	D57	L46		2 - 4
68.	Rogosin, P.	L23	L47	L75	ByW	L74	W73	2 - 4
69.	Newman,	W By	L3	L28	D59	L45	L49	$1\frac{1}{2}-4\frac{1}{2}$
70.	Stremel, J.	L77	L39	L52	L50	D66	W79	$1\frac{1}{2}$ - $4\frac{1}{2}$
71.	Peck, W.	L14	L58	L73	W65	L63*	L64	1 - 5
72.	Clark, R.	L13	L42	L41	W74	L58	L65	1 - 5
73.	Young, H.	L46	L76	W71	L38	L60	L68	1 - 5
74.	Walt, H.	L4	L63	L64	L72	W68	L66	1 - 5
75.	Stolpe, J.	L78	L38	W68	L36	L32*		1 - 5
76.	Bullockus, T.	L17	W73	L22	L61			1 - 5
77.	Hufnagel, F.	W70	L53	L42				1 - 5
78.	Restreppo, G.	W75	L8*					1 - 5
79.	Murphy, J.	L56	L43	L49	D66	L65	L70	$\frac{1}{2}$ -5 $\frac{1}{2}$
80.	Metz, F.	D62	L46	L55	L45			$\frac{1}{2}$ -5 $\frac{1}{2}$
81.	Gordon, M.	D51		L48*	L54*			$\frac{1}{2}$ -5 $\frac{1}{2}$

*Forfeit

MECHANICS' INSTITUTE TAKES LEAD IN BAY AREA TEAM MATCHES

The powerhouse Mechanics' Institute team won its first two matches in the San Francisco Bay Area Chess League team matches for 1963, defeating a new team, the Oakland YMCA, 5-2 and Castle 5-2. Meanwhile, the strong Golden Gate team and a surprising University of California team kept pace by also winning the first two matches.

DIVISION A

Round 1, January, 1963					Round 2, January, 1963					
OAKLAND "Y					CASTLE 2		MECH. INS	ST.5		
1. F Thornally	2	J Murray	$\frac{1}{2}$	1.	R Burger	$\frac{1}{2}$.	J. Murray	$\frac{1}{2}$		
2. R Thacker	0	C. Bagby	1	2.	V Zemitis	$\frac{1}{2}$	C Bagby	$\frac{1}{2}$		
3. R Trenberth	0	J Schmitt	1	3.	G McClain	0	J Schmitt	1		
4. R Cuneo	0	Sutherland	1	4.	D Belmont	0	Sutherland	1		
5. Quinlivan	$\frac{1}{2}$	Bullwinkel	$\frac{1}{2}$	5.	R Hultgren	0	Bullwinkel	1		
6. B Forman	0	K Bendit	1	6.	Hendricks	0	K Bendit	0		
7. R Headrick	1	C Svalberg	0	7.	R Willson	1	M Sable	0		

GOLDEN GAT	'E 4	REDWOOD	3	GOLDEN GATE	5 (DAKLAND Y	2
1. Pafnutieff	$\frac{1}{2}$	R Hoppe	$\frac{1}{2}$	1. Pafnutieff	1	F Thornally	0
2. H Gross	1	J Blackstone	0	2. E Krestini	0	R Thacker	1.
3. E Krestini	1/2	R Wilcox	$\frac{1}{2}$	3. C Capps	1	R Trenberth	0
4. C Capps	ō	M Wilkerson	1	4. P Dahl	1	M Quinlivan	0
5. P Dahl	1.	V Radaikin	0	5. J Kalisch	1	R Cuneo	0
6. J Kalisch	$\frac{1}{2}$	R Henry	$\frac{1}{2}$	6. E Simanis	1	B Forman	0
7. E Simanis	1/2	G Kane	$\frac{1}{2}$	7. A Palmin	0	R Headrick	1
	_						
CASTLE	3	U. C.	4	REDWOOD	$2\frac{1}{2}$	U. C.	$4\frac{1}{2}$
CASTLE 1. N Falconer	3	U. C. G Soules	4	REDWOOD 1. R Wilcox	$\frac{2\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$	U. C. G Soules	$\frac{4\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$
			Contract Con				$\frac{1}{2}$
1. N Falconer 2. G McClain	0	G Soules	1.	1. R Wilcox	$\frac{1}{2}$	G Soules	
1. N Falconer	0	G Soules R Ellis	1	1. R Wilcox 2. J Mortz	$\frac{1}{2}$	G Soules R Ellis	$\frac{1}{2}$
 N Falconer G McClain W Hendricks 	0 0 0	G Soules R Ellis T Dorsch	1	1. R Wilcox 2. J Mortz 3. R Hoppe	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$	G Soules R Ellis P Keleman	1 1 1 1 2
 N Falconer G McClain W Hendricks V Zemitis 	0 0 0 0	G Soules R Ellis T Dorsch P Keleman	1 1 1 1	1. R Wilcox 2. J Mortz 3. R Hoppe 4. M Wilkerson	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 \end{array}$	G Soules R Ellis P Keleman E Bogas	$\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \end{array}$

In Division B, a section with only four teams, the Mechanics i Institute i Rooks" are in the lead after two rounds.

DIVISION B

DIVISION B										
Round 1, January	_	, 1963		Ro	ound 2, Janua	ry	, 1963			
M. I. ROOKS $4\frac{1}{2}$	<u>.</u>	GOLDEN G.	$1\frac{1}{2}$		REDWOOD	2	M.I. ROOKS	4		
1. M Ewell 1	İ.	H Dasteel	0	1.	F Cardenas	0	M Ewell	1		
2. H Branton 1	Ĺ	H King	0	2.	M Morris	1	H Branton	0		
3. A Ford $\frac{1}{2}$	2	G Lutz	$\frac{1}{2}$	3.	S Wylie	0	K Laxson	1		
4. K Laxson	İ.	N Nielsen	0	4.	M Goodall	0	I Warner	1.		
5. E Bogisch)	C Huneke	1	5.	H Finley	1	Garcia	0		
6. Garcia 1	1	A Fishel	0	6.	Venable	0	E Bogisch	1		
REDWOOD 4	<u> </u>	M.I. PAWNS	2	_	M.I. PAWN	$S_{\frac{1}{2}}$	GOLDEN G.	$2\frac{1}{2}$		
1. F Cardenas (0	S Rubin	1	1.	S Rubin	1	H Rosenbaun	1 0		
2. Venable (0	Menaster	1	2.	F Schoene	0	B Gross, Dr.	1		
3. M Morris 1	1	Forfeit	0	3.	N McLeod	1	F Lutz	0		
4. V Jong	1	F Lutz	0	4.	D McLeod	$\frac{1}{2}$	N Nielsen	$\frac{1}{2}$		
5. S Genits 1	1	O Shank	0	5.	O Shank	0	C Huneke	1		
6. C Savery	1.	L Soohoo	0	6.	R Black	1	A Fishel	0		

ADDISON WINS SANTA MONICA OPEN

Bill Addison added another title to his collection in December when he won the Santa Monica Open with six wins and two draws. Dr. Anthony Saidy was knocked out of a first place tie in the last round by Paul Quillen.

SANTA MONICA OPEN, DECEMBER 1962

		DAINT	W MOT	ALC'N C	JPEN,	DE,C.	EMBE	U 130	4	
L_		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	- 8	Score
1.	Addison, W.	W32	W13	D24	W26	D3	W4	W5	W8	7 - 1
2.	Quillen, P.	L18	W27	W31	W6	$\mathbf{D}13$	W8	D14	W 3	6 - 2
3.	Saidy, A.	W7	W11	W 8	D 5	D1	W14	W4	L2	6 - 2
4.	Jacobs, R.	W31	W6	D9	W24	W 5	Li	L3	W14	$5\frac{1}{2}-2\frac{1}{2}$
5.	Rivise, I.	W 29	W15	W26	D3	L4	W11	Ll	W12	$5\frac{1}{2}$ $-2\frac{1}{2}$
6.	Bullockus, T.	$\mathbf{W}23$	L4	W34	L2	D16	W21	D11	W18	5 - 3
7.	Eglitis, A.	L3	D23	W21	D22	W29	L10	W16	W15	5 - 3
8.	Lessing, N.	W34	W17	L3	W12	W24	L2	W10	Ll	5 - 3
9,	Palmer, G.	W19	D22	D4	W18	L14	W13	D12	D11	5 - 3
10.	Stani, K.	L22	W 30	L18	W15	W25	W7	L8	W17	5 - 3
11.	Celle, O.	W20	L3	W27	W16	D2	L_5	$\mathbf{D6}$	$\mathbf{D}9$	$4\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$
1	Kennedy, E.	L14	W25	W13	L8	W26	W23	D9	L_5	$4\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$
13.	Rasis, C.	W30	L1	L12	W28	W18	L9	D23	W21	$4\frac{1}{2}$ $-3\frac{1}{2}$
14.			L26	W22	W1.7	W9	L3	D2	L4	$4\frac{1}{2} - 3\frac{1}{2}$
15.	Geller, S.	W25	L5	L16	L1.0	W27	W29	W26	L7	4 - 4
16.	Pollard, B.	L17	W20	W15	L11	D 6	D24	L7	W27	4 - 4
17.	Stern, C.	W16	L8	W32	L14	L21	W28	W24*	L10	4 - 4
18.	Stumbrs, O.	W2	L24	W10	L9	L13	W22	W29	L6	4 - 4
19.	Tupanjanin, R.	L9	L32	L28	W33	W34*	W31	L27	W26	4 ~ 4
20.	Whittemore, R.	L11	L16	L29	L30*	W33	W32	W25	W23	4 - 4
21.	Jester,T.	L27	W33	L7	W32	W17	L6	D 22	L13	$3\frac{1}{2}-4\frac{1}{2}$
22.	Kern, G.	W10	D9	L14	$\mathbf{D}7$	L23	L18	D21	W28	$3\frac{1}{2} - 4\frac{1}{2}$
23.	Thomas, G.	L6	D7	W33	D27	W22	L12	D13	L20	$3\frac{1}{2}-4\frac{1}{2}$
24.	Almgren, S.	W33	W1.8	D1	L4	L8	D16	L17		$\frac{2}{3} - 5$
25.	Fagin, V.	L15	1.12	W30	W31.	L10	L26	L20	W32	3 - 5
26.	Metz, F.	W28	W14	L5	L1	L12	W25	L15	L19	3 - 5
27.	Piatigorsky, J.	W21	L2	L11	D23	L15	D30	W19	L16	3 - 5
	Warnach, J.	L26	L34	W19	L13	W32	L17	W30	L22	3 - 5
	Clark, R.	L_5	L31	$\mathbf{W}20$	W34	L7	L15	L18	D30	$2\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$
30.	Collins, S.	L13	L10	L25	W20*	D31	D27	L28	D29	$2\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$
	Ramsey, C.	1.4	W29	L2	L25 ·	D30	L19	L32	W By	$2\frac{1}{2} - 5\frac{1}{2}$
32.	Stampers, T.	1.1	W19	L17	L21	L28	L20	W31	L25	2 - 6
	Turner, J.	1_24	1.21	L23	L19	L20	W By			1 - 7
34.	Wood, G.	178	W28	L6	L29	L19*	9 0			1 - 7

*Forfait

SOUTH	BAY	CLUB	CHAMPIONSHIP.	1962

	1	2	3	4.	5	6	7	Score
1. Johnson, L.	W13	W16	W3	W 5	W10	W6	D4	$6\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$
2. Debeaubien, A.	D19	W1.3	W10	W9	L5	W11	W6	$5\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$
3. Bliss, R.	W11	W20	L1	L6	W8	W9	W5	5 - 2
4. Huffman, J.	L6_	W18	D9	W20	W15*	W7	D1	5 - 2
5. Bagley, R.	W21*	W6	D15	L1	W2	W10*	L3	$4\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$
6. Wallenhorst, E.	W4	L5	W12	W3	W7	Lī	L2	4 - 3
7. Safonov, M.	W17	L10	W 8	W16	L6	L4	W12	4 - 3
8. Harter, L.	L17	W17	L7	W12	L3	W14	W11	4 - 3
9. Fels, L.	L15	W11	D4	L2	W16*	L3	W18	$3\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$
10. Kohloff	W14	W7	L2	W15	L1	L5*	62 60	3 - 4
11. Gardner, M.	L3	L9	W13	W14	W17	L2	L8	3 - 4
12. Pugh, W.	W18	L15	L6	L8	W19	W17*	L7	3 - 4
13. Pinkas, M.	L1	L2	L11	W18	L14	W20	W19*	3 - 4
14. Abshear, R.	L10	W19	L16	L11	W13	L8	W20	3 ~ 4
15. Nusbaum, G.	W9	W12	D5	L10	L4*	e0 er	100 mm	$2\frac{1}{2}$ - $4\frac{1}{2}$
16. Larsen, R.	W8	L1	W14	L7	L9*			2 - 5
17. Bishop, R.	L7	L8	W18	W19	L11	L12*		2 - 5
18. Delacourt, R.	L12	L4	L17	L13	W20	W19	L9	2 - 5
19. Johnson, W.	D2	L14	W20	L17	L12	L18	L13*	$1\frac{1}{2} - 5\frac{1}{2}$
20. See, L.	By W	L3	L19	L4	L18	L13	L14	1 - 6
21. Fether, R.	L5*				62			0 ~ 7

VAN NUYS CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP, 1962

	1_	2	3	4	5	Score	Tie-Br.
1. Parker, S.	W11	L4	W 8	W3	W6	4 - 1	
2. Smith, K.	W9	L5	W7	D6	W4	$3\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$	$8\ 3/4$
3. King, K.	W10	D6	W5	L1	W8	$3\frac{1}{2} - 1\frac{1}{2}$	8 1/4
4. Levin, J.	D7	W1	D6	W5	L2	3 - 2	9 1/2
5. Levin, H.	W12	W 2	L3	L4	W9	3 - 2	5 1/2
6. Myhro, R.	W 8	D3	D4	$\mathbf{D}2$	L1	$2\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$	6 1/2
7. Berez	$\mathbf{D4}$	W10	L2	L8	W12	$2\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{1}{2}$	$3 \ 1/2$
8. Friebergs, A.	L6	W11	L1	W7	L3	2 - 3	4 1/2
9. Snyder	L2	W12	L11	W10	L5	2 - 3	2
10. Lubin	L3	L7	W12	L9	W11	2 - 3	2
11. Steckel, R.	L1	L8	W 9	W12	L10	2 - 3	2
12. Kaiser	L5	L9	L10	L11	L7	0 - 5	

GAME OF THE MONTH

Sammy Reshevsky of Spring Valley, N. Y., took an early lead in the Inter-zonal Playoff being played this month at the Herman Steiner club in Hollywood. The playoff is for third place in the U.S. Championship in which Reshevsky, Larry Evans, and Bill Addison tied behind Bobby Fischer, first place, and Arthur Bisguier, second place. In the first round of the double-round playoff, Reshevsky beat Addison, drew with Evans, and Evans drew with Addison.

In the decisive game, Reshevsky obtained a positional advantage fairly early. Addison gave up a Pawn and then the Exchange hoping for counterplay. At the adjournment Addison had regained some ground and a draw looked possible. In the second session, however, Reshevsky bided his time until he arrived at an end game with two pawns plus and Queens on the board. He then played forcefully and accurately, marched his King up the board to put his opponent into a mating net, and Addison resigned after a total of nine hours of play.

Game No. 731	English	19.	Kt-Q2	Kt-K2
White	Black	20.	QR-B1	P-QB3
S. Reshevsky	W. Addison	· -	90000 N 38890	/AA
				夏岛
1. P-QB4	Kt-KB3		1	工业工
2. Kt-QB3	P-K4	i	1 2	
3. P-KKt3	P-Q4			1
4. PxP	KtxP	1		
5. B- Kt2	Kt-K2	E		贫
6. Kt-B3	QKt-B3	ļ	数	金鱼
7. P-QKt4	P-QR3			E E
8. 0-0	P-KKt3	una.		,,,,,,,
9. P-QR3	B-Kt2			
10. B-Kt2	0-0	21.	Kt(2)-Kt3	R-R2
11. P-Q3	Kt-B4	22.	P-Q4	PxP
12. P-K3	Kt-Q3	23.	KtxQP	P-Kt3
13. Q-B2	B-B4	24.	Kt-K4	KtxKt
14. Kt-KR4	B-Q2	25.	$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{t}$	P-QB4
15. Kt-R4	P-KKt4	26.	BxPch	K-R1
16. Kt-KB3	P-QR4	27.	Kt-Kt5	BxB
17. PxP	PxP	28.	QxBch	KxB
18. Kt-B5	B-B1	29.	KtxR	B-R6

30.	Q- K 2	P-Kt5
31.	Kt-Kt5	Kt-Kt3
32.	KR-Q1	Q-R1
33.	P-K4	Kt-K4
34.	R~B3	R-Q1
35.	R-K3	RxRch
36.	QxR	Q-R1
37.	Kt-B3	Kt-B5



38.	Q-Q7	KtxR
39.	QxPch	K-R3
40.	Q-B4ch	K-Kt3
41.	Qx K t	Q- K 4
42.	P-R4	K-Kt2
43.	Q-Q3	K-R3
44.	P-B4	PxP e.p
45.	K-B2	B-Kt5
46.	Q-Q2ch	K-Kt3
47.	Kt-Q5	QxKP
48.	KtxP	B-K3
49.	P-R5	P-B5
50.	Kt-R4	Q-B4
51.	P-R4	K-R2

52.	Kt~B3	$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{P}$
53.	KxP	Q-B4ch
54.	Q-B4	Q-Q6ch
55 .	Q-K3	B-Kt5cl
56 .	K-B2	Q-B7ch
57.	K-K1	B-B4
58.	Q-R7ch	K-Kt3
59.	Q-R6ch	K-R4
60.	QxP	B-Q6



61.	Q-Q4	Q-B8ch
62.	Kt-Q1	Q-R6
63.	Q-K3	Q~R4ch
64.	K-B2	B-R3
65.	K-Kt1	K-Kt3
66.	Kt-B2	Q-R8ch
67.	K-R2	Q-R7
68.	P-Kt4	K-Kt2
69.	K-Kt3	Q-R8
70.	Q-K7ch	K-Kt1
71.	Kt-K4	Q-Kt8ch
72.	K-B4	Q-QB8ch
73.	K-B5	Resigns

When the California State Chess Federation was first formed several years ago, the writer strongly favored two separate groups with coordination at the top only. Reasoning that the two strong chess centers were 400 miles apart, with a great gap between where there was no organized chess, it was felt that this was the only practical way to proceed. After several years of harmonious operation, it seemed that this stand had been unduly pessimistic. Regrettably, it appears that the argument had no substance after all.

The present operation of the CSCF is faulty in many ways, but if one remembers the chess situation as recently as 15 years ago, it will be seen that we have come a long way. Previous to World War II, there were no organized leagues, no Open, and only an occasional State Championship. The North-South Match was practically the only common ground between the North and the South, and one either had to know Herman Steiner or be a member of Mechanics' Institute to be invited to this event.

The improvement in the organization of California Chess can be attributed to the CSCF. Of this there is little doubt. To say the least, it seems short-sighted to jettison the organization which has accomplished so much. It would seem better to recognize the faults of the present organization and make a conscientious effort toward improvement.

First, the State Open Championship. This has been a highly successful event, and most complaints have been of a minor nature. A split in the Federation would do more harm than good to this event. One possible improvement here might be to have a committee, including the Director, to examine complaints from the previous year, correcting them if possible.

Second, the North-South Match. Historically, this is the tie that binds the State. When there was no other contact, Northern and Southern players met here and ultimately developed a workable organization. This event would probably lend itself to a split organization better than any other, but only if the South will realize its responsibilities. Too often the North has left a better team at home and still won overwhelmingly. Does the South depend solely on its imported masters, or does it lack the players of "club" strength who are so important in this type of match? More probable is a book of effort to get the good "club" player out. It would be tragic if the

combination of a Federation split and a few more South defeats should result in the demise of this historic event.

Third, the State Championship. Surprisingly, this event has usually produced a worthy Champion. Many think that this is purely by accident. The method of qualification is open to question, as many areas have no practical means to qualify an entry to the finals. The field in the finals is too large, making it necessary to play several games ahead of time. The North has been very remiss in sending its better players when the finals were held in Los Angeles. Qualification should be by areas rather than by leagues. Each area should be allowed a representative into a qualifying tournament, either semi-final or quarter-final. A small enough number should be qualified into the final event to assure its being played off at one time. This would allow the outlying areas a chance to qualify players without discriminating against the probable greater strength in the metropolitan areas. The old method of requiring that a player post a forfeit fee should be resumed.

Fourth, Membership. The membership is largely concentrated in the large centers, together with the cities whose clubs belong to leagues. No real effort has ever been made to attract players from other areas, such as industrial clubs, or smaller out-of-the-way cities, i.e. Eureka, Brawley, Bishop. An effort should be made to get a mailing list from Chess Review, together with a list of California members of USCF, with the idea of canvassing these players for Federation membership. Of course, a program must be offered, which will be attractive to members from these localities.

Fifth, Organization. This is the all-important point, and the area of present disagreement. The present organization is of a democratic type, with representation by leagues. The annual meeting, held before the North-South Match, is open to all. Unfortunately, non-league players do not join, and the annual meetings might be termed a farce. This meeting should be replaced by a Director's Meeting, which would accomplish more and consume less time. The Directors should be chosen by areas rather than by leagues. Tentatively, such a board might be chosen as follows:

Los Angeles Metropolitan (3), San Diego-Imperial (1), San Bernardino-Inyo (1), Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo (1), Salinas-Monterey(1), Fresno-Tulare-Kern (1), Central Valley (1), North Coast (1), Northern Calif. (Redding) (1), Bay Area (2). These directors should be

elected by their own area players, not by the league as at present.

If the Southern group feels that better results will be attained by two autonomous federations, it could be accomplished by the formation of Northern and Southern associations. These associations would form the CSCF with three (3) directors each, at least one being from outside each metropolitan area. Complete domination by the metropolitan areas would be a step backward into the dark ages of California Chess.

Lastly, the Reporter. This organ has lasted longer than any previous California chess publication, largely because of the efforts of the present editor. If the Southern Californians believe that they can improve upon it for any length of time, the writer feels that they will be sadly mistaken. This is a labor of love, and an editor can be very easily discouraged. However, there should be definite publication dates; if nothing else, a program of future events should be published. This would require the cooperation of a great many league and tournament officials, together with Associate Editors of whom the writer is one.

To recapitulate briefly, there are 3 important events sponsored by the CSCF, none of which would be helped by the sacking of the State-wide organization. The Open needs little improvement, the North-South Match needs improvement but the effort must come from the South, and the State Championship should be revamped. There should be an effort to attract new members, and the organization can stand a complete overhaul, but to break it up would be short-sighted.

The President should appoint a committee of five (5) to consider complaints and to recommend changes in the present organization. Recommended for this committee are Henry Gross and Guthrie McClain from the North, and Irving Rivise and George Goehler from the South as men who have known California chess from the old days, together with Major Edmondson of Sacramento, who has had experience with the organization of Chess in Texas, and in his capacity as a USCF Vice President should be able to moderate the discussion.

GAMES

INTER	ZONAL	PLAYO	$\mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}$, 1963

Gam	e No. 732	Ruy Lopez
	White	Black
L. E	vans	W. Addison
1.	P-K4	P-K4
2.	Kt-KB3	Kt-QB3
3.	B-Kt5	P-QR3
4.	B-Kt5	Kt-B3
5.	00	B-K2
6.	R-K1	P-QKt4
7.	B-Kt3	P = Q3
8.	PB3	0-0
9.	P-KR3	Kt-QR4
10.	B-B2	P-B4
11.	P-Q4	Q-B2
12.	QKt-Q2	Kt-B3
13.	PxBP	PxP
14.	Kt-R2	B-K3
		# 669



18	5.	QKt-B	KR-Q1
10	6.	Q-B3	Kt-Q2
1'	7.	Kt-K3	Kt-Q5
1	8.	Q-Kt3	KtxB
1	9.	KtxKt	Kt-B1
2	0.	Kt-K3	Kt~Kt3
2	1.	Kt-B5	B-KB1

22.	Kt-Kt4	P-B3
23.	P-KR4	K-R1
24.	P-R5	Kt-K2
25.	KtxKt	QxKt
26.	P-KB4	Q-KB2
27.	P-R6	PxBP
28.	QxP	Q-Kt3
29.	PxPch	BxP
30.	Kt-B2	B-KB1
31.	B-K3	B-Q3
32.	Q-B3	B-K4
33.	KR-Q1	Drawn

Game No.	733	Ruy	Lopez
White		Blac	k
L. Evans	S.	Res	hevsky

(First 1	4 moves a	ıs in No. 73	2)
14.		Kt-Q1	
15.	P-QR4	R-Kt1	
16.	PxP	PxP	
17.	QKt-B1	Kt-K3	
18.	Q-B3	R-Q1	
19.	Kt-Kt4	KtxKt	
20.	PxKt	B-Kt2	
21.	Kt-K3	Kt-Kt4	
22.	Q~K2	P-Kt3	
23.	QxP	BxP	
24.	Q~ K 2	BxB	
25.	KtxB	Kt-K3	
26.	P-KKt3	B-Kt4	
27.	Kt-K3	Q-Kt2	
28.	P-B3	BxKtch	
29.	QxB	P-B5	
30.	R-R7	Q-Q4	
31.	K-Kt2	Q-B4	
32.	R-K2	R-Q8	

33. QxQ KtxQ

34.	B-Kt5	K-Kt2	19.	QxKt	Q-Q5ch
35.	B-K7	Kt-Q6	20.	Kt-B2	QxP
36.	P-Kt5	P-R4	21.	Kt-Q2	Q-Kt2
37.	PxPe.p.ch	KxP	22.	Kt-B3	B-Q2
38.	B-B6	R-QKt8	23.	QR-Kt1?	QR-K1
39.	RxBP	R(8)xP	24.	Q-Q2	Kt-K6
40.	B-Kt7ch	K-Kt4	And	Black won.	
41.	RxR	RxRch			
42.	K-B	K-R4	Gan	ne No. 735	K's Ind.
	Draw agre	ed.		White	Black
			w.	Addison	R. Hoppe
CALIF.	CHAMPIONS	HIP, 1962			
			1.	P-Q4	Kt-KB3
Gai	me No. 734	Vienna	2.	P-QB4	P-KKt3
	White	Black	3.	Kt-QB3	B-Kt2
S.	Yarmak W	. Cunningham	4.	P-K4	P-Q3
		· ·	5.	P-B3	0-0
1.	P-K4	P-K4	6.	B-K3	P-K4
2.	B-B4	Kt-QB3	7.	P-Q5	P-B3
3.	P-B4	PxP	8.	Q-Q2	PxP
4.	Kt-KB3	Kt-KB3	9.	BPxP	P-QR3
5.	P-K5	P~Q4	10.	0-0-0	P-QKt4
6.	B-Kt5	Kt-KR4	11.	K-Kt1	QKt-Q2
5. P-K5	and 6. B-Kt5	are only super-	12.	R-B1	Kt-K1
ficially a	ttacking mov	es. Black gains	13.	B-Q3	Kt-B4
		e must waste	14.	B-QB2	P-B4
time rega	aining the Pa	wn.	15.	KKt-K2	B-Q2
7.	P-Q4	B-K2	16.	P-QKt4!?	Kt-R5
8.	0-0	0-0	17.	KtxKt	PxKt
9.	Kt-K1	P-KKt3	18.	B-Q3	Kt-B3
10.	B-K2	Kt-Kt2	19.	PQR3	PxP
11.	BxP	P-KB3	20.	PxP	Kt-Kt5
12.	KKt-B3?	P-KKt4!	21.	Kt-B3	KtxB
13.	PxP	BxP	22.	QxKt	B-KB3
14.	B~ K 5	Kt-B4	23.	KR~B1	B-Kt4
15.		P-Kt5	24.	RxRch	KxR
16.	BxB	QxB	25.	B-B1ch	K~Kt2
17.	Kt-K5	QKtxP	26.	Q-B2	Q-B2!
18.	KtxP	KtxBch	27.	Q-B7ch	K-R1
-0.				-	

	28.	KtxP	R~QB1	7.	Kt-B2	0-02
	29.	Kt-Kt2	B-Kt4	8.	0-0	Q-Q2 Kt-B3
	30.	QxQ	RxQ	9.	Kt-B3	Kt-K4
	31.	P-QR4	BxBch	10.	P-Kt3	B-Q3
	32.	KtxB	R-B5	11.	B~Kt2	0-0 D-63
	33.	P-Kt5	PxP	12.	P-Q4	PxPe.p.
	34.	PxP	B- K 6	13.	PxP	P~B5
	35.	R-B6	RxP	14.	P~Q4	Kt-B2
	36.	RxQP	R-Q5	15.	P~Q5	Kt-Kt4
	37.	KtxP	R~Kt5ch	16.	Kt-Q4	Q-B2
	38.	K-B2	RxP	17.	Q-Q3	Q~R4
	39.	R-Q7	B-B5	18.	P-KR4	Kt-R6ch
	40.	Kt-Kt4	P-R4	19.	K-R1	KtxPch
	41.	Kt-B6	R-B5ch	20.	RxKt	PxP
	42.	K-Q3	R-B6ch	21.	R~B3	QxPch
	43.	KxR	B-K4ch	22.		B-KKt5
	44.	K-B4	BxKt	23.	QKt-K2	Q-R7ch
	45.	R-KB7 and Wh	ite won.	24.	K~B1	Kt-Q2
				25.	Kt-Kt1	Kt-K4
HERM	AN S	TEINER CLUB,	1963	26.	Q-B3	BxR
				27.	•	R-B2
	Gan	ne No. 736	Reti	28.		KtxKt
		White	Black	29.	KtxKt	QR-KB
	J. I	Hanken T.	Weinberger	30.	Q- K 6	B- B4
				31.	B-B6	Q-R3
	1.	P-KKt3	P-KB4	32.	R-K1	QxB
	2.	P-QB4	P-K4	33.	QxQ	RxQ
	3.	B-Kt2	Kt-KB3	34.	K-K2	RxKt
	4.	Kt-KB3	P-K5	35.	BxR	P-Kt7
	5.	Kt-Q4	P-Q4	36.	BxP	R-B7ch
	6.	PxP	QxP		Resigns	

THIRD A	NNUAL HAMILTON A.F.B. OPEN
	April 26-28, 1963
Entry Fee: \$10	Prizes: 1-\$125, 2-\$75, 3-\$50, plus "A", "B", "C" prizes. (Based on 40 entries)
Six-Round Swiss:	Round 1, 7:30 P. M. April 26: 40 moves/l½ hours Rounds 2.3,4, April 27: 40 moves/l½ hours Rounds 5.6 April 28: 50 moves/2 hours

TASKS: In both problems the number of different series of moves has to be found. Series of moves are considered to differ when they differ from one another in some very small respect, e.g., in sequence of moves or promotion of pawns.

TASK No. 202 Olavi Riihimaa



Help stalemate in 7 moves. How many different solutions? (Black plays and helps White with his seventh move to stalemate Black.)

TASK No. 203 Eero Bonsdorff



How many different sequences are there of the shortest series of moves leading from the initial position to the diagram position, in which both sides have lost their right of castling on the Queen's side?

Mail solutions to: THE CALIFORNIA CHESS REPORTER
244 Kearny Street - 4th Floor
San Francisco 8, California