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## Foreword

Twenty-nine-year-old Robert Fischer of the U.S. defeated thirty-five-year-old Boris Spassky of the Soviet Union in the world chess championship match in Reykjavik, Iceland. It took Fischer twenty-one games out of a scheduled twenty-four games to become the new world chess champion. The final score was $121 / 2-81 / 2$.

All eyes were on the so called "Match of the Century." The chess and the non-chess world were waiting in great anticipation for this great battle, expecting to see chess of the highest caliber. Every game was expected to be an outstanding struggle, replete with brilliant combinations and masterful strategy and tactics.
True, there were several excellent games, but the match as a whole was disappointing. It was marked by blunders by both players. The blunders committed by Spassky were incredible. In two games, for example, Spassky overlooked a one-move combination. In the first, he was compelled to resign immediately, and, in the other, he threw away all chances for a win.

Fischer was also not in his best form. He made errors in a number of games. His play lacked brilliance, but his defense was excellent. He coasted along toward the end of the match, probably because of his commanding lead, being satisfied with draws.

Spassky's poor performance was on the surface inexplicable. He won the first game. He gained a point in the second, when Fischer failed to show up for the game. He then began to play badly, making one error after another. Why?

I believe there are a number of reasons for Spassky's poor showing. First, there was the psychological factor. Fischer's public declarations before the match started that he was not going to show up for the match and his arrival at the last minute must have had an adverse effect on Spassky. Fischer's behavior and antics during the match were of no help to Spassky's morale, either.

Second, Fischer's great record of the past, especially against Soviet stars Taimanov and Petrosian, could have dampened Spassky's confidence.

Third, Spassky's preparation for the match was ostensibly inadequate. He expected his opponent to play only the king pawn opening when Fischer conducted the White pieces. But Fischer surprised him when he switched to the queen pawn opening. Spassky was definitely not at all prepared for the latter.

Spassky was also not well prepared with the White pieces. His handling of the queen pawn opening was comparatively weak. When playing White, he invariably obtained inferior positions in the opening. It was not before the later part of the match that Spassky finally realized that he was not getting anywhere with the queen pawn opening and switched to the king pawn opening. He had relatively better success with the latter, but he was not sufficiently prepared with White, either. He was unable to make up the deficit of three points.

Finally, Spassky was very slow in making decisions. He spent a lot of time in positions which did not require great consumption of time. Consequently, he found himself in time trouble frequently in situations where more time was essential.

Samuel Reshevsky

## Game 1

Boris Spassky is reputed to be a slow starter. He likes to begin conservatively in the first few games and build up his play like a musical crescendo. He does not mind drawing the first game, as though he needed practice in order to reach his true form. He consequently elected a quiet variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defense set up by Robert Fischer. On his 15th move, Spassky could have continued aggressively but rejected it, and, instead, continued quietly, permitting his opponent to simplify by exchanging pieces, leading to a totally even endgame.

Fischer, dissatisfied with the prospect of a draw, grabbed a "poisoned pawn" which trapped his bishop -the worst blunder Fischer ever made. Fischer overlooked one move that Spassky could make. Fischer was compelled to give up the bishop for two pawns (three pawns are the equivalent of a bishop), which proved insufficient compensation. The crowd gasped with amazement when Fischer took the pawn. Fischer fought on after adjournment, but the position was untenable, and Spassky scored the first point.

## NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

Spassky
White
1 P-Q4
2 P-QB4
3 N-KB3

Fischer
Black
N-KB3
P-K3
P-Q4

| 4 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $0-0$ |
| 6 | B-Q3 | P-B4 |
| 7 | $0-0$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 8 | P-QR3 | B-R4 |

More usual is 8 . . . QPxP; $9 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, which gives White a slight edge according to recent games in international tournaments. I myself have played that way on numerous occasions with good results. Fischer's move poses a problem for White: How to obtain an opening advantage (White, having the first move, is presumed to get some opening advantage).

$$
9 \text { N-K2? }
$$

With this move White declared that he was unable or unwilling to seek a continuation which would be, at least, somewhat promising. Superior was 9 BPxP , KPxP; 10 PxP, BxN (otherwise, White retains his extra pawn by P-QN4); 11 PxB, Q-R4; 12 P-B4 with a freer game because of the two bishops.

| $9 \ldots$ | QPxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 BxBP | B-N3 |
| 11 PxP | QxQ |

The correct reply; for if 11 ...BxP; $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ would be threatening to win a pawn with 13 BxP , followed by QxB. Black would then play either 12 . . B-N3 or 12 . . . Q-K2 and White would get the initiative with $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ seizing the center with the double threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$, giving him a substantial edge.

| 12 RxQ | BxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 14 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

## Diagram 1

Position after Black's 14 . . . B-Q2
Black had to develop this bishop somehow. If he tried to do so by continuing 14 . . . P-QN3, he would have been faced with serious problems after: $15 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$, B-N2; 16 BxN, BxB; 17 R-Q7, QR-N1; 18 B-N5 with great pressure. For if $18 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 19 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{BI})-\mathrm{B} 7$, and if $18 \ldots \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Bl}$ ? ; $19 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{RxR} ; 20 \mathrm{BxN}$, $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{N} 2)-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$, and wins.

$$
15 \text { QR-B1? }
$$

This leads soon to equality. More enterprising was 15 P-K4! offering White to get a bind in the center and inactivate Black's forces to the point of passivity. Of course, Black would not be able to capture the king pawn because White then captures the bishop with his rook. He would continue, then, 15 ...KR-Q1; 16 P-K5, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 1 ; 17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, QR-B1; 18 QR-B1, followed by $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$, with excellent prospects. I don't understand why Spassky rejected this line!
15 . .
16 N(2)-Q4
17 NxN
$18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$

KR-Q1
NxN
B-R5!
18 B-N3
The best course for White was now to simplify by exchanging pieces. $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Bl}$ would pin both White's rooks, and $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kl}$, QR-Bl would have given Black some pressure.

| $18 \ldots$ | BxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 NxB | RxRch |
| 20 RxR | R-QB1 |
| 21 K-B1 |  |

The position was now perfectly even. Black could not hope for any play by placing his rook on the seventh rank (QB7) because White could easily dislodge the rook by playing R-Q2. In spite of this, Fischer played on.


And now, Black was threatening the incursion with . . . R-B7ch. Therefore . . .

23 R-QB1 RxR
24 BxR
Better than 24 NxR, P-QN4! followed by $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 3-\mathrm{B} 5$ where the knight would be strongly posted.

24
25 N-R5
Bad would be $25 \ldots$. . P-QN3 because of $26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6$,
$-\mathrm{QR} 3 ; 27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 8, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4 ; 28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3 ; 29$
Bad would be $25 \ldots$. . P-QN3 because of $26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6$,
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3 ; 27 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 8, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4 ; 28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3 ; 29$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, winning a pawn.

P-B3
N-Q3

| 26 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 28 | NxN | BxN |
| 29 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |  |

## BLACK (Fischer)



WHITE (Spassky)

## Diagram 2

Position after White's 29 P-N5

To prevent Black from playing . . . P-QN4, which would make it impossible for White to advance his king to QB4 and to other squares on the queen side.

## 29 BxKRP??

An incredible blunder. As we shall see soon, Fischer overlooked one move at the disposal of Spassky, which he really should have seen. In his desire to play for a win, Fischer became careless. The position was even. The correct move was 29 . . P-QR3 with the following continuation: $30 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{PxP} ; 31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, with White unable to make any headway.

| 30 P-N3 | P-KR4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 K-K2 | P-R5 |
| 32 K-B3 | K-K2 |

Now realizing that the bishop would be lost, Fischer tries to draw the game by bringing the king into the game as quickly as possible.

I believe that Fischer's miscalculation consisted of the following: he thought that he could save the bishop by now playing 32 . . . P-R6; $33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 8 ; 34 \mathrm{KxP}$, BxP and that now the bishop could escape at K8; but overlooked that White could now trap the bishop with 35 B-Q2!

| 33 | K-N2 | PxP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | PxP | BxP |
| 35 | KxB | K-Q3 |
| 36 | P-R4 | K-Q4 |
| 37 | B-R3 | K-K5 |

## BLACK (Fischer)



WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 3
Position after White's 37 B-R3

Unproductive would be 37 . . . K-B5 on account of 38 B-B8, P-KN3; 39 B-K7, P-B4; 40 K-B4, K-N6; 41 P-R5, K-R5; 42 P-R6, P-N3; 43 K-K5, KxP; 44 KxP, KxP; $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$, picking up the KN and KB pawns, and the king pawn could not be stopped from queening. The two passed pawns of Black could easily be stopped by the bishop with the Black king eventually being forced out of K1 square enabling White to promote his pawn to a queen.

| 38 | B-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 | P-N6! |$\quad$ P-R3

The correct move. If $39 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{PxP}$, and Black would exchange its pawns for White's king pawn, and although White would remain with a bishop and a pawn to the good, the ending would still be a draw because White's bishop is on black squares and the square on which White's QRP has to queen is on a white square. White would, therefore, be unable to queen his pawn.

39
P-B4

Unavailing would be 39 ... K-B4; 40 K-B3, P-N4; 41 B-K7, K-N3 (if 41 . . . P-N5ch; 42 K-N3, K-N4; $43 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, winning the KNP); $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$; 43 K-B4, P-B4; 44 K-K5, P-N6 (the only try; for if 44 . . . K-B2; 45 B-R4, etc.); 45 B-R4, P-N7; 46 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and White's king gets to QB 7 , capturing the QNP.

$$
40 \text { K-R4! }
$$

And now, the king was threatening to get to the QNP via KN5-6-KB7. It is interesting to note that if White's QRP were at QR5 instead of QR4, Black could easily have drawn by playing 40 . . P-B5, getting rid of the

KP. He would then give up the KP and the KNP and place his king at Q2, with White unable to make any progress even though he would be a bishop to the good!

| 40 | P-B5 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | PxP | KxP |
| 42 | K-R5 | K-B4 |
| 43 | B-K3 | K-K4 |

If 43 . . . P-K4; 44 B-N5, P-K5; 45 B-K3, K-K4; $46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$, winning the king pawn.

| 44 | B-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad$ K-B4

And so a position was reached after several moves, as in the previous note.
47 . . K-B3

It is difficult to understand why Fischer continued to play at this point.

| 48 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $51 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| 52 KxP | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
| $53 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 54 KxP | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | KxP |
| $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |
|  | Resigns |

For if 56 . . . P-R5; 57 K-B7, K-R3; 58 B-B5, K-N4; 59 B-Q6, K-R3; $60 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, and the NP would fall.

Game 2 was forfeited by Fischer when he failed to show up for the game at the stipulated time.

## Game 3

Being two points behind, Fischer resorted to the Benoni Defense with the Black pieces. This sharp defense offers both sides winning chances. I have played both sides of this opening and have had good results with both White and Black. A sharp, fighting encounter always occurs in the Benoni. On his 11th turn, Fischer introduced an innovation. Spassky appeared surprised. He took a long time in replying. He found the correct answer, but two moves later he neglected to elect a logical follow-up which would have given him the upper hand. Fischer took immediate advantage of his adversary's inaccuracy and seized the initiative. From thereon, Spassky was on the defensive. Fischer, at first, undertook action on the king wing, and when that side was stabilized, he shifted suddenly to the opposite side, finally effecting a passed queen bishop pawn with menacing threats. Spassky defended comparatively well in an inferior position. Fischer pressed on until his opponent was compelled to give up his king pawn in order to survive. An ending of queens and bishops of opposite colors was reached. Spassky seemed to have some drawing chances, but on his 41 st move, he made an inexplicable hasty move which cost him' the game immediately.

## BENONI DEFENSE

| Spassky | Fischer |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | N-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-B4 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |  |

This move leads to the Benoni and is the sharpest continuation. More conservative is $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ or $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ in which White settles for an even game.

| $4 \underset{\mathrm{PxP}}{ }$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| $5-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

The main characteristic of this defense is that Black is saddled with an isolated queen pawn for which he obtains partial control of the king's file where his rook can apply pressure against White's king pawn, and his king bishop has freedom of action. Black's problem is the proper development of his QB. White's future is either in the center or on the queen side. It takes great tactical skill to get the upper hand. This applies to both sides in this complicated line.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
6 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 3 \\
7 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2 &
\end{array}
$$

A good alternative is $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, followed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ and $0-0$ in which White strives to seize control of the center and constricts the mobility of Black's forces. The object of the textmove is to apply immediate pressure against Black's QP with N-B4, followed by B-KB4.

So that if $8 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$, then $8 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$, dislodging the knight and removing pressure on the QP .

| 8 | P-K4 | B-N2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9 B-K2 | $0-0$ |  |
| $100-0$ | R-K1 |  |
| 11 | Q-B2 |  |

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 4
Position after White's 11 Q-B2

Protecting the KP in order to be able to play N-QB4.
11
N-R4!?
A new move in this position. Its objective is to start action against White's king position by bringing Black's queen to KR5. The new move is not particularly good, but it has its psychological effect of upsetting the player faced with it.

12 BxN

Spassky correctly gave up his bishop for the knight, which is usually disadvantageous, but in this case Spassky received compensation in the fact that Black's king side pawns were broken up and Black's king's safety reduced. Fischer's immediate threat was . . . $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

| 12 ... | PxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 N-B4 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3 ?$ |  |

This was poor judgment. White's idea was to eventually play $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 5$, but this was never to pass because Black's ensuing strategy prevented Spassky from carrying out his intention by making immediate threats against the king. Correct was $14 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{BxN} ; 15$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, followed by an early $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$. This would have given White a positional advantage.

| $14 \ldots$ | Q-R5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 B-Q2 | N-N5 |

Forcing the exchange of knights, enabling Black to straighten out his pawn position. Interesting but unsound was 15 . . . N-B6ch!?; 16 PxN, Q-R6; 17 N-N2, K-R1; 18 N-B4, QxBP; 19 Q-Q3, Q-N5ch; 20 Q-N3, and Black's attack would stall.

## 16 NxN

Unwise was $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ because of 16 . . B-K4, where White would have weakened his king position unnecessarily.

| 16 . . | PxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 B-B4 | Q-B3 |
| 18 | P-KN3 |

18 Q-Q2 was more flexible as it would offer White the possibility of opening the KB file with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$. The textmove also tended to weaken the king position.
18 P-QR4 $\quad$ B-Q2

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 5
Position after White's 19 P-QR4
An excellent move! It assured Black the advance of his queen side pawns in an attempt to initiate serious action on that wing while maintaining pressure in the center. White's play from hereon became completely defensive. Note that 19 . . . P-QR3 would not have accomplished the same end because White could then have stopped the advance of the QNP with 20 P-R5.
20 KR-K1 P-QR3
$21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ ?
Q-Q3 in order to prevent the immediate advance of the QNP was necessary, and if 21 . . Q-N3; 22 R-K2,
followed by doubling of the rooks on the king file. Fischer would then have more difficulty in obtaining promising play on the queen side.

| 21 | P- | P-N4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | QR-K1 | Q-N3 |
| 23 | P-N3 | R-K2 |
| 24 | Q-Q3 | R-N1 |
| 25 | PxP | PxP |
| 26 | P-N4 |  |

This turns out badly as it gives Black a strong passed pawn and paralyzes White so that he drifts into a "zugzwang" position. He should have tried $26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 1$, and if 26 . . . P-N5; 27 N-Q2-B4, in which Black's QP would become a target.

| $26 \ldots$ | P-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 | Q-Q2-K1 |

White was now left without any constructive moves. He was compelled to make waiting moves, and that is usually bad and frustrating.

| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | $\mathrm{R}(3)-\mathrm{K} 2$ | K |
| 30 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | K 2 |
| 31 | $\mathrm{R}(3)-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| 32 | QxB | Rx |
| 33 | RxR | RxP |
| 34 | RxR | RxR |
|  |  | QxR |

An ending with bishops of opposite colors usually ends up in a draw even though one is a pawn ahead, but in this case, White's king was posted precariously, which gave Fischer winning chances.

35 B-R6

Not 35 BxP? because of 35 . . QxP; 36 B-B4, Q-Q8ch; $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ leading to mate.

35
Q-N3
36 B-B1
Attempting to get the bishop to QN 2 where threats of mate at KN7 and KR8 would menace Black. But . . .
36 K-B1 $\quad$ Q-N8!

Spassky decided to bring out the king in the open instead of remaining on KN1 where it could be mated.

| $37 \ldots$ | B-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 K-K2 | Q-K5ch |
| 39 Q-K3 | Q-B7ch |

If 39 . . QxP; 40 Q-N5ch with a perpetual check.
40 Q-Q2 Q-N6
41 Q-Q4??
BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 6
Position after Black's 40 . . . Q-N6

An incredible blunder, especially in view of the fact that the time control was over. He made this inexplicable reply almost immediately after Fischer made his 40th move, overlooking Fischer's answer which forced Spassky's immediate resignation. After $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kl}$ ! it is not clear how Fischer could have won. If 41 Q-KB6; 42 Q-K3, Q-R8ch; 43 K-K2, B-Q6ch; 44 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{QxQP} ; 45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, with good drawing chances, because White could exchange queens and still have a drawing position even though Black would be two pawns ahead. If 41 . . P-B6; 42 Q-N5ch, B-N3; 43 Q-Q8ch, K-R2; 44 QxP, P-B7; 45 Q-B4, QxQP; 46 Q-Q2, Q-R8ch; $47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, and White could offer resistance.

41
B-Q6ch
42 Resigns
For if $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$, Q-Q8; 43 Q-N2, P-B6; 44 QxP, Q-B6ch, followed by mate.

## Game

This was the first time Fischer was conducting the White pieces, and, as expected, advanced his king pawn two squares, which is his favorite weapon. He has had numerous successes with the king pawn opening against some of the greatest players in the world. He has studied the Ruy Lopez and the Sicilian Defense extensively and is one of the greatest exponents of these openings. The Russians were, of course, aware of this important fact, and they were ready for him. It must have taken months of study by a well-known group of Grandmasters to come up with an adequate defense, and they, indeed, did.

Spassky replied 1 . . . P-QB4, the Sicilian defense, making the first 13 moves rapidly. Fischer took a lot of time for the next few moves, but he was unable to acquire any opening advantage. Spassky soon sacrificed a pawn for which he obtained the two bishops and good play. He initiated an assault against White's king with excellent prospects, but missed a winning continuation on his 29th move, overlooking a finesse. Fischer managed to get a draw.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 |
| 2 N-KB3 | P-Q3 |
| 3 P-Q4 | PxP |


| 4 | NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 6 | B-QB4 |  |

The Russians must have expected this move because Fischer invariably has resorted to this variation.

| 6 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QN} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $0-0$ |
| 9 | $0-0$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | NxN |
| 11 | BxN | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ |
| 12 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |  |

12 Q-Q3 could be a better alternative.
$12 . \quad$ B-N2 $\quad$ P-QR4!

BLACK (Spassky)


## WHITE (Fischer)

Diagram 7
Position after White's 13 Q-Q3

This is the new move the Soviets came up with, and it is a good one. Black sacrifices a pawn for excellent play.

14 P-K5
There is nothing better. If $14 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5 ; 15$ N-R4, B-R3; 16 B-B4, BxB; 17 QxB, R-B1 with equality. The usual move that Fischer likes to make in this kind of position is P-B5 but it would be refuted here by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$, winning the KP .

| $14 \underset{\text { PxP }}{ }$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Of course, not 16 QxP because of $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$.
16 . $17 \mathrm{NxN} \quad \mathrm{B} 4$

The only move, for if 17 Q-K3, B-N4; 18 Q-B2 (18 Q-N3, B-QR3 wins material), NxB; 19 PxN, B-R5; 20 Q-Q2 (if $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ threatening mate), B-N4, and White would have nothing better than to repeat moves. But Fischer would not be content to do anything like that, since he always plays for a win.

| $17 \ldots$ | BxBch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 K-R1 | Q-N4 |

Well played! Spassky could have gotten equality by playing 18 . . QxQ; 19 PxQ, B-R3; $20 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 7$ (20 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{BxN} ; 21 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ would regain the pawn with an easy draw), BxQP; $21 \mathrm{NxR}, \mathrm{BxR} ; 22 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{RxN}$, again with equality. But Spassky was playing for a win.

$$
19 \text { Q-K2 }
$$

The logical continuation. The move protects both the $K$ and KNP.

| 19 . | QR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 QR-Q1 | RxR |
| 21 RxR | P-KR4 |

A fine move initiating a serious threat for the White monarch. Fischer had to contend with this pawn advancing to KR6.

$$
22 \text { N-Q6? }
$$

This turned out to be a costly waste of time. Mandatory was 22 N-Q4. The knight was badly needed for the king's defense.

| 22 | B-R1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | B-B4 | P-KR5 |
| 24 | P-R3 | B-K6 |

Against 24 . . . Q-N6 (threatening . . . QxRPch), White had $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, but now the threat of 25 . . Q-N6 needed attention. Therefore . . .

| 25 Q-N4 | QxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 QxRP | P-N4! |

A powerful move, threatening . . . K-N2 and . . . R-R1, to bolster the attack.
27 Q-N4
B-B4
$28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$

The sacrifice of the knight at KB7 would fail: 28 NxP , KxN! 29 Q-R5ch (29 R-Q7ch, K-B3, and wins), K-K2; 30 Q-R7ch, R-B2; 31 Q-N8, B-Q3, and wins.

28
K-N2
29 N-Q4
R-R1??

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)

## Diagram 8

Position after White's $29 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$
Tossing away the win. Spassky handled the game expertly up to this point, but here he overlooked one move at Fischer's disposal. Spassky could have won with 29 . . . R-Q1! attacking the knight which would have to be defended by $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, then $30 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 31 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ (forced because of the threat of 31 . . . R-R5), BxN; 32 QxB, B-Q3; $33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5$ ! and wins because the double threats of . . . RxB and . . . Q-R7ch followed by . . . R-B5ch could not have been parried.

| $30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | BxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 QxB | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

32 Q-B3!
The saving move which Spassky undoubtedly overlooked.

| 32. | QxQ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 PxQ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

Black regains his pawn, which gives him an easy draw. The result must have been very disappointing to the champion.

| 34 | R-Q7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35 | K-N1 |
| 36 | B-K2 |

## Game 5

Disheartened by his mishandling of the 4th game, Spassky was not at all recognizable in the 5th game. Playing White, he handled the opening lackadaisically and emerged with the inferior position. He acquired two bishops against a bishop and a knight, which is usually advantageous, but not so in this case. His king bishop was completely inactive while his queen bishop was partly useful. Fischer's knight, on the other hand, was well posted, ready for a serious incursion into Spassky's territory.

Not realizing that Fischer's position was superior, Spassky attempted to play aggressively, thereby weakening his position further. The net result was that Fischer was able to accumulate minute advantages to the point that it required precise defense by Spassky to have a chance of holding the game. On his 27th turn, Spassky made an incredible blunder and resigned promptly after Fischer's reply.

## NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENSE

| Spassky | Fischer |
| :--- | :--- |
| White | Black |
| 1 | P-Q4 |$\quad$ N-KB3

This move has been played before but very infrequently. More usual is $6 \ldots . .0-0 ; 70-0, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, leading to various lines and variations thoroughly analyzed. Fischer obviously wanted to steer away from the trodden path in order to upset his opponent psychologically. Judging from the conduct of the game, he did just that.

$$
7 \mathrm{PxB} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3
$$

Necessary, in order to meet $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ with . . . P-K4.

$$
8 \text { P-K4 }
$$

A normal-looking but questionable move because it immobilizes the king bishop. To be considered is 8 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, and if 8 . . . P-K4; 9 P-Q5, N-K2; $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$.


BLACK (Fischer)


## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 8A
Position after Black's 10 . . . P-KR3

With the intention of continuing $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3 ; 12$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$ with a strong bind.
10 P-B4?! P-KR3
11 P

An aggressive move which is not called for in this position. The textmove only tends to create a weak pawn for White-the KP. Wise was $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ with an eventual N -B5.

> 11...N-N3!

An excellent reply. If Black decided to win a piece with 11 . . PxP, he would have given Spassky an opportunity to launch a promising attack: 11 ... PxP; 12 BxP, P-KN4; 13 P-K5! N-N5 (13 . . . PxP; 14 BxKP, attacking the knight); $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ (or even 14 PxP ) with excellent attacking chances.

## 12 NxN

Practically forced. For if $12 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{BxN} ; 13 \mathrm{PxB}$, NxBP; 14 BxN, PxB; $150-0,0-0 ; 16$ RxP, N-Q2, followed by 17 . . Q-B3 and 18 . . N-K4 where the knight would be excellently posted.


Advisable was $130-0,0-0 ; 14$ P-B5 with even chances. The textmove destroyed any possible play for White. From here on, Spassky was on the defensive.

| $13 \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 B-K3 | P-N3 |
| $150-0$ | $0-0$ |
| 16 P-QR4? |  |

This only made this pawn a target later for Black's bishop. Prudent was 16 Q-Q2, followed by R-B3 and doubling of the rooks on the KB file.

| 16. | P-QR4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| $19 \mathrm{R}(2)-\mathrm{KB} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 4$ |
| $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |

There was no plausible continuation for White. He simply had to mark time and see what his opponent would do.

| 21 . . | Q-K1! |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 B-K1 | Q-N3 |
| 23 Q-Q3 | N-R4 |
| 24 RxRch | RxR |
| 25 RxRch | KxR |
| 26 B-Q1? |  |

Allowing the knight to reach KB5 where it is powerfully posted. Why not 26 P-N3 to keep the knight out? With the suggested move, Fischer would have had great difficulty in scoring the point even though his position would be superior.
$26 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 5$

An unbelievable mistake even for a Class A player. It can only be explained by the fact that Spassky was not himself that day.
27 Resigns BxP!

## BLACK (Fischer)



Diagram 9
Position after Black's 26 . . . N-B5

For if $28 \mathrm{QxB}, \mathrm{QxP}$, and the double threat of . . . QxB mate or . . . QxP mate could not be parried. And if 28 Q-Q2, BxB; 29 QxB, QxP, White would be hopelessly lost.

## Game 6

Fischer surprised Spassky and everyone else with his choice of openings in this game. He opened with 1 P-QB4 instead of his pet first move of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. This was perhaps the first time he ever resorted to this move. It certainly takes great courage to play a new opening at any time, especially when facing an opponent of Spassky's stature.

Spassky, after taking some time getting over the shock of the unexpected move, decided to select his usual line, the Tartakower Variation of the Queen's Gambit Declined.

On his 14th move, Fischer introduced a novelty by playing his bishop to queen knight five. Spassky, who is reputed to know so much about this line, appeared disturbed. He took a long time for the reply, but he failed to come up with the correct plan. Fischer seized the initiative and advanced his king pawn where it exercised great pressure. He soon broke through Black's defenses by advancing his king bishop pawn, thereby making his king pawn free to advance further into Spassky's territory.

Spassky's forces were completely inactivated. He was called upon to use all of his resources to stem the onslaught of Fischer's pieces. Spassky was reduced to waiting and repeating moves. Fischer bided his time in carrying out his crushing plan.

QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-QB4 | P--K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q4 |
| 3 P-Q4 | N-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | B-K2 |
| 5 B-N5 | 0-0 |
| 6 P-K3 | P-KR3 |
| 7 B-R4 | P-QN3 |

The Tartakower Variation, which Spassky is reputed to know better than anyone in the world. He has used it successfully in many important competitions against strong opposition.

| 8 PxP | NxP |
| ---: | :--- |
| 9 BxB | QxB |
| $10 ~ N x N$ | PxN |

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 10
Position after Black's 13 . . . R-B1
$11 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Bl}$
B-K3
12 Q-R4
P-QB4
13 Q-R3
R-B1

So far, nothing new. This position has arisen in numerous games.

14 B-N5
Usual is $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$. The purpose of the textmove is to provoke . . . P-R3.
14 ... P-R3

Well timed. The move gave Black hanging pawns. If, instead, White castled, Black could continue 15 R-R2, forcing the bishop to retreat, and Black could then play . . . P-B5 with a satisfactory position.

| $15 \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| $160-0$ | R-R2?? |

A seriously tactical move from which Spassky never recovered. Correct was $16 \ldots$ Q-N2, attacking the bishop. After its retreat, Black would continue . . . N-Q2, and White could not post his knight strongly at his Q4, as in the game.
17 B-K2
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
$18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ !

This move was possible because Black's queen was at K 2 . If the queen were at QN 2 , White would be unable to make this strong move, enabling him to get Black's bishop, thereby weakening Black's position.

18
Q-B1?

Gets the queen out of play. Prudent was 18 N-B3; 19 NxB, PxN.
19 NxB
$20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !

A powerful stroke, which would not be possible if Black had played 18 . . N-B3, instead of 18 . . . Q-Bl.

20
P-Q5

20 . . . PxP was inadvisable because it would have given Black a miserable pawn formation. White would eventually have regained his pawn by concentrating on the KP.
21 P-KB4
Q-K2
22 P-K5

Now, White enjoyed a strong bind in the center. Spassky was already strategically lost. R-N1?

Permitting White to place his bishop favorably. Black had to try to get his knight to Q4. Consequently, he should have continued 22 . . . N-N3, and if $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, Q-Q2.

$$
23 \text { B-B4! K-R1 }
$$

23 . . . N-N3 fails on account of 24 Q-N3!

$$
24 \text { Q-R3 N-B1 }
$$

From here on, Spassky was completely on the defensive.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
25 & \text { P-QN3 } \\
26 \text { P-B5 } & \text { P-QR4 }
\end{array}
$$

The breakthrough which enabled Fischer to bring all of his forces against Black's king.

| $26 \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 RxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $28 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 1)-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

Directed at White's threat of R-B7.

| 29 | Q-N3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 | P-KR4 |
| 31 | P-K6! |

BLACK (Spassky)


WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 11
Position after Black's 30 . . . R(1)-N2

Making possible R-B7 and Q-K5.

31
R(N2)-B2
32 Q-K5
Q-K1

Spassky was practically in "zugzwang.'

$$
33 \text { P-QR4 }
$$

White had plenty of time to do anything he pleased.

| $33 \ldots$ | Q-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $34 \mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $35 \mathrm{R}(2)-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

Fischer seemed to play a cat and mouse game at this point.

| $35 \ldots$ | Q-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 B-Q3 | Q-K1 |
| 37 | Q-K4 |

Threatening 38 R-B8ch, NxR; 39 RxNch, QxR; 40 Q-R7 mate.

37
38 RxN
39 RxP
N-B3
PxR
K-N1
Unavailing was 39 ... Q-R4 because of 40 P-KN4, QxRP; 41 Q-R8ch, K-N2; 42 Q-B8 mate.

40 B-B4
41 Q-B4
K-R1
Resigns

If $41 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1 ; 42 \mathrm{QxRP}$ with the threat of 42 R-N6ch, and if the rook interposes, then P-K7ch would be decisive.

## Game

After having little success with White with 1 P-Q4, Spassky decided to shift to the king pawn opening. Fischer relied on his favorite, the Sicilian Defense. He accepted the offer of the so-called "poisoned pawn."

A tense struggle followed. Spassky sacrificed three pawns and a bishop for attacking possibilities. Fischer defended accurately and repulsed Spassky's attack, winding up with a pawn plus.

Fischer's advantage should have netted him the point, but inexact strategy offered his opponent drawing chances. Spassky defended well and finally halved the point.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Spassky <br> White | Fischer |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Black |
| 2 | P-K4 |

This move leads to lively play. A great amount of analysis has been done on this line, with no decision reached as to who stands better if both sides continue correctly. Fischer maintains that Black obtains an equal game, at least. Perhaps this match will decide one way or the other.

| $6 \underset{\text { P-KB4 }}{ } \quad$ P-K3 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Q-N3 |

Another continuation is $7 \ldots$ QN-Q2, followed by . . . B-K2 and . . . Q-B2 and . . . 0-0. Fischer prefers the textmove.
8 Q-Q2
QxP
$9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$
Q-R6

White was threatening to trap the queen with 10 P-QR4, followed by 11 R-R2.

| 10 | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $110-0$ | B-K2 |
| 12 | B-R4 |
| 13 NxN | P-R3 |
| 14 | P-B5 |
| 15 | B-N5ch! |

BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 12
Position after Black's 14 . . . PxP

Sacrificing the bishop for the attack.
15
PxB

Accepting the challenge. Against $15 \ldots \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, White could continue 16Q-B3, PxB; 17 QxP, R-Q1; 18 QxRP, PxN; 19 QxBch with attacking possibilities.
16 NxPch
K-B1

Wisely giving back the piece. If 16 . . . K-K2; 17 NxNP, Q-R3 (17 . . . Q-R5 led to mate: 18 Q-Q6ch, K-K1; 19 N-B7 mate); 18 Q-N4ch, K-B3; 19 QxBch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{N} 3 ; 20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ with more than sufficient compensation for the pawn.

| 17 NxB | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |

18 Q-Q7 offered better prospects: 18 . . . Q-R3 (to protect the QNP); 19 RxP ; or $18 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 19$ QxNP(7), Q-R3; $20 \mathrm{QxQ}, \mathrm{RxQ} ; 21 \mathrm{RxP}$ with an approximately even position.

18
R-Q1
19 NxP(N5)
Q-K2

The correct decision. Black had better winning chances with the queens on the board.

| 20 | Q-B4 | P-KN3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | P-R4 | B-N4 |
| 22 | Q-B4 | B-K6ch |
| 23 | K-R1 | P-B5 |
| 24 | P-N3 |  |

White had to try to get rid of the advanced KBP because it supported the strongly posted bishop.

The tempting 24 . . . N-Q5 was insufficient because of $25 \mathrm{~N}(5) \mathrm{xN}$, Q-K5ch; $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, P-N4; 27 Q-Q3, Q-Q4; 28 P-B4, etc.

| 25 | QR-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 | QxQ |
| 27 | R-K2 |

To be considered was 30 . . . K-N3 in order to keep White's knight out of the important square KB5.

| 31 | N-N7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32 | P-B4 |
| 33 | R-B3 $-Q B 1$ |
| 34 | PxP |

The best try. Neither 37 NxN nor 37 NxB would give any promising play. The textmove, at least, offered White some action against the Black king.

| $37 \ldots$ | BxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 NxB | R-B8ch |
| 39 K-N2 | N-B5 |

Attempting to exchange knights, since White's knight was more useful, but Spassky refused the offer.

$$
40 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch} \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3
$$

Not 40 . . . K-B1; $41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$, threatening N-Q6ch or $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$, regaining a pawn.

$$
41 \text { P-R4 }
$$

The sealed move, and it was the best at White's disposal.

41 P-B3

To meet the threat of $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5-\mathrm{KN} 5 \mathrm{ch}$.
42 R-K6
R-B7ch
43 K-N1
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ?

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 13
Position after White's 43 K-N1

Admitting the draw. With 43 . . . RxN! 44 RxR, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, Black would have winning chances. If in this 45 R-Q4, N-Q7! threatening 46 . . . N-B6ch.

| 44 | N-N7ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 45 | R-Q4ch |
| 46 | N-B5ch |
| 47 | R(6)-K4! |

47 R-K1 looked tempting. It would threaten R-KBlch, but Black would defend with 47 ... R-N7ch; 48 K-R1 (48, K-B1, N-Q7ch) P-N6; 49 RxN, R-R7ch with perpetual check.

| $47 \ldots$ | R-B8ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 48 K-R2 | R-B7ch |
| $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | Drawn |

Black had no choice, for if 49 . . . R-QB1; 50
R-B4ch, K-K7; 51 N-N3ch, K-K6; 52 R(4)-K4ch, K-B6; 53 R-Q3ch, followed by mate.

## Game 8

Fischer, White, repeated his 4th game opening move-1 P-QB4. Spassky set up a symmetrical position, which usually leads to a draw.

The first 10 moves went along a well-established line. On his 11th turn, Fischer introduced a brand new move. It was not of any great significance, but it seemed to disturb Spassky. He took over an hour for his reply. No one present at the playing hall could explain why Spassky should spend so much time on the move.

Spassky's 11th move was an obvious one and the best reply. On his 15 th move, he committed an incredible blunder, overlooking Fischer's immediate threat of winning the exchange. Spassky made another mistake on his 19th turn, after which the game was completely lost for him.

## ENGLISH OPENING

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-QB4 | P-QB4 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | N-QB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | N-B3 |
| 4 P-KN3 | P-KN3 |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | B-N2 |
| 6 0-0 | 0-0 |
| 7 P-Q4 | PxP |

The symmetry is now broken. 7... P-Q3 is possible.

| 8 | NxP | NxN |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | QxN | P-Q3 |
| 10 | B-N5 | B-K3 |
| 11 | Q-B4 |  |

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 14
Position after Black's 10 . . . B-K3

It is incomprehensible why such a simple and perhaps awkward move should have bothered Spassky. Usual is 11 Q-Q3 to get out of the line of Black's king bishop. Black was threatening 11 . . N-Q4, which would demolish White's queen side pawns.

11
Q-R4
The purpose of this move was to get the queen into play and to develop Black's king rook at QB1.

## 12 QR-B1

So that if Black attacked the QBP, White would be in a position to protect it with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$.

| $12 \ldots$ | QR-N1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 P-QN3 | KR-B1 |
| 14 Q-Q2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

Diagram 15
Position after White's 15 B-K3

Setting the trap.

$$
15
$$

P-QN4??

Spassky fell for the trap.
16 B-R7
The QR has no square to go to.

| $16 \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 BxR | RxB |
| 18 PxP | BxP |
| 19 KR-Q1 | N-Q2?? |

This move loses an important pawn, after which Black
collapses completely. Black should have tried 19...K-B1.

| 20 | N-Q5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 | NxPch |
| 22 | RxQ |
| 23 | RxB |
| 24 | B-B1 |
| 25 | K-N -B 1 |
| K | KxN |
|  | R-N8ch |
|  | N-B4 |
| P-QR4 |  |

Spassky, being the fighter that he is, put up resistance, but the position was untenable, as Fischer easily illustrated.

$$
26 \text { P-K4 }
$$

White's strategy was to dislodge Black's knight by effecting P-K5, after which White's rooks would be in a position to utilize their potential.

| 26 | $\ldots$ | B-R8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | P-B4 | P-B3 |
| 28 | R-K2 | K-K3 |
| 29 | $R(2)-Q B 2$ |  |

Intending to play $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$, forcing the exchange of rooks, after which Black's resistance would collapse.

| $29 \ldots$ | B-N7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 B-K2 | P-R4 |
| 31 R-Q2 |  |

Intending $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$.

| 31 | B-R6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32 P-B5ch | PxP |
| 33 PxPch | K-K4 |

If 33 . . . KxP; $34 \mathrm{RxP}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 35 \mathrm{R}(4)-\mathrm{Q} 4$, with the Black monarch in trouble.
34 R(4)-Q4
KxP

White was threatening $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and $36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ mate.
35 R-Q5ch
K-K3
36 RxPch
37 R-QB6
K-K2
Resigns

## Game 9

Spassky returned to the Queen Pawn Opening. A well-known variation developed. Fischer introduced a new move on his 9th turn. Spassky failed to come up with the correct plan in the opening.

Instead of concentrating in the center and attempting to initiate an assault against Black's king, which is the logical idea to pursue, Spassky shifted to the queen side. This gave Fischer time to exert pressure against White's weak queen pawn, diverting Spassky from carrying out his intention of creating active play on the queen side.

The net result was that Spassky was compelled to simplify. The resulting endgame offered no chances for either side.

## QUEEN PAWN OPENING

| Spassky <br> White | Fischer |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Black |
| 2 | P-Q4 |$\quad$ N-KB3

5 . . . KPxP leads to the Tarrasch Defense. Apparently, Fischer does not favor this defense for Black. Spassky, who had used this defense successfully in his last world championship match against Petrosian, has abandoned it for some reason.

$$
6 \text { P-K4 }
$$

The most recent reply. Spassky had used this continuation with good results in numerous events. The play emanating from $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ offers White good prospects.

| 6 | NxN |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | PxN | PxP |
| 8 | PxP | N-B3 |

More usual is 8 . . . B-N5ch, but Fischer, as usual, prefers to veer away from the trodden path.
9 B-QB4
$10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

Of course, not 10 BxNP because of 10 . . Q-R4ch, winning the bishop.

| 10.0 | B-N5ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 B-Q2 | BxBch |
| 12 QxB | P-QR3 |
| 13 P-QR4? |  |

BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 16
Position after Black's 12 . . . P-QR3

The wrong plan. Logical was $130-0,0-0 ; 14$ Q-K3, followed by $0-0$ and placing the rooks on Q1 and K1 with the purpose of effecting an eventual $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$.
13
$0-0$ !
14 Q-B3
If 14 PxP, NxP; 15 PxP, NxNch; 16 PxN, BxP with the better game.

| $14 .$. | B-N2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 PxP | PxP |
| $160-0$ |  |

The black QNP was immune to capture. If 16 BxP , RxRch; 17 QxR, N-N5; 18 Q-N1, Q-R4; 19 B-K2, BxP!; 20 QxB, N-Q6 dis. ch; $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ( $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, NxPch), Q-R8ch; 22 B-Q1, QxBch; 23 N-K 1, NxN; 24 QxN, QxP with excellent winning chances. If 16 RxR , QxR; 17 BxP, N-R2, regaining the pawn with the superior position.

| $16 \ldots$ | Q-N3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 QR-N1 | P-N5 |
| 18 Q-Q2 |  |

Giving up hope of an initiative. Worthy of consideration was 18 P-Q5, PxP; 19 PxP, PxQ (if 19 . . Q-R4; 20 BxPch , and if 20 . . . KxB; 21 Q-B2ch, K-N1; 22 PxN); $20 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; 21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ with complications favoring White.

| $18 \ldots$ | NxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 NxN | QxN |
| 20 RxP | Q-Q2 |
| 21 Q-K3 |  |

21 P-K5 would fail against 21 . . KR-Q1, and if

## BLACK (Fischer)



WHITE (Spassky)

## Diagram 17

Position after Black's 17 . . . P-N5
22 R-N4, QxB; 23 Q-R6, QxRch!; 24 KxQ, R-R8ch; $25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \mathrm{ch} ; 26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch} ; 27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, R-R5ch; 28 K-N5, PxQch.

21
22 KR-N1

Not 22 R-Q1?, QxB; 23 RxQ, R-R8ch with mate following. And $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ would lead to equality.

| 22 | $\ldots$ | QxB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | QxQ | RxQ |
| 24 | RxB | P-N4 |
| 25 | R-N8ch | RxR |
| 26 | RxRch | K-N2 |
| 27 | P-B3 | R-Q7 |
| 28 | P-R4 | P-R3 |

28 . . . PxP; 29 K-R2, and Black's double KR
pawn would be of no value. 28 . . . P-N5 would also be unproductive because of $29 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{RxP} ; 31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ with an easy draw.
29 PxP
PxP

Drawn

## Game 10

Fischer, White, decided to try $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, expecting the Sicilian Defense, for which he probably had an improvement over the 4th game. Spassky, suspecting this, answered with 1 . . . P-K4, which led to the Ruy Lopez. Both players reputedly know this opening backwards and forwards.

The opening drifted into the well-known Breyer Defense, which has enjoyed great popularity lately. Spassky handled it well, and Fischer had trouble with it.

Spassky sacrificed a pawn at an early stage in order to receive free play for his pieces. This he achieved, but made a tactical error on his 25th move, enabling Fischer to initiate an attack. Even then Spassky could have defended better than he did.

Fischer won the exchange. Spassky fought on, but to no avail.

## RUY LOPEZ

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 |
| 3 B-N5 | P-QR3 |
| 4 B-R4 | N-B3 |
| $50-0$ | B-K2 |
| 6 R-K1 | P-QN4 |
| 7 B-N3 | P-Q3 |
| 8 P-B3 | 0-0 |
| 9 P-KR3 | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |

Breyer's idea was to relocate this knight at Q2, in order to be in a position to strike at the center with . . . P-QB4 and also to develop the QB at QN2, where it will exert pressure on White's KP.

| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $\mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| 12 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 13 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$ |  |

Another system is $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Bl}-\mathrm{N} 3$.
13
B-KBI
14 P-QR4
The system adopted by White in this game is for the purpose of playing positionally with action directed at the center and the queen side pawns.

14
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3$
Spassky is provoking P-R5. He was content to lose a few tempi in order to close up the queen side.
15 P-R5
QN-Q2
$16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 2$
Q-N1!

A hidden and clever move. Black was preparing the sacrifice of a pawn for freedom of movement.

| 17 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | NPxP | QPxP |
| 19 | PxKP | QNxP |
| 20 | NxN | QxN |
| 21 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | Q-B5 |
| 22 | BxN | QxB |

Better than 22 . . . PxB; 23 PxP, KR-Q1; 24 R-K3.

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

## Diagram 18

Position after White's 17 R-N1
23 PxP
KR-Q1
24 Q-B1

Directed against the threat of . . Q-B6.

24
$25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Q-QB6
QxP?

An amazing mistake, which handed over the initiative to Fischer. With 25 . . . PxP, Black could retain the advantage. For instance, if $26 \mathrm{RxP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$, QxP, and if $26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ (threatening $27 \mathrm{NxBP}, \mathrm{KxN}$ ?; 28 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 3 \mathrm{ch}$, winning the queen), $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.

$$
26 \text { B-N3! }
$$

Exerting pressure against Black's KBP, which posed a real problem for Black.

| 26. | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 | Q-B4 |

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

Diagram 19
Position after White's 26 B-N3

The losing move. With 27 . . . P-B5, Black could have held his own: $28 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{PxB} ; 29 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$, and if 30 N-K5, R-Q8; 31 RxR, QxRch; 32 K-R2, P-B3; 33 NxP, Q-Q5!

| 28 N-K5 | Q-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 QR-Q! | R-K2 |

If 29 . . . QR-Q1; $30 \mathrm{BxPch}, \mathrm{RxB}$ (leading to mate would be 30 . . K-R1; 31 N-N6ch, PxN; 32 Q-R4 mate); 31 QxRch, QxQ; $32 \mathrm{NxQ}, \mathrm{RxR} ; 33 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{KxN}$; $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, remaining the exchange ahead.

| 30 BxPch | RxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 QxRch | QxQ |
| 32 NxQ | BxP |

32 . . . KxN; 33 R-Q7ch.
33 RxB

Best. Inferior would be 33 N -R6ch (in order to break up Black's pawns on the king side), PxR; $34 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B5}$, in which Black could accomplish something with his two connected passed pawns.

| 33 | KxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34 | R-Q7ch |
| 35 | R-N7 |

Ordinarily, Black would have a good chance of survival with the bishop and the two pawns. But in this position, White was able to inactivate the passed pawns with his rook, and the endgame was, consequently, hopelessly lost.

| $35 \ldots$ | R-R8ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 K-R2 | B-Q3ch |
| 37 | P-N3 |
| 38 K-N2 | P-N5 |
| 39 | R-N6 |

If 39 ... K-B4; $40 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$ wins a pawn.

| 40 | K-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 41 | K-K2 |$\quad$ K-B2

Now that Black is reduced to complete passivity, White is taking advantage of his pawn majority on the king side.

| 42 . . | P-N3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 43 P-N4 | PxP |
| 44 PxP | P-N4 |

A last desperate atterıpt at acquiring counter-play.
45 P-B5

Not 45 PxP?, B-K4; 46 P-N6ch, K-N2, with good chances for a draw.

| 45 | . . | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 47 | $\mathrm{R}(4) \times P$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| 48 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 49 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

49 . . . PxR; 50 R-K6 mate.

50 R-N8
$51 \mathrm{R}(4)-\mathrm{N} 7$
52 R-N6
53 R-N6

R-Q2
R-Q3
R-Q2
Resigns

The knight pawn was lost, which would give White two powerfully connected free pawns. Black had no counter-play. The advance of Black's bishop pawn was impossible; for if 53 . . . P-B5; 54 R-N5ch, R-Q4; 55 R --K6 mate. An attempt at a perpetual check would also fail: 53 . . . R-QR2; $54 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 55 \mathrm{RxP}$, R-R6ch; $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, with no more checks available for Black.

## Game 11

Before this game started, Spassky was three points behind. Realizing the urgency of the situation, Spassky mustered all of his resourcefulness and played his best game of the match so far.

Playing White, Spassky opened with 1 P-K4. Fischer, undaunted, played the Sicilian Defense again. He took the "poisoned pawn," and this time Spassky varied from the 7th game. He was obviously prepared for this variation this time.
Fischer played aggressively-too much so. He tried to set up a quick mating threat, but Spassky found the correct defense, and Fischer found himself in a precarious situation. His queen was suddenly trapped. He could not save it, and the rest was elementary.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Spassky | Fischer |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q3 |
| 3 P-Q4 | PxP |
| 4 NxP | N-KB3 |
| $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-QR3 |
| 6 B-KN5 | P-K3 |
| 7 P-B4 | Q-N3 |
| 8 Q-Q2 | QxP |
| $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | Q-R6 |
| 10 BxN |  |

Different from the 7th game, where Spassky played 10 B-Q3. The textmove makes more sense since it breaks up Black's pawn position on the king wing, making it dangerous for Black to castle on the king side.

| $10 .$. | PxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 B-K2 | P-KR4 |

Preventing B-KR5, where the bishop would exert pressure on Black's KBP.
$120-0$
N-B3
$13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Rl}$
To get out of a possible check.
13
B-Q2

Indicating that he might castle on the queen side.
14 N-N1!
BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 20

Position after Black's 13 . . . B-Q2

A fine conception. White wants to advance his queen bishop pawn, in order to get a strong bind in the center; in addition, it serves to endanger Black's queen by reducing the squares available to it.

14
Q-N5
If 14 . . . Q-N7; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, followed by $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$
and $17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$, trapping the queen.
15 Q-K3
Depriving Black's queen the flight square, QN3.
15
P-Q4

The immediate threat was $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 ; 17$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and the queen would be lost. This explains the reason for Black's last move. The only other alternative to save the queen was $15 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$, so that if 16 P-QR3, N-K2; 17 N-B3, Q-B3.

| 16 PxP | N-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 P-B4 | N-B4 |
| 18 Q-Q3. | P-R5? |

Trying to set up a mating trap: 19 . . . N-N6ch; 20 PxN, PxPch; 21 K-R1, B-B4ch; 22 N-Q4, P-K4, etc. Wiser was 18 . . . B-B4.

19 B-N4!
So that if 19 . . . N-N6ch; 20 PxN, PxPch; 21 B-R3.

19 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ?

White was threatening to play 20 BxN , giving Black a triple pawn. The textmove turned out badly. Preferable was 19 . . . N-R3.

| $20 \mathrm{~N}(1)-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |

Unavailing was 21 . . Q-R5 because of 22 Q-B3, attacking the rook and, at the same time, intending to trap the queen with $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 5$.
22 P-B5
Q-N4?

BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 21
Position after Black's 22 . . . Q-N4

The only try was 22 . . . Q-Q1, but after $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, B-N4; 24 Q-Q4 Black's position would be bad.

$$
23 \text { Q-QB3! }
$$

And now, White had three threats: he was attacking the KR with his queen, the knight was attacked and White was about to win Black's queen by playing 24 P-R4. Was there a way out for Fischer? There was not.

| 23 P-R4 | PxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 P-R6 |  |

If 24 . . Q-K7; 25 QR-K1, QxRch; 26 RxQ, and White wins more material.

| 25 PxQ | PxPch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 KxP | R-R6 |

Why did Fischer continue with a queen down? Nobody had the answer!

| 27 Q-B6 | N-B4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 P-B6 | B-B1 |
| 29 QPxP | BPxP |
| 30 KR-K1 | B-K2 |
| 31 KRxP | Resigns |

This was the champion's first good game out of 11 games!

## Game <br> 12

The opening was certainly a surprise. Fischer, White, played, again, 1 P-QB4, and, once again, Spassky responded with the Queen Pawn Opening.

The opening turned into an old form of the Orthodox Variation. Up to Black's 16th move, the game went exactly as in the game Stahlberg-Capablanca, Margate 1936, an event in which I participated and won and also received the coveted title of Grandmaster. Spassky improved on Capablanca's 16th move and obtained approximate equality.

Fischer managed to get the two bishops against a knight and bishop for Spassky. He had a slight positional advantage, but Spassky's calm defensive tactics prevented Fischer from making any appreciable progress. The game ended in a draw after 55 moves.

## QUEEN'S GAMBIT DECLINED

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q4 |
| 3 P-Q4 | N-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | B-K2 |
| 5 B-N5 | P-KR3 |
| 6 B-R4 | 0-0 |
| 7 P-K3 | QN-Q2 |


| $8 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | P-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | PxP |
| 10 BxP | P-QN4 |
| $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |

Intending to strike at the center with 12 . . . P-QB4.
12 P-R4
Preventing the freeing . . . P-QB4.
12
Px $P$
Better than 12 . . . P-N5; $13 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{PxB}$ (13
NxB; 14 N-K4 with advantage); 14 N-K4, P-KB4; 15 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ with advantage.

13 NxP
Preventing, again, . . . P-QB4.

| $13 \ldots$ | Q-R4ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | B-N5 |
| $15 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-B4 |
| $16 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ | Q-Q1 |

In the Stahlberg-Capablanca game, the latter continued $16 \ldots$ Q-N3. The textmove was superior because it did not allow White to win an important tempo by attacking the queen with the knight.

| 17 | $0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 | NxP |
| 19 | B-K4! |

A very fine positional stroke. White wants to gain control of his QB6 square by forcing exchange of Black's queen bishop.

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 22
Position after Black's 18 . . . B-N2

One good move deserves another. Not 19 . . BxN?; $20 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1 ; 21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6$, winning material. 19 . . R-N1 was, however, another possibility. If $20 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{RxB} ; 21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 ; 22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$, Q-N4.

$$
20 \text { B-N3 Q-R2 }
$$

The queen was being chased, but, nevertheless, White could not benefit much.

| 21 | N-B6 | B(2)xN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | BxB | QR-B1 |
| 23 | N-R4 | KR-Q1 |
| 24 | B-B3 |  |

Black's reply to 24 Q-B3 (which appeared as a strengthening of the bind) would be $24 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} \mathrm{l}$, disposing of one of the bishops.
24 . . $\quad$ P-QR4
25 R-B6
$25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{RxR}$; $26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ was more promising.

| $25 \ldots$ | RxR |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 BxR | R-QB1 |
| 27 B-B3 |  |

27 Q-B3 would be met satisfactorily by 27 N -B4.

| 27 | Q | Q-R3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | P-R3 | Q-N4 |
| 29 | B-K2 | Q-B3 |
| 30 | B-B3 | Q-N4 |
| 31 | P-N3 |  |

Spassky was satisfied to repeat moves, but not Fischer.

| $31 \ldots$ | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 32 B-K2 | Q-N5 |

Strange, Black's queen has been moving one square at a time for a number of moves!

| 33 | B-R6 | R-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | B-Q3 | N-B4 |

Better was 34 . . . B-Q3, and if 35 Q-B3, R-B1; 36 B-R6, R-N1.

| 35 Q-B3 | R-B1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 NxN |  |

36 R-B1 would be met by 36 . . . R-Q1.

37 R-B1
BxN
38 B-B4
R-Q1
Q-Q7!

Causing White's rook to get out of play.
39 R-B1
B-N5
$40 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$
R-Q2

White's roving bishops have not been able to achieve anything substantial.

$$
41 \text { Q-B6 }
$$

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 23
Position after White's 41 Q-B6
The sealed move, threatening to annoy the rook, once again, with $42 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 5$.

41
Q-B7!
Pinning White's king bishop. It also enabled Black's rook to reach the seventh rank.

## 42 B-K5

Not 42 BxRP?, BxB; 43 Q-R8ch, B-Q1. If 42 Q-R8ch, K-R2; $43 \mathrm{BxRP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7$, winning the bishop.

| 42 . | R-Q7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 43 Q-R8ch | K-R2 |
| 44 BxN | PxB |

Fischer was able. to break up Black's king pawn formation, but this was not sufficient to offer him any advantage.

| 45 | Q-B3 | P-B4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46 | P-N4 | Q-K5 |
| 47 | K-N2 | K-N3 |
| 48 | R-B1 | B-R6 |
| 49 | R-QR1 | B-N5 |
| 50 | R-QB1 | B-K2 |

Now, Spassky refused to repeat moves. Does that tell us anything?

| 51 PxPch | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 52 R-K1 | RxPch |
| 53 KxR | B-R5ch |
| $54 \mathrm{~K}-K 2$ | QxQch |
| 55 KxQ | BxR |
| Drawn |  |

## Game 13

Spassky, as White, resorted to the king pawn opening. Fischer, trounced in the 1 lth game when he played the Sicilian Defense, employed psychology and played the Alekhine Defense, which, if memory serves, he had never used against a strong adversary.

Spassky was so befuddled that he misplayed the opening. On his 13th turn, he was compelled to give up a pawn, for which he obtained a superficial bind on the center. He was able to restrict the movement of Fischer's pieces. In a cramped position, Fischer defended precisely. Pieces were exchanged, leading to an ending of rooks and bishops of opposite colors. Fischer was two pawns ahead at adjournment.

The most exciting phase of the game occurred after adjournment when Spassky and his assistants found a unique line, and the fireworks began. Spassky played excellently up to a certain point. On his 69th move, he made an inferior move and threw away the draw he was fighting for so hard.

## ALEKHINE DEFENSE

| Spassky <br> White |  | Fischer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |
| Plack |  |  |

Another line is $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$; $6 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{BPxP} ; 7$ $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$.

| $5 \quad \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 B-N3 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 2$ |
| 7 QN-Q2 |  |

So that after 7 . . . PxP; 8 PxP, Black would not be able to exchange queens.
8 P-KR3 $\quad 0-0$

To prevent 8 . . . B-N5, pinning the knight.
8 P-QR4? P-QR4

Preferable was $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, leaving a flight square for the KB after it is attacked by . . . P-QR5.

| $9 \quad \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 PxP | N-R3 |
| $110-0$ | N-B4 |
| 12 Q-K2 | Q-K1! |

Winning a pawn.

## $13 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4$

There was no way of saving the QR pawn; for if 13 Q-N5, QxQ; 14 PxQ, B-Q2, attacking the pawn, which would be indefensible.

| 13. | $\mathrm{~N}(3) \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 BxN | NxB |
| $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |  |

Spassky discards 15 Q-B4, B-Q2; 16 QxP, B-QB3;
17 R-K1, Q-Q1, with the better prospects. He probably overestimated his position.

| 15 | N-N3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | B-Q2 | P-QR5 |
| 17 | B-N5 | P-R3 |
| 18 | B-R4 | B-B4 |
| 19 | P-KN4 |  |

$19 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ looks more promising. If 19 . . . BxP; 20 $\mathrm{NxB}, \mathrm{PxN} ; 21 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 3, \mathrm{BxP} ; 22 \mathrm{NxP}$, with attacking possibilities. White was a pawn down. Sharp play was mandatory.

19
B-K3
19 . . . BxN; 20 QxB would give White dominating influence of the board.

| 20 N-Q4 | B-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 Q-Q2 | Q-Q2 |

Black managed to get his pieces into play.

| 22 QR-Q1 | KR-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 P-B4 | B-Q4 |
| 24 | N-QB5 |

White appeared to have a reasonable position, but because of the exposure of his king, White was not in a position to undertake vigorous action against Black's king position. Consequently, White had no choice but to pursue a positional course.

24
25 Q-B3
26 K-R2

More promising was $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ (in order to make $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ possible), and if 26 . . N-Q2; $27 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{QxN}$; 28 P-B5, KPxP; 29 PxP, PxP; 30 R-KB1, threatening NxP,
and Black could not play 30 . . . BxP because of 31 $\mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{RxB} ; 32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 \mathrm{ch}$, winning the rook.

| 26 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| 30 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 31 | QxQ |
| 3 | PxB |

To prevent $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 7$.

| 32 | P-N5 | RPxP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | PxP | P-B4 |
| 34 | B-N3 | K-B2 |
| 35 | N-K5ch | NxN |
| 36 | BxN |  |

The play of both sides was forced.
36 R-KB1 P-N4

White's threat now was 38 R-B4-R4-R7ch.

| 37 B-B6 | R-R1! |
| :--- | :--- |

Bad would be $38 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{RxB}$, and Black would pick up White's QP easily and have an easy win.

| 38 P. | P-R6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 R-B4 | P-R7 |
| 40 P-B4 |  |

So that White's bishop would control the QRI square.

| 40 . | BxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | B-Q44 |

## BLACK (Fischer)



WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 24
Position after Black's 41 . . . B-Q4

The adjourned position, an unusually complex one. The experts gave Spassky practically no chance of drawing.

$$
42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 3!
$$

The sealed move. It threatened 43 R-KR4, and if the rook on KR1 moved, then R-R7ch, with, at least, a perpetual check.

42
R-R6ch
Preferable was 42 P-K4; 43 BxP, K-K3, with complications.

$$
43 \text { P-QB3 }
$$

$43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ would not suffice because of 43 . . $\mathrm{R}(6) \mathrm{xP} ; 44 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q})$, RxQ; $45 \mathrm{BxR}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ and the rook would be trapped.
43
R(1)-R1
44 R-KR4
P-K4

To avoid the perpetual check.

| $45 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 47 RxP | RxPch |
| $48 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | KxP |

A remarkable endgame. The analysts of both sides did a thorough job.

| 50 | R(5)xBch | K-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 51 | R-Q6ch | K-N2 |
| 52 | R-Q7ch |  |

52 R-K6 was tempting, but after 52 . . . R-QB $1 ; 53$ B-K5, R-B3; 54 R-Q7ch, K-B1, it would not leave White much play.

| 52 | K-R3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 53 R (7)-Q2 | RxR |
| 54 KxR | P-N5 |
| 55 P-R4 | K-N4 |
| 56 P-R5 | P-QB5 |
| 57 R-QR1 |  |

Parrying the threat of 57 . . P-B6ch, followed by 58 . . . P-R8(Q).

| 57 . . | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 58 P-N6 | P-R5 |
| 59 | P-N7 |

Unsatisfactory was $59 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch} ; 60 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$

K-Q3, R-Q1ch), K-B5, followed by . . . P-N6ch with telling effect.

| 59 | P-R6 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 60 | B-K7 | R-KN1 |

61 B-B8
The rook is locked in, and yet Black still has winning chances.

61
P-R7
$62 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$
K-B3
63 R-Q1!
The king shall not pass!

| $63 \ldots$ | P-N6ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 64 K-B3 | P-KR8(Q) |
| 65 RxQ | K-Q4 |
| $66 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$ | P-B5 |
| $67 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Qlch}$ | K-K5 |

BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 25
Position after Black's 68 . . . K-Q6
68 R-QB1
K-Q6
69 R-Qlch??

The losing move. It must have been heartbreaking for Spassky to have defended so magnificently up to this point and then throw away the game with one move. The correct move was 69 R-B3ch, K-Q5 (if 69 . . . K-K7; 70 RxBP, P-B6; 71 R-B6, P-B7; 72 R-K6ch, K-Q6; 73 R-KB6, etc.); 70 R-B3, P-B6ch; 71 K-R1, P-B7; 72 RxPch, K-B6 (72 . . . K-Q6; 73 R-B1, K-Q7; 74 K-N2); 73 B-N4ch, K-Q6; 74 R-B1, RxP; $75 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$, and Black would not be able to make headway.

69
70 R-QB1
71 B-B5

If 71 RxP, P-B7; 72 R-K4ch, K-B6; 73 R-K6, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q})$ and wins.

If $75 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 ; 76 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 77 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, KxB , and wins. If $75 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{RxB} ; 76 \mathrm{RxR}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 7 ; 77$ R-K4ch, K-B6; 78 R-K8, P-B8(Q); 79 R-B8ch, K-K7; 80 RxQ , KxR; $81 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 7$; $82 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$, K-Q7; $83 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6 ; 84 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch} ; 85$ KxQ, K-B6; $86 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 7$; $87 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$, K-B7, and wins.

The winning move which Spassky must have overlooked.

| 73 R-K4ch | K-B8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 74 B-Q4 | P-B7 |
| Resigns |  |

## Game 14

Fischer, White, returned to 1 P-QB4. Spassky, as in previous games, stuck to the Queen's Pawn opening. Fischer selected on his 5th move B-B4, instead of B-N5, which he played in the other games.

The well-known Tarrasch Variation, in which Spassky was saddled with an isolated queen pawn, offered little play for either side. Fischer had a slight positional advantage but with little prospect of making headway. The position was approximately even. Fischer, however, was not content with equality and pressed too vigorously. As a consequence, he made a tactical error on move 18. Spassky seized the initiative immediately, even though Fischer remained with the two bishops.

Fischer was compelled to exchange queens in order to extricate himself from a bad situation but lost a pawn in the process. Spassky had good winning chances in the ensuing endgame, but, on move 27, as has been his custom, committed a blunder, overlooking a one move combination, returning the pawn and giving up all hope for a win. The game was drawn after 40 moves.

## QUEEN'S PAWN OPENING

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ White | Black |
| 1 P-QB4 | P-K3 |
| 2 | N-KB3 |
| 3 | P-Q4 |


| 4 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $0-0$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |

The best reaction to White's set-up. However, also possible is 6 . . P-B3; $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{QN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, leading to a form of the Orthodox Variation.

$$
7 \text { PxBP N-B3 }
$$

There's no rush in recapturing the pawn-White cannot defend it satisfactorily.

| 8 PxQP | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 B-K2 | BxP |
| $100-0$ | B-K3 |
| 11 | R-B1 |

Although Black has an isolated queen pawn, White cannot exert pressure against it. The position is even. Fischer probably chose this variation because of his commanding lead of 3 points and was reluctant to assume any unnecessary risk.

## 12 P-QR3

Black's queen pawn was immune to capture. For if 12 NxP, NxN; 13 RxB, NxB; 14 PxN, BxP with the better position.
12... P-KR3

13 B-N3
Now, Black's pawn was threatened. Consequently, Black's reply.

| 13 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |

Spassky was inviting complications. He could have simplified with 14 . . . P-Q5; $15 \mathrm{NxN}, \mathrm{RxN}$; 16 PxP, BxP with perfect equality. For if in this $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 3$, and White could not continue $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ? because of 18 . . . B-N6, winning the knight.

$$
15 \text { N-R4 N-K5 }
$$

Both knights are attacking bishops.

| 16 RxR | BxR |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 N-KB3 | B-Q2! |
| 18 | B-K5? |

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

## Diagram 26

Position after Black's 17 . . . B-Q2

In his desire to retain the two bishops, Fischer overlooked Black's sharp reply. Wise was 18 NxB , QxN; 19 Q-Q4, QxQ; 20 NxQ, R-B1; $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, with a balanced position.

18
BxN!
19 QxB
N-QB3

20 B-KB4?
Overestimating his position and, therefore, still unwilling to give up the two bishops' advantage. Imperative was $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

Now, White was in trouble. The dual threats are (1) the queen knight pawn is attacked, (2) Black is threatening to trap White's queen bishop with 21 . . . P-N4; 22 B-N3, P-R4-5. White is unable to parry the two threats satisfactorily.

## 21 B-QN5

If 21 Q-N3, P-Q5; 22 Q-Q5, R-K 1, with good play.

21
22 BxN

QxP
N-B6!

BLACK (Spassky)


WHITE (Fischer)
Dlagram 27
Position after White's 22 BxN

The move Fischer probably overlooked. It wins a pawn by force.

$$
23 \text { Q-N4 }
$$

No better was 23 B-K5 because of 23 . . . NxQ; 24 $B x Q, P x B$.

| 23 ... | QxQ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 PxQ | PxB |
| 25 | B-K5 |

25 ... N-R7 would be a mistake because of 25 . . . R-N 1 , and the knight would be imprisoned.
26 R-B1
R-Bl
27 N-Q4

Setting up a trap, and Spassky bit for it.

$$
27 \text {. . P-B3?? }
$$

It is most incredible that the world champion would make an oversight involving a one move combination! The correct continuation was 27 . . . NxN; 28 BxN , K-B1; $29 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{PxB} ; 30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, with good winning chances. Also $27 \ldots \mathrm{BxN} ; 28 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bl}$ would offer Black winning chances.
28 BxP
BxN

If 28 . . . PxB; 29 NxN with an even position.

| 29 BxB | NxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 PxN | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| $31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |

Not 31 RxP because of 31 . . . P-QR4, followed by 32 . . . PxP, getting a strong passed pawn. Of course, not in this, $32 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 8 \mathrm{ch}$.

| 31 | RxP |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | RxP | RxP |
| 33 | R-R6 | K-B2 |
| 34 | RxPch |  |

It is an easy draw now.

| 34 | K-B3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 35 R-Q7 | P-R4 |
| $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | P-N4 |
| $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | R-K5ch |
| $38 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | K-K3 |
| 39 R-KN7 | K-B3 |
| 40 R-Q7 | K-K3 |
| Drawn |  |

## Game 15

Playing White, Spassky opened with his king pawn. Fischer, although he defeated the champion with the Alekhine Defense in the 13th game, reverted to his favorite, the Sicilian Defense.

On his 7th move, Fischer varied from previous games of this opening. Instead of continuing 7 Q-N3, going for the "poisoned pawn," he continued 7 . . B-K2. Spassky, apparently prepared for this, was able to get an overwhelming position. White's 13th move, bishop takes knight, posed a real problem for the challenger.

He had three ways of recapturing the bishop. None was favorable for him. He finally decided to give up a pawn.

The champion had a won position but made several inferior moves, permitting Fischer to build up a strong attack. Only supurb defense saved Spassky from defeat. The game ended in a draw.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Spassky | Fischer |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 |
| 2 N-KB3 | P-Q3 |
| 3 P-Q4 | PxP |
| 4 NxP | N-KB3 |
| $5 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-QR3 |
| 6 B-KN5 | P-K3 |


| 7 | P-B4 | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Q-B3 | Q-B2 |
| 9 | $0-0-0$ |  |

This is an announcement that Spassky was not playing for a draw. Castling on the queen side is usually a strong indication of intended aggressive action.

| $9 \ldots$ | QN-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 B-Q3 | P-N4 |
| 11 | KR-K1 |
| 12 | Q-N3! |

A very strong move, which presented Fischer with a difficult problem. If he castled on the king side, White would obtain a powerful attack with 13 P-K5.

## BLACK (Fischer)



WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 28
Position after White's 12 Q-N3

The only alternative, which also has drawbacks. But the monarch could not remain in the middle of the board.

Against 12 . . P-N5, to drive the knight away from the center, White could continue energetically with 13 N-Q5!, PxN; 14 PxP, and if 14 ... K-Bl; 15 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 5$, attacking the bishop, and if Black defends by playing $15 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, then $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6$ would be crushing. Consequently, Fischer decided to try his luck on the other wing. But this also had drawbacks.

## 13 BxN <br> NxB

13 . . . PxB would have left Black with a poor pawn structure and an inactive king bishop. 13 . . . BxB would be unwise because of $14 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{PxB}$ (14 ... BxN; 15 BxNch, followed by 16 RxB, remaining with a pawn to the good); $15 \mathrm{~N}(\mathrm{Q} 4) \times \mathrm{NP}$, followed by NxPch, with a clearly won position.

14 QxP
The question is what did Black have for the pawn? The answer is that he had nothing for it.
$14 \underset{\text { Q-N3 }}{\ldots} \quad$ QR-Bl

This retreat of the queen was necessary because of the threat of $15 \ldots$. KR-N 1 , attacking the queen and king knight pawn.

| 15 ... | P-N5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 N-R4 | KR-N1 |

Why did not Fischer try to regain the pawn with 16 . . Q-R4; 17 P-N3, N-R4; 18 Q-B2, NxP and White could not capture the knight because of $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 4$, winning the queen? The answer is that after

18 . . NxP, White would play $19 \mathrm{BxP}, \mathrm{BxB}$ (if 19 . . . QxB; 20 QxN); 20 N-B6, Q-B2; 21 NxBch, QxN; 22 QxN.

| 17 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| 19 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 20 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

Unproductive was 20 . . . NxN; 21 BxN , PxP; 22 R-QB1, Q-R4; 23 B-B6, with good play for White.

| 21 NxBP | B-KB3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 P-KN3 | P-KR4 |  |
| 23 | P-K5? |  |

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 29
Position after Black's 22 . . . P-KR4
A questionable idea, because it made the pawn at K 5 a target for Black's forces. Spassky was too eager to open lines quickly. Wiser was either $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$, followed by
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$, or $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$, followed by $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$, opening the queen bishop file for action of the rooks, without permitting White to have any counter-play.

| 23 PxP | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 | $B-K R 1!$ |

The bishop here exerted pressure on White's king pawn. Unwise would be 23 . . . BxP; $24 \mathrm{~N}(\mathrm{Q} 4)-\mathrm{N} 5$, PxN; $25 \mathrm{NxNP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 3 ; 26 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{QxN} ; 27 \mathrm{RxN}$ with an easily won position.

$$
25 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

25 Q-K3 was to be considered, and if Black tried to win the king pawn with 25 . . . N-Q2; $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ would force the exchange of Black's queen bishop. Black would win the queen pawn, but Black's king would be exposed to White's pieces.

| 25 .. | R-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 RxRch | RxR |
| 27 N-KN5 |  |

Unfortunately for White, he could not continue 27 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ (in an attempt to simplify by forcing the exchange of pieces) because of 27 . . . NxN; $28 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxBch}$; 29 RxB, R-Q8 mate.
27 QxP BxP

Bad would be $28 \mathrm{NxBP}, \mathrm{BxN} ; 29 \mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KBl}$ with a nasty pin.
R-Q2

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 30
Position after Black’s 28 . . . R-Q2
This gave Fischer too many attacking chances. Wiser was to bring the queen back to the aid of the king by playing 29 Q-B2, and if $29 \ldots$ BxN; 30 PxB . And now, Black could have two possibilities: (1) 30 ... Q-N3ch; $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{N} 3$, with no difficulty, (2) 30 . . N-Q6; $31 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{RxB}: 32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$, with some winning chances.

| $29 \ldots$ | BxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 PxB | Q-N3ch |
| 31 K-B1 | Q-R4 |

Now, White's king was dangerously exposed, and the two pawns were attacked.

| 32 | Q-R8ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 | P-QR4 |

The only defense. Black's queen had to be kept out of White's QR3, QR2, where it would menace the king's
safety. The moves from here to the 4Uth move were made in rapid succession, as both players had little time left.

| 33 | N-Q6ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34 | BxN |
| 35 | K-B2 |

36 . . . RxN; 37 Q-Q4ch, followed by 38 RxP, with the attack over. All winning chances would be lost for Black, because all White would have to do to get a draw would be to exchange queens, and the ending would be a theoretical draw.

37 Q-N7
Protecting the knight and pinning the bishop.
37
Q-KB4
38 K-N3
Getting out of the pin.
38
Q-Q4ch
Fischer could have better winning chances with 38 R-Q8.

| 39 K-R3 | Q-Q7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 R-QN4 | Q-B8ch |
| 41 R-N2 | Q-R8ch |
| 42 R-R2 | Q-B8ch |
| 43 R-N2 | Q-R8ch |
| Drawn |  |

If either played differently, he would get into trouble.

## Game 16

Conducting the White pieces, the challenger returned to the king pawn opening. Spassky replied with 1 ... P-K4, discarding the Sicilian Defense.

Fischer played the Ruy Lopez, choosing the Exchange Variation, a quiet line, which usually leads to quiet positions, offering little play for either side. Apparently, Fischer was not in a fighting mood, being content with his comfortable lead of three points.

Spassky tried to complicate matters. He managed to outplay his opponent. Fischer defended well. Although the champion won a pawn, he was unable to utilize the extra pawn to any extent, because he was saddled with triple queen bishop pawns.

In the resultant endgame, Spassky remained with a pawn ahead, but this was not sufficient to score the point.

RUY LOPEZ

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :---: | :---: |
| White | Black |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-K4 |
| $2 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | N-QB3 |
| 3 B-N5 | P-QR3 |
| 4 BxN | QPxB |
| $50-0$ |  |

Not 5 NxP because of either 5 . . Q-Q5, or 5 ... Q-N4, regaining the pawn with advantage.

| 5 | P. | P-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | P-Q4 | B-KN5 |
| 7 | PxP | QxQ |
| 8 | RxQ | PxP |
| 9 | R-Q3 | B-Q3 |

The play up to now is well known. It first occurred in a game, Fischer-Smyslov, in which the latter continued 9 . . . BxN; $10 \mathrm{RxB}, \mathrm{PxP}$, with an even position. The Russians were prepared for this line and came up with an even better continuation for Black.

## 10 QN-Q2

N-B3
Also playable is $10 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$, preventing 11 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 4$. The textmove is better.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 11 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4 \\
& 12 \mathrm{QNxP}
\end{aligned}
$$

$12 . \quad$| 13 NxB | QBxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| $0-0$ |  |

The reason Black did not castle on the queen side was because he wanted to have the opportunity to initiate action on that wing. If he castled on that side, it would preclude that, because the king would be subject to attack when the queen side pawns were advanced.

$$
14 \text { B-K3 P-QN4! }
$$

Black was saddled with doubled bishoppawns, and so he decided to undertake action to nullify that disadvantage.

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

## Diagram 31

Position after Black's 14 . . . P-QN4

## 15 P-B4?

A premature advance. It is true that if 15 . . PxP; $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ would regain the pawn with a fine position, but Black was not forced to take the pawn. Better was 15 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ (in order to drive away Black's well-posted knight), N-B4 (if 15 . . . NxN; 16 RxN, leaving little play for Black); 16 R-B3, N-R5; 17 RxP, NxP; 18 B-Q4, N-R5; 19 N-K4 with good play.

15
QR-N1!
A very fine move, enabling Black to open the queen knight file for action.

$$
16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} \text { I }
$$

A good alternative was 16 PxP enabling Black to undouble his bishop pawn by recapturing the pawn with the bishop pawn, but the suggested move would keep Black's QR out of play for awhile.

| $16 \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 R-Q4 | KR-K1 |
| $18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |

Disposing of the nasty knight.

| $18 \ldots$ | NxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 RxN | R-K5 |
| 20 P-KN3 | B-K4 |
| 21 R(1)-B2 | K-B2 |
| 22 K-N2 | RxP! |

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 32
Position after White's $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 2$
An interesting move, but was it sufficient to win?

$$
23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

23 RxR, P-B6; 24 R(N2)-B2, PxR; 25 RxQP, K-K3 would offer Black better chances.

| $23 \underset{\text { KxR }}{ }$ | P-B6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 RxQP | PxR |
| 25 | R-N4 |

25 . . . RxR would offer Black no winning chances. Black's passed queen bishop pawn could not be advanced advantageously.

$$
26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2
$$

Regaining his pawn.

| $26 \ldots$ | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 RxP | R-QR4 |
| 28 | B-B4 |
| 29 | K-B3 |

29 . . . BxB; 30 PxB, RxRP; 31 RxPch, K-N3; 32 R-B6ch, K-R4; 33 R-B5ch, K-R3; 34 R-B6ch, P-N3; $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ would lead to nothing for Black.

| $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | RxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 BxB | PxB |
| 32 RxP | RxP |
| 33 RxP | RxP |
| $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)
Diagram 33
Position after White's 34 K - B ?

The position is a theoretical draw. Curiously enough, the players refused to call it a draw and played 26 more moves before a draw was agreed upon. The rest of the moves are insignificant.

| 34 |  | R-Q7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | R-R7ch | K-B3 |
| 36 | R-R6ch | K-K2 |
| 37 | R-R7ch | R-Q2 |
| 38 | R-R2 | K-K3 |
| 39 | K-N2 | R-K2 |
| 40 | K-R3 | K-B3 |
| 41 | R-R6ch | R-K3 |
| 42 | R-R5 | P-R3 |
| 43 | R-R2 | K-B2 |
| 44 | R-B2ch | K-N4 |
| 45 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | P-N3 |
| 46 | R-B4 | P-R4 |
| 47 | R-B3 | R-KB3 |
| 48 | R-R3 | R-K3 |
| 49 | R-KB3 | R-K5 |
| 50 | R-R3 | K-R3 |
| 51 | R-R6 | R-K4 |
| 52 | K-R4 | R-K5ch |
| 53 | K-R3 | R-K2 |
| 54 | K-R4 | R-K4 |
| 55 | R-N6 | K-N2 |
| 56 | $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4$ | K-R3 |
| 57 | R-N6 | R-K8 |
| 58 | K-R3 | R-R8ch |
| 59 | K-N2 | R-QR8 |
| 60 | K-R3 | R-R5 |
|  | Drawn |  |

## Game 17

The 17th game was interesting and exciting. Spassky made a strong bid for a win.

Conducting the White pieces, Spassky relied on the king pawn opening, again. This is really his forte. The king pawn opening lends itself more to combinative play than the queen pawn opening. It is only recently that Spassky has shifted from the former to the latter.

Fischer, again, tried to surprise the champion by playing 1... P-Q3, a move he had never used in serious play. Spassky played enterprisingly, sacrificing a pawn early in the game for attacking possibilities.

Just as Spassky seemed to build up an attack, Fischer calmly gave up a rook for a bishop, relieving the pressure exerted by his opponent. The ensuing endgame was intricate.

After adjournment, a prolonged struggle was expected, but after five moves the game was drawn by a repetition of moves three times. This was surprising to all, in view of the fact that Spassky was behind three points in the match. Apparently, the champion and his second felt that the position offered very small winning chances, and that if he pressed too hard, Fischer might win, and Spassky's chances of retaining the title would vanish completely.

## PIRC-ROBATSCH DEFENSE

| Spassky | Fischer |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-Q3 |
| 2 P-Q4 | P-KN3 |
| 3 N-QB3 | N-KB3 |
| 4 P-B4 | B-N2 |
| 5 | N-B3 |

Black must strike at the center immediately; otherwise, White would be in a position to strangle Black with the stronghold he would acquire in the center.

$$
6 \mathrm{PxP}
$$

An alternative is $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, which leads to a different pattern in the middlegame.
6
Q-R4
7 B-Q3

White must return the pawn. Bad would be 7 PxP, NxP , regaining the pawn with an excellent position.

| 7 | QxBP |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Q-K2 | $0-0$ |
| 9 | B-K3 | Q-QR4 |
| 10 | $0-0$ |  |

The last three moves by White were normal developing moves.
10 . B-N5

Black was willing to give up his bishop for the knight, because the bishop could not be utilized satisfactorily in the coming middlegame.

$$
11 \text { QR-Q1 }
$$

The champion took a comparatively long time for this move, and yet it does not seem to be the best. A better alternative was $11 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$ with the threat of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ or with the idea of bringing the queen to KR4. Another possible move was $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, with an eventual $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$, driving the queen away.
11
N-B3
12 B-B4

For the purpose of activating this bishop. Choice of the textmove was predicated on the idea of sacrificing a pawn for aggressive action.
12
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R} 4$

Preventing P-KR3 on account of . . . N-N6.
13 B-N3
Provoking Fischer to take the pawn.
13
BxQN
14 PxB
QxBP

Accepting the challenge. Black's monarch was now more exposed to Spassky's contemplated assault.
15 P-B5
N-B3
16 P-KR3
BxN
17 QxB
N-QR4

Fischer's idea was to dispose of the dangerous king bishop, which could have caused him concern. 17 . . N-K4; 18 Q-B4, P-QR4 was worthy of consideration.
18 R-Q3
Q-B2
19 B-R6
NxB

| 20 BPxN | Q-B4ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 K-R1 | Q-K4! |

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 34
Position after White's 21 K-R1
Fischer decided to give up the exchange-an excellent idea! He realized that after 21 . . . KR-B1; 22 PxP, RPxP; 23 P-KN4, threatening $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$, would be fatal for him.

| 22 | BxR | RxB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |

Protecting the king pawn, giving Black the opportunity to seize control of the queen bishop file with the next move. This important fact justified Black's sacrifice of the exchange.

| 23 . . | R-B 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 PxP | RPxP |
| 25 Q-B4 |  |

Black's queen was too well posted, and White had to force the exchange of queens.

If Black moved his queen, White would proceed strongly with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$.
26 RxQ
$\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

Heading for the stronghold K4.

$$
27 \text { R-B2 }
$$

Preventing . . . R-B7.

| $27 \ldots$ | N-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 K-R2 | R-B8 |
| 29 R(3)-K2 | N-B3! |

Blocking the bishop file so that White's rook could not penetrate into Black's home ground.

| 30 | R-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 | R(KB2)-K2 |
| 32 | K-N3 |
| 33 | R(B2)-Q2 |
|  | R-QR8 |
| K-N2 | R-KB8 |

To prevent the king from reaching KB2. The well posted rook was hindering White's progress. It might be called a "nuisance rook."

| 34 | R-KB2 | R-K8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35 | R(KB2)-K2 | R-KB8 |
| 36 | R-K3 | P-QR3 |
| 37 | R-QB3 | R-K8 |
| 38 | R-B4 | R-KB8 |
| 39 | R(2)-QB2 | R-QR8 |
| 40 | R-B2 | R-K8 |

The adjourned position. Although White has material advantage, he is saddled with an isolated king pawn. In addition, Blach`s rook is well posted, so that White`s rooks could not he utilized to their fullest. White's

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

## Diagram 35

Position after Black's 40 . . . R-K8
available plans were: (1) To try to establish a passed king rook pawn. (2) To try to bring his king to KB 2 , his rooks to QN2 and K2, and attempt to exchange rooks at K 1 . If this could be done, White would have winning chances. (3) To try to bring his king to the queen side and advance his queen side pawns. (4) He could play $R-Q N 2$ in an attempt to advance his QNP.

41 R(KB2)-B2
Better was 41 P-KR4, to prevent Black's next move.

41
42 R-B1
43 R(1)-B2
44 R - B 1
$45 \mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{B} 2$

P-KN4
R-K7
R-K8
R-K7
Drawn

Apparently, Spassky and his assistants concluded, after exhaustive analysis, that the winning chances were too small to warrant the risk of losing.

## Game 18

The 18th game was a fierce and interesting struggle. Fischer, White, opened with the king pawn. Spassky resorted to the Sicilian Defense, which he had not used since the third game of the match. The variation in this game was, however, different from the one in the third game. Fischer varied on his 6th move, playing B-KN5 instead of B-QB4, his favorite move.

On his 8th turn, Fischer castled on the queen side, indicating he was ready for a fight. Spassky advanced his queen side pawns, indicating his intention to attack. On his 18th move, Spassky closed the queen knight file, giving up the attack. This came as a great surprise to all.

A positional type of struggle arose. Fischer seemed to have the upper hand, after Spassky made a few questionable moves. Fischer won a pawn in the middlegame. Spassky never castled and was forced to bring his king to a safe haven on the queen side.

The resultant endgame was difficult and complex. Fischer was in a position to try something but elected to play safely and resorted to a repetition of moves. The game was drawn after 47 moves.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Fischer | Spassky |
| :--- | :--- |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 |
| 2 N-KB3 | P-Q3 |


| 3 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | PxP |
| 5 | NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ |  |

6 B-QB4, Fischer's favorite continuation, had little success in the third game, and so Fischer varied in this game. As it turned out, he didn't fare so well with this move, either.
7 Q-Q2

P-K3
P-QR3
To prevent White from playing $8 \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{N} 5$, exerting pressure on Black's queen pawn.

| 8 | $0-0-0$ | B-Q2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | P-B4 | B-K2 |
| 10 | N-B3 | P-N4 |

Announcing that he was not going to sit back and take it. Spassky declared by this move that he was going to fight back.

$$
11 \text { BxN PxB }
$$

Assessing the position at this point, Black has a poor pawn structure, but, in return, he has attacking prospects.

12 B-Q3
Q-R4
Threatening 13 . . P-N5, which would win the queen rook pawn.

$$
13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{N} 1
$$

Meeting the threat.
14 N-K2 $\quad$ Q-QB4

Offering a pawn.
15
P-QR4
Declining the offer. After 15 . . PxP; 16 PxP, $\mathrm{BxP} ; 17 \mathrm{BxB}, \mathrm{QxB} ; 18 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4$, White would have been able to post his knight at Q5, with devastating effect.

16 N-B4
Exerting pressure on the king pawn.
16 . . P-R5
If 16 . . P-K4; $17 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, with telling effect.
17 R-QB1
R-QN1
18 P-B3
P-N6?

Allowing White to close the queen side. Spassky was afraid that if he played $18 \ldots$ Q-N3, White would continue B-B4, attacking Black's king pawn. To be considered was 18 . . . N-K4 (preventing B-B4) and if $19 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{QxNP} ; 20 \mathrm{QxQ}, \mathrm{RxQ} ; 21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 22$ R-R7, R-QN1, followed by . . . B-N3.

| 19 | P-QR3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 KR-B1 | N-K4 |
| 21 BxN | N-B5 |
| 22 QR-K! | QxB |
| 2 | K-Q1 |

The monarch is fleeing. With all the artillery piling up on the king file, it was prudent to place the king on a safer square.

23 K-R1

A waiting move. More logical was to undertake something with $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 4$.

| 23 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 4$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |  |
| 25 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

Black was threatening $25 \ldots$ P-K4, winning a knight.

| $25 \ldots$ | K-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 N-N4 | P-R4 |

Preventing White's queen from penetrating Black's territory via KR6.

$$
27 \text { P-N3 }
$$

Still waiting for Black to do something. Worthy of consideration would be 27 Q-K3-KN3-KN7.
$27 \ldots$
$28 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
$29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$

Unwise would have been $29 \mathrm{NxR}, \mathrm{QPxN} ; 30 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and the bishops would have become very strong.

R-R4
Black could not have allowed capture of the rook in view of the fact that the queens would have been exchanged, lessening Black's pressure.

| 30 PxP | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 | R-B2 |

A courageous advance. Black could have continued quietly 31 . . R-KNl, and White could not have

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

Diagram 36
Position after White's $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$
undertaken anything, but Spassky became impatient, not that the textmove was bad.

| 32 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B5}$ | BxN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | RxB | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

The freeing move, opening the queen file for action.
34 PxP
QxQP?

A misjudgment. Of course, not 34 ... RxP, because of $35 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{QxQ} ; 36 \mathrm{NxRch}$, etc. But correct was 34 . . . R-Q1; $35 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{QxQ} ; 36 \mathrm{RxQ}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; 37 NxP, RxP; 38 R-K1, K-K3; 39 R(5)-B1, R-Q7, with good chances for Black.
$35 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$
36 RxRP?

Q-Q2

Better would have been 36 Q-B4ch, K-N3: 37 RxRP, and if 37 . . . BxN; 38 QxBch, with winning chances.

The threat was $37 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$, winning the exchange. Black also had to contend with 37 Q-B4ch. Since the knight was well posted, Black used good judgment in disposing of the knight for a poorly posted bishop.

## 37 BPxB

It is usually wise to take toward the center, but, in this case, 37 RPxB would have enabled Black to advance his queen rook pawn later, with telling effect.

| 37 . . | R-Q4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 R-Blch | K-N2 |
| 39 Q-K4 | R-QB1 |
| 40 R-QN1 |  |

40 RxR would have lost to 40 ... KxR; 41 R-R8ch, K-B2, and Black's threat of 42 . . . R-Q8ch could not have been parried.

| 40 | K-N3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | R-R7 | R-Q5 |
| 42 | Q-N6 |  |

42 RxQ, RxQ; 43 R-Q6ch, R-B3; 44 RxRch, KxR, with even chances.
42 . . Q-B3

The sealed move. Bad would have been 42 . . . Q-K3 because of 43 Q-N7, with the serious hreats of $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{N} 7$ mate or $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$. Possible was 2 . . . Q-Q3, and if 43 Q-N7, R-B2, and if Black juld exchange queens and rooks, the endgame would approximately even.
43 R-KB7 $\quad$ R-Q3
44 Q-R6

## BLACK (Spassky)



WHITE (Fischer)

## Diagram 37

Position after White's 42 Q-N6
With the threat of 45 Q-K3ch, R-Q5; 46 Q-B2, winning the bishop pawn.

44

## Q-KB6

45 Q-R7
Black was intending to advance his king pawn.
45 ...
46 Q-R6
47

Q-B3

47 Q-R7
Q-KB6
Q-B3
Drawn
Although a pawn ahead, Fischer decided against taking chances by playing for a win. Chances for victory were not too bright. White's king was in the corner and subject to mating nets. White's rook was needed to protect the king; the rook was, therefore, out of play. A try for White could have been: $48 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$, in an attempt to advance this pawn. Black would have countered by advancing his king pawn. To assess the result would require lengthy analysis.

## Game 19

The 19th game was probably the most exciting and interesting of the match so far. Spassky, White, stuck to his king pawn opening. Fischer, for the second time in the match, selected the Alekhine Defense. Fischer, however, varied from the 13th game by continuing 4 . . . B-N5, instead of 4 . . P-KN3.

Spassky failed to obtain an opening advantage. On his 18th turn, Spassky sacrificed a knight. Fischer appeared prepared for this unexpected stroke. He replied almost immediately, declining the gift.

Spassky then continued his sparkling effort by offering a rook, which, if taken, would have given Spassky a fierce attack. Fischer refused to fall into the trap. Instead, he defended coolly and staved off defeat by forcing the exchange of queens, which disposed of all attacking threats.

The resultant endgame consisted of Spassky having two rooks and four pawns against Fischer's rook, knight, bishop and three pawns. A draw was agreed upon after 40 moves.

## ALEKHINE DEFENSE

| Spassky |
| :---: |
| White |
| 1 |
| 2 |
| 2 |
| 2 |
| 3 |

Fischer
Black
N-KB3
N-Q4
P-Q3

| $4 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | B-N5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5 B-K2 | P-K3 |
| 6 0-0 | B-K2 |
| 7 P-KR3 | B-R4 |
| 8 P-B4 | N-N3 |
| $9 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | 0-0 |

Black could have won a pawn with 9 . . . PxP; 10 NxP, BxB; 11 QxB, QxP, but after 12 R-Q1, Q-R5; 13 $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 5, \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$, Black would be in trouble because both Black's KBP and QNP would have been under attack.

$$
10 \text { B-K3 }
$$

Worthy of consideration would be $10 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{PxP}$ (10 . . . BxP or 10 . . QxP; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, winning a piece); $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$.
10 . . P-Q4

It is interesting to note that Black moved his queen bishop twice and his queen pawn twice with impunity. It is usually imprudent to move a piece more than once in the opening.

$$
11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5
$$

Unwise would have been $11 \mathrm{PxP}, \mathrm{NxP}$, leaving White's queen pawn isolated without compensation for White; neither would 11 P-QN3 have been good because of 11 . . PxP; 12 PxP, N-B3, with the queen and queen bishop pawns insecure.
$12 \mathrm{BxB} \quad \mathrm{BxN}$ !

A possibility would have been $12 \mathrm{PxB}, \mathrm{KN}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ (12 . . N-B5; 13 BxN , PxB; $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$, winning a
pawn); 13 P-B4, P-B4; 14 PxPe.p., NxKBP; 15 B-Q3, attempting to undouble the bishop pawns with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
12
N-B5

## 13 P-QN3

A questionable move, giving up the two bishops. Preferable was $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$, followed by $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$, driving away the knight.
13 PxN NxB

Spassky enjoyed a temporary bind in the center, but, with bishops of opposite colors, prospects for a win were reduced considerably.

An immediate step toward weakening White's hold on the center.

$$
15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4
$$

Unappetizing would have been $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4 ; 16$ P-R3, RPxP; 17 RPxP, RxR; 18 QxR, B-N4; $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{B} 3$, with good play for Black.

15
P-QB3
Fischer wisely kept the position closed. In favor of White would have been 15 .. NPxP; 16 KPxP , BPxP; 17 P-Q6, winning material.
16 P-QN4 NPxP
$17 \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{Q} 4) \mathrm{xP}$ would have weakened White's pawn at K5.
17.. Q-R4

18 NxP !

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Diagram 38
Position after Black's 17 . . . Q-R4
An unexpected sacrifice. It was a sound stroke and took all of Fischer's resourcefulness to meet it successfully.
18 . . . B-N4!

One good move deserves another! Fatal for Black would have been $18 \ldots \mathrm{BPxN}$; 19 PxP , PxP (19 . . . N-Q2; 10 P-Q6, etc.); 20 BxP, N-Q2; 21 BxR, RxB; 22 RxP! KxR;23 Q-B3ch, and wins.

$$
19 \text { B-R5! }
$$

Another most unexpected surprise. But as brilliant as the textmove appeared, a better try would have been 19 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 3$, with the idea of continuing $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$, driving away the bishop from its favorable square and permitting White's knight to get to either K7 or KB4.

20 BxPch

BPxN
RxB

Best. If 20 . . . K-R1; 21 PxP, PxP; 22 BxP , and wins.

$$
21 \mathrm{RxR}
$$

Q-Q7
Forcing the exchange of queens and stopping the assault, assuring himself a draw. But why not 21...Q-Q1! White would then have had to demonstrate what he had for the two pieces sacrificed.

$$
22 \mathrm{QxQ}
$$

If White had persisted in the attack by playing 22 Q-B3, he would have lost: 22 . . QxPch; 23 K-R2, QxKPch; 24 P-N3, Q-N7ch, and wins.

| 22 . | BxQ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 QR-KB1 | N-B3 |

Finally, Black's remaining pieces came into play.

BLACK (Fischer)


WHITE (Spassky)
Diagram 39
Position after Black’s 24 . . . PxP

## 24 PxP?

Here, Spassky missed a worthwhile try: 24 R-B7, NxQP; 25 R(1)-B7, B-R3; 26 PxP, PxP; 27 RxRP, R-N1; 28 R(R7)-N7, R-R1; 29 P-N4! threatening $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{N} 5$, winning the bishop.

| $24 \ldots$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 R-Q7 | B-K6ch |
| 26 K-R1 | BxP |
| 27 P-K6 | B-K4 |
| 28 RxQP | R-K1 |

The king pawn was lost, after which there was no hope of victory for White.

| 29 R-K1 | RxP |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 R-Q6 | K-B2 |

The saving move for Black.

| 31 | RxN | RxR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | RxB | K-B3 |
| 33 | R-Q5 | K-K3 |
| 34 | R-R5 | P-KR3 |
| 35 | K-R2 | R-R3 |

Black had to win back the pawn, and the remaining moves were meaningless.

36 P-B6 RxBP
Of course, not 36 . . . RxRP; 37 R-QB5, and wins.

37 R-R5
P-R3
38 K-N3
39 K-B3
40 K-K2
Drawn

K-B3
R-B6ch
R-B7ch

## Game 20

Fischer, White, stuck to the king pawn opening. Spassky relied on the Sicilian Defense. The same variation as in the 18th game developed. On his 10th move, Fischer varied and played $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$, instead of N-B3.

Fischer having castled on the queen side, Spassky decided to castle on the opposite wing. A tense fight was anticipated at that point, but Fischer's 12th move compelled his opponent to exchange pieces, including the queens. An endgame was reached, which appeared to be a simple draw.

Spassky, however, decided not to exchange the last rook. Fischer, obviously content with a draw, started playing the endgame too passively, giving his adversary an opportunity to seize the initiative.

At adjournment, Spassky had a slight positional advantage. He tried to tempt Fischer to play for a win, but he declined the invitation and just kept his pieces at home base, defending. Spassky was unable to break through Fischer's defensive set-up, and a draw was agreed upon after 54 moves.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

Fischer
$\quad$ White
1 P-K4
2 N-KB3
3 P-Q4

118

| 4 | NxP | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KN} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| 8 | $0-0-0$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |

In the 18th game, Fischer continued here 10 N-B3. The textmove was intended to play this bishop to KB3.

10
$0-0$
More usual is 10 . . . Q-B2.
11 B-B3
Now that the king pawn is protected, White is threatening an eventual $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$.

11
P-R3
12 B-R4
12 BxN was another possibility. White now had two plans: (1) to put pressure on Black's queen pawn, (2) to initiate an assault on the king wing with an eventual P-KN4. Black was, therefore, practically compelled to simplify with the next move.

| 12 | NxP |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | BxB | NxQ |
| 14 | BxQ | NxB |

If $14 \ldots \mathrm{NxN} ; 15 \mathrm{BxP}$ with advantage.

| $15 \mathrm{NxN}(\mathrm{B} 3)$ | KRxB |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 RxP | K-B1 |
| 17 KR-Q1 | K-K2 |
| 18 N-QR4 |  |

## BLACK (Spassky)



## WHITE (Fischer)

## Diagram 40

Position after White's 14 BxQ

Threatening to penetrate via QN6 or QB5.

| $18 \ldots$ | B-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 RxR | RxR |
| 20 N-B5 | R-N1! |

Refusing to go into a dead drawn position. He could have played 20 ... RxRch; 21 KxR , N-Q1 with approximate equality.

$$
21 \text { R-Q3 }
$$

A good alternative was $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, intending $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and if 21 . . K-Q3; $22 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{ch}$.

21
22 R-N3

P-QR4
P-QN4

After 22 . . . P-QN3, White would have been in a position to force a draw with $23 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{R} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 2$; 24 N-B5, etc.
23 P-QR3 24 R-QB3 P-R5

Superior was 24 R-K3, threatening P-B5.

| 24 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q1}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 26 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |

More logical was the idea to dispose of Black's knight with $26 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 4$.

| 26. | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{N} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 R-B3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KN} 4$ |

Spassky was attempting to utilize his majority of pawns on the king wing.
28 P-KN3 $\quad$ K-Q3
29 N-B5

Worthy of consideration was $29 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{B} 2$, threatening $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ch or $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N} 4$.

| 29 ... | P-KN5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 N-K4ch | K-K2 |
| 31 N-K1 | R-Q1 |
| 32 N-Q3 | R-Q5 |
| 33 N(4)-B2 | P-R4 |

Black has improved his position since move 20. Fischer was playing too passively during that time.
34 R-B5
35 R-B3
R-Q4
N-Q5

Black had no other promising plan.
36 R-B7ch
R-Q2
Possible was 36 . . . B-Q2, with complications, but the players had little time left.

| 37 | RxRch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 | N-K1 |

To prevent the incursion of Black's knight via KB6.

| $38 \ldots$ | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 PxP | PxP |
| $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | B-B4 |
| $41 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |  |

BLACK (Spassky)


## WHITE (Fischer)

Diagram 41
Position after White's $41 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 1$
The adjourned position. Black stood better. Fischer was on the defensive. White had to guard his king rook pawn with one of his knights. Analysis showed that White could defend adequately. Black's only hope for victory was to establish a passed king bishop pawn and penetrate into White's fourth rank, but even this, if achieved, would have been insufficient if White defended accurately.
$41 \underset{\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3}{ } \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
$42-\mathrm{K} 3$
43 K-Q3
B-B2
$44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$

44 K-K4, B-N3ch, and wins.
44
K-B3
$45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
White was just marking time, waiting for his opponent to undertake something.

| 45 K- | K-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 46 K-K4 | K-Q3 |
| 47 | K-Q3 |

Black was enticing his opponent to play for a win with 47 N-B5ch. After 47 . . $N x N$; $48 \mathrm{KxN}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, Black would have stood better because of the penetration of his king and the possibility of advancing his king pawn.

| $47 \underset{\text { K-B3 }}{ }$ | B-N3ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $48 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

Unproductive would have been $49 \ldots \mathrm{BxN}$; 50 KxB .

| $50 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $52 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| $53 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |

## Drawn

## Game 21

Spassky, White, opened with the king pawn. Fischer, although having had success with the Alekhine Defense twice, surprised his opponent again by returning to the Sicilian Defense. But this time he played 2 . . . P-K3, which he had never played before in any serious competition.

On his 7th turn, Fischer introduced a new move. The opening turned into a form of the Scotch Opening. Fischer was saddled with an isolated pawn but obtained free play for his pieces.

On his 14th move, Spassky gave up one of his bishops for a knight and exchanged queens, thereby weakening Fischer's pawn structure on the king side. In return, Fischer was left with the two bishops.

In the middlegame, Spassky sacrificed the exchange, giving up a rook for a bishop and a pawn, acquiring two passed pawns on the queen wing. Fischer's rook was placed behind these two pawns, stopping their advance. The endgame was even. But Spassky pressed too hard for a win and weakened his pawn position on the king side. Fischer, thereby, was left with a dangerous free king rook pawn. Spassky resigned after 40 moves.

## SICILIAN DEFENSE

| Spassky | Fischer |
| :--- | :--- |
| White | Black |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 |
| 2 N-KB3 | P-K3 |


| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | PxP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | NxP | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4!?$ |

Usual are $7 \ldots \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, or $7 \ldots \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$, or 7 ... P-Q3; the textmove is dubious, but, as a surprise, playable.
8 PxP
PxP

Black now had an isolated QP, but his queen bishop was freed for action.

| $90^{0-0}$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10 NxN ? |  |

This supported Black's queen pawn. Wiser was 10 P-KR3, 0-0; 11 R-K1, R-K1; 12 Q-Q2.

| 10 . | PxN |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 B-Q4 | $0-0$ |  |
| 12 | Q-B3 | B-K3 |

A blunder would have been 12 . . $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{N} 5$ because of $13 \mathrm{BxN}, \mathrm{BxQ}$; $14 \mathrm{BxQ}, \mathrm{RxB}$; 15 PxB . Interesting was $12 \ldots \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} 5$; $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$, with complications.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
13 \text { KR-K1 } & \text { P-B4 } \\
14 \mathrm{BxN} &
\end{array}
$$

Preferable was 14 B-K5, BxB; 15 RxB, with a slight positional edge.

14
QxB
Not 14 . . . PxB; 15 Q-R5.

15 QxQ
PxQ
16 QR-Q1
White was attempting to exert pressure on the queen pawn. The immediate threat was 17 B-B4. Consequently, Black's reply.

16
KR-Q1
Protecting the king bishop.

| 17 | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 | P-QN3 |$\quad$ QR-N1

## BLACK (Fischer)



## WHITE (Spassky)

Dlagram 42
Position after White's $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 3$
Threatening ... B-QN5. Safer was 18 . P-Q5.

19 NxP!
A fine conception, but insufficient for a win.

| 19 BxN | BxN |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 RxB | BxPch |
| 21 KxB | RxR |

22 BxP
R-Q7
23 BxRP
RxQBP

Not 23 . . . RxKBP; 24 B-Q3, with White having three passed pawns and an easily won position.

24 R-K2
This must have been the move Spassky banked on.

24
25 BxR
RxR
R-Q1!

Necessary, in order to get the rook behind White's queen side pawns, stopping their advance.

| 26 | P-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 | B-B4 |

Not 27 ... RxP because of 28 P-R5, R-R7; 29 P-R6, followed by $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QN} 4$, and Black's king would not have been in time to stop these pawns. After the textmove, White found that he was not in a position to make any progress. A very curious position!
28 K-N3
29 K-B3

White was embarking on a dangerous course in attempting to win. The correct course was to be satisfied with a draw. He should have held the position by playing 30 P-B4, followed by moving his king back and forth to KB3 and KN3, and Black could not have made any headway.

29

## K-K2

30 P-KN4?
This gave his opponent an opportunity to establish a dangerous passed king rook pawn.

| 30 | P. | P-B4! |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 | PxP | P-B3 |
| 32 | B-N8 | P-R3 |
| 33 | K-N3 | K-Q3 |
| 34 | K-B3 |  |

A better defense was $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ or $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| 34 | R-R8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35 | K-N2 |
| 36 | B-K6 |
| 37 | B-Q7 |

After 39 ...KxP; 40 P-R5, R-R7; 41 P-R6, White would have had excellent chances of drawing.
40 B-K6
P-R4

41 B-Q7 and Resigns

Spassky could have put up resistance after adjournment. Fischer's threat would have been to place his king at his KN5 and advance his king rook pawn. Spassky's only defense would have been to post his bishop on the diagonal KR1-QR8. When Black had his king at KN5 and his pawn at KR4, Spassky could have had his bishop at Q5 or QB6, so that when Black played . . . P-R5, White could have continued B-B3ch, driving the king away and not allowing . . . P-R6ch. After Black captured the KBP, his winning chances would still have been difficult.
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