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Introduction

The championship chess match, to which the whole chess world has been looking for with the keenest possible interest, the contest for world's chess supremacy, is a thing of the past, and today Jose Raul Capablanca is the new champion, having wrestled the coveted title from Dr. Emanuel Lasker, who occupied the chess throne for over twenty-seven years. It is not necessary to dwell here on the details of the contest, which are given in full below. Suffice it to say that the young champion may be proud of his achievement, because he went through the fight without losing a single game, while placing four wins to his credit from a Lasker, who never before in any of his matches or tournaments had four points on the debt side of his score. The fact alone speaks volumes to the credit of the new champion. While a great many of Capablanca's friends were sure that he would be victorious, an equal number of chess devotees, if not a majority, were equally certain that Lasker would add another victory to his score. The people thought that his long experience and his remarkable record to date would be too much for the young adversary who, although having splendid victories to his credit, was not looked upon as a dead certainty, and only a few of his most ardent admirers were sure that the verdict would be in his favor.

When Dr. Lasker challenged the late W. Steinitz, the most remarkable thing happened, namely, that he could not find sufficient backing among his friends in New York and, but for the financial support he received from three New York newspapers, it was rather doubtful whether the match would have come off at the date set in the articles. Among the members of the Manhattan Chess Club, for instance, the sentiment was almost exclusively in favor of Steinitz, who succeeded in getting the amount of his backings at once, and scarcely anybody could be found to stake his faith upon the then rather youthful Lasker, for the simple reason that his record could not be compared very favorably with that of his rival; but the knowing ones were altogether wrong, and Lasker became the new champion. The land lay somewhat different in the case of the Lasker-Capablanca contest. While the latter's record was not as good as that of Lasker, Capablanca was looked upon as one of the greatest chess geniuses ever, and hence it is easily explained that in this case more confidence was placed in him than Lasker received in his match with Steinitz.

Chess players of former generations will well remember the almost unsurmountable difficulties in order to have the match between the late W. Steinitz and J.H. Zukertort arranged, while Dr. Lasker repeatedly told the story about the difficulties he experienced in getting to terms with Steinitz, but the difficulties in arranging these matches were nothing in comparison with those in the match which was just concluded. In November of 1919 Capablanca received a letter from the Dutch Chess Federation, when at London, asking him whether he would be willing to play a match with Dr. Lasker and under what conditions. He replied by return mail that he would be but too pleased to play such a match, but he could then not name any conditions.
without knowing Dr. Lasker's ideas about such a contest. He suggested, therefore, that a meeting should be arranged at The Hague between Dr. Lasker and himself in order to save time. Unfortunately, Dr. Lasker took several weeks before answering a letter from the Dutch Chess Federation. He, however, when the answer came, agreed upon such a meeting on principle and fixed a date for it. The meeting duly took place and, after a great deal of arguing and discussion, articles were finally signed. When the players met at Havana they agreed upon a code of rules and regulations to govern the match. These will be found on another page of this book.

No sooner did it become known that the articles had been signed than Capablanca got several offers for financing the match. One came from Spain, another from the United States and, finally, one from Havana, which city offered the biggest amount ever offered for a similar contest. When about to inform Dr. Lasker thereof, word came from the latter that he had resigned the championship title, transferring it to Capablanca, and he gave as reason for such a step that the chess world at large did not take a sufficient interest in the matter.

As soon as Capablanca could conveniently arrange it, he left Havana, went straight to Europe, saw Dr. Lasker again and finally succeeded in persuading him to accept the offer of Havana, and they agreed to begin the match at Havana on January 1, 1921. New articles were signed, after a somewhat stormy meeting at The Hague, in which city at one time Capablanca practically had given up all hopes for a match before the articles were signed. Everything seemed to be settled now, when Dr. Lasker made new demands, which were, however, not provided for in the articles. Now things were again up in the air. However, Capablanca succeeded in obtaining permission from Havana to meet Dr. Lasker's new demands. Then Dr. Lasker set the date for the beginning for the match for March 10. Why he fixed the date in the advanced season, when a cable was sent to him on December 25th, assuring him that his new demands would be met, he alone can tell. People were amazed, and still more so when they were told that his friends in Europe warned him against playing the match in March and April, when he could easily have begun play in February. Still he was assured in Havana that the weather conditions would be all the could be desired until the end of April.

When everything, therefore, seemed to be on easy street, another trouble set in. The American commissioner at Berlin refused to vise Dr. Lasker's passport to travel via New York, or any other American port, to Cuba and, when the correspondent of the Associated Press cabled the news to New York, he added that, unless he could travel via New York he would not go to Havana at all.

Now Mr. Herbert R. Limburg, the president of the Manhattan Chess Club, wired and wrote to the Secretary of State at Washington, asking him to rescind his decision and inform the American commissioner at Berlin to vise his passport accordingly. But when the Secretary of State did rescind his first order and cabled to Berlin to vise the
passport, Dr. Lasker had already made arrangements to go via Amsterdam direct to Havana, and so at last all difficulties were overcome.

Right here it must be stated that never in the history of chess did one of the principals in a great chess match have to go through so much trouble, loss of time and expense as did Capablanca in arranging that the whole chess world was interested and most anxious to see the fight between the two giants, they ought to be might grateful to the Cuban master to have successfully brought about the most important battle of modern times.

According to my experience, true enough, there were rather some very warm days during the progress of the match, but the evenings were always ideal. I never felt the influence of the days, because I took great care not to expose myself to the sun during the noon or early afternoon hours, practically keeping a siesta until the late hours in the afternoon. I found the food good in every respect and, of course, I avoided eating much meat and practically abstained from taking alcoholic beverages. I never had any complaints to make and kept in perfect health and temper during the whole of my nine weeks' stay at Havana.

As regards the venue of action, I found it the most ideal for a chess match. The players were situated in an absolutely private room, nobody but the referee and seconds being admitted. The room, with a ceiling over twenty feet high, had an exit to the gardens where the players could walk about when not engaged at the board and waiting for the adversary's move. Refreshments of whatever sort were instantly furnished by a waiter, who was assigned to the players, referee, seconds and reporters exclusively. In short, there never was a chess match played under more ideal surroundings, free from tobacco smoke and noises; the Doctor was so much pleased as to specially refer to the noiseless way in which the director of play, referee and umpires walked about, never a whisper disturbing either player in their studies on the board.

A highly interesting feature must not be overlooked here, namely, the exceedingly friendly intercourse between the principals. During my long experience in witnessing important matches and tournaments, I have never before seen a more courteous intercourse between the players than on this occasion. There never was the slightest dispute over the rules or anything else and, whenever any doubtful matter arose, the players at once agreed one way or the other, never appealing to either the referee or seconds. Even when Dr. Lasker decided to take his last day off, on Friday, March 22, and arrived at the Casino on the Saturday following and in an interview with the referee, Judge Alberto Ponce, stated that he was sick and could not possibly play that night, Capablanca said: "Very well;" and so Dr. Lasker, with the permission of the referee and Capablanca, got leave of absence to the Tuesday evening following. Surely, more courtesy could not possibly have been expected.

The final scenes of the match can be briefly described as follows:

Instead of presenting himself for play on Tuesday, March 26, a letter from the
Doctor was received by Mr. Ponce, in which he desired to resign the championship to Capablanca, have the match declared concluded, etc. In reply he was advised that the reasons given by him to abstain from further play in the match were not acceptable and that the referee would order play in the match to proceed, but if he would consent to send another letter, the committee in charge, the referee and Capablanca would be pleased to take matters again into consideration. Finally, Dr. Lasker wrote the following letter:

"Senior Alberto Ponce, Havana Chess Club:

"Dear Sir - In your capacity as referee of the match I beg to address this letter to you, proposing thereby to resign the match. Please advise me if this determination is acceptable to my adversary, the committee and yourself.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Emanuel Lasker
Havana, April 27th, 1921."

To this letter Mr. Ponce made the following reply:

"Esteemed Dr. Lasker:

Repying to your letter, proposing to resign the match you were engaged in with Mr. Capablanca, I am please to inform you that, after informing Mr. Capablanca and the committee of your intention, and inasmuch as neither the committee nor Mr. Capablanca had any objections thereto, I have no hesitation in also accepting your proposition. I remain, sincerely yours,

(Signed) Alberto Ponce."

On Wednesday evening, April 27, in the small reception room of the Union Club, the principals, referee and seconds met and, after a brief discussion, declared the match officially at an end. It was then that Capablanca was declared to be the winner and the new world's champion. Just as the match was started at the Union Club on March 15 without any ceremonies whatever, the contest was also concluded at the Union Club without indulging in any formalities.

It really would be a grave omission if the generosity of the committee in charge were not acknowledged here. If this match had been played anywhere except in Havana, it is very doubtful if Dr. Lasker would have received the full amount of the sum guaranteed to him in the articles. It was no fault of the committee that they were deprived of witnessing the full number of games, namely, twenty-four, and they might rightly have refused to pay Dr. Lasker the full amount. There was a rumor afloat that the committee would insist upon a reduction of the fee, but I am happy to say that it was altogether groundless, the committee never intending to thus darken their well-known generosity.

In conclusion, there is scarcely any apology needed for the decision of Mr. Capablanca to publish this little volume, containing all the games of the match, with analytical notes by the victor.

Hartwig Cassel
Havana, May 1921
Jose Raul Capablanca
(Reprinted from the book of the international tournament,
played at the Manhattan Chess Club in 1918)

As has been aptly said before, the name of Jose R. Capablanca is surely one to conjure with. The winner of the Manhattan Chess Club's tournament, now in his thirty-first year, is in the heyday of his fame and in line for succession to the proud title of world's champion, which, on the score perhaps that youth must be served and but for the outbreak of the war, might even now be in his possession. Dr. Emanuel Lasker himself, with whom the talented Cuban made his peace at the close of the memorable St. Petersburg tournament early in 1914, wrote interestingly concerning his youthful rival's exploits at San Sebastian for the New York Evening Post as follows:

"This is a great moment in his life. His name has become known everywhere; his fame as a chess master has become firmly established. The Berliner Tageblatt published his biography; the Lokal-Anzeiger his picture; countless newspapers, chess columns and chess periodicals will speak of him, the man and the master. And he is twenty-three years of age. Happy Capablanca! His style of play has pleased. It is sound and full of ideas. It has a dash of originality. No doubt that the chess world would not like to miss him, now that it has got to know him. In the beginning of his career, eight years ago, there were those who were fearful of his becoming what he is. They wanted him to have a profession, and be a chess master besides. Happily, nature was stronger than their influence. The world would have gained little had he become an engineer; the chess world would certainly have been poorer thereby."

Capablanca was born in Havana, November 19, 1888. In chess, as is well known, he was a most precocious youngster, learning the moves as the tender age of four and, like Morphy, making the most astonishing progress. When twelve, he was champion of Cuba, after defeating Juan Corzo by 4 - 2, with 6 draws. In 1914 he came to the United States to complete his education, attending first a preparatory school and later, Columbia University, which he represented in 1907, when that university won the intercollegiate championship from Harvard, Yale and Princeton with the record of 11½ out of a possible 12 points. The same year, he figured in the American college cable team in the annual match against Oxford and Cambridge for the I. L. Rice international trophy, drawing with Rose of Oxford at Board No. 1.
During the season of 1908-9, Capablanca determined to launch upon his professional chess career, and the *American Chess Bulletin* arranged for him his first tour. He established a new record by playing 734 games, of which he won 703, drew 19 and lost only 12. In the spring of 1909 he created a veritable sensation and opened the eyes of the world to the real possibilities of his remarkable genius for the game by defeating Frank J. Marshall, United States champion and America's most representative international player, in a set match by the surprisingly one-sided score of 8 - 1, with 14 draws. Such a feat was assuredly unparalleled and gave him the right to be known as the Pan-American chess champion.

Next, in the season ensuing, came his second American tour, which yielded his further laurels as an exhibition player of consummate skill. In 1910 Capablanca won the New York State championship, with Marshall competing, and, early in 1911, he took part in his first masters' tournament, only to be placed second, with a score of 9½ - 2½, to Marshall, who made 10 - 2.

However, it proved to have been an experience in every way well worth while, for, making his European debut at San Sebastian in Spain immediately after, Capablanca, like Pillsbury at Hastings, came through with flying colors and carried off the chief prize before the astonished gaze of some of the greatest players of the day. His score here was 9½ - 4½, just enough to beat Rubinstein and Vidmar, with 9 - 5 each, and Marshall, with 8½ - 5½. The Cuban won six games, drew seven and lost but one, to Rubinstein.

Straightway the name of Capablanca was in everyone's mouth as that of the logical candidate for world's championship honors. As a matter of fact, negotiations with Dr. Emanuel Lasker were entered upon during 1912, but proved unsuccessful, actually causing a breach between the two great players.

Naturally, the victory at San Sebastian was followed by a tour of the chief chess centers of Europe, and on this trip he played 305 games, of which he won 254, drew 32 and lost 19. After that he obeyed a summons to South America, going direct to Buenos Aires from Europe and repeating his successes in that distant part of the world.

The second American National Tournament, held in New York early in 1913, yielded Capablanca still another triumph. In this contest he made a score of 11 - 2, his chief rival, Marshall, following with 10½ - 2½. The tables were turned, however, in the masters' tournament arranged for the following month in his native city, where Marshall disappointed the young master's enthusiastic compatriots by winning with a score of 10½ - 3½, as against Capablanca's 10 - 4.

Later, the same year (1913), Capablanca, with Marshall absent, made a "clean sweep" in the Rice Chess Club's masters' tournament, scoring 13-0, identical with the record of Dr. Lasker in the New York Impromptu Tournament of 1893. Oldrich Duras was second, with 10½ - 2½, and R. T. Black third, with 10 - 3.
This brings us to the never-to-be-forgotten tournament at St. Petersburg in 1914, nearly four months before the outbreak of the war, to which the hapless Czar himself contributed 1,000 roubles. Here Capablanca and Dr. Lasker were brought face to face for the first time. Capablanca, unbeaten throughout the preliminary and well on into the final stage, looked like a winner, after drawing his first two games against the champion, who had lost to Rubinstein. Then something happened: Capablanca lost his third game to his only rival, succumbed to Dr. Tarrasch the very next day, while Dr. Lasker, playing as had rarely done before, went through to a successful finish and gained first place with 13½ - 4½. Capablanca's score was 13 - 5. So near and yet so far, but the voice of the chess world for a Lasker - Capablanca match was by no means stilled.

Then, as war was declared, Capablanca left Europe for a second trip to South America. New York provided still another masters' tournament in April, 1915, really taking the place of a contemplated New York - Havana congress, which was doomed to failure. Once more Capablanca was placed first with 13 - 1, followed by Marshall with 12 - 2, neither losing a game and easily outranking all of the other six competitors.

His most successful simultaneous exhibition was given on February 12, 1915, against 84 opponents at 65 boards in the auditorium of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, which was crowded to the very doors. In six and three-quarter hours of continuous play he made a score of 48 wins, 12 draws and 5 losses.

In the Rice Memorial Tournament, January, 1916, held in honor of Professor Isaac L. Rice, who had died in November, 1915, Capablanca again had it all his own way, being placed first with 14 - 3. Janowski, 11 - 6, was the second prize winner.

It is worthy of note that the young master has invariably been either first or second and for the most part first. When second, he was in every case only half a point behind the winner.

Practically all of 1917 was spent by Capablanca in Cuba, during which time he abstained from important chess, appearing only twice in public. This included the Manhattan Chess Club's masters' tournament during October and November, in which his score was 10½ - ½, and Kostic second, with 9½ - 1½. A brilliant successful tour of the United Kingdom followed and that brings the record up to the climax of his career, which is the reason for this book.
Dr. Emanuel Lasker was born at Berlinchen, province of Brandenburg, Prussia, Germany, on December 12, 1868. After graduating from the Real-Gymnasium at Landsberg, on the Warthe, he studied mathematics at the universities of Berlin and Goettingen, in which latter school of learning he did not, however, finish his studies. These he completed at Heidelberg in 1897, where he received the degree of doctor of mathematics.

Chess he began to study when quite a boy, twelve years old, but in later years he took up real studies with his older brother, Dr. Berthold Lasker. In due course and after he had given much time and study to the game, he became a professional player in 1890. One year later he gave exhibitions of his skill at a German exposition in London. He spent seven years in England, making a great name for himself by his exhibitions in various London and provincial clubs.

Following is his most remarkable record at chess:

Tournaments

After a time with Emil Feyerfeil, he won the Hauptturnier at Breslau in 1889 and thus received the degree of German master. A few months later in the same year he entered the Amsterdam international tourney, being awarded the second prize. In 1890 he divided first and second prizes in a national masters’ tourney at Berlin and in the same year he obtained third prize in an international minor contest at Graz, Styria.

In 1892 he secured two first prizes in London - first in a national tournament and next in a quintangular contest.

In the impromptu international tournament in New York, played in 1893, he made the remarkable record of winning every one of the thirteen games he played, but at Hastings in 1895 he only was placed third in an international tournament.

In 1896 he secured first prize in the quadrangular tournament at St. Petersburg, his competitors being Steinitz, Chigorin and Pillsbury, and in the same year he captured the first prize in the Nuremberg international tournament and repeated this achievement four years later in the London international contest. After absenting himself from the arena for
nine years, he entered the St. Petersburg tourney, but this time he had to be content to
divide first and second prizes with Rubinstein. The same year, at Paris, he again carried
away chief honors, as he did in the last St. Petersburg tournament in 1914.

During the war he won first prize in a tourney with Schlechter, Rubinstein and Dr.
Tarrasch also in the ring. This contest took place at Berlin.

**Matches**

He beat Bardeleben in 1889 with 2 to 1 and 1 drawn; in 1890 he beat Bird with 7 to 2 and
3 draws, Miniati with 3 to 0 and 2 draws, Mieses with 5 to 0 and 3 draws, Englisch with 2
to 0 and 3 draws, while Lee was beaten by him in the following year by 1 to 0 and 1 draw.
In 1892 he beat Blackburne by 6 to 0 and 4 draws and Bird by 5 to 0.

At Havana he beat Vazquez by 3 to 0 and Golmayo by 2 to 0 and 1 draw. These matches
were played in 1893, and returning from Havana, he beat Showalter the same year by 6 to
2 and 1 and Ettlinger by 5 to 0.

In 1894 he beat Steinitz in the match for the championship of the world by 10 to 5 and 4
draws and three years later a second time by 10 to 2 and 5 draws.

In 1907 Marshall ventured into the lion's path, but was swept aside to the tune of 8 - 0 and
7 draws. Next, a year later, came Dr. Tarrasch, who made a better showing (8 - 3 and 5
draws).

Janowski twice encountered the champion during 1909, the first time in a series of four
games, in which both won two, but the subsequent match was won by Dr. Lasker by 7 - 1
and 2 draws.

In 1910 came the memorable match with Schlechter. It was restricted to ten games, draws
counting. The final score was: Dr. Lasker, 1; Schlechter, 1; drawn, 8. Schlechter won the
fifth game and Dr. Lasker the tenth.

The same year Janowski re-entered the arena and lost by 8 - 0 and 3 draws.

During the war Dr. Lasker defeated Dr. Tarrasch once more and this time by 5 - 0 and 1
draw.
The Rules and Regulations

A few days after the arrival of Dr. Emanuel Lasker at Havana, the players agreed upon Judge Alberto Ponce as referee and, after a conference with him, the following rules and regulations were agreed upon:

1. The match to be one of eight games up, drawn games not to count, but if, after 24 games, neither player has scored eight games, then the player having the greater number of points to be declared the winner.

2. One session of play of four hours' duration. (The original agreement called for a second session of two hours after an interval of at least three hours). Originally it was agreed to have six play days each week, but at Havana this rule was changed to five play days each week.

3. Time limit: fifteen moves an hour.

4. Referee: Judge Alberto Ponce.

5. The $20,000 purse to be divided as follows: Dr. Lasker to receive $11,000, Capablanca $9,000, win or lose or draw.

After five games have been played, the "Commission for the Encouragement of Touring throughout Cuba" gave an extra prize of $5,000, of which $3,000 should go to the winner of the match and $2,000 to the loser.
## The Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Moves</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>JC 2:44; EL 2:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>EL 2:36; JC 2:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 20, 21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C66*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>JC 3:59; EL 4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>EL 2:04; JC 2:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29, 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>+JC</td>
<td>JC 2:55; EL 2:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, April 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>C66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>EL 2:30; JC 2:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>JC 1:22; EL 1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3, 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>EL 2:07; JC 1:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>JC 1:55; EL 1:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>D61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+JC</td>
<td>EL 4:20; JC 4:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+JC</td>
<td>JC 3:00; EL 3:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>C66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>EL 2:05; JC 1:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>JC 1:05; EL 1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>C66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+JC</td>
<td>EL 3:30; JC 3:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Score: Capablanca 4; Lasker, 0; drawn 10. Number of games, 14. Number of moves, 576. Time, Capablanca 35 hours 55 minutes; Lasker 36 hours 9 minutes; Total 72 hours 4 minutes.

Game numbers 4, 9, 12 and 13 were played in one session; game numbers 2, 5, 8, 11, 14 in two sessions; game numbers 3, 10 in three sessions.

Openings adopted: 10 Queen's Gambit Declined (D12-D64), 3 Ruy Lopez (C66) and 1 Four Knights Game (Editor's Note: * Game 5 began as a Four Knights Game and transposed to a Ruy Lopez).
GAME 1
Capablanca - Lasker [D63]
15.03.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.d4 d5 2.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)f3 e6 3.c4 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)f6 4.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)g5 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)e7
5.e3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)bd7 6.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)c3 0–0 7.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)c1 b6
8.cxd5 exd5 9.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)b5

A new move which has no merit outside of its novelty. I played it for the first time against Teichmann in Berlin in 1913. The normal move is 9.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)d3; but 9.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)a4 may be best, after all.

9...\(\text{\textcopyright} \)b7 10.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)a4 a6

10...c5 at once is the proper continuation.

11.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)xd7 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)xd7 12.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)xe7 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)xe7
13.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)b3

With the idea of preventing ...c7-c5, but still better would have been to castle with 13.0–0

13...\(\text{\textcopyright} \)d6

Black could have played 13...c5 In the many complications arising from this move, I think, Black would have come out all right.

14.0–0 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)fd8 15.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)fd1 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)ab8 16.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e1

The object was to draw the Knight away from the line of the Bishop, which would soon be open, as it actually occurred in the game.

16...\(\text{\textcopyright} \)f6 17.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)c2 c5 18.dxc5 bxc5
19.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e2 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)e4

All the attacks beginning either with 19...\(\text{\textcopyright} \)g4; or 19...d4 would have failed.

20.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)a3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)bc8 21.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)g3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)xg3 22.hxg3
23.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)d2

23.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)dc1 would not have been better, because of the rejoinder 23...d4 etc.

23...h6 24.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)f3 d4 25.exd4 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)xf3
26.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)xf3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)xd4 27.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e2 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)xd1+
28.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)xd1 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)d8 29.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e2 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)d6 30.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)h2
31.b3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)f5 32.g4 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)g5 33.g3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)d6!

Unquestionably the best move; with any other move Black would, perhaps, have found it impossible to draw.

34.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)g2 g6 35.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)c4 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)e6 36.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)xc5
37.f3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)g5 38.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)xg5 hxg5
39.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)f2 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)d6 40.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e3 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)e6+ 41.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)d4
42.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e3

42.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)c5 was too risky. The way to win was not at all clear and I even thought that with that move Black might win.

42...\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e6+ 43.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)f2 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)d6 44.g4 \(\text{\textcopyright} \)d1
45.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e2

45.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)e3 was the right move. It was perhaps the only chance White had to win, or at least come near it.

45...\(\text{\textcopyright} \)a1 46.\(\text{\textcopyright} \)d3
Had the King been at e3 he could go to d4, which would have gained a very important move.

46...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g7}} 47.b4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f1}}

Best. Black, however, would have accomplished nothing with this move, had the White King been at d4.

48.\texttt{e3}

The remainder of the game needs no comments.

48...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b1}} 49.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c6}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{xb4}} 50.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{xa6}} \textcolor{red}{\texttt{b2}}

\texttt{½–½}

2hr. 44 - 2hr. 35

\textbf{GAME 2}

Lasker - Capablanca [D37]

17.03.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.\texttt{c3} \texttt{f6} 4.\texttt{f3} \texttt{bd7} 5.e3

On general principles it is better to bring the Queen's Bishop out first.

5...\texttt{e7} 6.\texttt{d3} 0–0 7.0–0 dxc4 8.\texttt{xc4} c5 9.\texttt{e2} a6 10.\texttt{d1} b5 11.\texttt{d3} \texttt{b7} 12.e4

Played in order to develop the Queen's Bishop and thereby condemning his whole plan of development, since he could have done that before, as indicated in the previous note, and the only reason he could have had for playing e2-e3 on the fifth move would have been to develop this Bishop via b2.

12...\texttt{xd4} 13.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{e5} 14.\texttt{b3}

Combinations beginning with 14.\texttt{xb5} are wrong, viz., 14...axb5 15.\texttt{xe6} fxe6 16.\texttt{xd8} \texttt{axd8} 17.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xe4} and Black has a won game.

14...\texttt{xd3} 15.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{c7} 16.e5

White could not play 16.\texttt{g5} because of the rejoinder 16...\texttt{xe4}

16...\texttt{d5} 17.\texttt{g3} \texttt{xc3} 18.\texttt{xc3} \texttt{d7}

It was my impression that, after this move, Black had a very superior game.

19.\texttt{g3} \texttt{fd8} 20.\texttt{h6} g6 21.\texttt{e3} \texttt{d5}

This leads to the exchange of one of the two Bishops, but it would be very difficult to find a better move.

22.\texttt{a5} \texttt{ae8} 23.\texttt{xb7} \texttt{xb7} 24.\texttt{h6} \texttt{d5} 25.b3 \texttt{d4}

It was probably here where Black failed to make the best move. Instead 25...\texttt{b4} was the better move.

26.\texttt{f1} \texttt{d5} 27.\texttt{e3} \texttt{a3}

27...\texttt{f8} was better, as White could not very well afford to take the Bishop; he
would be compelled to play first 28.\( \text{Ke4} \) to be followed later on by \( \text{Kf4} \).

28.g3 \( \text{Kb2} \) 29.\( \text{Ke1} \) \( \text{Cc2} \)

29...\( \text{Kxe2} \) followed by ...\( \text{Kb4} \) was the proper course to follow.

30.\( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{Ke7} \)

This was my thirtieth move. I was very much pressed for time and I could not make the necessary analysis to find out whether 30...\( \text{Kf8} \) would have been a winning or a losing move. If 31.\( \text{Kxf8} \) \( \text{Kxf8} \) 32.\( \text{Kf6} \) \( \text{Kg8} \) 33.\( \text{h4} \) and Black would have a very difficult position to defend.

31.\( \text{Kxe2} \) \( \text{Kxe2} \)

31...\( \text{Kxa2} \) now would lose because of 32.\( \text{Kxc2} \) \( \text{Kxc2} \) 33.\( \text{Kc1} \) followed by \( \text{Kc8+} \), etc.

32.\( \text{Kxe2} \) \( \text{Kb1+} \) 33.\( \text{Kg2} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 34.\( \text{Ke4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 35.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 36.\( \text{Kxe4} \) \( \text{xe4+} \) 37.\( \text{Kxe4} \) \( \text{Kg7} \) 38.\( \text{Kc4} \) \( \text{Kc5} \) 39.\( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 40.\( \text{hxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 41.\( \text{Kxg5} \) \( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

2hr. 36 - 2hr. 37

GAME 3

Capablanca - Lasker [C66]

19.03.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 3.\( \text{Kc3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4.\( \text{b5} \) d6 5.d4 \( \text{d7} \) 6.0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 7.\( \text{Ke1} \) exd4 8.\( \text{Kxd4} \) 0-0 9.\( \text{Kxc6} \) bxc6 10.\( \text{Ke5} \) h6 11.\( \text{Kd4} \) \( \text{Kd7} \) 12.\( \text{Kd3} \) \( \text{Kf6} \) 13.\( \text{Kxe7} \)

An old move, generally played by all the masters. I believe, however, that 13.\( \text{Kg3} \) is the best continuation.

13...\( \text{Kxe7} \) 14.\( \text{Ke3} \) \( \text{b8} \) 15.b3

Unnecessary at this point, since Black cannot take the pawn.

15.\( \text{Kb6} \) 16.\( \text{Kae1} \) \( \text{Ke8} \) 17.\( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 18.\( \text{Kd2} \) \( \text{g5} \)

A very good move, which gives Black the better position.

19.\( \text{Kxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 20.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Ke5} \) 21.\( \text{Kd1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 22.\( \text{Kd3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 23.\( \text{Kf2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 24.\( \text{Kg3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 25.\( \text{g1} \)

25.f3 would have been answered by 25...\( \text{c5} \)

25...\( \text{f8} \) 26.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a5} \) 27.\( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{xa5} \) 28.\( \text{c3} \)

Played under the impression that Black would have to play 28...\( \text{d7} \). Since Black can play the text move, it would have been better for White to have played 28.c4

28.\( \text{b7} \)

If 28...\( \text{d7} \) there would follow 29.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 30.e5
29. f3 e6 30. cd3 a6 31. d4 f6 32. c1 e5 33. d2 b5 34. c3 c6 35. a4 a6 36. f2 b6 37. d1 f7

Of course, if 37...c4 38. f2

38. e3 b8 39. h1 e8 40. dd1 h8 41. g4

Of very doubtful value. It would have been better to play 41. g3 threatening h3-h4.

41...d7 42. d5 b7 43. g3 h4 44. d3 e6 45. c4 h8 46. c1 e8 47. e3 d7 48. g2 bb8 49. e1 c6 50. e3 be8 51. b1 h7

52. d2 b8 53. d3 bh8 54. h1 b6 55. h2 c6

Black goes back with the King because he sees that it would be impossible for him to go through with it on the Queenside, since as soon as the King goes to b4 White drives it back by checking with the Knight on c2.

56. h1 b8 57. h2 f8 58. h1 d7 59. h2 f7 60. f5 fh8 61. e3 e6 62. d5 c8 63. e3 ½–½

There is no way for Black to break through. 3hr. 59 - 4hr. 20

GAME 4
Lasker - Capablanca [D61]
23.03.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1. d4 d5 2. c4 e6 3. c3 f6 4. g5 e7 5. e3 0–0 6. f3 bd7 7. e2 c6

7...c5 is the proper move.

8. d3

8.0–0–0 would have been a much more energetic way of continuing, but probably White did not want to take the risk of exposing himself to a Queenside attack, having then his King on that side of the board.

8...dxc4 9. xc4 d5 10. xe7 xe7 11.0–0 xc3 12. bxc3 b6 13. d3 g6 14. a4 b7 15. a5 c5 16. d2

This may not have been White's best move. Yet it is extremely difficult to point out anything better.

16...e5

Probably the only move to save the game. It was essential to break up White's center and to create a weakness in White's game that would compensate Black for his own weakness on the Queen's side of the board.

17. e4 xe4 18. xe4 ae8 19. axb6 axb6 20. a7 exd4 21. c6

21. xe7 was slightly better, but Black had, in that case, an adequate defense.

21... d8 22. cxd4 cxd4 23. exd4
Not 23...\(\text{c}4\) because of 23...\(\text{b}8!\)

23...\(\text{e}6\) 24.\(\text{d}f6\) \(\text{e}xf6\) 25.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}5\)
26.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{f}6\) 27.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}7\) 28.\(\text{a}1\)
\(\text{d}d7\) 29.\(\text{x}d7\) \(\text{x}d7\) 30.\(\text{g}3\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)

There was no reasonable motive to continue such a game, as there was not very much to be done by either player. 2hr. 04 - 2hr. 16

GAME 5
Capablanca - Lasker [D63]
29.03.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.d4 \(\text{d}5\) 2.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 3.c4 \(\text{e}6\) 4.\(\text{g}5\)
\(\text{bd}7\) 5.e3 \(\text{e}7\) 6.\(\text{c}3\) 0–0 7.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{b}6\)
8.cxd5 \(\text{exd}5\) 9.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}5\)

Considered up to now the best answer for Black, but I believe to have had the pleasure of finding over the board in this game the one way to knock it out.

10.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{b}8\) 11.\(\text{x}d5\) \(\text{b}7\)
12.\(\text{x}e7+\) \(\text{e}7\) 13.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{bc}8\)
14.\(\text{a}3\)

This move might be said to be the key of White's whole plan. The main point is to be able to play \(\text{a}6\).

14...\(\text{e}6\) 15.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 16.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{xf}3\)

Dr. Lasker thought for over half an hour before deciding upon this continuation. It is not only the best, but it shows at the same time the fine hand of the master. An ordinary player would never have thought of giving up the Exchange in order to keep the initiative in this position, which was really the only reasonable way in which he could hope to draw the game.

17.\(\text{xc}8\) \(\text{xc}8\) 18.\(\text{gxf}3\) \(\text{xf}3\) 19.\(\text{g}1\)
\(\text{e}8\) 20.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 21.\(\text{f}1\)

The play here was extremely difficult. I probably did not find the best system of defense. I can not yet tell which was the best defense here, but it is my belief that with the best play White should win.

21...\(\text{e}4\) 22.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{h}3+\) 23.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}6\)
24.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{xd}4\) 25.\(\text{c}4\)

The move with which I counted upon to check Black's attack.

25...\(\text{xe}3\) 26.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 27.\(\text{d}8+\)
\(\text{g}7\) 28.\(\text{d}4+\) \(\text{f}6\) 29.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{e}6\)
30.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{g}5\) 31.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{gxh}4\)

This was Lasker's sealed move. It was not the best. His chance to draw was to play 31...\(\text{g}6\) Any other continuation should lose.

32.\(\text{xh}4\) \(\text{g}4\) 33.\(\text{g}5+\) \(\text{f}8\) 34.\(\text{f}5\)

Not the best. Instead 34.\(\text{d}2\) would have won. The text move gives Black a chance to draw the game.

34...\(\text{h}5\) 35.\(\text{d}8+\) \(\text{g}7\) 36.\(\text{g}5+\) \(\text{f}8\)
37.\(\text{d}8+\) \(\text{g}7\) 38.\(\text{g}5+\) \(\text{f}8\) 39.\(\text{b}3\)
\(\text{d}6\) 40.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{d}1+\) 41.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}7\)
42.\(\text{xh}5\) \(\text{xe}3\) 43.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}4\) 44.\(\text{a}8+\)
Not the best. The move 44.\(\textit{h}1\) offered better chances of success.

\(44...\textit{e}7\) 45.\(\textit{b}7+\) \(\textit{f}8\)

A blunder, which loses what would otherwise have been a drawn game. It will be noticed that it was Dr. Lasker's forty-fifth move. He had very little time to think and, furthermore, by his own admission, he entirely misjudged the value of the position, believing that he had chances of winning, when, in fact, all he could hope for was a draw.

\(46.\textit{b}8+\) 1–0

2hr. 55 - 2hr. 45

GAME 6
Lasker - Capablanca [C66]
30.03.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.\(\textit{e}4\) \(\textit{e}5\) 2.\(\textit{f}3\) \(\textit{c}6\) 3.\(\textit{b}5\) \(\textit{f}6\) 4.0–0 
\(\textit{d}6\) 5.\(\textit{d}4\) \(\textit{d}7\) 6.\(\textit{c}3\) \(\textit{e}7\) 7.\(\textit{e}1\) \(\textit{exd}4\)
8.\(\textit{e}4\) 0–0 9.\(\textit{xc}6\) \(\textit{bxc}6\) 10.\(\textit{g}5\) \(\textit{e}8\) 11.\(\textit{d}3\) \(\textit{h}6\) 12.\(\textit{h}4\) \(\textit{h}7\)
13.\(\textit{xe}7\) \(\textit{xe}7\) 14.\(\textit{c}4\)

Up to this point the game was identical with the third. Here Lasker changed the course of the game.

14...\(\textit{e}8\) 15.\(\textit{e}2\)

15.\(\textit{e}3\) had to be considered.

15...\(\textit{b}8\) 16.\(\textit{b}3\) \(\textit{c}5\) 17.\(\textit{f}3\) \(\textit{b}5\)

Not the best. The text leaves Black with an exceedingly difficult ending. 17...\(\textit{g}5\) was the right move.

18.\(\textit{xb}5\) \(\textit{xb}5\) 19.\(\textit{xb}5\) \(\textit{xb}5\)
20.\(\textit{f}1\) \(\textit{g}5\) 21.\(\textit{d}2\) \(\textit{e}6\)

The maneuvers of this Knight are of much greater importance than it might appear on the surface. It is essential to force White to play c2-c3 in order to weaken somewhat the defensive strength of his b-pawn.

22.\(\textit{c}3\) \(\textit{f}6\) 23.\(\textit{c}4\) \(\textit{f}4\)

Again the moves of the Knight have a definite meaning. The student would do well to carefully study this ending.

24.\(\textit{e}3\) \(\textit{g}6\) 25.\(\textit{d}2\) \(\textit{b}8\) 26.\(\textit{g}3\) \(\textit{a}5\) 27.\(\textit{a}4\)

It is now seen why Black had to compel White to play c2-c3. With the White pawn at c2 Black's game would be practically hopeless, since White's b-pawn would not have to be protected by a piece, as is the case now.

27...\(\textit{e}5\) 28.\(\textit{f}4\) \(\textit{d}7\) 29.\(\textit{e}2\) \(\textit{b}6\)
30.\(\textit{d}3\) \(\textit{c}6\) 31.\(\textit{ae}1\) \(\textit{f}7\) 32.\(\textit{c}4\)

32.\(\textit{e}5\) would have lead to a much more complicated and difficult ending, but Black seems to have an adequate defense by simply playing 32...\(\textit{fxe}5\) followed by ...\(\textit{d}6-d5\), when White retakes the pawn, e.g. 33.\(\textit{fxe}5\) \(\textit{d}5\)
32...\texttt{xc}c4 33.\texttt{xc}c4 \texttt{e}e6

This is the best move, and not 33...\texttt{e}e6 which would be met by 34.\texttt{d}d3

34.e5 fxe5 35.fxe5 d5+ 36.\texttt{xc}c5 \texttt{xb}3 37.c4

Not the best, but at any rate the game would have been a draw. The best move would have been 37.\texttt{f}f1+

37...dxc4 38.\texttt{e}e4

 Probably the only way to obtain a sure draw.

38.c3 39.\texttt{c}c4 h5 40.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{b}2 41.\texttt{xc}c3 \texttt{xc}h2 42.\texttt{b}b6 \texttt{b}2+ 43.\texttt{xa}xa5 g5 ½–½

There was not any object for either player to attempt to win such a game.

2hr. 30 - 2hr. 30

\textbf{GAME 7}

Capablanca - Lasker [D64]  
02.04.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.d4 d5 2.\texttt{f}f3 e6 3.c4 \texttt{f}f6 4.\texttt{g}g5 \texttt{e}7 5.e3 \texttt{bd}7 6.\texttt{c}c3 0–0 7.\texttt{c}c1 c6 8.\texttt{ec}2 c5

This move is not to be recommended.

9.\texttt{d}d1

9.cxd5 would have been the proper continuation.

9...\texttt{a}a5 10.cxd5 \texttt{xd}5 11.\texttt{xe}7 \texttt{xe}7 12.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{f}f6 13.0–0 cxd4 14.\texttt{xd}4

14.cxd4 was the alternative. It would have led, however, to a very difficult game where, in exchange for the attack,

White would remain with an isolated d-pawn; leading at this stage of the match by one point, I did not want to take any risks.

14...\texttt{d}d7 15.\texttt{e}e4 \texttt{ed}5 16.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{d}8 17.\texttt{xf}6+ \texttt{xf}6 18.\texttt{c}e5 \texttt{b}6

With this move Black neutralizes whatever little advantage White might have had. The draw is now in sight.

19.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{fc}8 20.\texttt{xb}6 axb6 21.\texttt{xc}8+ \texttt{xc}8 22.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{xc}1+ 23.\texttt{xc}c1 ½–½

1hr. 22 - 1hr. 20

\textbf{GAME 8}

Lasker - Capablanca [D12]  
03.04.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]
1.d4 d5 2.\( \textsf{\textit{f}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{f}} \) 3.e4 c6 4.e3

This allows Black to bring out the Queen's Bishop without any difficulty.

4...\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{f}} \) 5.\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \) e6 6.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) dxe5 7.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) xf6 8.0–0 \( \textsf{\textit{g}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{g}} \) f6 9.\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \) d6 10.\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \) xe4 11.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) xe4 0–0 12.\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \) d2 \( \textsf{\textit{g}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{g}} \) f6 13.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) ad1 \( \textsf{\textit{f}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{f}} \) g6 14.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) xe6 hxg6 15.\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \) \( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) f8 18.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) d2 f6 19.\( \textsf{\textit{g}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{g}} \) h4 \( \textsf{\textit{f}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{f}} \) f7 20.g3 \( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) d7 21.\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \) b6 22.\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \) \( \textsf{\textit{c}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \) e8 23.\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \) e2 \( \textsf{\textit{e}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{e}} \) f6 13.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) xf6 14.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) g6

All these maneuvers with the Knight are extremely difficult to explain fully. The student would do well to carefully analyze them. Black's position might now be said to be unassailable.

24.\( \textsf{\textit{a}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{a}} \) a6 25.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) a5 26.\( \textsf{\textit{b}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{b}} \) 26...\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) was better, as it gave Black some slight winning chances.

27.\( \textsf{\textit{b}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{b}} \) a5\( \textsf{\textit{a}} \) 28.a5 \( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) d6 29.\( \textsf{\textit{b}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{b}} \) \( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) 30.\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{d}} \) d2 \( \textsf{\textit{c}} \)\( \textsf{\textit{c}} \) ½–½

The game was given up for a draw, because having analyzed the game during the twenty-four hours' interval, we both came to the conclusion that it was impossible to win the game for either side. 2hr. 07 - 1hr. 48
Black could have tried to keep up the attack by playing 21...h5. The text move simplifies matters and easily leads to a draw.

```
22. \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 23. \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 24. \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) \( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)
```

1hr. 55 - 1hr. 37

**GAME 10**

**Lasker - Capablanca [D61]**

08.04.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 2. \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 3. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4. \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 5. \( \text{e3} \) 0–0 6. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 7. \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 8. \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{a5} \) 9. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 10. \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 11. \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 12. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 13. \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 14. \( \text{h4} \)

The development is now complete. White has a lone d-pawn, but, on the other hand, Black is somewhat hampered in the maneuvering of his pieces.

14... \( \text{ac8} \) 15. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{b5} \)

With this move and the following Black brings about an exchange of pieces, which leaves him with a free game.

16. \( \text{fe1} \) \( \text{bd5} \) 17. \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 18. \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 19. \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c6} \)

Not 19... \( \text{a6} \) because of 20. \( \text{d7} \) followed by 21. \( \text{c5} \).

20. \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 21. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{b6} \) 22. \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{fd8} \) 23. \( \text{e2} \)

Probably White's first mistake. He wants to take a good defensive position, but he should instead have counterattacked with 23. \( \text{a4} \) and \( \text{c5} \).

23... \( \text{d5} \) 24. \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \)

Black has now the open file and his left side pawn position is very solid, while White has a weak d-pawn. The apparently weak Black a-pawn is not actually weak because White has no way to attack it.

25. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 26. \( \text{b3} \)

In order to free the Queen from the defense of the b-pawn and also to prevent ... \( \text{c4} \) at any stage.

26... \( \text{h5} \)

In order to prevent g2-g4 at a later stage. Also to make a demonstration on the Kingside, preparatory to further operations on the other side.

27. \( \text{h3} \)

Weak, but White wants to be ready to play g2-g4.

27... \( \text{h4} \)

To tie up White's Kingside. Later on it will be seen that White's is compelled to play g2-g4 and thus further weaken his game.
This was White's sealed move. It was not the best move, but it is doubtful if White has any good system of defense.

31...a5 32.\w2b2 a4

Now Black exchanges the pawn and leaves White with a weak, isolated b-pawn, which will fall sooner or later.

33.\w2d2 \w2xd2 34.\w2xd2 axb3 35.axb3 \w2b6

In order to force \w2d3 and thus prevent the White Rook from supporting his b-pawn by \w2b2 later on. It means practically trying up the White Rook to the defense of his two weak pawns.

36.\w2d3 \w2a6 37.g4 hxg3 38.fxg3 \w2a2 39.\w2c3 \w2c2 40.\w2d1

The alternative 40.\w2a4 was not any better. White's game is doomed.

40...\w2e7 41.\w2e3 \w2c1+ 42.\w2f2 \w2e6 43.\w2d1 \w2b1

Not 43...\w2b4 because of 44.\w2d2 \w2b1 45.\w2b2 \w2xb2 46.\w2xb2 \w2d3+ 47.\w2e2 \w2xb2 48.\w2d2 and Black could not win.

44.\w2e2

Not a mistake, but played deliberately. White had no way to protect his b-pawn.

44...\w2xb3 45.\w2e3 \w2b4 46.\w2c3 \w2e7 47.\w2e2 \w2f5+ 48.\w2f2 g5 49.g4 \w2d6 50.\w2g1 \w2e4+ 51.\w2f1 \w2b1+ 52.\w2g2 \w2b2+ 53.\w2f1 \w2f2+ 54.\w2e1 \w2a2

All these moves have a meaning. The student should carefully study them.

55.\w2f1 \w2g7 56.\w2e3 \w2g6 57.\w2d3 f6 58.\w2e3 \w2f7 59.\w2d3 \w2e7 60.\w2e3 \w2d6 61.\w2d3 \w2f2+ 62.\w2e1 \w2g2 63.\w2f1 \w2a2 64.\w2e3 e5

This was my sealed move and unquestionably the best way to win.

65.\w2d3

If 65.\w2e2 \w2d2+ 66.\w2f2 e4 67.\w2c3 \w2f3 68.\w2e3 \w2e1 69.\w2f2 \w2g2 and White would be helpless; If 65.\w2f3 \w2d2+ exchanging Knights wins.

65...exd4 66.\w2xd4 \w2c5 67.\w2d1 d4 68.\w2c1+ \w2d5 0–1

There is nothing left. The Black pawn will advance and White will have to give up his Knight for it. This is the finest win of the match and probably took away from Dr. Lasker his last real hope of winning or drawing the match.

4hr. 20 - 4hr. 20
GAME 11
Capablanca - Lasker [D63]
13.04.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.d4 d5 2.\(f3\) e6 3.c4 \(f6\) 4.g5 \(d7\) 5.e3 \(e7\) 6.c3 0–0 7.c1 \(e8\) 8.e2 c6 9.d3 dxc4 10.exd4 \(d5\) 11.xe7 \(x\) 12.0–0 \(f8\) 13.fd1 d7

I do not consider the system of defense adopted by Dr. Lasker in this game to be any good.

14.e4 b6

The text move, by driving back the Bishop, gains time for the defense. Instead 14...xc3 would have simplified matters somewhat, but it would have left Black in a very awkward position.

15.f1 c8 16.b4

To prevent ...c6-c5, either now or at a large stage. There is no Black Bishop and White's whole plan is based on that fact. He will attempt, in due time, to place a Knight at d6, supported by his pawn at e5. If this can be done without weakening the position somewhere else, Black's game will then be lost.

16..e8 17.b3

White might have played 17.a4 at once, but wanted at first to prevent the Black Queen from coming out via d6 and f4.

17..ec7 18.a4 g6 19.a5 d7 20.e5 b6 21.e4 b8 22.c3

The text move gives Black a chance to gain time. 22.a3 at once was best.

22.f4 23.d6 d5

Had the White Queen been at a3, Black could not have gained this very important tempo.

24.a3 f6 25.xe8

This Bishop had to be taken, since it threatened to go to h5, pinning the Knight.

25..xe8 26.exf6 gxf6

To retake with either Knight would have left the e-pawn extremely weak.

27.b5

With this move White gets rid of his weak Queenside pawns.

27.bc8 28.bxc6 xc6 29.xc6 xc6 30.axb6 axb6 31.e1

31.b5 was better.

31..c8 32.d2

This was my sealed move and unquestionably the only move to keep the initiative.

32.f8
32...\textit{c}c3 would have been met by 33.\textit{a}1

33.\textit{d}e4

The White Knight stands now in a very commanding position. Black's game is far more difficult than appears at first glance and I believe that the only good system of defense would have to be based on \ldots f6-f5, after \ldots h7-h6, driving back the White Knight.

33...\textit{d}8 34.h4 \textit{c}7

This might be said to be the losing move. Black had to play 34...h6 in order to be ready to continue with \ldots f6-f5, forcing the White Knight to withdraw.

35.\textit{b}3

White's plan consists in getting rid of Black's powerfully posted Knight at d5, which is the key to Black's defense.

35...g7 36.g3 \textit{a}7 37.c4 \textit{a}5 38.c3 \textit{x}c3 39.xc3 \textit{f}7 40.e3 \textit{d}6 41.e4 \textit{a}4

Neither one of us had very much time left at this stage of the game. Black's alternative was 41...\textit{a}7 which would have been met by 42.d5 leaving Black with what in my opinion is a lost position.

42.\textit{b}7+ \textit{g}6

If 42...\textit{e}7 43.\textit{c}6 wins.

43.\textit{c}8 \textit{b}4 44.\textit{c}1 \textit{e}7

Black's game was now hopeless; for instance 44...\textit{a}3 (Best.) 45.d3+! f5 (Best.) 46.e8+ \textit{h}6 47.e1 \textit{a}8 48.xe6+ \textit{x}e6 49.xe6+ \textit{g}7 50.e5+ etc. In practically all the other variations the check with the Bishop at d3 wins.

45.d3+ \textit{h}6

45...f5 would have prolonged the game a few moves only, for 46.d7 would always win.

46.\textit{c}7 \textit{a}1+ 47.g2 \textit{d}6 48.xf8+ 1–0

\textit{GAME 12}

Lasker - Capablanca [C66]
16.04.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 3.b5 \textit{f}6 4.0–0 \textit{d}6 5.d4 \textit{d}7 6.c3 \textit{e}7 7.e1 exd4 8.xd4 0–0 9.f1 \textit{e}8 10.f3 \textit{f}8 11.g5 h6 12.h4 g6 13.d5 \textit{g}7

I cannot very highly recommend the system of defense adopted by me in this variation.

14.b5
The combinations beginning with this move are all wrong. After the text move, Black should get the better game. White's proper move was simply to hold the position by playing 14.c3

14...g5 15.\(dxc7\)

If 15.\(\&f2\) \\(\&d\)xd5 would give Black the better game. The combination indulged in by White is good only in appearance.

15...gxh4 16.\(\&x\)xa8 \(\&\)xa8 17.\(\&c\)c7 \(\&\)d8
18.\(\&\)xe8 \(\&\)xe8 19.\(\&\)b1 \(\&\)e6 20.c3 \(\&\)xa2

A mistake. The question of time at this point was not properly appreciated by Black, who went in to recover a pawn, which was of no importance whatever. Worse yet, the capture of the pawn only helped White. Black had here a won game by playing 20...\(\&\)e5

21.\(\&\)a1 \(\&\)e6 22.\(\&\)d2 a6

22...h3 was better. After the text move Black has an extremely difficult game to play.

23.\(\&\)f2 h5

23...\(\&\)g5 would have given Black better chances to win. After the text move there is nothing better than a draw.

24.f4 \(\&\)h6 25.\(\&\)e2 \(\&\)f6 26.\(\&\)xh4 \(\&\)xe4 27.\(\&\)xd8+ \(\&\)xd8 28.\(\&\)xa6 d5
29.\(\&\)e2 \(\&\)xf4 30.\(\&\)xh5 \(\&\)c7 31.\(\&\)ad1 \(\frac{1}{2}\)–\(\frac{1}{2}\)

Having had twenty-four hours to consider the position, we both came to the conclusion that there was nothing in it but a draw.

2hr. 05 - 1hr. 54

GAME 13

Capablanca - Lasker [D63]
19.04.1921 [Notes by J. R. Capablanca]

1.d4 d5 2.\(\&\)f3 \(\&\)f6 3.c4 e6 4.\(\&\)g5 \(\&\)e7
5.e3 \(\&\)bd7 6.\(\&\)c3 0–0 7.\(\&\)c1 \(\&\)e8
8.\(\&\)c2 h6 9.\(\&\)h4 c5 10.cxd5 \(\&\)xd5
11.\(\&\)xe7 \(\&\)xe7 12.dxc5 \(\&\)xc5 13.\(\&\)b5

Not best. The move 13.b4 was more energetic and perfectly safe.

13...\(\&\)d7 14.0–0 \(\&\)b6 15.\(\&\)xd7 \(\&\)xd7
16.\(\&\)fd1 \(\&\)ed8 17.h3

Loss of time. 17.\(\&\)a4 at once was the proper move.

17...\(\&\)ac8 18.\(\&\)a4 \(\&\)c6 19.\(\&\)b5 a6
20.\(\&\)xb6 \(\&\)xb6 21.\(\&\)xd8+ \(\&\)xd8
22.\(\&\)e2 \(\&\)f8 23.\(\&\)xc8 \(\&\)xe8 \(\frac{1}{2}\)–\(\frac{1}{2}\)

Not much of a game. With three points to the good, I took matters too easy. My opponent, having the Black pieces, could not have been expected to do much.

1hr. 05 - 1hr. 15
1.e4 e5 2.\textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}c6 3.\textit{\&}b5 \textit{\&}f6 4.0–0 d6 5.d4 \textit{\&}d7 6.\textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}e7 7.\textit{\&}xc6 \textit{\&}xc6 8.\textit{\&}d3 exd4 9.\textit{\&}xd4 \textit{\&}d7 10.\textit{\&}g5 0–0 11.\textit{\&}ae1 h6 12.\textit{\&}h4 \textit{\&}h7 13.\textit{\&}xe7 \textit{\&}xe7 14.\textit{\&}d5 \textit{\&}d8 15.c4

White has now a powerful position and Black has to play with extreme care in order to avoid drifting into a hopeless position.

15...\textit{\&}e8 16.f4 c6

This weakens the d-pawn, but something had to be done to obtain maneuvering space for the Black pieces. Besides, with the advance of the f-pawn, White's e-pawn becomes also weak, which is somewhat of a compensation.

17.\textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}b6 18.b3 \textit{\&}ad8

Unnecessary. Instead 18...\textit{\&}e7 was the proper move.

19.\textit{\&}h1 \textit{\&}f6 20.h3 \textit{\&}c8 21.\textit{\&}d1

This is waste of time. In order to obtain an advantage, White will have to make an attack on the Kingside, since Black's d-pawn, though weak, cannot be won through a direct attack against it.

21...\textit{\&}e7 22.\textit{\&}fe1 \textit{\&}de8 23.\textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}a5 24.\textit{\&}f1 \textit{\&}h5 25.\textit{\&}g1 a6 26.\textit{\&}ff2 \textit{\&}g6 27.\textit{\&}f3

If 27.\textit{\&}f5 \textit{\&}xf5 28.exf5 \textit{\&}h5 29.\textit{\&}xe7 \textit{\&}xe7 and Black has a good game.

27...\textit{\&}h5 28.f5

Of doubtful value. While it shuts off the Bishop, it weakens furthermore the e-pawn and also creates a hole on e5 for Black pieces. The position, at first glance, looks very much in favor of White, but careful analysis will show that this is much more apparent than true.

28...\textit{\&}h4 29.\textit{\&}h2

A blunder, made under time pressure combined with difficulties attached to the position.

29...\textit{\&}g4+ 30.\textit{\&}h1 \textit{\&}e5 31.\textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}xf3 32.\textit{\&}xf3 \textit{\&}f6

32...\textit{\&}g3 was dangerous and might lead to the loss of some material.

33.a4

To prevent ...b7-b5. There are a number of variations where White would regain the quality in exchange for a pawn had he played 33.g4 to be followed by e4-e5 and \textit{\&}e4, but the resulting ending would be so much in favor of Black that the course pursued by White may be considered the best.

33...g6 34.fxg6 fxg6 35.\textit{\&}e3 \textit{\&}f5 36.\textit{\&}d3

There are some very interesting variations beginning with 36.\textit{\&}d3 viz., 36...\textit{\&}xe4 37.\textit{\&}xd6 \textit{\&}g7 38.\textit{\&}h4 \textit{\&}f5
39. \( \text{\textἶ}xf5 \) gxf5 40. \( \text{\textḵ}xh6 \) \( \text{\textě}e1+ \) 41. \( \text{\textḵ}h2 \) \( \text{\textě}e5+ \) 42. g3 \( \text{\textě}xc3 \) and White is lost.

36...g5 37. \( \text{\textḵ}d2 \) \( \text{\textģ}g6 \) 38.b4

White's idea is to change off as many pawns as possible, hoping to reach an ending where the advantage of the Exchange may not be sufficient to win.

38...\( \text{\textě}e6 \) 39.b5 axb5 40.axb5 \( \text{\textţ}a8 \) 41.\( \text{\textḏ}b1 \) \( \text{\textė}e5 \) 42.\( \text{\textě}e1 \) \( \text{\textḵ}h7 \) 43.bxc6 bxc6 44.\( \text{\textě}g3 \) \( \text{\textě}xg3 \) 45.\( \text{\textė}xg3 \) \( \text{\textţ}a3 \) 46.\( \text{\textḵ}h2 \) \( \text{\textţ}b7 \) 47.c5

Forced, as 47...\( \text{\textţ}b2 \), winning a piece, was threatened.

47...dxc5 48.\( \text{\textţ}c4 \) \( \text{\textţ}a1 \) 49.\( \text{\textě}e5 \) \( \text{\textţ}c1 \)

The moves of this Rook are worth studying. I believe that Black had no better way to play.

50.h4

This brings the game to a climax, for which Black is now ready.

50...\( \text{\textţi}e7 \) 51.\( \text{\textţ}c6 \) \( \text{\textţ}e6 \) 52.\( \text{\textţ}d8 \) gxh4 53.\( \text{\textţ}d3 \) \( \text{\textţ}f6 \)

The key to Black's defense, the holding of the f-file.

54.\( \text{\textţ}d7+ \) \( \text{\textţ}h8 \) 55.\( \text{\textţ}d5 \) \( \text{\textţ}ff1 \) 56.\( \text{\textţ}h3 \) \( \text{\textţ}xe4 \) 0–1

3hr. 30 - 3hr. 40