

Journal of the Society for Psychical Research

Volume 70.2 Number 883 April 2006

An Assessment of Ostensible Communications with a Deceased Grandmaster as Evidence for Survival <i>Wolfgang Eisenbeiss and Dieter Hassler</i>	65
Differences in Body Image Between People Reporting Near-Death and Spontaneous Out-of-Body Experiences <i>Craig D. Murray and Jezz Fox</i>	98
NOTE	
Research Note: Testing for Precognitive Boredom with a Population of Visual Artists: A Pilot Study <i>Nicola J. Holt</i>	110
BOOK REVIEWS	
<i>The New Paradigm: A Confrontation Between Physics and the Paranormal Phenomena</i> by John O'M. Bockris <i>John Poynton</i>	121
<i>The Perfect Medium: Photography and the Occult</i> Yale University Press..... <i>Maurice Grosse</i>	123
<i>A Science for the Soul: Occultism and the Genesis of the German Modern</i> by Corinna Treitel..... <i>Leslie Price</i>	124
<i>Heaven Confirmed</i> by Miles Edward Allen <i>Guy Lyon Playfair</i>	125
<i>Music, Witchcraft and the Paranormal</i> by Melvyn J. Willin..... <i>Maurice Grosse</i>	126
CORRESPONDENCE	
Letter from John Poynton.....	127

SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH
49 MARLOES ROAD, LONDON, W8 6LA

AN ASSESSMENT OF OSTENSIBLE COMMUNICATIONS WITH A DECEASED GRANDMASTER AS EVIDENCE FOR SURVIVAL

by WOLFGANG EISENBEISS and DIETER HASSLER

ABSTRACT

A chess match purportedly between living and deceased Grandmasters was staged by Eisenbeiss and publicized in the 1980s in the popular media. Upon reviewing the case, and taking account of material which had hitherto not been published, Hassler concluded that the case was worthy of deeper analysis and publication for the scientific community. A resume of the match, which was played at international championship level, and the circumstances of its intermediation by an automatic-writing medium who had no knowledge of chess or chess history, form the introduction to the newly disclosed material in this case: during the course of the match, a substantial body of information on the life of the discarnate Grandmaster was elicited, which has subsequently been successfully verified, including an unanticipated element. An evaluation of the verification reveals that the 'hidden' part of the information communicated was 94% accurate. The value of the case is to be seen in the ostensible communication of objective facts (knowing that) combined with the exercise of acquired mental and intellectual skills (knowing how) over a sustained period of time, as well as the revelation of unanticipated hidden information. Weighing on the one hand the psychological motivation underlying the production of this information by the medium, and on the other the discarnate psyche suggests the survival hypothesis as the more plausible explanation for the information flow.

INTRODUCTION

The remarkable story of a chess match played between living and deceased Grandmasters was publicized on German TV (SAT1, December 1992) and from 1987 in various popular books and magazines (Eisenbeiss, 1987a, 1987b; Emmenegger, 1987; Gardner, 1988; Holbe, 1988; Metz, 2001a; Petersen, 1994; Schiebeler, 2001; Vágó, 1988, Wirthensohn, 1991). These publications focus on the sensational aspects: a match played at Grandmaster-level intermediated by a non-chess-playing automatic-writing medium. A few references were made to the other aspect of the case, including information allegedly received from the discarnate being concerning his life and his achievements. This material was used to devise thirty-nine open questions, which were then passed to a historian and chess-expert to research and answer, without his being made aware of the reason for this investigation. The communication and the questions and answers have never been subject to evaluation and publication for the scientific community. The authors believe disclosure of this material is merited because this case (in some aspects similar to the case of the musical medium Rosemary Brown — see Brown, 1974) perhaps uniquely evidences both extra-sensory communication of facts (knowing that) and acquired skills (knowing how) which are consistent with other reports of mediumistic communication published in this *Journal*. The match itself will just be summarized briefly for the sake of completeness and by way of background.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CASE

In 1985 one of the authors (asset-manager and amateur chess player Dr Eisenbeiss, St. Gallen, Switzerland) took up the suggestion of Dr Waldhorn (dentist, Uri, Switzerland) to try to initiate a chess match between living and deceased persons. Eisenbeiss was an appropriate person to do so because of his experience with mediums over many years.

He was able to persuade the world-famous chess champion, Viktor Korchnoi, then third in the world rankings, to participate. Grandmaster Korchnoi knew his opponent could be either the physical medium or the mind of a deceased chess player, depending on the interpretation attached to what occurred.

Since 1982 Eisenbeiss had been acquainted with the automatic-writing medium Robert Rollans (29 January 1914 - 2 March 1993). He knew him and worked with him for 8 years, well enough to trust his assertion that he did not know how to play chess, had no knowledge of chess history, and was not cheating through secret communication with a living chess expert. Rollans was not paid for his services. His motive was to support the survival hypothesis. His widow attests to this judgement (a copy of the letter of confirmation has been lodged with the Editor).

Eisenbeiss gave Rollans a list of deceased Grandmasters with the request to find one of them willing to co-operate. On 15 June 1985 a communicator purporting to be the Hungarian Master Géza Maróczy (1870-1951, ranked worldwide third around 1900), assisted by Rollans's 'control', answered in Hungarian (later German) to confirm his willingness to play the match. In their first transcript the control spirits (Tata and Gabriel, late relatives of Rollans) say (original in German):-

Our dearly beloved, we are already waiting for you to begin. Now, at last, we have been able to bring with us Géza Maróczy. Because this is a beginning, we two will accompany you. We are going to help communicate. But first he personally will try to write using your hand. And there he is:-

The script goes on with much larger, clumsy letters in Hungarian:-

I am Maróczy Géza. I say hello to you. [Continuing in German.] I can talk German so first of all I can answer the identifying question. It was the opening with the king's pawn and the French defence. I am unable to continue, I will finish writing. [Letters becoming untidy.] I am going to tell everything to my friends. [Continuing in Hungarian.] Goodbye.

The control takes over again, saying (in smaller letters and more fluent writing - see Appendix 1, taken from the transcript of 15 June 1985):-

We are back again, as you will notice. Our friend is not accustomed to writing with an earthly being. That is why he gets tired very quickly. But he is on our and your side and says that we are to convey the second move, which is d2-d4. [d2-d4 being the long version compared with the abbreviated form d4 below]

THE MATCH

(For simplicity we omit the adjectives 'alleged' or 'purported' when referring to Maróczy throughout the following account, but they should be understood as implied.) Maróczy opened the match by using the medium's hand and writing "e4", which is standard notation for the white king's pawn to be advanced two squares. This move was forwarded from Rollans to Eisenbeiss, who in turn

sent the message to Korchnoi. Korchnoi's countermove "e6" was relayed in the reverse direction. Rollans put it up on a travel chessboard and communicated it as he was accustomed as a spirit medium. Rollans and Korchnoi at no time had direct contact with each other (except for a handshake when they met in the SAT1 TV show at the end of September 1992, 4½ months before the end of the match). This process continued the same way, always with Eisenbeiss as the intermediary, for 7 years and 8 months until 11 February 1993, when Maróczy resigned at move 48. The long duration was due to Korchnoi's frequent travels, when there were delays in his receiving news of Maróczy's latest move (this was before the advent of SMS text messaging!). Additionally, Rollans sometimes was out of house on a journey or for his work, moving his home or ill and unable to set up communication; in fact he died just three weeks after Maróczy resigned. The time between moves was thus very variable. Typically it took about 10 days to get the next move from Maróczy/Rollans after communicating the move from Korchnoi, Rollans felt a tickle in his body and then knew he had to go and sit down at his table to write down a new message (with no other person(s) present). At one instance he related that he was taking a shower when he sensed that tickle and had to cut it short.

The full match went as follows:-

1. e4	e6	19. Qe4	Qxe4+	37. Rf5+	Kxg4
2. d4	d5	20. fxe4	f6	38. h6	b3
3. Nc3	Bb4	21. Rad1	e5	39. h7	Ra8
4. e5	c5	22. Rd3	Kf7	40. cxb3	Rh8
5. a3	Bxc3+	23. Rg3	Rg6	41. Rxf6	Rxh7
6. bxc3	Ne7	24. Rhg1	Rag8	42. Rg6+	Kf4
7. Qg4	cx d4	25. a4	Rxg3	43. Rf6+	Kg3
8. Qxg7	Rg8	26. fxg3	b6	44. Rf1	Rh2
9. Qxh7	Qc7	27. h4	a6	45. Rd1	Kf3
10. Kd1	dx c3	28. g4	b5	46. Rf1+	Rf2
11. Nf3	Nbc6	29. axb5	axb5	47. Rxf2+	Kxf2
12. Bb5	Bd7	30. Kd3	Kg6		O-1
13. Bxc6	Bxc6	31. Rf1	Rh8		
14. Bg5	d4	32. Rh1	Rh7	(48. b4	c2
15. Bxe7	Kxe7	33. Ke2	Ra7	49. Kxc2	Ke2
16. Qh4+	Ke8	34. Kd3	Ra2	50. b5	d3+
17. Ke2	Bxf3+	35. Rf1	b4	51. Kc3	d2
18. gxf3	Qxe5+	36. h5+	Kg5	52. b6	dl=Q)

The moves are given in the usual 'algebraic' notation, which should be familiar to any chess player. Other readers wishing to follow these moves could make use of the internet (Metz, 2001b) or consult the data given for a chess program such as Fritz (Fritz, n.d.).

Korchnoi's comment about the quality of this match, given at the 27th move, was:-

During the opening phase Maróczy showed weaknesses. His play is old-fashioned. But I must confess that my last moves have not been too convincing. I am not sure I will win. He has compensated the faults of the opening by a strong end-game. In the end-game the ability of a player shows up and my opponent plays very well.

MEDIUMISTIC COMMUNICATION VIA AUTOMATIC WRITING

About a year after the onset of that match, Eisenbeiss had the feeling that the communication was stable enough to ask for improved identification of Maróczy as the true communicator.

Some days before move 27 was communicated (with no prior announcement), he asked Maróczy via the medium Rollans to communicate a report about his life with special emphasis on his chess-playing on earth.

On 31 July 1986, from 11.04 a.m. to 1.50 a.m. the next day (interrupted by long breaks) Rollans received a lengthy text of 38 handwritten pages with a wealth of information on Maróczy's life, and also providing move 27. At the outset the communicators complained (in German) that Eisenbeiss was asking to do the test when the match was already so far advanced; he should have suggested it earlier. They also criticized the lack of confidence in their identity and argued that after 40 years of co-operation between the same 'team' of communicators and the medium Rollans it should be clear that no-one faking an identity would be allowed to communicate. This could only conceivably occur if someone unknown to them were invoked for the first time in a single communication.

Eisenbeiss nevertheless was able to convince 'the other side' that it was necessary to obtain the information and so Maróczy took over and - in larger letters and far less fluent writing - began with 1½ pages in Hungarian.

Translated into English he said:-

This is true, my dear friend. I have forgotten everything which I didn't like. But I am astonished when somebody does not believe me to be here personally, because I know for sure that not all of us here are able to play chess.

That is why I was a bit angry, but now I think that it doesn't matter if somebody does not believe everything that qualified spirits relay.

It is a pity that the 'Interrogatorium' began so late, but it nevertheless does not matter if I alone tell about my life and the best of my chess matches.

Maróczy occasionally gave further short text passages in Hungarian, e.g. in his messages of 1, 5 and 19 July and 4 September 1985, and 22 March and 13 June 1988. We tried, but we were unable to get an understanding of the extent of Rollans's knowledge of Hungarian prior to development of the case. His widow, when asked about Rollans's Hungarian abilities 19 years after the final end of the case, was not able to give a clear answer, and other witnesses to his linguistic abilities could not be found. Thus the text passages in Hungarian cannot be counted as a minor incidence of *xenoglossy*, forming a second line of acquired ability in this case (after the ability to play chess).

Maróczy now switched to German, which from its sentence construction and choice of words is clearly not that of a native speaker, but is still comprehensible; as will be seen from the verification, Maróczy had studied for two years in Zurich, so knowledge of German is plausible under the survival hypothesis. He expresses his disappointment at the quality of the match under way as not representative of Grandmaster level; he attributes this partly to the difficulties of transmission from his side to a living person who lacks knowledge of chess, and partly to his lack of practice since his death.

After these preliminary remarks, at page 11 Maróczy began to tell the story

of his life. To facilitate appreciation of the verification process undertaken, the relevant passages are presented in a table (devised by Hassler) alongside the data from the verification sources obtained by Eisenbeiss (see column 3 in Appendix 2).

VERIFICATION

Eisenbeiss, in order to carry out this verification, devised 39 questions, all derived from the information in Rollans's lengthy transcript of 31st July 1986, divided into the three following categories :-

- I Questions concerning Maróczy's personal sphere (15),
- II Questions of a general nature about Maróczy's chess-playing (13),
- III Questions about Maróczy's tournament successes (11).

Eisenbeiss asked Korchnoi to verify the many statements allegedly made by Maróczy about his chess tournaments, but he said he could not, because he did not know the answers and it would take too much time and effort to find out.

Eisenbeiss then contacted the Hungarian Chess Club and eventually was lucky enough to find Mr László Sebestyén in September 1986, a historian and chess expert, who agreed to provide the answers. Sebestyén was not told of the background to the questions, but was led to believe he was contributing to a publication on Maróczy's chess-life. Hence Sebestyén never had contact with Rollans or Korchnoi.

Sebestyén consulted several libraries (the library of the Budapest Chess Club, Library of the Hungarian Parliament, Library of the Hungarian Scientific Academy), and Maróczy's two then surviving children (both over 80!) and a cousin. Working for more than 70 hours, he managed to find answers to nearly all the questions, which he forwarded to Eisenbeiss on 17 September 1986, who in turn reimbursed Sebestyén for his thorough work.

The questions (and their original numbering) are listed in column 4, the question-category in column 2 and the answers in column 5 of the table in Appendix 2.

PERSONS INVOLVED

Géza Maróczy

Géza Maróczy is described in Lindörfer (1991, pp. 163-164) as follows: Hungarian Grandmaster; (1870-1951); engineer and teacher; he had his first great success in the Nuremberg tournament 1896, when he came second after Lasker and ahead of Tarrasch, Pillsbury, Steinitz et al.; at the beginning of this century he was already ranked among the strongest masters; his greatest victories: Monte Carlo 1902, 1904, Ostend 1905; Barmen 1905 (jointly with Janowski), Vienna 1908 (jointly with Schlechter and Duras); from then on his results varied, because he was more engaged professionally; good performances were the first place in Karlsbad 1923 (tied with Aljechin [Alekhine] and Bogoljubow) and Hastings 1924/25. In 1936 he still played with the victorious Hungarian Team on the first board at the Berlin Olympic chess contest. He wrote books on several tournaments. The Maróczy-System of the Sicilian Defence is named after him. M. was a splendid positional player. His speciality was the end-game; his end-games with queens were unsurpassed; etc.

Before the Korchnoi match, Maróczy (via Rollans) expressed his concern at not being equal to his opponent because of the long time without practice. His motivation for participating in the contest in a transcript dated 10 July 1988 reads like this:-

I was and will be at your disposal in this peculiar game of chess for two reasons. First because I also want to do something to aid mankind living on earth to become convinced that death does not end everything, but instead the mind is separated from the physical body and comes up to us into a new world, where individual life continues to manifest itself in a new unknown dimension. Second being a Hungarian patriot I want to guide the eyes of the world into the direction of my beloved Hungary a little bit. Both these items have convinced me to participate in that game with the thought of being at everyone's service.

After this statement Maróczy alluded to the refusal of his surviving children to help verify some of his earlier communications.

Viktor Korchnoi

Mr Viktor Korchnoi (born in Leningrad, 23 March 1931) emigrated from the Soviet Union to Switzerland 1976/77. *Chessbase* (4 April 2002) says: "He is unquestionably one of the great chess players of all time, twice world championship challenger (1978 and 1981), a top Grandmaster with great international successes, even today at the age of 71. Now Viktor Korchnoi has been awarded the title of *Doctor honoris causa* by the Independent University of Moldova."

A book of his, *Praxis des Turmendspiels* (Practical Rook End-Games), shows a speciality of his, the end game with rooks only.

Robert Rollans

Mr Robert Rollans was born in 1914 in Câmpina, Rumania, and was a musician and composer. In 1971 he came to West Germany as a tourist and stayed in this country, living in Munich until 1978, in Würzburg until 1981, in Sankt Augustin near Bonn until 1987, when he moved to Bad Pyrmont, south of Hameln, Germany. From 1991 to his death in 1993 he lived in Munich.

Mr Rollans came to recognize his automatic-writing ability at 33 years of age when sitting over a letter he intended to write at 2 o'clock in the morning. Unexpectedly he sensed a force taking his hand to write, "Don't be afraid, it's me: your brother Robi." His brother - a young physician - had died 8 years earlier. Rollans, being ignorant of the possibility of automatic writing, was scared but eventually overcame his fear and became a medium over the course of the following years.

Mr Rollans entered into two states of semi-trance. The usual one was when writing with his mind emptied, when he did not follow the course of the messages. After the trance he had no recollection of the content of the writing. The other, which developed later, allowed him to be conscious of what moves were being transmitted and conferred a temporary deep understanding of what was going on. But when this state of insight came to an end, the understanding was extinguished and all that was left was the memory of having had the understanding.

Mr Rollans initially had no knowledge of chess (how to play and the history of the game) and acquired rudimentary skill only during the course of the case. He was just not interested in chess, could not play and had no knowledge of

chess history, as his widow wrote in a letter dated 27 November 2004. When Dr Eisenbeiss started the process he found that Mr Rollans did not even know how to move the chess-men. He gave him a lesson on chess. His widow also asserted that Rollans was never seen to deliberate over a chess-board about the next move.

He had been in Hungary several times for holidays and thereby acquired some proficiency in Hungarian, the extent of which is uncertain. His widow in a letter of 25th October 2004 stated: "My husband never lived in Hungary and never learned the Hungarian language. Having a gift for languages, he knew a few phrases in Hungarian." And in the letter of 27 November 2004 she said: "My husband was able to translate the Hungarian passages of the text into German after he came out of trance, because it was colloquial language (simple sentences)."

His German was fluent with only minor colouring corresponding to his Rumanian mother tongue.

To the best of our knowledge, Mr Rollans did not seek help (from persons or databases) concerning moves of the match or matters of chess history during the years of the match. Witnesses who attest to these circumstances and their continuation from the beginning to the end of the match are Dr Eisenbeiss, Mrs Ellen Rollans, Prof. Schiebeler and Mr Holbe.

Mr Rollans undertook his part of this endeavour on a voluntary, unpaid basis. His purpose in facilitating this match was his wish to prove that physical death is by no means the end of personal life. Mr Rollans believed in reincarnation.

Mr Rollans died on 2nd March 1993, 19 days after Maróczy had resigned. At the beginning of the game Rollans reported the words of Maróczy "... and you, dear Robert, will convey the game to its end." In those days none of the persons involved anticipated that the game would be so protracted (7 years and 8 months) and hence did not read any additional meaning into Maróczy's comment, which in retrospect might appear prescient of Rollans's own death.

Laszlo Sebestyén

Mr Laszlo Sebestyén was born on 4 December 1921 and died on 6 August 1996. He was a professional historian, with special interest in Hungarian history and a member of the Budapest Chess Club. He was thus uniquely qualified to research the chess history of Maróczy.

EVALUATION AND RESULTS

The original 39 questions containing numerous sub-questions were broken up to yield a total of ninety-one question points, which were tabulated as set out in Appendix 2 and evaluated by the second author with the categories cited in column 2. Passages of Rollans's transcript (column 3) are set alongside the 91 question points derived from this transcript (column 4 with a numeration allowing one to trace their origin from the 39 questions and the complete numeration of the question points in column 1) and the answers provided by Sebestyén (column 5). The expected correct answers, together with relevant comments, are shown in abridged form under the heading, Remarks (column 6), to assist the reader in understanding the assessment (given in column 7) of

the Sebestyén answers compared with the statements of Rollans/Maróczy. The assessment categorizes the accuracy of results, together with the frequency, in Table 1.

Table 1

Types of Result	Frequency	Percentage
Correct	80	87.9%
Semi-correct	1	1.1%
Incorrect	3	3.3%
Unsolved	7	7.7%

The percentage of correct statements is remarkable, but must be analyzed in more depth. As may be expected, the questions are of varying degrees of difficulty in terms of identifying a correct answer and some are in the category of potentially leading a respondent to a correct lucky guess. This is why the degree of difficulty was ranked into the following six categories:—

- 1 General knowledge (what many people would know);
- 2 Encyclopaedic knowledge (what can be looked up in an ordinary encyclopaedia);
- 3 Guessable, inferable;
- 4 Expert knowledge, but easy to investigate (specialist books readily accessible in libraries containing the information);
- 5 Expert knowledge, but difficult to investigate (hidden sources);
- 6 Private knowledge (known by few persons only, not known to be written down).

The classification made by the authors is shown under Degree of Difficulty (in column 8), and their frequency is listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Degree of Difficulty	Frequency	Percentage of all Questions
1	0	0.0%
2	2	2.2%
3	8	8.8%
4	48	52.8%
5	13	14.3%
6	20	22.0%

It is noteworthy here that the bulk of the questions fall into degrees of difficulty grade 4 and higher.

We think that questions in grade 5 and 6 only - hidden and private information - should be taken into consideration here, because it is difficult to explain these by extra sensory perception (ESP) or Super-ESP. The result is displayed in Table 3:

Table 3

Result (5 or 6)	Frequency	Percentage of 91	Percentage (5 or 6)
Correct & (5 or 6)	31	34.1%	93.9%
Semi-correct & (5 or 6)	0	0.0%	0.0%
Incorrect & (5 or 6)	2	2.2%	6.1%
Unsolved & (5 or 6)	0	0.0%	0.0%

Of the total of ninety-one question points, thirty-three (36%) fall into these higher categories (5 or 6). Only two (6% of all difficult questions) have been rated as incorrect and thirty-one (94% of all difficult questions) as correct. This shows a remarkable level of accuracy in the statements made by the medium.

Answering questions of grade 5 and 6 did not require time and effort so much as chess expertise and access to information sources not readily available to Rollans (Hungarian libraries and Maróczy's surviving relatives). This is another reason why we trust Rollans's assertion that the information was obtained through paranormal channels.

SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE CASE

This case cannot be done justice by looking at it merely from a statistical point of view. There are three elements of the case to be described here which have special relevance in terms of a determination of whether the case can be explained by reference to animistic theories (e.g. by Super-ESP or Super-psi) or by reference to spiritualist theories, accepting the claim that a discarnate intelligence was communicating.

Romi(h)

In questioning Maróczy about his life, Eisenbeiss had deliberately selected a chess match against a relatively unknown player, but which had included a surprising key-move which might at the time have been so impressed upon Maróczy's memory as still to be recollected now. It was the match against a certain Romi, played in San Remo, Italy in 1930. The position after Romi's 40th move was: Maróczy (white) Kh2, Qh6, Re1, Rg6 and pawns a2, e7, f4, g2, h3 and Romi (black) Ke8, Qb2, Rd2, Rh8, Bc8 and pawns a7, b7, c6. In the book, *Pearls of the Art of Playing Chess*, Budde (1985) remarks: "How Maróczy is able to recover from a seemingly hopeless situation is more thrilling than a thriller." After Romi's 40th move Budde says: "What could Maróczy play in his hopeless situation?" Even the San Remo Tournament-Winner Alekhine believed Maróczy to be lost. But then Maróczy came with his unique move (41. Qh5) and things changed. Romi resigned eight moves later and Maróczy quite unexpectedly became the winner.

With this in mind, Eisenbeiss asked Maróczy (via Rollans) whether the name 'Romi' meant anything to him. In his answer Maróczy mocks Eisenbeiss for not knowing the correct spelling of 'Romi' which should have been 'Romih' (i.e. with an 'h'). Eisenbeiss was not aware and had no idea that the name could be spelled this way. So the particular way in which the question was answered came as complete surprise. To give an appreciation of this, Maróczy's answer is reproduced here (original in German):-

But now it's time to answer your question whether I played a game with a certain Romi. I am sorry to say that I never knew a chess-player named Romi. But I think you are wrong with the name. I had a friend in my youth, who defeated me when I was young, but he was called Romih - with an 'h' at the end. I then never again saw the friend whom I so admired. In 1930 at the tournament of San Remo - who is also present? My old friend Romih coming from Italy also participated in that tournament. And so it came about that I played against him one of the most thrilling matches I ever played. I suspect that you were thinking about the same person but gave the name incorrectly. Any other Romi you might know is I'm afraid unknown to me.

Which then is the correct spelling? Sebestyén found both and could not reach a final decision on which was correct. He reported (see Appendix 2, row 44):-

This tournament was in San Remo not in Monte Carlo. The name of the person inquired after is with an 'h' in the book by Hungarian Dr Szily József: *Maróczy Géza élete és pályafutása, 100 válogatott játszmával*, Sport La és Könyvkiadó, 1957 - translated: *The Life and Career of Géza M. with 100 Selected Games*, Sports-Newspaper and Book-Publishing House, 1957, Budapest. In this book he was styled "Romih" and participated in the tournament as an Italian. In contrast, I read the name without an 'h' in the *Grosses Schachlexikon* of K. Lindörfer, Bertelsmann Lexikon Verlag, Gütersloh, BRD 1977, i.e. Romi, and as styled he was a member of the Italian team at the London Chess Olympics of 1927, playing on the second board. In a Soviet chess book I found the name as Romi without an 'h' as well. Now I cannot decide which author is wrong. In M.'s literature I found no hint. In the tournament of San Remo, M. played against the Italian and defeated him. I did not come across further information.

After further effort, Eisenbeiss found another encyclopaedia (Chicco, 1971) which also mentioned (Max or Massimo) Romi (without an 'h', born 5 May 1893). Furthermore he unearthed a book (Földeák, 1971) mentioning Romi without an 'h'. So it seemed all the more unclear whether the spelling with the 'h' could be the right one.

But Eisenbeiss finally settled on a definitive response after obtaining a copy of the official book from the San Remo Tournament 1930 (Chalupetzky & Tóth, 1930), which details all the matches played and contains additional information including portraits of the participants, with Romih throughout spelled with the 'h'. Furthermore, with the help of a chess expert from Italy (Paoli, 1992), Eisenbeiss learned that the aforementioned Romih was of Slavonic origin, where the spelling with 'h' is common. Romih emigrated in 1918 to Italy and after "many many years" (Paoli, 1992) sometime in the 1930s, but definitely after the tournament of San Remo in 1930, decided to drop the 'h' because it was unfamiliar to Italians. Anyone called Romih who emigrated to Austria (where adoption of a Germanic spelling was mandatory) incidentally assumed the form 'Romich' to keep the pronunciation as close to the original as possible.

The Slavonic origin of Romih also makes it more probable for Maróczy as an Hungarian to have known Romih, both being subjects of the Habsburg Austro-Hungarian 'Dual Monarchy'.

So, because Maróczy claimed to know Romih from his youth, it is logical that he would have known the original spelling of Romih's name and would not have replaced it with the later Italianization. For the Super-ESP Hypothesis to work, the controlling mind, on perceiving varying references to Romih or Romi, would have to be able to grasp the correct one from Maróczy's perspective, decide to address the situation, formulate a response to the conflict and dramatize it in the context of a teasing dialogue with Eisenbeiss/Rollans about his/their ignorance of the correct spelling (for more see our Discussion and Conclusion below).

Rollans would have had to deal with the same issue if he had tried to obtain the information through normal channels.

Capablanca

A further special feature of the case is seen in a question which was put by Eisenbeiss to Maróczy, who, like a contestant in the quiz-show *Who Wants to Be a Millionaire*? mulls over what would have been the correct answer but fails to alight upon it, and then, like a politician being cross-examined by a reporter, avoids the question altogether by switching to an unrelated topic, which, however, proves more interesting and evidential than the original question; the psychological background for this astonishing twist is also considered.

On 4th August 1988, the Swiss chess magazine *Schachwoche*, 31 published an advertisement for the Schweizerische Volksbank which included a reader competition question, which Eisenbeiss duly put to Maróczy via Rollans. The question was: Who was the Austrian founder of the Vera Menchik Club? The advertisement explained that this club was founded on the occasion of the 1929 Karlsbad tournament. Membership was restricted to those who had been beaten by Vera Menchik. Menchik (1906-1944) was born Czech but settled later in the UK, and was a pupil of Maróczy. She became the first-ever women's world chess champion (from 1927 to 1944). She died in an air raid. The founder of the club was the first member and president of the club by virtue of having lost against Menchik in the course of the Karlsbad tournament.

In his answer transcribed by Rollans on 8th August 1988, Maróczy speculates as to who the founder was, first naming Rudolf Spielmann and later Ernst Grünfeld. In a transcript of 11th August 1988, he confesses to his still being uncertain as to the founder and discusses Dr Becker as a possibility. In the end he rejects Becker, reasoning that Becker - though of Austrian origin - was now a national of a South American country he could not specify, and therefore could not be the right person.

Maróczy in the transcript states that he was a teacher of Menchik, knowing her very well and being proud of her successes. The idea of a Vera Menchik Club as described was a "silly joke to which he paid no attention". This was the reason, he argues, for his not remembering the founder's name. Maróczy in essence said on other occasions (transcripts of 8 and 21 August, 1988) "that it's very natural and like your world: what is pleasant and important can be more

easily remembered, whilst the unpleasant and inconsequential — sooner or later-get forgotten."

The solution to the prize question was published in the same magazine on 18th August 1988, based on an article which appeared in 1982 (Flohr, 1982) and which had named as founder Professor Albert Becker of Vienna. Becker had emigrated to Argentina in 1939.

The following transcript dated 21st August 1988 deals with the question of whether Prof. Albert Becker was still alive, which Maróczy could not answer. He still does not name Becker as the founder of the club, as might be expected under the Super-ESP hypothesis; once the solution was published it should be possible for the medium to access the information either clairvoyantly or telepathically from the minds of the magazine's readers. But instead of correcting his wrong answer, Maróczy (in the same transcript of 21st August 1988) quite unprompted comes up with a different story which evidently demanded his attention much more than the "silly joke". At that same tournament in Karlsbad in 1929 there was another incident which he describes (in German) as follows:-

I have been talking about the embarrassing situation of the world champion Capablanca in Karlsbad. He was playing a chess match with Sämisch when his wife unexpectedly showed up from Cuba. He was a quite a 'lady's man' and had hugely neglected his wife. He was not only busy enjoying triumphs in his chess matches but also in love-matches with the ladies, which ended with many conquests. He was accompanied by his Russian mistress, who was even more striking than his wife, having black hair and deep dark eyes, into which some colleagues dreamily gazed. I myself was also impressed by her femininity and beauty and that is why I can remember the incident very well.

The moment when Capablanca caught sight of his wife, his face turned white and then red. I was there. He said nothing, as if nothing unexpected had happened, but his behaviour changed, which until then had been relaxed and even happy, because in fact he was better than his opponent, and also because his mistress continually flattered him happy with her adoring glances. His mistress could not grasp what had happened because she probably had never seen his wife. She did not know who she was and thought her to be one of his many lady friends. When she realized what was afoot she didn't know where to flee and eventually left the hall. What happened between the couple afterwards I no longer know. I can imagine what was said because shortly after Capablanca left his wife and married the striking Russian lady. But this also spelled the end of his amorous conquests, as the new lady never gave him a chance for an affair; she was with him at all tournaments.

The game with Sämisch was blown; he lost, as all this excitement led to a poor move. This is what people still believe today. Maybe this was one reason . . .

This description accords very well with the report given in Flohr (1982) which reads:-

Jose Raoul Capablanca from Havana had magnetic attraction for spectators, especially for the ladies. Capablanca had an exotic appearance, elegant and handsome like Rudolfo Valentino . . .

. . . the game Sämisch played against Capablanca is famous as the one in which the former world champion probably made the biggest mistake of his career, I may be the only person today who knows how and why this happened to Capablanca.

Naturally Capablanca was married in Havana. His wife had not come to Karlsbad. Where is Havana (especially in those days) and where is Karlsbad? Capablanca felt

safe far away from home and 'switched queens'. His wife, a Cuban, was black-haired and so Capa found a fair European. This blonde turned out to be a Russian (he later married her), as Capa said "a Caucasian princess". Alekhine remarked maliciously: in the Caucasus all ladies are princesses! So, what happened? In round 16 . . . quite unexpectedly Mrs Capablanca from Havana appeared in the hall! The former world champion was so surprised (a bit embarrassing, because the blonde might also be in the hall?!) that he quickly made his first and last worst move ever . . . losing a piece immediately and later the game.

No other source could be found revealing these details. And that is why we have no means to decide on the true colour of the mistress's hair (black being more apt for a Caucasian lady and thus supporting Maróczy's version). There are two books (Görschen, 1976; Nimzowitsch et al., 1983) reporting the tournament in Karlsbad in 1929 and the match between Capablanca and Sämisch, but neither gives a reason for Capablanca's unexpected 'fatal' move (9. La6??). Görschen comments: "Lethal hallucination. Never before nor after did Capablanca commit such a blunder! The move may be explained only by reference to psychological circumstances." Görschen as a writer on Capablanca's career does not know the background, whilst Maróczy being a witness gives a reasonable psychological explanation for the drama.

So is it easier to accept the proposition that Rollans's psi ability enabled him to perceive this single source (but not the others), discard the information about the founder of the Vera Menchik Club and instead (for whatever reason) focus on another topic, or to accept the Maróczy (via Rollans) proposition that the Capablanca wife episode was more vividly etched on his memory, because of the upset it caused to Capablanca's game, than the foundation of a Vera Menchik Club, which led neither to a divorce nor a famous championship-level blunder and which Maróczy ranked as a "silly joke"?

If one were to suppose Rollans were conducting a fraud, and to this end had obtained access to the Flohr paper and other sources, it is equally hard to understand why he should have ignored the information requested of him and instead introduced a new narrative thread.

1924 New York Tournament

A further incident provides a second example of inferences that can be drawn from information that is *not* given and the psychological background to this. Maróczy in his transcript talks about the 1924 New York tournament, emphasizing that he achieved a draw against Alekhine, but failing to mention that the tournament was disappointing for him overall, as he finished in sixth place. In the transcript he says:-

I once again travelled to America in 1924, again to New York. I had a thrilling game against Alekhine there, ending in a draw. You certainly have observed my trick in saying "I no longer know which of us won the game." In doing so I want to bury a failure in order not to have to write so much, because failures are rather common among all chess players. This is a joke only, my dear friends; in fact it is true for me that I am not able to remember everything, most of all whenever winning eluded me.

The facts are correct: Maróczy took part in the New York Tournament in 1924 and had a match with Alekhine ending in a draw, as confirmed in Lasker (1992). This article confirms that Maróczy finished sixth, well below expectations. The psychological explanation for failure to disclose this in the

transcript is given by Maróczy himself (see above). If Rollans were trying to engineer a story with verifiable facts as evidence of survival, he could have inserted Maróczy's final ranking, a checkable fact. Clearly elsewhere the Maróczy transcripts contain innumerable such verifiable facts. As one example of information which would fall into category 4 for difficulty to obtain (N.B. not analyzed as one of the questions in Appendix 2) Maróczy via Rollans wrote in a transcript of 8th August 1988:-

There (Karlsbad 1929) neither did she (Menchik) win the tournament, but Grandmaster Nimzowitsch, who was one of the greats at that time. Nevertheless I did not like him, not because of envy, which I personally never had in chess games, but because of his strange character making him unpopular. In contrast, Spielmann was a likeable jovial person, whom we all liked . . . etc.

These judgements about the personalities of Nimzowitsch and Spielmann would be unknown to non-chess-experts but are confirmed in chess encyclopaedias. About Nimzowitsch: "... but his temperament, egoistic, highly strung, irritable, over-sensitive to criticism, and almost pathologically suspicious, was not calculated to bring him support" (Hooper, 1988, p. 225) and "Nimzowitsch was a difficult, hard man. His capriciousness made him to be disliked by many of his colleagues" (Lindörfer, 1991, p. 179). Whereas about Spielmann, Hooper (1988, p.319) writes: "Spielmann was a man of mild temperament and friendly disposition. He regarded the game as an art, the beauty subsisting in *sacrifice* and combinative play"

This serves to illustrate how precise in detail Rollans's transcripts could be and therefore how surprising it is for him not to describe important features of the New York Tournament which are otherwise available in more readily accessible public sources.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The most obvious weakness of the case has to be seen in the fact that there was no independent witness, no Hodgson so to say, as in the case of Leonora Piper, to keep the medium Rollans and the organizer Eisenbeiss under constant surveillance. Is it really true that Rollans had no expertise in chess from beginning to the end? After all he had plenty of time to learn chess or seek help or study the life of Maróczy.

Eisenbeiss on the other hand was the central person to handle the information from different sides. He was the main channel passing nearly all the information of this case. In theory he could have made up the facts to suit his intentions. But Dr Eisenbeiss swears blind to the faithfulness of his account and to the fact that there were no hidden arrangements amongst the quoted participants themselves and/or outsiders. As already stated, Rollans and Korchnoi had no direct contact with each other until a short time before the end of the game.

So the reader is invited to believe in the authors' assertion that this case was not faked or misreported; the authors were unable to detect circumstances in which cryptomnesia could be a credible explanation. But the reader should be left in no doubt that it would have been extraordinarily difficult (if not impossible) and inexplicable in ordinary terms for Rollans to have obtained access to the totality of the information and skills needed to engage in a

Grandmaster chess match and narrate detail of an obscure life in the early 20th Century by conventional means. The same holds for Eisenbeiss, who had no prior access to most of the sources (books and witnesses). Even the expert Korchnoi when asked by Dr Eisenbeiss saw himself unable to answer the 39 questions and said it would require too much effort to find out.

The most probable alternative explanation to the survival theory is the animistic theory, which would interpret the case as a perception by Rollans of extant knowledge and abilities through clairvoyance and telepathy in its highest form: the Super-ESP or Super-psi Hypothesis. We might reject the Super-ESP Hypothesis on the grounds that such high forms of ESP have never been established under controlled laboratory conditions. But we should accept Braude's argument (Braude, 2003, pp. 15, 19) that we should not rule out spontaneous cases of psi where the phenomenon is particularly strong; at present there is insufficient understanding of alleged Super-ESP and its limits. According to Braude, we should not be impressed by the vast amount of hidden information which was verified in this case; it might be understood to be derived from Super-ESP. Nevertheless we invite the reader to review the table in Appendix 2, at least in respect to questions rated 5 or 6. The correlation of Rollans/Maróczy's and Sebestyén's texts is based not just on closed questions (yes/no) but rather on complex open questions verified from varying sources. Apart from this, we are not convinced, like Braude and others, that the incidents attributed to psi cannot be explained by the survival hypothesis, when we lack in-depth understanding of what causes psi.

The case in hand shows far more than just a display of objective knowledge (knowing that), which might or might not be perceived through Super-ESP. What we find so intriguing is the combination of acquired skill (playing chess) and objective knowledge (verified distributed hidden information) over a protracted period (7 years, 8 months), enriched by an unanticipated revelation about a minor (hitherto unknown) detail about the spelling of a name (Romi(h)). Here we agree with Braude (2003, p.91) that "Super-psi explanations have trouble handling both multiple sources of obscure information and also the consistency of mediumistic achievements." Additionally, Rollans's chess-playing skill cannot be taken as an extension of an ability he already possessed. This argument is used by Braude (2003, p. 122) to cast doubt on the survival hypothesis as an explanation for cases of spontaneous fluency in an unlearned language (xenoglossy, as another kind of a paranormal skill).

None of the persons around Rollans nor Rollans himself knew the many details about Maróczy's life in advance. So the psi faculty required of Rollans would have to be so extraordinary as to permit the extraction of the information which appears in his transcripts from books and magazines in different libraries, against a huge amount of background 'noise' from other sources (Braude, 2003). Certain facts not set down in written form would have had to be collected from the private memories of living people who were certainly not thinking about these facts at the moment when it was transcribed by Rollans as 'automatic writing'. (Unfortunately we do not have a full reconciliation of Sebestyén's answers to his sources, but most are self-evident.) Furthermore, Rollans's psi ability would have to extend to considering all the possible moves of the chess pieces and selecting the right one or tapping into the capabilities

of a chess-master who unconsciously assisted play. This marvel would then have to persist at a consistently high level over many years (one of the elements of Braude's 'Argument from Crippling Complexity'). Most psychic researchers agree on the assumption (not fact) that intellectual (and practical) faculties are not communicated via ESP. For more in-depth discussion of the super-psi versus survival hypotheses see Gauld (1982), Braude (2003), Almeder (1992), Griffin (1997), Grosso (1999), and Schiebeler (1988).

As a bonus in the case at hand, we have the unanticipated correction of the spelling of Romi(h). Rollans's psi faculty was interrogated for a Romi, not a Romih. According to the psi hypothesis he should have found several sources for the name Romi, including the information about the tournament in San Remo in 1930, as had Eisenbeiss. Rollans's psi faculty would have had to perceive the nexus of Romi and Romih. Conceivably this could have been achieved by a search for "San Remo, 1930" leading to the official book of the 1930 San Remo Tournament, which mentions Romih. What could have made him so certain about the identity of both that he could select one spelling and then concoct a teasing dialogue around it? Both spellings were correct, because Romih had Italianized the spelling and both could be found in the sources. Why then insist on Romih?

Is there any psychological motive that might have led Rollans to mock at Eisenbeiss? We do not know for sure, but we doubt there was one. On the other hand it is easy to see a motive for Maróczy, because he claimed to know Romih from his youth and it is logical that he would know the original spelling and stay with it; he probably did not know of the Italianization adopted at an undetermined time after 1930. Maróczy's motive might have been Eisenbeiss's seeming omniscience as interrogator, which Maróczy delighted in deflating.

As a supplementary argument, we think it justified to draw conclusions from information spontaneously provided in lieu of the requested and anticipated response. A weighing of the psychological motivation which could underpin one hypothesis or the other (psi or survival) might tip the balance of probability in one direction. In our first example (Capablanca) Maróczy's rationale for forgetting the name of a man whom he would have considered to be merely indulging a pointless joke but then relating an unprompted story about a woman whose beauty had impressed him is plausible, whereas for Rollans the medium it is difficult to understand why he should be unable to retrieve the name requested, given his ability to convey detailed precise information on other occasions, even less why he should digress to an unprompted narrative thread.

The second example (1924 New York tournament) in essence is similar to the first, but the anticipated - yet missing - information is replaced by other disclosures. However, from the transcripts (not all of which are covered by this paper) we know Maróczy to have been very ambitious and it is thus entirely in character that he would omit reporting failures or mediocre tournament rankings. Yet for Rollans, whose main objective was to provide convincing evidence to support the survival hypothesis, it would make no sense to censor information concerning Maróczy's failures.

Thus all these considerations lend support to the survival hypothesis.

In conclusion, we note that not all the information was gathered under

rigorous conditions. However, this may not be untypical for the observation of phenomena of this kind outside controlled laboratory experiments. Moreover, outside laboratory conditions imperfections are tolerated which allow the unplanned to occur (a characteristic feature of unanticipated evidence being that the initiative seems to come from the discarnate, e.g. as with 'drop-in communicators'). Both laboratory experiments and ex-laboratory observation have their respective merits. So why not repeat this sort of experiment with other participants under more strictly controlled conditions? Until such a case can be replicated elsewhere, it is our view that this is a strong case of its type, suggesting — albeit to materialist-scientific standards not proving — survival and demonstrating the utility and pertinence of the spiritualist hypothesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful for the kind cooperation of Mr Viktor Korchnoi, Dr Enrico Paoli, the late Mr Robert Rollans, Mr Géza Maróczy and the late Mr László Sebestyén, and we thank Mr Elmar Schneider for his secretarial work. We express our thanks to Mr Ivan Gheczy, who translated the Hungarian part of the transcript, and to Thomas Brown (son of musical medium Rosemary), who edited the text.

Goethestr. 39
CH-9008 St. Gallen
SWITZERLAND

WOLFGANG EISENBEISS

sposap@tamara.com

Flurweg 3
D-91080 Uttenreuth
GERMANY

DIETER HASSLER

info@reinkarnation.de

REFERENCES

- Almeder, R. (1992) *Death and Personal Survival: The Evidence for Life after Death*. Boston: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Braude, S. E. (2003) *Immortal Remains: The Evidence for Life after Death*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brown, R. (1974) *Immortals at my Elbow*. London: Bachman & Turner.
- Budde, V. (1985) *Perlen der Schachspielkunst*. Hollfeld, Germany: Beyer Verlag.
- Chalupetzky, F. and Tóth, L. (eds.) (1930) *Das erste italienische Grossturnier San Remo 1930, der Rekordsieg Dr Alekhines, Sammlung aller Turnierpartien*. Breslau: Verlag Adolf Kramer.
- Chicco, A. and Porreca, G. (1971) *Dizionario Enciclopedico Degli Scacchi*. Milano, Italy: Mursia Ed.
- Eisenbeiss, W. (1987a) Die ungewöhnlichste Schachpartie. *Die Schachwoche* 38, 21-22. Sarmensdorf, Switzerland.
- Eisenbeiss, W. (1987b) Geisterschach mit Viktor Kortchnoi. *Materialdienst der EZW* 11, 325-327. Stuttgart: Quell Verlag.
- Emmenegger, B. (1987) Schachspiel mit einem Toten. *Sonntagszeitung* Sept. 13, 15. Zurich.
- Flohr, S. (1982) Erinnerungen an Karlsbad 1929. *Schach-Echo* 22 (November). Weilrod, Germany: Schachverlag Gerhard Katzer.
- Földeák, W. A. (1971) *Géza Maróczy-Leben und Lehren*, 49-50. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fritz, (n.d.) Program downloadable from www.chessbase.de

- Gardner, A. (1988) Chess with a 'dead' partner. *Pursuit* 21(4), 179-181. NJ, USA: Little Silver.
- Gauld, A. (1982) *Mediumship and Survival: A Century of Investigation*. London: Heinemann.
- Görschen, F. C. (1976) *Capablanca's Verlustpartien*, 107-109. Hamburg-Bergedorf: Verlag das Schach-Archiv Kurt Rattmann.
- Griffin, D. R. (1997) *Parapsychology, Philosophy and Spirituality*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Grosso, M. (1999) Survival research: evidence, problems and paradigms. *Human Nature*, 11-25.
- Holbe, R. (1988) *Bin Toter spielt Schach*, 19-28. München: Knaur.
- Hooper, D. and Whyld, K. (1988) *The Oxford Companion to Chess*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasker, E. (1992) Das New Yorker Turnier von 1924. *Schach Journal* 3, 47ff. Berlin.
- Lindörfer, K. (1991) *Großes Schach-Lexikon*. München: Orbis Verlag.
- Metz, H. (2001a) Interview mit Kortchnoi. *Schach Magazin* 64 / *Schachecho* 6, 164-165. Bremen.
- Metz, H. (2001b) *Spirituelle Partie*. <http://www.rochadekuppenheim.de/meke/meke1a/m12.htm>
- Nimzowitsch, Spielmann, Becker, Tartakower, Brinckmann, Kmoch (eds.) (1983) *TV. Internationales Schachturnier Karlsbad 1929*, 306-310. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Schach-Zeitung ed. [new edition Olms, Zurich, 1983, reprint from 1929]
- Paoli, E. (1992) letter to Dr Eisenbeiss, 21st October 1992.
- Petersen, I. (1994) Skak med en afdød. *NytAspekt* 2, 12-15. Copenhagen.
- Schiebeler, W. (1988) Der Tod, die Brücke zu neuem Leben. *Die Silberschnur*, 237-248. Melsbach, Neuwied.
- Schiebeler, W. (2001) Schachspiel mit einem Verstorbenen. *Rubrik Parapsychologie*, 11—16. Schutterwald: Wegbereiter or <http://www.wegbegleiter.ch/wegbeg/schachsp.htm#startpunkt>
- Vágó, A. (1988) Egy Parti Sakk. *Képes* 21, 56-61. Budapest.
- Wirthensohn, H. (1991) Schachpartie mit einem Toten. *Esotera* 8, 4-5. Freiburg: Hermann Bauer KG.

APPENDIX 1

interde aufhören zu
schreiben! Ich sage
alles meinen Freunden
den Misszontelä-
Tasrt

- Wir sind es wieder, wie
du auch bemerken kannst.
Unser Freund ist gar nicht
gewohnt zu schreiben mit
einem Irdischen. Deshalb
wird er sehr schnell müde.
Er ist aber neben uns u.
neben dir und sagt uns,
dass

Section of Robert Rollans's transcript of 15 June 1985 (see page 66).

APPENDIX 2

Q	Categ	Transcript of Medium Robert Rollans	Questions Concerning M.'s Personal Sphere
1	I	As you certainly already know, in my last incarnation on Earth I appeared in Szegedin on March 3, 1970.	1. When was Maróczy born?
2	I		2. Where was Maróczy born?
3	I	After attending grammar school in my home country, I went to Zurich as a student of the Polytechnic College.	3. Where did M. attend grammar school (Gymnasium)?
4	I		4.1 How was education continued after grammar school (next stage only)?
5	I		4.2 Where did education continue after grammar school?
6	I	Here (in Zurich) I studied for 2 years; after that I finished my engineering studies in Budapest.	5. How long did the next stage of education (referred to in question 4) last after grammar school?
7	I		6. Where did M. conclude his studies (subsequent to the stages of education referred to in questions 4 and 5)?
8	I	Then I was employed as a draughtsman at a company for construction of water-mains at Kaposztor Meigyeri (a small town in Hungary).	7.1 Where was M. employed first after finishing his study?
9	I		7.2 What was his job (duties) there?
10	I		7.3 What were the activities of the company employing him?
11	I	After that I became teacher at the secondary school for mathematics and geometry.	8.1 Did M. at any time work as a teacher?
12	I		8.2 If so, at what level?
13	I		8.3 If so, which subjects did he teach?
14	I	Afterwards I was comptroller (Rechnungsrat) with an insurance company.	9.1 Did M. later work for an insurance company?
15	I		9.2 If so, in what role?
16	I	But my first great love was also my first great disappointment. My beautiful Zsuzsa had forgotten me during my years in Switzerland and had married someone else.	10. What was the first name of M.'s great love of his youth while he was a student (partly abroad)?

Answers from László Sebestyén	Remarks	Assessment	Degree of Difficulty
1. Birth: March 3, 1870; Death: May 29, 1951.	Since M. died in 1951, this [1970] can be considered a stenographic error.	ok	2
2. Town of Szeged, third-largest of the country, south-eastern part of Hungary.		ok	2
3. In Szeged, near Piaristen.	Szeged	ok	6
4. At the Polytechnic school in Zurich.	Student of the Polytechnic College	ok	6
	Zurich	ok	6
5. Two years. It may be worth mentioning that a Hungarian association existed in Zurich in those days, for which M. worked as librarian. Here he studied a scientific book about chess for the first time (István Márki, a textbook in Hungarian).	2 years	ok	6
6. The Zurich School lasted for two years. There are hints that M. finished his studies in Budapest. But his daughter could not attest to that. It can be assumed that a two-year-course at the Polytechnic School in the 19th Century corresponds to the course of study at the Technical University in our days.	Study of engineering in Budapest	ok	6
7. In his first position M. was a draughtsman at the municipal waterworks for 4 Crowns a day (then Hungarian money). He was engaged in the planning and construction of new water-mains for the capital in Kaposztásmegyer.	Kaposztor Meigyeri	ok	6
	Draughtsman	ok	6
	Construction of water-pipes	ok	6
8. From the beginning of the school-year 1904-05, M. was a senior teacher for mathematics and descriptive geometry. The type of the school was secondary school, the former so-called merchant's school (Pólgari of district VIII, Knézits Gasse, Budapest).	Yes	ok	3
	Secondary school Mathematics and Geometry	ok	6
9. Starting October 7, 1908, M. was appointed comptroller in a newly-established Workers' Accident Insurance Company, where he was in charge of checking the amounts of compensation paid.	Yes	ok	3
	Comptroller (Rechnungsrat)	ok	6
10. I have read all of M.'s diaries, but did not come across a word about the first great love of his youth. His surviving children do not know anything about this either. In my opinion it cannot be excluded, because he reached 34 before marrying. Chess colleagues closer to him abroad may have written about a relationship if it was serious: Marshall, Dr Tarrasch, Janowski or Schlechter in his memoirs.	Zsuzsa	?	6

17	I	But I was able to forget her easily, because I discovered there to be other pretty girls in Budapest who helped me to overcome this disappointment. But all this was resolved in 1904 when I married my new love, the daughter of a university professor from Vienna.	11.1 From which town did M.'s wife come ?
18	I		11.2 What was the profession of her father?
19	I	But all this was resolved in 1904 when I married my new love, the daughter of a university professor from Vienna. On my honeymoon trip I travelled to Monte Carlo and at the same time participated in the chess-tournament there.	12.1 When did M. marry?
20	I		12.2 Where did they go for their honeymoon trip ?
21	I	We had two children, a boy and a girl.	13. How many children (boys, girls) did M. have ?
22	I	I saw many cities in the world during my earthly life, but none fascinated me more than Paris.	14. M. was well-travelled. Which city was the most fascinating in the world for him ?
23	I	I amused myself in this wonderful city, full of pulsating life, home of so much spirit and art. so many magnificent buildings, the Eiffel Tower, the beautiful coffee houses, "Cafe de la Paix, Cafe de la Régence", where you could meet the entire artistic élite, where chess was also played and where I felt especially at ease.	15.1 In which of several cafés frequented by artists did M. prefer to spend his time in Paris during the time of the Grandmasters Tournament of 1900? First preference.
24	I		15.2 Second preference.
25	II	As you can see, I was one of the few players who participated in chess tournaments as non-professional, as an amateur pursuing chess as a sideline.	1. Was M. a professional chess player or was he one of the few Grandmasters who stuck to their Corinthian amateur principles ?
26	II	I had a handicap compared to the others who had the whole day free to practise. That is why I did not become a world champion despite Dr Lasker having proposed that I organize a world championship and play in it.	2. Was M. ever proposed as organizer of a world championship in which he would play?
27	II		If so, by whom?

11. M.'s wife was born in Budapest on September 4, 1883. Her father was senior professor at the School of Midwifery in Szegedin. His full name was: Jakab Mann von Csonoplya, senior professor and Hofrat. This last title may be due to his profession at the time of the monarchy and also due to being physician to the Duchess Augusta. All her children were brought into this world with his medical assistance. Csonoplya is a village of old Hungary in Komitat Bács. Jakab Mann's family immigrated from Alsace-Lorraine under the reign of Maria Theresia.	The statement 'Budapest' is not unequivocal. University professor	ok ok	6 6
12. They married at the beginning of January 1904. For their honeymoon trip they travelled to Monte Carlo, where M. participated in the 4th Monte Carlo Chess-Tournament (Feb. 8-18, 1904) and succeeded in winning the first place for the second time. The top five were: Maróczy, Schlechter, Marshall, Gunsberg, Marco.	1904 Monte Carlo	ok ok	6 6
13. Georg Maróczy, born Nov. 2, 1904 and Magdolna M., born May 30, 1906. Both still alive. They personally informed me about family relationships.	Two children	ok	4
14. Neither Georg nor Magdolna and M.'s cousin could provide a definite answer. They presumed it to be possibly London.	Paris	?	3
15. Café de la Régence. This café was so well known in Budapest in those days, because of the chess matches played in Paris literary and arts circles, that prominent Budapest chess players gave the nickname "Café de la Régence" to the Café Velence in our capital city, which Budapest chess-playing circles used as a base. Maybe that is why M. with time to spare after the tournament matches held in the Millionaires' Club in the Grande Cercle went off with other colleagues to the famous place where once Robespierre played chess.	Café de la Régence Café de la Paix	ok ?	6 6
1. M. was an inveterate amateur. In his paper "Epilogue" he says: "Wherever we live, under modest conditions, there is no basis for chess professionalism."	Amateur	ok	3
The former world champion, Lasker, several times challenged M. to hold a contest between them. This view is backed up by Lasker's <i>Chess Magazine</i> , 1906, where he expresses the following opinion: "At present there are two players who are entitled to fight for a world championship, the German Dr Tarrasch and the Hungarian Maróczy. The world of chess expects these two to play against me." In the following lines he characterizes the two masters, saying that M. is stronger than Dr Tarrasch. In New York the same year he proposed to M.: "Travelling from St. Petersburg to San Francisco - possibly taking in South America - we should play one-on-one matches in every important place where chess is played."	Yes Dr Lasker	ok ok	3 5

28	II	We had two children, a boy and a girl. Both had no talent for playing chess. It is a pity, because I would have wished it so much.	3. How was his children's chess-playing aptitude ?
29	II	My friend Janowski was a good player but he was addicted to gambling. Every casino or gambling-parlour had a magnetic attraction for him, where he lost most of his time and not only that but all his money also. This deprived him of the energy one necessarily needs in a chess tournament. That is why he never became one of the best despite his being very talented. But it was a pleasure to play with him.	4.1 What was the major passion of M.'s chess friend, Janowski?
30	II		4.2 Did he win major international tournaments ?
31	II	But now I am going to tell you something about my most beautiful trips to America. That was in winter 1906 at the beginning of the year. I was invited by the Manhattan Chess Club as well as by the Cosmopolitan Chess Club, both in New York, to play single and simultaneous matches.	5. When did M. first go to the USA, where he was invited by the Manhattan Chess Club and the Cosmopolitan Chess Club, New York, to play simultaneous matches ?
32	II	The Americans enjoyed themselves and they were in demand everywhere and I found my feet well and was invited over and over to different places. Thus I travelled through most of America. And in this way I was kept busy in several American cities, visiting among others New Orleans, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Winnipeg, Minneapolis, etc.	6.1 Was M. occupied only in New York on that visit?
33	II		6.2 If not, in which other cities? First city?
34	II		6.3 Second city?
35	II		6.4 Third city?
36	II		6.5 Fourth city?
37	II		6.6 Fifth city?
38	II		6.7 Sixth city?
39	II	In 1924 I went to America another time, to New York again.	7.1 Did M. go to the USA on a later occasion ?
40	II		7.2 When?

In general M. thought the following about world championships: "Until 1948 the title of world champion was like the private property of the reigning champion, which meant such a high financial burden for any challenger that could hardly be met." M.'s opinion about the specific situation was: "I could not afford to organize that contest".			
3. They had no special talent for playing chess. Even their father did not teach them. Magdolna says: "When we played our father sometimes stood behind us but did not say a word. M. Euwe, M.'s Dutch world champion student, gave me some lessons."	Notalent	ok	6
4. Whether Janowski had a major passion or not must remain open. But it is a fact that he gambled away his entire prize money at the local roulette club in 1902 at the second tournament in Monte Carlo, where he placed third, and could only get back home with the help of the bank. Because he did not repay the loan - certainly not until 1903 - due to the bank's rules, he was not invited to the 3rd tournament in Monte Carlo the following year and had to stay at home. David Janowski was a Polish-French master, winner of the first tournament in Monte Carlo, 1901.	Gambling No	ok ok	5 3
5. In 1906, M. was invited to go to New York for a simultaneous match tour. He arrived in New York March 2, 1906.	1906	ok	4
6. Apart from New York, M. visited the following other locations: end of March Philadelphia, beginning of April Boston and during this month Scanton, Wilkes-Barre, Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Winnipeg, Canton, Memphis and New Orleans.	No Chicago Boston Philadelphia Winnipeg New Orleans Minneapolis	ok ok ok ok ok ok	3 5 5 5 5 5
7. In 1924 he was invited to a tournament. In 1926-27 he was a director of the Manhattan Club and took part in the preparations for organization of the world championship match, Capablanca-Alekhine. At the beginning of 1927 M. was a judge in New York at a four-round grandmaster tournament for 6 players. The final result was: Capablanca, Dr Alekhine, Nimzovics, Dr Vidmar, Spielmann, Marshall.	Yes 1924	ok ok	3 5

41	II	Apart from the many simultaneous matches I also played singles against Hanham, Durr, Waldmann etc.	8.1 What does the name 'Hanham' mean with respect to Maróczy?
42	II		8.2 What is the significance of the name 'Durr' to Maróczy?
43	II		8.3 What is the significance of the name 'Waldmann' to Maróczy?
44	II	But now it's time to answer your question whether I played a game with a certain Romi. I am sorry to say that I never knew a chess-player named Romi. But I think as regards the name you are mistaken. I had a friend in my youth, who beat me when I was young, but he was called Romih - with an 'h' at the end. I never again saw the friend whom I so much honoured. In 1930 at the San Remo tournament - who is also present? Someone from Italy - my old friend Romih - who also participated in this tournament. And so it came that I had one of the most thrilling matches with him I ever played. I suspect that you were thinking about the same person but gave the name incorrectly. Any other Romi you might know is I'm afraid unknown to me.	9.1 On the occasion of the Monte Carlo tournament in 1930, M. played amongst others against a Mr Romi or Romih. Which version is the correct spelling of that name?

8. J. M. Hanham (1840-1925) was an American master. Already in 1902 his name appears in M.'s life at the Monte Carlo tournament, when Hanham defeated his opponent Marco, who had chosen Hanham's method of defence. In the course of the simultaneous match tour mentioned above, on March 5th 1906, they played against each other but not in a simultaneous match, but - as M. himself writes - a time-limited single match, which was won by M.. Hanham was very irritated at that defeat. M. met J. Wildmann and H. Durr at the simultaneous tournament in Winnipeg. Here he played against 14 persons simultaneously, amongst them Wildmann and Durr. M. won all the games and this is mentioned in his own analysis: "particularly memorable was my simultaneous play in Winnipeg".	Single with Hanham	ok	4
	Single with Durr	ok	4
	Single with Waldmann	ok	4
9. This tournament was in San Remo, not in Monte Carlo. The name of the person in question is written with a final 'h' in the 1957 book by Hungarian Dr Szily József, <i>Maróczy Géza élete és pályafutása, 100 valogatott játszmával</i> , Sport La es Könyvkiadó (<i>The Life and Career of Geza M. with 100 Selected Games</i> , Sports-Newspaper and Book-Publishing House, Budapest). Here he was styled 'Romih' and participated in the tournament as an Italian. In contrast, I read the name without the final 'h' in the 1977 <i>Grosses Schachlexikon</i> of K. Lindörfer, published by Bertelsmann Lexikon Verlag, Germany, i.e. as Romi, and as such he was a member of the Italian team at the 1927 London Chess Olympics, playing on the second board. In a Soviet chess book I found the name as Romi without 'h' as well. Now I cannot decide which author is wrong. In M.'s literature I found no hint. Regarding the San Remo tournament, M. played against the Italian Romi and defeated him. I did not come across further information. Dr Eisenbeiss found another encyclopaedia, <i>Dizionario Enciclopedico Degli Scacchi</i> and a magazine, <i>Wiener Schachzeitung</i> , Olms-Verlag 1930, mentioning a (Max or Massimo) Romi (without 'h', born May 5, 1893). But Dr Eisenbeiss also managed to get the official book of the San Remo Tournament 1930 (F. Chalupetzky & L. Tóth, 1930), presenting all matches played and additional information, including a picture of the participants, with Romih continually spelled with the 'h'. Furthermore, with the help of a chess expert from Italy (Dr Enrico Paoli, for many years Italy's No.1), who wrote to him in 1992, Dr Eisenbeiss learned that the aforementioned Romih was of Slavonic origin, where the spelling of Romih with 'h' is common. Romih emigrated to Italy in 1918 and eventually decided to leave out the 'h' because it was unfamiliar to the Italians.	From the official book of the tournament and the inquiry of Dr Paoli it is clear that Romih is the original (correct) spelling.	ok	6

45	II	There were moments when not only the observers watching the game but also I myself, always the optimist, had thought the game lost. But as it can be in chess and is the beauty of the game, there are surprises and occasional luck, with a sudden inspiration or an opponent making a mistake. And I had that luck because at the end of a lively game I became the winner who at the age of 60 takes revenge for a game lost in my youth.	9.2 What was the relationship between M. and Romi(h)?
46	II		9.3 What peculiarity characterizes that game?
47	II	I liked it although I came ninth only; the first was Alekhine and last one at sixteen was my friend Romih.	10.1 What was the ranking of Maróczy, Romi and Alekhine in that Monte Carlo tournament? M's ranking?
48	II		10.2 What was Romih's ranking in that tournament?
49	II		10.3 What was Alekhine's ranking in that tournament?
50	II	And so I had a very talented female pupil, who was a Czech. She was born in Russia and married in England. She was an excellent player of chess - of course because of my training - do you see my innate modesty? She was one of the few women who participated in games played with men and this with great success. Her name was Vera Menchik. Although she was just a pupil of mine, in Ramsgate in 1929 she came second behind Capablanca, but - and this is the annoying thing - the pupil came in ahead of her teacher. Had she not been my pupil, I would have been mad at this, but I was satisfied and proud of my excellent pupil. She had even more successes and would have progressed even more had she not died young in a German air raid during World War II.	11. Who was M.'s most talented chess pupil?
51	II		12.1 What can be said about this pupil concerning chess (tournament successes)?
52	II		12.2 Nationality of this pupil?
53	II		12.3 Where was she later married?
54	II		12.4 What can be said about her death?
55	II	And because you so desire I have to remind you of the existence of the Maróczy-System of Sicilian defence. 1. e2 — e4 etc. etc. It is fairly well-known. I also must mention that I wrote several books on my chess matches.	13. In what opening play is there a tactic named after M.?

In the book <i>Perlen der Schachspielkunst</i> (Pearls of the Art of Playing Chess, Beyer Verlag 1965) it is said: "How M. is able to recover from a seemingly hopeless situation is more thrilling than a thriller." After Romi's 40th move it says: "What else could M. play in his hopeless situation?" Even the San Remo Tournament-Winner, Alekhine, believed M. to have blown it. But then M. came up with his unique move and things changed. Maróczy won.	Friend of his youth whom he had not seen since those days (unverified) and he played chess against him	ok	5
	A thrilling game because M. was losing until move 40, but then had a brilliant idea for the next move, which won the game	ok	5
10. Dr Alekhine was first with 14 points, Maróczy was ninth with 9 points and Romih was last with 2½ points.	Ninth	ok	4
	Last	ok	4
	First	ok	4
11. Vera Menchik (1906-1944) originally Czech, later married M. Stevenson, lived in London and became a British citizen. She was the first women's world champion in chess history (from 1927 to 1944) by getting 10½ points from 11 games and winning at the London Tournament in 1927. She died during an air raid. Magdolna Maróczy reported that she was killed by a V2-rocket.	Vera Menchik	ok	4
	Excellent female player of chess, playing successfully against men	ok	4
	Czech	ok	4
	England	ok	5
	Died young in an air raid in World War II	ok	5
13. Particularly in the French and Sicilian Defence one encounters his name. Thus he showed it to be feasible to play the following variant of the French defence: 1. e4, e6 2. d4, d5 3. Nc3, Bb4; the so-called dragon variation of the Sicilian defence is also associated with M. The nature of this variant is: 1. e4, c5 2. Nf3, Nc6 3. d4, cxd4 4. Nxd4, g6 5. c4. or 1. e4, c5 2. Nf3, e6 3. d4, cxd4 4. Nxd4, a6 5. c4! and then keeping tight control of square d5. M. wrote a book entitled <i>Theory of Opening Play</i> on this topic. This 'Maróczy System' is described also in Klaus Lindorfer, <i>Großes Schachlexikon</i> , Orbis Verlag, p. 164.	Sicilian Defence	ok	4

56	III	My first great success was at a tournament in Nuremberg in the Summer of 1896, where I came second. (I want to apologize if I sometimes occasionally get the dates wrong, because I can no longer command certainty about exact years).	1.1 In which tournament did M. have his first major success?
57	III		1.2 What place did he achieve?
58	III	I defeated Steinitz, Pillsbury, Janowski, Winawer and others whom I cannot remember. I also played with Dr Tarrasch, but don't know who won. Alekhine came first.	2.1 Whom of the well-known Grandmasters of those days did M. beat in this tournament? First beaten.
59	III		2.2 Second beaten.
60	III		2.3 Third beaten.
61	III		2.4 Further opponents.
62	III		2.5 Who came first?
63	III	The following year, 1900, on the occasion of the world exhibition in Paris different sports competitions were organized, amongst them also a chess tournament which I attended with great pleasure. I defeated Sterling, Brody, Jankowski, but lost the games with Lasker and Burns much to my annoyance. I do not recall which place I reached, only that Lasker came first.	3.1 Against whom did M. win or lose at the Paris Tournament on the occasion of the world exhibition 1900? Here first loser.
64	III		3.2 Second loser.
65	III		3.3 Third loser.
66	III		3.4 First winner.
67	III		3.5 Second winner.
–	III		4. Who won that tournament? Same as question 3.4
68	III	My biggest success was in Monte Carlo in 1902. It was the first time that I came first in a grand tournament with the élite. I beat Janowski, Pillsbury, Teichmann, Dr Lasker and others. I was proud to bear the Hungarian flag to victory.	5.1 In which tournament did M. have the biggest success of his life?
69	III		5.2 What are the names of the first five of that tournament? Here the winner.
70	III		5.3 Number 2
71	III		5.4 Number 3
72	III		5.5 Number 4
73	III		5.6 Number 5

1. It is advisable to divide the tournaments into two categories according to their significance: minor and major international master contests. So, for example, the otherwise important tournament of Hastings in 1895, where M. won first place and became a Master, belongs to the minor category. On the basis of this, further invitations for the major tournaments followed. In this category Nuremberg in 1896 was the first such occasion where M. had a major success with 12½ points gaining him second place after the winner, E. Lasker, on 13½ points. Behind M. were Pillsbury and Dr Tarrasch (12½), Janowski (11½) and Steinitz (11). Among the more famous Masters whom he beat here were Pillsbury and Janowski. To determine which tournament was his first major success one should consider M.'s own opinion. For example, he wrote in connection with Nuremberg: "My first major tournament was Nuremberg."	1896 Nuremberg	ok	4
	Second	ok	4
2. See answer above (1). M. began playing against the then most dangerous opponent, Pillsbury and defeated him. M. was also successful against Marshall, G. Marco, R. Teichmann, to mention the best only.	Steinitz	ok	4
	Pillsbury	ok	4
	Winawer	?	4
	Dr Tarrasch	ok	4
3. Lasker came first (14½) in Paris 1900, followed by Pillsbury (12½), Maróczy, Marshall (12), Burns (11) Csigorin (10½). Maróczy won against Mason, Janowski, G. Marko, F. Marshall and lost against Lasker, H. N. Pillsbury and Didier.	Lasker instead of Alekhine	?	4
	Sterling	?	4
	Brody	?	4
	Janowski	ok	4
4. E. Lasker.	Lasker	ok	4
	Burns	?	4
	Lasker (not rated here)	–	–
5. He himself rated Monte Carlo 1902: "The tournament in Monte Carlo yielded my first big success. I succeeded in gaining the upper hand over the best of the masters." Judging by this statement I think Monte Carlo 1902 to be more important than Nuremberg. The ranking of the first five in Monte Carlo 1902 was: Maróczy (14¾), Pillsbury (14½), Janowski (14), Teichmann (13½), Schlechter, Dr Tarrasch, Bolt (12).	Monte Carlo 1902	ok	4
	Maróczy	ok	4
	Pillsbury	ok	4
	Janowski	ok	4
	Teichmann	ok	4
	Schlechter, Dr Tarrasch, Wolf	X	4

74	III	The following year 1903 I came back to Monte Carlo; but this time the die fell differently. I did not win; it was Dr Tarrasch who won. But I was not a total loser; I was third or second; I don't remember.	6.1 What place did M. reach in Monte Carlo in 1903?
75	III		6.2 Who was the winner?
76	III	Back again in Monte Carlo 1904. This time I got lucky twice. I went on my honeymoon to Monte Carlo and at the same time I participated in the tournament. This time successfully. I prevailed against Marshall, Marco, Schlechter and others.	7.1 Who got the first places in the tournament of Monte Carlo 1904? Here the winner.
77	III		7.2 Loser 1
78	III		7.3 Loser 2
79	III		7.4 Loser 3
80	III	But now back to the past; to be more precise back to my next successes and travels. In Ostend in 1905 another victory beating Tarrasch, Schlechter, Alapin, Leonhard, Taubenhaus; I don't recall the others.	8. Who won the tournament in Ostend in 1905?
81	III		How did Maróczy fare . . .
82	III		8.1 ... against Tarrasch?
83	III		8.2 ... against Schlechter?
84	III		8.3 ... against Alapin?
			8.4 ... against Leonhardt?
			8.5 ... against Taubenhaus?
85	III	Other successes were to win the Olympics in 1927 as well as in the one in Munich 1936 together with other Hungarian colleagues as Steiner, Vajda, Nagy and others.	9.1 Who was in the Hungarian team which won at the Olympics in London 1927? Here participant 1.
86	III		9.2 Participant 2
87	III		9.3 Participant 3
88	III		9.4 Participant 4
89	III		9.5 Who represented Hungary in Munich in 1936?
90	III	In the tournament of Karlsbad I came first together with ... I don't know whom unfortunately.	10. Who won the tournament of Karlsbad in 1923?
91	III	Vienna in 1908 as well. There were also other successes where I got a second or third place but which I cannot tell you because of my fading memory.	11. Which major tournament did M. win in 1908?

6. In Monte Carlo in 1903, M. came second with 19 points. The first place was earned by Dr Tarrasch with 20 points.	Place 2	½ok	4
	Dr Tarrasch	ok	4
7. Monte Carlo 1904: Maróczy (7½), Schlechter (7), Marshall (6½), Gunsberg (4), Marco (3), Swiderski (2).	Maróczy	ok	4
	Marshall	ok	4
	Marco	ok	4
	Schlechter	ok	4
8. In his memoirs M. writes about the tournament of Ostend 1905: "Serious critics called it a world tournament . . . Critics and the whole world of chess rated my triumph in Ostend as my greatest performance". The final ranking: Maróczy (19½), Janowski (18), Dr Tarrasch (18), Schlechter (15½), Marco (14). Apart from Ostend in 1905, one should mention also Karlsbad in 1923. M. was 53 years of age then and was playing after a long break - from 1908 to 1920 - during which time he had withdrawn from chess. Nevertheless he tied for first place here together with two chess giants of the modern age: Alekhine and Bogoljubov (11½ each). Behind them were names like Nimzovics, Dr Tartakower, Dr Tarrasch, Rubinstein, etc. Not to mention the Olympics of London 1927 and Munich 1936, where M. played on the first board and helped his team to win first place.	Maróczy	ok	4
	Win and loss	ok	4
	Two draws	X	4
	Two wins	ok	4
	Two wins	ok	4
	Two wins	ok	4
9. Olympics London 1927 (June 18 - June 29): Hungarian team: Maróczy, Nagy, Vajda, Steiner E., Havasi. The ranking: Hungary (40), Denmark (38½), England (36½), Holland (35), Czechoslovakia (34½). The Munich Olympic competition was in 1936, not 1926. The contest was played on 8 boards. The Hungarian team: Maróczy, Steiner L., Steiner E., Havasi, Szabó, Barcza, Vajda, Gereben, Balogh, Kórodi. The ranking of the 21 participants: Hungary (69), Poland (67½), Germany (66½), Yugoslavia (65½), Czechoslovakia (65) points.	Maróczy	ok	4
	Steiner	ok	4
	Vajda	ok	4
	Nagy	ok	4
	Maróczy	ok	4
10. Apart from Ostend in 1905, one should mention also Karlsbad 1923. M. was 53 years of age then and was playing after a long break - from 1908 to 1920 - during which time he had withdrawn from chess. Nevertheless he tied for first place here with two chess giants of the modern age: Maróczy tied with Alekhine and Bogoljubov (11½ each). Behind them were names like Nimzovics, Dr Tartakower, Dr Tarrasch, Rubinstein, etc.	Maróczy	ok	4
11. The Vienna Tournament in 1908. Results: Duras, Maróczy and Schlechter (14 each), Rubinstein (13), Teichmann (12).	Vienna	ok	4