EDITORIAL

Joseph E. Peckover, composer and tireless enthusiast, now 70 years old, has inaugurated monthly meetings in New York of a parallel group to The Chess Endgame Study Circle, called "Endgame Circle New York". Invited to send a message of greeting to be read at their first reunion, I offered the following "apology for the endgame study", based on an article I wrote for the Yugoslav "Problem" issue of vi.60.

"You have all wondered at one time or another whether chess was a game, a science, or an art. Did you come to any conclusion? The answer that is frequently given is that chess is one of the "inexact sciences", but I do not consider this a very instructive answer. A much better answer is to say that chess is a game and a science and an art, but that no one of these three elements is itself essential. In any given context the game element will predominate, or the science element or the artistic element. In the case of a hard-fought game between imaginative masters all three elements will be inextricably present in high degree to provide an irresistibly attractive chess spectacle. But if the three elements are inextricable in this example they are not beyond definition. The barest recognisable constituents of chess are the board plus the men plus the rules, BMR for short. The scientific approach to BMR is to extract truth from it. This truth is, for a given position, "win" or "draw". The proof of the truth is achieved by analysis. So the scientists in chess are the analysts and theorists, whether they be opening, middle-game or endgame theorists. The game element arises when two players face one another in a live contest. All those rules of chess concerned with the initial game arrangement of chessmen, illegal moves, penalties, clocks, players' behaviour, adjourned games, resumption, resignation, touch and move, recording of moves, and such aspects as the scoring of points, blunders, psychological factors, matches, tournaments, and so on, are all clearly non-scientific elements and equally clearly game elements of chess. Now, if we have adequately accounted for the scientific and game elements in chess, and if chess consists of science and game and art, then whatever in our chess experience remains unaccounted for so far must, logically, be art. And really the only big omission is beauty.

If you accept this analysis, then I ask you to put to yourselves, and to your chess acquaintances, the question whether you put the game element or the science element or the artistic element first in your practice of chess. The inveterate tournament competitor, however high his standard, must, whether he likes it or not, put the game element first. If he denies this and says that he puts art first, ask him what he does when there is a conflict between art and game, for instance when in a match he has to make a move, any move, or lose on time. In
such a situation, the chess-clock, a pure and characteristic game device, dictates the player's action - he moves... and to hell with art! And to hell with science too, for that matter.

Well, the player puts the game first. We have seen that the theorist puts science first. And to my knowledge it is only the endgame study enthusiast who puts art first. Only he, whether he be composer, solver, analyst or just friendly enthusiast, only he puts beauty first and foremost. Perhaps I should hasten to add two things. One, that most of us don the other hats with great ease. And two, that chess problems are just as artistic as endgame studies, but I exclude them from the present argument simply because they are based on an additional rule extraneous to the R of BMR, namely the rule of specific restriction of the number of moves (mate in 2, mate in 3, and so on) in which the aim is to be achieved.

So, gentlemen, I greet you, you who put beauty first. I beg of you one thing. Do not keep your enjoyment of beauty to yourselves. Never miss an opportunity of appreciating or passing on to others your pleasure. In this way, and in this way alone, will you achieve what I am sure you all desire, namely the creation of a chess climate of opinion in the United States of America where such great talent as unquestionably exists may flourish, compete and triumph in the international arena of the composed chess endgame study.”

A. J. R.

Extract from a letter dated 10.iv.67 from Herbert W. Thorne, New York:

“...since March 8th - dammit, every day for hours - sometimes till 4 or 5 in the morning - I have been working on composition of my first endgame study - and when I don't work on it, I think about it. I've given up practically all reading except on the subway or at the library (I'm a librarian) - this endgame is a White to draw with many lines (long-drawn out) of play possible because the position, despite great superiority of black forces, is so balanced that it takes long lines to come to the acception of the draw with many sub-variations to show and proof of wrong choice of line by White that I have experienced a greater embarrassment of riches than I could have conceived possible - but also such a wealth of chessic experiences, all, oh, so pretty! - that I have written already around 25 pages of notes (of course, also for variant initial positions, or lines that are eliminated). I am writing this disjointed way if you will forgive me deliberately so as to indicate the tumult of this "tremendous" undertaking... reason for not writing sooner is that I always expected that on that day I would reach the final version and analyze the best lines of play and proof of soundness and then take a rest and then write the damned thing up and send it... Well, it's been days and days... I do believe I have the finalized version - and much simplified from earlier versions, though still quite complex with long, pretty lines - but I, of course, have to check again and resist the temptation to change just a little in the initial position so as to have some of those pretty variations - BUT. N O! Peckover tells me simplify! .... mumble, mumble ....”
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Diagrams and Solutions


"Tries lead to positional draw or stalemate... interesting Bf counterplay... W refusal to capture... subtle choice of squares by WK... interferences... harmonious combination of all these." A. G. Kuznetsov is a journalist and chess writer, a master in USSR of both game and composition. Kralin is a young composer with several recent successes.

No. 387: V. I. Kalandadze and R. L. Tavariani. 1. Kf5t Kh7 2. Rh6t Kxh6 3. g5f Kh7 4. g6f Kg8 5. Ec5 Qh6 6. Be3 Qh8 7. Bc5 =, or 6. . . Qxe3 stalemate. "The idea of this joint Georgian study is wellknown, but the spectacular wR sacrifice, action of wB in shutting in bK and attacking bQ, the purity of the stalemate and the lightness of construction deserve a prize." Kalandadze is an engineer in the Computing Centre of the Georgian Academy of Sciences. Tavariani is mainly known as a problemist; he is a practitioner in curing diseases by physical culture. (.This study was later disqualified, because of the serious dual 7. Ke6 Kf8 8. Kd7, as 8 . . . Qg8? 9. Bc5 mate.)


No. 386  A. G. Kuznetsov and N. Kralin
4th Prize, Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 387  V. I. Kalandadze and R. L. Tavallani
5th Prize, Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 388  L. I. Katsnelson and V. A. Korolkov
6th Prize, Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 389  V. I. Kalandadze
1st Special Prize, Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 390  J. Vandiest
2nd Special Prize, Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 391  A. Hildebrand, V. Korolkov and L. Loshinsky
3rd Special Prize, Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67
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“A 4-stalemate task.” Hildebrand is a Swedish journalist and chess writer, composer of studies and problems. Loshinski is one of the great problem composers of all time, many times USSR champion.


No. 396: G. N. Zakhodyakin. 1. g7 Qg6+ 2. Kh1 Qxg7 3. Rf4+ Kh5 4. Rf5t Kh5 5. Re6+ de 6. Rf2 and wins, as bQ is forcibly exchanged and afterwards 4-a5 wins. “A spectacular R-sacrifice and sharp final position in which bQ cannot break out.” Zakhodyakin is one of the veterans of Soviet composition, the chess study owing much to his individual and subtle art.

No. 397: A. V. Sarichev. 1. Bg2 Rg1 2. Rg4 Bd5 3. Rxg7 Bb8 4. Rg5 Bxg2 5. Rg8t Kc7 6. c6 Rc1t 7. Kb2 Rg1 8. Kc3 Ba7 9. Rg7t Kb8 10. Rg8t=. If B1 fails to capture wBg2 on move 4, then wRg8t-g7t = ensues. 7. Kd2? Ra2. 9. . . Kb6 10. c7 Kb7 11. c8Qt=. “This pleases by its subtlety and paradoxical finale where B1, 2 pieces ahead, cannot win.” Sarichev is an electrical worker and one of the oldest Soviet composers.
No. 392  V. A. Bron
4th Special Prize,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 393  A. P. Kazantsev
1 Hon. Men.,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 394  I. Vandecasteele
2 Hon. Men.,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 395  A. G. Kuznetsov
and B. A. Sakharov
3rd Hon. Men.,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 396  G. N. Zakhodyakin
4th Hon. Men.,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

No. 397  A. V. Sarichev
5th Hon. Men.,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.ii.67

Win 6

Draw 4

Win 3

Win 5

Win 6

Draw 4
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c2 5. Bxc2 Sf4\+ 6. Kf3 Se6 7. g6 hg 8. h7 Sg5\+ 9. Kg4 Sxh7 10. Bd1\+ Kh6
11. Sg4\+ Kh5 12. Sf6\+ Kh6 13. Sg8 mate.
“Complex play leads to an interesting mate.”
Gorgiev is one of the founders of Soviet study composing, now enjoying his second childhood in composition. He is a doctor and microbiologist.

“A lightweight with beautiful stalemate finale. Various tries.” Author is a Moscow pianist.

No. 400: V. V. Sereda. 1. Rh1 cd 2. Kf3 Sc1 3. c6 Kd6 4. cd Kxc7 5. Rxc7 Scl
“Despite ingenious B1 counterplay W wins with a spectacular R-sacrifice.”

   Sf4 9. Kb4. i) 1. Rh1 Sg1 2. Rh1 Sxf7. ii) 1... h1Q 2. Rxh1. 1...
   Bf2 2. Kg3. iii) 2. Kg3 h1Q 3. Rh1 Sxh1. 2. Kf4 Sd4 3. Rh1 Sxh1
   Sg6 4. Kg3 =, not 4. Kf3 Se7. v) Threat wBe4. 4. Ke5 Sg6 5. K-
   13. Sg3 Sd5 10. Be4 Sc3/\+.
   “A small study by this English composer, with active chase of bS by wK”. Michael Bent is a self-employed agriculturist and handyman. We should not ourselves call this a “small” study. (AJR)

No. 402: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Sb6 Sc6 2. a7 Bf3\+
3. Kg1 Sd8 4. Sxb8 h4 5. a8Q Bxa8 6. Sb7 h3 7. d8\+ wins. Most attractive.
“A small study by 2 USSR masters, with a fresh motivation for S-promotion.”

No. 403: A. Y. Sadikov. 1. Rd8+ Ke1 2. Rh8 Re5\+ 3. Kb4 Rh5 4. Rhx5
“A very economical perpetual chase of bQ by wB.”
No. 398  T. B. Gorgiev
6th Hon. Men.,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.II.67

No. 399  A. M. Belenky
1st Command
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.II.67

No. 400  V. V. Sereda
2nd Command,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.II.67

No. 401  C. M. Bent
3rd Command,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.II.67

No. 402  F. S. Bondarenko
and A. P. Kuznetsov
5th Command,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.II.67

No. 403  A. Y. Sadikov
6th Command,
Vecherny Tbilisi 7.II.67
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7. Kg6f Kf4 8. Kg7f Kg4 =.

No. 405: G.A. Nadareishvili. 1. c8Sf Ka6 2. Sd6f Qxd6f 3. Kc8f Kb6

The 1st Prize was No. 284. The judge: A. Popandopulo (Leningrad).
The solution might be continued to prove it is only a draw 9 ... Qc3
10. f5 Qe3f 11. Kg6 Qc6f 12. Kg7 Qc3f =.

Kb6 5. Kxd6f Kxa7 6. c4+ Kb8/ii 7. Kd7 Ba8 8. c5+ Ba8 9. c4+ Ba8
Kd7f =.

... Kc7f Kb8 7- Kc7 wins. 6. Kc7f c5 wins. ii) Threat of Kc7 to
outflank wK. If Bl can force wP's to c4 and c5, Bl will win by
Ba6 and bK march to capture wP's. With wP's on c3 and c6 this
manoeuvre only draws, as bK has to capture on c3 and cannot save bPc6.
wins. 9. c4f Ba8 wins as (ii). With 9. c3 the key position is reached:
W to play would lose. v) It is a blemish that 12. Kc7 is just as good
(AJR); 12. ... Ka7 12. ... Bb7 13. Kd8f 13. Ke8 Bb7f 14. Kc7 Ka8 15. Kd6
Kb8 16. Kg7, the point being that with wKd6 it does not matter
whether K is on a7 or a8.

No. 407: D. F. Petrov. 1. e7f Ke7 2. Sf5f Kf6 3. Sxh6 Kg7 4. Sg4 Rd3f
Rg7 11. Sf5 wins. The wR sacrifice and sequel ensure wide reprinting
of this fine study. There is an anticipation, however, in Hugh Bland-
ford's 407a; 1. Sh6 Rg7 2. Be5f (2. Th4f Rg6) 2 ... c5 3. Bd2f (3. Ba6?
Rg3f 3) 3...Rg3 4. Bf4 Rg7 5. Bd6 etc. wins (AJR)

No. 407a H. F. Blandford
British Chess Magazine ii.61

No. 408: V. Klyukin. 1. Sc4f Ka4 2. Sc6f
ce b4 7. Be2 f1Q 8. Se7 Qxe2/i 9. Sc6f
and 10. Sd4f wins. i) 8 ... Qc1 9. Bxa6
wins by removing the stalemate defense
9 ... Qh6 10. Se6f Qxc6f.

No. 409: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. Rh2f Rb7 2
Rxb7f Kc8 3. Rb8+ Kxb8 4. c7+ with 3
stalemate avoiding underpromotion var-
iations: 4 ... Ka8 5. c8Rf, 4 ... Kb7 5
c8f. This study is completely anticipated
by F. J. Prokop see 1172 in “1234”.

(aJR)
No. 404  B. V. Badaj
Original

No. 405  G. A. Naderelshvili
2nd Prize,
Leninskaya Smena 1966

No. 406  V. V. Yakimchik
3rd Prize,
Leninskaya Smena 1966

No. 407  D. F. Petrov
1 Hon. Men.,
Leninskaya Smena 1966

No. 408  V. Klyukin
2 Hon. Men.,
Leninskaya Smena 1966

No. 409  E. L. Pogosjants
3 Hon. Men.,
Leninskaya Smena 1966
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The Tidskrift for Schack Informal International Study Tourney 1965 was judged by Mr. Osmo Kaila of Finland. Mr. Kaila, who was 50 in May 1966, was the first man to hold three FIDE titles, those of international master, international judge and international problem judge.

The comments on the Tfs prize winning studies are taken from his award. In his report Mr. Kaila also mentions that doubts about the originality of certain studies gave him a headache, because of which he recommends: 1) that sufficient points be awarded in solvers' tourneys to those advising anticipations, and 2) an international study collection to which tourney organisers should have recourse "ex officio". Mr. Kaila observes too that occasionally solvers discover more in a study than did the composer, and his view is that in such a case one should when assessing the content of the position also take into account the extent to which the composer exploited it.

The tourney covered 70 positions published in Tfs during 1965. Of these about 30 were found by solvers or the judge to be faulty or anticipated. The final award was announced on p. 26 of Tfs i/67.


Shows finely the possibilities for W in his fight for the draw, but unfortunately I and II cannot be regarded as a unit because there are in all three differences in position.


The composer is known for studies with the “Troitzky” material of 2S v 2P and has gained new ground in this difficult field. See, for instance, the ultimate winner of the TFS 1964 Tourney (No. 88 EG3).


No. 418  H. Källström
3rd Pr. Tidskrift
för Schack Tny 1965
Award:
Tidskrift för Schack, ix.66

Win

No. 420  E. Onate
1st H.M. Tidskrift
för Schack Tny 1965
Award:
Tidskrift för Schack, ix.66

Draw

I: Diagram
II: wRg7 to d5, bKd6 to c7,
wP's at c5 and c6

No. 422  Dr. A. Mandler
3rd H.M. Tidskrift
för Schack Tny 1965
Award:
Tidskrift för Schack, ix.66

Win

No. 421  B. Soukup-Bardon
2nd H.M. Tidskrift
för Schack Tny 1965
Award:
Tidskrift för Schack, ix.66

Draw

No. 419  Dr. J. Fritz
5th Pr. Tidskrift
för Schack Tny 1965
Award:
Tidskrift för Schack, ix.66

Draw
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5. Ra4+ Kb7 6. Rxa2 Sc3 7. Ra1 h5 8. f5 h4 9. f6 h3 10. Ra8= for now
if 10. .. Kxa8 it is W who queens with check. A good offering, rich in
content, but for a W win to figure in the main line of a drawing study
is a serious fault.


wins.
No. 427: A. C. Miller. 1. Rb4/i Kxd2/ii 2. Rb1 Kc2 3. Rh1/iii Sg3† 4. Kg4 Sxh1 5. Kxh3 =. i) 1. Ra4? Kxd2 2. Ra2† Kd1, or 2. Ra1 Sc1 wins. 1. Rf4? Kxd2 2. Rf1 Sg3†. 1. Sf3†? Kf2 2. Sxh2 Sxd4† 3. Kg4 Kg2 4. Sf1 Sf5 wins, or 2. Rd1 Kxf3 3. Ra1 h1Q or 3. . . Sg3†. ii) 1. . . Kg2 2. Rb1 Sg1 3. Se4† Kf3 4. Rb3† Kg2 5. Rb2†. Here 2. . . Kg2 3. Se4, or 2. . . Sg3† 3. Kg4 Kg2 4. Sf3 draws. iii) 1. Ra1? Sc1. 3. Re1? Sg1. 3. Rf1? Sg3†.

No. 428: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Qe8 a2† 2. Ka1 Rh1 3. Qxe4† Kh2 4. Bf1 Ed5 5. Qxd5 cd 6. g4 Bxf2 stalemate. No. 48 (EG2) was 4th Prize in New Statesman 1965, but flaws were discovered. See EG3 (p. 56) and EG5 (p. 107).

No. 429: K. H. Hannemann. 1. Sd1† with four variations: 1. . . cdQ 2. Qd3† Kb2 3. Qb1† =, or 1. . . cdR 2. Qxc4† Kb2 3. Qc1† Kxa2 4. Qxa3† =, or 1. . . cdB 2. Qc2† Kb4 3. Qa4† Rxax4 4. a3† =, or 1. . . cdS 2. Qd2† =. We have reprinted this study, first published over 27 years ago, because it is not wellknown. Indeed Harold Lommer sent it to us recently as the theme is one he was very keen on achieving himself. The theme is 4 different variations arising out of alternative B1 promotions on the same square. The setting is task-like, W's moves are all checks, but otherwise all is to be admired. 1. . . Kb4? 2. Qe1†.


No. 436: E. Szentai. 1. Sf4/i Qxe6 2. g4+ Rxf4/i 3. Rh6t Rh4 4. Rg5t Bxg5 5. Bf3t Qg4 6. Sg3 mate. i) Threat 2. g4+ Rxf4 3. Rh3t Rh4 4. Rg5t Bxg5 5. Bf3 mate. ii) 2. ... Qxg4 3. Rc3t g5 4. Sf6 mate.
No. 437: J. Balazs. 1. a7 d4 2. a8Rf i Bg8 3. Ra5 Be6 4. Rb5 ii Bf7 5. Rg5 wins.


No. 445: V. Stancik

1. Sa2+ Kg2 2. Sc3+ Kg1 3. Sd2+ Kg2 4. Se2+ Kh1 5. Sf1+ Kh2 6. Sg1+ Kg2 7. Sh2+ Kg1 8. Sh3+ Kh1 9. Sg4+ Kh2 10. Sg5+ Kg3 11. Sh6 mate

i) 1... Kc2 2. Sd4+ Kb2 3. Bc3+ Ka3 4. Sc1 mate

ii) 4. Sf3+ Qxf3

iii) 8... Kf6 9. Bc3+ Kxe6 10. Sg5+ Kd6 11. Bc5 mate

iv) 11. Bf7? also mates quickly as W can check on a8.

No. 446: L. Zoltan

1. Rh8+ Kg5 2. Rf8+ Kg6 3. Rf7 Kg5 4. Rf4 Kg4 5. Rf3 Kg5 6. f4 Kg6 7. Re8 Kg5 8. Re3 Kf6 9. Rg3 Ke6 10. Rf3 Kf5 11. Rf2 wins

i) 1. Rh3? Kg5 2. Rxg3 Kf4 3. Rh3 Ke3 4. Rg3 Kg4 =

ii) 6... Kh5 7. Rg8

iii) 8... Kf5 9. Rf3 wins.

No. 447: M. Kalgin


i) Not 5. g7? Exg7 6. Kg6 Kg8 7. f6 Bh6 8. e5 Ke8 9. e6 Kf8 =, as W is in Zugzwang. A striking position and a close try.

No. 448: A. Kopnin

1. diagram

2. bRh5 to h6. Draw?
The main point is the original move 8. Sc7; the twin adds a nice extra touch.

No. 449: N. Kralin

```
manoeuvre forces e6, which after 6. Rb7 etc., would still be available
to give Bl the opposition in the K-traverse across the board.
```

No. 450: G. Popov

```
A remarkably rich study, with flight from check and stalemate
prominent features.
At the end 12. Bb6\# Kxb6 13. bc also wins. (AJR)
```

No. 451: V. Tiavlovsky
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No. 452: S. Sergiev. 1. 0-0-0/i Re2 2. f5 Ke8/ii 3. g7 Rg8 4. Rh8 Kf7 5. Rd7+ wins. i) Threat 2. Rhel mate, ii) Or 2. .. Ra8 3. Rh7+ wins. 2. .. Rg8 3. Rh7+ Ke8 4. Rhd7 mates. A simple but pleasant castling study.

No. 454: F. Bondarenko and Al. Kuznetsov. 1. Re2 fe 2. Qa8 Be5/i 3. Qg8/ii Bf6 4. Sf4 Bh4+ iii 5. g3 and wins, as if 5. .. Bg7 6. Qg7 Bf6 7. Qh7. i) If 2. .. Bf6 3. g3 Bh4 4. Qf3 wins. ii) Avoiding stalemate after Bg3. iii) 5. Sh3 mate threatened. 4. .. Bg7 5. Qd5 mates next move, 4. .. Bg5 5. g3 is the same as the text. An unusual study, where W must deal with mate and stalemate threats before mating himself.

ANTICIPATIONS WITHOUT COMMENT

J. R. Harman gives: No. 337: 538 in “1234” (Lazard).
No. 345: 252 in Tattersall (Crum).
No. 356: 34 in Fouwmeester’s “Schaakstukken Spelen U Voor” (Lommer).

“Chess Treasury of the Air”, published by Penguin Books at 6 shillings, and about the best value in chess literature for a long time, consists of selected talks and similar items broadcast on the B.B.C. from 1958 to 1964, when chess was withdrawn. They include two out of some half-dozen broadcast by AJR on the endgame study.

284
"WALTER VEITCH INVESTIGATES"

No. 242: Dr. A. Wotawa. By moving the wEg6 to b1 the composer eliminates the dual solution 1. S(6)d4 mentioned in EG8. E1 can now meet it by 3...Qe8+. Our thanks to Mr. Breiger for this note. 

A. C. Miller (EG7, page 184): Mr. Rombach of Toronto, in response to our comment in EG8, points out that the correct key move is 1. d7 (not 1. Sd4) and only after 1...dQ 2. Sd4 etc.

No. 334: V. Kalandadze. To Note (i) we plead "guilty but not insane". To show that W can scrape a draw by 3. Bg3 is, of course, totally irrelevant in a "White to win" study, but the question was put to us out of context.

No. 335: E. Pogosjants. 1. Sd6 is a dual solution despite Note (i) which gives 1. Sd6 Rx6 =. Simply 2. Rb8 and the draw is clear.

If 1...Rc7 2. Kc6 Rx6 3. Sxb7 Bf6 (c3) 4. Sd6 =.

No. 336: F. S. Bondarenko and A. P. Kuznetsov. There is no win. 1. Rg5+ hg 2. Qb1 Bg3 (instead of 2...h1Q+) =. The bPh2 renders the wQ ineffective. Probably at one time during composition 2. Qb1 threatened Qh7+ and forced ...h1Q+, but later the need for this was forgotten.


No. 343: G. Nadareishvili. The win seems doubtful. 1. a4 Kg2 (instead of 1...Sc2). Now if (a) 2. a5 Kg3 3. Kf5 Sc6 =; or (b) 2. Kf4 Sd5+ 3. Ke4 Sc3+ =; or (c) 2. Kf5 Kf3 3. Ke3 Ke3 4. d5 Kd3 5. d6 Kc4 6. d7 Ke5 =.


No. 363: L. Zoltan. The kinship with the remarkable No. 357 is unmistakeable and interesting. We doubt however whether there is a win. 1. g5 Ke3 (not 1...Be8) 2. g6 a1Q 3. Rxa1 Exc2+ 4. Ke2 Bxg6 which seems an easy draw.


No. 367: M. N. Klinkov & A. P. Kuznetsov. Black wins. After 1. Bf6+ Kxf6 2. d6 Ra3+ first (not 2...cd) 3. Kf4 on other moves 3...cd transposes into Note ii) Bh7 threatening ...e5 and ...Rf3 mate, to which there is no satisfactory counter.
No. 371: O. Weinberger. A diagram misprint. The bBf2 should be on g2.


No. 378: H. Steniczka. A 4-move short-cut through this 17-move tangle is 1. Qe2f Kb7(8) 2. Qb3f Ka8 3. Qf3f Ka7 4. Kxg3 wins as . . Se3 no longer works. The simple remedy to this would be to move the wK to h5, but there is another more fundamental weakness in the position. The win can also be achieved by forcing the bK to the e-file, e.g. 1. Kg5 g2 2. Kf4 Sa3 3. Qg1 Kb8 4. Ke3 Sc4f 5. Ke2 Kc6 6. Qa7 (instead of 6. Qd4) Kd8 7. Kd1 Ke5(8) ( . . Se5 would always be met by Qa8f and Qxg2) 8. Kc2 Kg(4) 9. Qd4 Ke7 10. Kc3 and wins.


No. 381: L. Kopac. After 1. Sb6f Kb7 2. Sc4 d6 3. Sxd6 Kc6 4. Kg5 (instead of 4. Bc3) Rf3 5. Sf5 wins as quickly and by the same method as used in No. 382, which robs the twin studies of their point. (Kg5 can be played as early as move 3.)


(See Review on p. 287).
**Review: The Chess Study in the Ukraine, by T. B. Gorgiev and F. S. Bondarenko. (Kiev, 1966).** This 148-page paper-covered volume is written by two composers well-known to readers of EG. It begins with a rather thin section reviewing the history of study composition generally, and illustrating a few maxims of study aesthetics. The book moves on to chapters on the development of composition in the Ukraine from the late twenties till the war, featuring several well-known studies by V. A. Ern, who lived at Kharkov before settling in Sverdlovsk; other names of significance include Aisenstadt, Bogdassiants, and Sevitzov. The largest section contains selections from the work of present-day Ukrainian composers; in number and quality Bondarenko, Gorgiev and Kakovin stand out considerably. The other leading names are Godes, Hvalchev, Kopaiev, Kovalev, Lyubchenko, Olmutsky and Rudenko. Most of these feature in the FIDE-Alhums and the last-named is the distinguished problemist. The last part gives the results of Ukrainian toursneys, rather dominated by Bondarenko and Kakovin in conjunction. As a whole, the book is necessarily parochial, and in the attempt to represent as many Ukrainian composers as possible, some of the 226 studies are a little weak. However the collection does contain many little-known and worthwhile studies. Anyone who knows Russian will find the Ukrainian text an interesting linguistic challenge. Two attractive studies from the book are given, both showing wK marches.

P. S. V.

---

**Review: Studi Scacchistici, by Giorgio Porreca. Milan. 1967. 376 pages.** As far as I know this is the first major study anthology to appear in the Italian language. It should therefore be a further sign of the growing popularity of studies. The author is an international master over-the-board, which is also encouraging. The book has many interesting and valuable features. There are 484 studies, every one by Soviet composers or near-Soviet (a fact not hinted at by the title). The selection is particularly useful to anyone who missed the spate of collections that were published in Russia around 1960 and which are now difficult to obtain. The immediate pre-war and post-war periods provide many examples, to such an extent that the book may almost be considered a successor to Sutherland and Lommer's "1234 Modern Chess Endings" (1938), at any rate for Soviet composers. Unlike "1234", however, "Studi Scacchistici" attempts a classification into seven chapters, each with sub-headings. These are set out below, with the numbers of studies.

I. Checkmate: 94
   - single w piece on the board
   - two or more w pieces

II. Stalemate: 91
   - wK on the edge of the board
   - wK not on the edge
   - two or more main variations
   - pinning of w piece
   - w self-immuring
III. Repetition of Moves: perpetual check
perpetual attack (chase)
immobilisation (of Bl)
positioned draw

IV. Win of Material: combative play
double attack
skewer
discovered attack
S-tour penning
domination

V. Promotion: to Q
to R
to B
to S
multiple

VI. Tempi: win of a tempo
opposition and related squares
simple Zugzwang
reciprocal Zugzwang

VII. Geometrical Manoeuvres: staircase
simple systematic manoeuvre
complex systematic manoeuvre

It is interesting (but we have no space) to compare the above classification with Mr. J. R. Harman's as set out in his article in EG7. Other noteworthy features of the Italian book are the biographical footnotes, the detailed sources, the frank bibliography, the useful but not lengthy annotations, the use of bold type to set off the main line against the surrounding variations very effectively, and the book's handy, if rather fat, format. A sufficient understanding of the text can be achieved with a reasonable knowledge of French, or Latin - and chess. A.J.R.

Vecherny Tbilisi 1967 ("Rusthaveli" Tourney)
Final Award published 27.v.67
1st Prize: L. A. Mitrafanov, No. 383.
2nd and 3rd Prizes: V. A. Korolkov, No. 384, and V. Neidze, No. 393.
4th Prize: A. G. Kuznetsov and N. Kralin, No. 386.
5th Prize: L. Katsnelson and V. A. Korolkov, No. 388.
1st Special Prize: V. Kalandadze, No. 389.
3rd Special Prize: V. A. Bron, No. 392.
1 Hon Men: I. Vandecasteele, No. 394.
3 Hon Men: G. Zakhodyakin, No. 396.
4 Hon Men: A. Sarychev, No. 397.
5 Hon Men: T. B. Gorgiev, No. 398.
6 Hon Men: A. Belenky, No. 399.
1 Comm: V. Sereda, No. 400.
2 Comm: C. M. Bent, No. 401.
3 Comm: V. Tjavlovski, (not in EG).
5 Comm: A. Y. Sadikov, No. 403.
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A SERVICE TO ALL TOURENY JUDGES

The Chess Endgame Study Circle offers an “anticipations” service to all tourney judges anywhere in the world. Over 4,000 studies are classified in Richard Harman’s collection in accordance with the system set out in his article in E G 7. The total of 4,000 is, of course, not all-embracing, nor even large, and there are still large gaps in its coverage. However, it is growing every day, and we are taking advantage of Mr Harman’s offer in order to demonstrate the value of his classification system, in which we have great faith.

The procedure is very simple:

**The tourney judge** sends the positions and their main solution lines to Mr Harman, identifying only the tourney and giving a reasonable period, 2-3 weeks, say, to allow for accidental absence, before requesting return.

**Mr Harman** will, for each position submitted, supply an identifiable and normally accessible reference for any anticipations within his collection.

Will judges please note that Mr Harman

- will not divulge any of the positions submitted to him
- will not normally supply the positions and solutions to anticipations
- will not comment on or himself judge the degree of anticipation
- will not guarantee to find every anticipation.

As well as being a service to judges, this facility will, if it is used, be the best possible test of the usefulness of the system set out in E G 7. That there has been a need for such a service has long been clear and it is underlined by the remarks of Mr Kaila quoted in the paragraphs preceding the solution to No. 416 in this issue.

Address:

DECLINING THE DOUBLE ATTACK, AS A STUDY THEME

by G. Afanasiev and E. Dvizov

In practical chess play, it often happens that a move combining a double attack is not the best continuation. For example,

White plays 23. Bc4-d5! ... Alekhine comments on this move: "The only way to maintain the advantage. The capture 23. Rxe5? (with double attack on e7 and h5. Authors' note.) would lead only to a draw, e.g. 23. Rxe5? Rxf1 24. Kxf1 Rxf3† 25. Bf2 Bh4 26. Rxe5 Rxf2† 27. Kgl Rf4 =."

The famous study by the Platov brothers is based on the avoidance of an obvious double attack:
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The following study by the authors was aimed at drawing the attention of chessplayers to this new theme:
The authors' study given in Diagram D shows the idea of declining the classical pawn fork, quite obvious and seemingly an easy winner:
The double attack 1. g4t looks right, but fails through 1. . . Kg6! (not 1. . . Kg5 2. gh Kxh5 3. Kf7 Kg5 4. Bf6t Kf5 5. e4t Kf4 6. Bb2 h5 7. e5 h4 8. e6 h3 9. e7 h2 10. e8Q h1Q 11. Qe5t Kxf3 12. Qd5t wins) 2. gh Kf7 3. B any a1Q 4. Bxal stalemate.
Therefore White must find a better first move: 1. Kf7! Rh3(hl) (.. Kg5 2. e4 mate) 2. e4t Kg5 3. Bf6t Kh5 4. g4 mate.
The last study illustrates the avoidance of a series of double attacks, which are subtly refuted by Black:

The solution is 1. Rg3t (not 1. Bg2t Kh2 2. Rf1 Sf4+ 3. Kh4 (h6) Sf3 (d7t) wins) Kh2 2. Rg2t (2. Rh3t Sf4+ 3. Kg5 f1Q 4. Rxh2t Kg1 wins) Kxh1 3. Rxf2 Sf6t (not 3. . . b1Q 4. Sg3t Kg1 5. Rf1t draws) 4. Kh4 b1Q 5. Kh3t (avoiding the double attack 5. Sg3t? Kg1 6. Rf1t Kg2 7. Rxh1 Sf3 mate. Similarly after 5. Rf1t? Kh2 6. Rxh1 Sf3 mates). Se 1(h6) (to control g3) 6. Rh2t Kg1 7. Rg2t Kf1 8. Sc3t Ke1 9. Rg1t draws.
From the examples given above, one can fairly conclude that the avoidance of a double attack, or of a series of them, can constitute the theme of a study, on the same lines as the double attack itself. These avoidance studies, as a rule, contain two separate plays—one in the main line, the other in the thematic try (tries). Thus the theme enriches the content of a study and creates new possibilities in composition.
The authors will feel satisfied if the theme they suggest meets with the appreciation and support of both composers and players.
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