“JRH” means an “anticipation” comment by Mr J. R. Harman. In these, 1234 means the Lommer and Sutherland anthology.


i) wK plays to stop ..c5. 1. Kc2? Kd6 2. Kb3 Kc5 -

ii) 2. . . Kc7 3. c5 Kb7 4. Kb4 Kc7 5. Ka5 Kb7 6. c4, as main line.


vi) 13. Ka4? Kb8 = . vii) No time to re-cross the board, so bK attacks.


ix) 15. K? Kb4 =


vii) Stopping ..Sc7f. The rest is familiar.

viii) Or 11... Sd8 Sa8 12. Sb5 Sb6 13. Sd4t.
2) Cr 4. Kh1 Sf3 5. Rf6+ Kg4 6. Rf4+ Kg3, and no perpetual. A neat try. Judge E. Byelikov of Moscow announced his award from 10 studies in the number for vi.68. V. Dolgov was also awarded an H.M.


1) To free the bishop. Not 1. Bf6+ Kg8 draws. 
2) Forcing the pawn to move. A good study, downgraded by the judge in view of the duals and a partial anticipation. (A. Herberg, 1956).
No. 864: Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Be5 Qxe5 2. Qxc4† Kg1 3. Qc1† Kh2 4. Qd2† Kh3 5. Qg2† Kh4 6. Qh1† Kg5 7. Qh5† Kf6 8. Qh8 mate. A pointed B-sacrifice.

The Stella Polaris Informal Tourney for studies published in 1967 was judged by A. Hildebrand. Award in SP 1/68.

No. 865: E. Pogosjants. 1. Sf8/ii hlQ 2. Sd7 Qg1 3. g4 f5 4. g5 f4 5. g6 Qf2 (forcing W's hand who was happy not to exchange) 6. Sb6† Qxb6† 7. Kxb6 c3 8. g7 f2 9. g8Q f1Q 10. Qg4/i Qf4 11. Qxf4 c5 12. Qd4 (else stalemate) cxd4 13. exd4 Kb4 14. c5/i ii a4 15. c6 a3 16. c7/iii ab 17. c8Q b1Q 18. Qc5† Ka4 19. Qa5 mate. “A study of calibre; 5 Q-promotions, Q-sacrifice etc.” i) 1. Sxf6 i hlQ 2. Sd7 Qg1 3. g4 Qf2 4. Sb6† Qxb6† 5. Kxb6 c5 and 6. . . stalemate. ii) 10. Qa8? Qg1(f2)f 11. c5 Qxc5t 12. Kxc5 = . iii) 14. d5? a4 15. d6 a3 16. b4+ Kxc4 = . iv) 16. b4+ Kxa3 17. c7 b2 18. c8Q b1Q+ 19. Kc7 Qb5 20. Qe5† Ka4 = . JRH: “See 16 in Kok’s book.”

No. 865 E. Pogosjants
1st Prize, Stella Polaris, 1967
(SP 1/67) 6

No. 866 S. Belokonj
2nd Prize, Stella Polaris, 1967
(SP 2/67) 4

No. 867 E. Pogosjants
1 Hon. Men., Stella Polaris
1967 (SP 1/67) 4

No. 868 S. Belokonj
2 Hon. Men., Stella Polaris,
1967 (SP 2/67) 6

No. 867: E. Pogosjants. 1. d7 Ke7 2. d6f Kd8 3. Sc6f Kd8 4. Se5t
Kxd6/i 5. Sf7t Ke7 (5. .. Sxf7 model stalemate) 6. Sxh8 Kf6 7. Kh6 Sf4
(7. .. Se3 8. Sg6=) 8. Sf7 Se6/ii 9. Sd8 Bg6 (Bringing about a “new”
i) 4. .. Ke8(6) 5. d7 Ke7 6. Kb8=. ii) 8. .. Kxf7 9. Kg5= or
Se7(5) winning.

i) 3. Bh4? Qb8 4. Be1 Sg6 5. Bd2(c5) Sf4(e5) or if 3. Be5? Sg8 winning,
Qe5 9. Ba5t Qc7 10. Bd2= . “A positional draw mechanism known
amongst others from A. O. Herbstman but with its own points in the
WK play”.

No. 869: P. Perkonoja. 1. a6/i Kc4 2. g8Q/ii Bxg8 3. a7 Be6 4. Sf6 Sc5t
Bxf6 4. Kb6 Sxa6 winning. “A not specially original but cleverly
composed piece win study”.

K-march to a8 and a1 respectively. Well-known finish.”

The Tidskrift for Schack Informal International Study Tourney 1966
was judged by A. Hildebrand, FIDE International Judge. The com-
ments after the solutions are from his award. His unenthusiastic opi-
nion on the general level of the entries was mentioned in WV’s talk
printed in EG 15.


No. 873: B. V. Badaj. 1. R8d7f/i Kf6 2. Rxe6| Kxe6 3. Bg4f Ke5 4. Rd5f Kf4 5. Rf5f Kxg4 6. Rxh8 Be4 7. Rf8f Kb5 8. Rg8f Kg6 stalemate. i) Not 1. Rxe6f? Kxe6 2. Bg4f Ke7 3. Rd7f Ke8 4. Rd1 Bf1 5. Re1† Be7 6. Bh5f Kf8; nor 1. R6d7f? Kf6 2. Rxf8f Sxf8 3. Rg7 Sg6f. A clear and well-constructed stalemate study but just lacking the spark to make it a memorable work of art. Bron, Perkonoja and Badaj have a certain similarity in that their technique is of the highest but unfortunately often applied to bleak or already known ideas.


i) 1. Kxf4? Bb2 2. Kf5 Ba3 = . ii) If 1. ... f3 2. Ke6 etc. Or 1. ...Bg7 2. Rh7 f3 3. Ke6, but not 2. Rg6 f3 3. d7/ Kc7 = (Not so! 4. Rd6 wins. A minor fault only. WV) iii) If 5. ...Bc1 (or f3) 6. Kd5 wins. An interesting special case, rendered study-like by the tries of Kxf4 (horizontal capture on move 1, vertical on move 5) and the final Zugzwang positions.

---

No. 874: H. Källström

4th Prize. Tidskrift för Schack Tny 1966
TfS 4/66 (Award 5/67)

---

No. 875: Dr. J. Bán

1st H.M. Tidskrift för Schack Tny 1966
TfS 10/66 (Award 5/67)

---

No. 876: B. Soukup-Bardon

2nd H.M. Tidskrift för Schack Tny 1966
TfS 6/66 (Award 5/67)

---


No. 878: C. A. Peronace & O. J. Carlsson. 1. Se7/i Kxe7/ii 2. g7 f2 3. g8Q f1Q 4. Qe8† Kd6 5. Qd7† Kc5/iii 6. Se4† Kb4 7. Qd5† Ka5 8. Qc7† Ka6 9. Qa7† Kb5 10. Qc5† Ka6 11. Sc3 Qf4† 12. Ka8 Qf3† 13. Sd5 wins. i) 1. Sh5? f2 2. g7† Kf7 3. Se5† Kg8 4. Sc4 f1Q 5. Sh6† Kh7 6. g8Q† Kxh6 = ii) 1. ..f2 2. Sf5 f1Q 3. g7† Kf7 4. g8Q† Kxf6 5. Qg7† Ke6 6. Qe7† Kd5 7. Se3† wins. iii) 5. ..Ke5 6. Sg4† Ke4 7. Qxa4† wins. Such Q + S v Q studies really belong to the past and not to a 1967 prize list. If nevertheless we end with this work it is because of the excellent two quiet moves of 1. Se7 and 11. Sc3.
The 1967 award of the Soviet magazine ‘Shakhmaty v SSSR’ was announced in the number for ix.1968 by the judges, F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. The first prizewinner was An. Kuznetsov’s corrected study on p. 381 of EG13, and second prize was taken by V. Yakovenko’s study on p. 414 of EG14 in the article by Bondarenko (curious coincidence!) Other honoured studies in EG were the 2nd HM - Zemlianski’s 552 and the 6th Comm. - 533 by A. Sadykov. Generally, the standard seems as good as ever; and it is nice to see some less prominent names. (PSV)

No. 879: V. Yakimchik. 1. Rh5† Kg1 2. Sg5 f1Q 3. Sh3† Kh2 4. Sf2† Kg3 5. Se4† Kf3 6. Rh3† Kg4 7. Rh1 Qf3 8. Rh3 Qf5 9. Rh5 Qf1 10. Rh1 and draws by perpetual attack of bQ by wR. Straightforward and rather static, but the R moves are attractive.

JRH: “See 1201 in 1234.”

No. 881: G. M. Kasparian. 5th Prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1967

No. 882: A. Bondarev. 1st HM, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1967

No. 880: V. Evreinov. 1. Rdd8 g5 2. f5 g4 3. Rg8† Kh6 4. Rxe4 Kh7 5. Rc3 Rxh2 6. Rh4† Kg7 7. Rg3† Kh8 8. Rh8† Ke7 9. Rd3 ef 10. Rdd8 f6 11. Rxe8† Kf7 12. e6† Kg6 13. Rg8† Kh6 14. e7 Rbe2† 15. Kd1 Ra2 16. Rg6† Kh7 17. Rh8†, and wins, queening with check. A remarkably sustained series of mating threats, culminating in a pleasant double rook sacrifice.

No. 881: G. M. Kasparian. 1. g6†/i Kxe7 2. g7 Kf7 3. Ba7 Kg8/ii 4. Bg1/iii Kf7 5. Ba7 Kg8 6. Bg1 positional draw - Black cannot take the pawn as Bd4† and Kb3-a2 loses the bB; he cannot advance bP as it will be lost, and S checks are no use. An original position.


No. 882: A. Bondarev. 1. Sg3† Kg1/i 2. Qc1† Kh2/ii 3. Sf1† Kh1 4. Se3† Qg1 5. Qc6† Kh2 6. Qf3 Qa1† 7. Kf5 Qa2/iii 8. Sg4† Kg1 9. Qg3† Qg2 10. Qe3† Kh1 11. Qd3 a3 12. Kf4 a2 13. Qd1† Qg1 14. Sf2† Kh2 15. Qh5† Kg2 16. Qf3† and wins. Material very well-known, but the quiet moves are less frequent. i) 1. .. Kh2 2. Se2† Kh1 3. Qh7† Qh2 4. Qe4† Qg2 5. Qb1† is a more standard win. ii) Kf2 3. Sh1† wins the queen. iii) 7. .. Qb1† 8. Kg5 Qb5† 9. Kh4 leads to a quick mate.
No. 883: L. Katsnelson 1. Sd5 cd 2. Bf8 Rxf8 3. Kg7 d3 4. ed Ra8/i 5. cb Kb4 6. b6 Kb5 7. b7 Rb8 8. h8Q wins. i) If 4. . . Rb8(d8) 5. c5 wins. The point of the study is this divergence of wP to gain a tempo by attacking bR on the back rank.

No. 884: T. B. Gorgiev 1. Sd4 Qa1 2. Sb5 Kb2 3. Sd6 Rd1 4. Sc4+ Kc1 5. e8S d5 6. Sxd4 Ra3 7. Sxc4 Ra3 8. Se5 mates next move. This is one of a number of similar compositions by this well known and long successful composer; they have caused much controversy and an article in “Shakhmaty v SSSR” described these as problems.


No. 890: S. Bielekon. 1. b7 b1Q 2. b8Q Qg6+ 3. Kb7 Qg2+ 4. Ka6 Qa2+ 5. Kb8 Qf2+ 6. Kc8 Qf6 7. Kb7 Qf3+ 8. Ka6 Qa3+ 9. Kb6 Qe3+ 10. Kc6 Qh6+ 11. Kb5 brings a speedy end to the checks, as W can now free his blocked pieces. The forcing of bQ from 2nd to 3rd rank gives the needed artistic touch.
wins. i) 1. h7? Kg6 =. ii) 1. ... Bb2 2. h7 Kgl/xiii Bd2 3. e5f Kg7 6. Bb2f
wins. iii) 3. ... Bc3 4. Sc6 Kh7 5. Kg4 Kg6 6. Se7+ Kf7 7. Sd5 wins. iv) 4. Sc6?
stalemate. v) 5. Kg4? Kg6 6. Kg3 Kh7 thr ... Bc1 =. vi) 6. ... Bc3 7. Sf7+
and Sd5 wins. vii) 7. ... Kh7 8. Kg4 Kg6 9. Se5+ wins. viii) 9. Sf7?

No. 888: V. Yakimechik
4th Comm.
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1967

No. 889: S. Bielokon
5th Comm.
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1967

No. 891: A. Koranyi
1st Prize,
Breyer mem. tny, 1968
Award 31.X.68

No. 892: G. Kasparyan
2nd Prize,
Breyer mem. tny, 1968
Award 31.X.68

No. 892: Kasparyan. 1. Sf5+ Ke5/i 2. Sd7+ Kf5 3. Bb1+ Kg5 4. h4+
i) 1. ... Ke6 2. Sd4+ Kf6 3. Sd7+ Ke7 4. Be6 =. Or 1. ... Kc5(ii) 2. Se6+


No. 893 V. Bron
4th Prize,
Breyer mem. tny, 1968
Award 31.x.68 8

No. 894 B. Breider
1 Hon. Men,
Breyer mem. tny, 1968
Award 31.x.68 7

No. 895 T. Gorgiev
2 Hon. Men.
Breyer mem. tny, 1968
Award 31.x.68 5

No. 896 G. Kasparyan
3 Hon. Men.
Breyer mem. tny, 1968
Award 31.x.68 4


iii) 2...h5 3. d5 h4 4. d6 h3 5. Sf1 wins. iv) 5...h4 6. Ke7 h3 7. d6 h2
8. Sg4+ wins.

ii) thr 7. Sd5+.

Kxf2 Se4+ =.

Rxh5 wins. i) 1. Rxb7 Sxb7 2. a6 Sd6 3. a7 Sc4+ and 4...Sb6 E1 wins.
SPOTLIGHT

directed by W. VEITCH & W. D. ELLISON

It is a double pleasure for me (WV) to see the last of the title “Walter Veitch Investigates”. Firstly, it was too personal for a column never intended to be a solo effort and the very welcome increase in contributions by others has made it quite unsuitable. Secondly, Wallace D. Ellison of Blackfordby, Leicestershire, has agreed to collaborate in producing this column in future. Readers have already seen some of his very pertinent comments in EG 15 and will note below his corrections of two previous comments of mine.

We share the hope that a growing band of contributors will help us to direct the ‘spotlight’ on to both the merits and defects of the studies in EG. For convenience, all correspondence to W. Veitch as before (address on back page).

EG3, No. 94: E. Pogosjants. No win. After 1. Ra2 Sd3† 2. Kd2 simply 3. Kc3 (as good as any) Se6 4. a7 Sc7 or 4. Se8 Sc5=. 2. Kd1 avoids this line but allows 2. ... Sb2† 3. Rxb2 Ra5 or 3. K- Sc4=. (WDE)

EG4, No. 168: A. Grin (more familiar to many perhaps as A. Gulaev). Black wins. 1. Bb2 Kh7 (instead of 1. .. Kh6) 2. Kc6 Rh6† 3. Kc5 Rh5† followed by Bd5. Fortunately this bust, advised by Mr. Rombach of Toronto, can easily be eliminated; the addition of a wPh5 saves this very neat study.

EG8, No. 327: G. Nadareishvili. This First Prize winner is spoilt by a dual win pointed out in “Sahs”, i.e. 6. a8Q (instead of 6. a8R) g6 Qe4 d1Q Bf7 Se5 (8. ... Qb1† 9. Kc7 Qc2† 10. Kd6) 9. Qxe5 Qxd3 10. g4† winning the bQ or mating.

EG9, No. 341: V. Isarianov. On p. 285 we gave a dual draw. Now Mr. Rombach shows a White win. 1. R8d7† Kb8 2. Rb7† Ka8 3. Rf7! All one had to do was see it!

A Question of Style.

EC11, p. 299: H. K. Mattison. Having pointed out that this study, an intended draw, is unsound because Black comes out with 2S v P, Mr. C. J. de Feijter revised it by reversing the colours and introducing a bPb7 to provide an initial move. The resulting Position A: White - Kh8, Sd8, Pc6; Black - Kc4, Bc5, Se2, Pb7, Pc7. is solved by 1. cb Ba7 2. Sc6 etc. as in B.

Mr. J. van Reek criticised this as being “not in the style of Mattison”, whose studies, he explained, never had captures in the introductory play. Trying to improve on A, he arrived at Diagram B, but rejected it on the same grounds, regarding 2. ... Kxc4 as “an ugly move” like 1. cb in A. He finally suggested that the best way out of the difficulty was to omit 1. cb Ba7 from A.
There was a curious sequel when I told WDE of Mr. van Reek's criticism. Though I had not mentioned B, he sent me the identical position with the comment that a wP given up is rather different from a blatantly captured, but that perhaps Mattison's ghost, through Mr. van Reek, might object to the Pc4. When he learned that it already had he found Diagram C, in which Mattison's Pc2 serves exactly the same purpose as the Pc4 in B, and there the matter rests for the time being. Readers' views will be welcome. (WV).

B. after H. K. Mattison

![Diagram B](image)

Win


C. H. K. Mattison

1 Pr. Magyar Sakk. 1925

![Diagram C](image)

Win


EG13, No. 639: S. Tikhy. Mr. F. Fargette, of Neuilly-sur-Seine, justifiably considers that this study is surpassed by one of Halberstadt's with 3 S-promotions and only 15 pieces. (Diagram D).

D. V. Halberstadt

Themes/64 1956 H.M.

Dedicated to H. Lommer

![Diagram D](image)

Win

Solution: 1. Bf7† Ke7 2. g8Sf Kf8 3. e7† Kg7 4. e8S† Kh8/i 5. g7† Kxh7 6. Sgf6† Kh8 7. g8S† Kg8 8. Se4† Kf5/i 9. Sfxd6† Ke3 10. Sf4† Kf4 11. Sh6 mate. i) 4. . . Kf8 5. g7† Kxf7 6. Sh6† Ke7 7. Sf5† K- 8. g8Qf wins. ii) 8. . . Kg4 9. S(e8)f6† Kh3 (.. Kf5 10. Sh6† mates next) 10. Sg5† Kg3 11. Sfe4† Kg4 12. Sh6 mate. There is, however, a dual win by 9. Sd7† (instead of Sfxd6†) Ke6 (.. Kg4 10. Sf6† mates in 2) 10. Sg6† Kf5 11. Sg7† Kg4 12. Se5† dx5 (.. Kh3 13. Sg5† mates next) 13. Bh3† Kh3 14. Sg5† Kg3 15. Sf5 mate. Since this line contains a neat clearance sacrifice and saves the B from taking root at f7, it seems best to amend the study by adding a bPc7 to prevent 9. Sfxd6†.

No. 641: Zh. Byuzandyan. No win. 16. . . dc (instead of a2) shatters the illusion.
No. 689: W. Proskurowski. The study is correct. The composer has kindly written to say that note (ii) should read: If 2. Bf1? Rh2 (not 2. .. Kb7) 3. Bd3 Kb7 (now!) 4. Be4+ Kxb6 5. a8Q Rh8+=. The critical comment on p. 466 therewith falls away.

No. 722: G. V. Afanasiev. The composer advises that wR at a3 should be a wQ, which makes the study sound.
P. 450, No. 11: A. A. Troitzky. Again there is a dual draw, i.e. 1. Kd7, as is demonstrated by the solution to the Rinck study here, which presumably was sparked off by the Troitzky. 1. Kd7/i Bf4 2. Ba3 Bg5/ii 3. Bc1/iii Bxc1 4. e7\=.
i) 1. Bf6\? Bf4 wins.
ii) 2. .. Kxa3 3. e7 c1Q 4. e8Q Qc7\+ 5. Ke6 Qe5\+ 6. Kf7 Qh5\+ 7. Ke7\=.


P. 452, No. 23: D. Joseph. Faulty because 5. .. Kh3 draws and therefore presumably never published. Quite recently a chance purchase of ours was the 1965 book in German, "Das 1x1 des Endspiels" by Dr. H. Staudte (of "Schach-Echo" and "Schwalbe" fame) and M. Milescu (the Israeli and former Romanian study composer). For a paper-back of 164 pages the price of nearly £2 is, by British standards, rather high but otherwise the book has much to commend it. It sets out to show analogies between games and studies, and does this in a very interesting and entertaining way. Having just had EG 15, it was a surprise to find on p. 27/8 the following, which can serve as a (slightly abbreviated) sample.

H. N. D. Grigoriev
Isvestija, 1928 2

"In Position H the bK must already reckon with a check from g8, but has the equally sharp weapon of a check on b3. Yet White can overcome this, unlikely though it seems. 1. Kc3. No tempo is lost as Black must match the K-moves. 1. .. Ka3 2. Kc4 Ka4 3. g4 b5\+. But what has White achieved, except to remove bK from a potential check and run into a tempo-gaining check himself? 4. Kd3! The point! By the threat of Ke3 the wK forces the bK to return. 4. .. Ka5 (The position now recalls a well-known 1905 Duras study) 5. g5 b4 6. g6 b3 7. g7 b2 8. Kc2. Now that the bP has passed the
I.

Knoch v. Van Scheltinga
Amsterdam 1936

(Version from play)

Position I is, we stress, a hypothetical one which van Scheltinga only could have reached. Grandmaster Fine analysed it in "Basic Chess Endings" (1941) and considered that Black could draw by 1. ... Kg5 2. Kf3 Ke5 3. Kg4 (The only move for 3. h5? Kf5 loses the pawn) 3. ... Ke4 4. h5 f5† 5. Kg3 Ke3 6. h6 f4† drawing "as both pawns queen simultaneously". But he who has carefully followed the Grigoriev above will immediately spot the snag: White plays not 5. Kg3? but 5. Kh5† wrecking Black's efforts." (Also mentioned is that even in Fine's line 7. Kg4 f3 8. h7 f2 9. h8Q f1Q 10. Qe5† Kd2 11. Qd4† Kc2 12. Qxb4 etc. may well win.)

P. 452 - No. 23a: As regards this related study (published in Shakhmatnaya Khronika 3/1945) Mr. Botwinnik writes in his "100 Selected Games" that he composed it because, having seen Fine's analysis above, he assumed the side-step manoeuvre to be new. Evidently he did not know the Grigoriev study.

P. 460 - G: B. Horwitz. WDE supplies these titbits. The original "Chess Studies" by Kling and Horwitz jointly appeared in 1851. In 1884, after Kling's death, Horwitz republished the same studies omitting all mention of his deceased partner and in a second part added studies by himself which had appeared between 1879 and 1883 in "Chess Monthly", then edited by Hoffer and Zukertort. Horwitz died in 1885, when nearly 80, and a second edition of his book, dated 1889, includes a preface which sets out the facts and gives due recognition to Kling. Position G is in the second part of the book and its likely date is therefore 1881 rather than 1851. The circumstances help to explain its inaccuracy, but on the other hand the 1889 preface claims that the studies "have undergone careful revision by the editors" (of Chess Monthly) and that "so rigorous a test... must have gone a long way to ensure correctness". It also refers to an "elaborate review" of the book by Ranken in the B.C.M.

EG15, p. 461 - J: P. A. Basilikov. The study is correct.

After 1. a6 Kd3 2. Bf2 b3 3. a7 my suggested drawing line was 3. ... b2 4. a8Q Kc2 5. Qe4† Kc1 but WDE refutes this neatly by 6. Bc1 Bxe1 7. Qc4† Kd1 (7. ... Kd2 8. Qh4†) 8. Kf3 Bxd2 (8. ... b1Q 9. Qe4† or 8. ... Ba5 9. Qa4†) 9. Qb3† Kc1 10. Ke2 and White wins after all. I have two Russian books with this study but neither mentions 3. ... b2 (WV)

A fortunate result of the reference to the study has been to prompt Mr. Vandiest to compose an attractive extension of it. (see Diagram J.) Since Black wins after 1. Kd6 Bg8 2. b6 a2 3. Bxe6† Bxe6 4. b7
as in the Basilikov study, and also after 1. b6 Ke5 the solution is:
1. Ke7 Bg8 2. b6 a2 3. Bxe6† i Bxe6 4. b7 a1Q 5. b8Q Qf8†/ii 6. 
Kd6 Qd5† (6. b7 Bc6 7. Ke7 Qxb6 stalemate. i) Or 3. b7 a1Q 
4. Bxe6† etc. but not 4. b8Q Qg7† wins. ii) 5. .. Qg7† 6. Kd6 Qd5† 7. 
Kc5 Qd5† 8. Kb6 =.

P. 464 - L: S. Kozlowski. Great carelessness in notation on my part 
here, duly spotted by Mr. Peckover. 8. Re7 of course allows 8. ... Rxc7 
Re8 achieves the critical position. In this line the drawing resource of 
playing the bR to the g-file was, for convenience, discussed at move 9 
but can naturally be adopted much earlier, e.g. 3. ... Rg3. (WV)

No. 732: Y. Bazlov. “Very beautiful indeed, this stalemating manoeu-
vre!” writes Mr. Vandiest, “But is that all there is to it?” His answer 
to this question appears as Diagram K, in which he skilfully exploits the latent 
possibilities. Solution:- 1. a7 (not 1. Sf6† 
Kf7 2. a7 Re5† & 3. ... Ra5 =) Re8 (1. ... d2 
2. a8Q† Kf7 3. Qd5† & 4. Qxd2) 2. Sf6† 
Kf7 3. Sxe8 d2 4. Sd6† Ke6 5. a8Q d1Q 6. 
Qg8† Ke5 7. Se4† Kd4 (7. ... Ke4 8. Qe6† 
etc.) 8. Qd8† Ke4 9. Ke6† (9. ... Qf7† Kf3 =) 
Kd4 (9. ... Kf3 10. Qh5† Ke4 11. Qh4†) 10. 
Qd7† Ke4 11. Qe6† Kd4 (11. ... Kf3 12. 
Qg4†) 12. Qd6† Ke4 13. Qf4† finally win-
ing the bQ after evading three attempts 
to draw by stalemate. Both the original 
study and this new version are free of 
duals.

No. 734: S. Lissy. It deserves to be noted that 1. Sc7† Ke7 2. Bf6† Rxf6 
(instead of ... Kf8) does not save Black for after 3. Sd5† Kd6 4. Kxf6 
triangulation (wKd3/c3/c4) now forces bP to f5 whereafter it falls to 
the wK. 1. b7? only draws to 1. ... Rb6 2. b8Q Rxb8 3. Sxb8 Kd6 4. Kf5 
Kc7.

No. 735: E. Pogosjants. No win seems possible after 4. ... d3 (instead 
of 4. ... Sc3), a positional sacrifice clearing the rank for the bR and 
restricting White. If 5. Rxa2 Rb4 6. Rb2 (6. Ra3 d2 7. Sf2† Kg3 8. Kf1 
Kf3 9. Rb1 Ke3 10. b4† Kf4 11. Sf2 Rxb4 =) d2 7. Sf2† Kg3 8. Kf1 Kf3 
9. Rb1 Ke3 10. Kg2 Ke2 11. Kg3 Rb8 12. Sd1 Rxb3 = . If 5. Rh2† Kg4 
Kg3 6. Sxd3 Rf4 =. (WDE)

No. 747: I. Kriheli. A letter from Mr. van Reek stimulated the follo-
wing analysis on this interesting position. Re the comment in Note (i) 
Black can win, e.g. 1. Rf7? Re8 2. c7 Rc8 3. Rd7 Bg5 4. Kf3 h6 5. Ke4 
Bg1 etc. On the other hand, apart from the introductory “bust”, there
are dual drawing possibilities in the main line, of which the simplest is 10. Rd7 (instead of Rd4) reestablishing Zugzwang, while the more basic dual is 9. Kh1 Re2 10. Kg1 h2=+. Kh1 h4 12. Rd4. Now if 12...h3 13. Rd3 =. If 12...Be7 13. Rd8=+. If 12...Rxc7 13. Rf4+ Kf7 14. Rhxh4 Bd6 15. Rf7=+. Finally if 12...Kf7 13. Rf4+ Ke8 (there is nothing better) 14. Rhxh4 Bd6 15. Re4+ Kd7 16. Re1= for with bP on h2 there is no win (cf. Fine BCE No. 532).

Our thanks to all correspondents, also those not specifically mentioned above, i.e. Mr. Boogaard (Nuland, Holland), Mr. Flower (Brussels), Mr. Harman (London), Mr. Marvan (Prague), Mr. Richardson (Leeds).

A. S. Kaminer

and

N. Rossolimo

Shakhmaty 1928

Win 3


Nicolas Rossolimo, born in 1910 in Kiev, who is now a U.S. Grandmaster.

B. Radu Voia (Romania)

1928

Draw 5

1. Sf5 b3 2. Sg3 Ke2 3. Bxf1

Kxf2 4. c6 c2 5. Sz2 Bd2 6. Sc1 Qxf1 7. Sa2 and draws, as bK cannot approach. The 'fortress' theme usually involves wK, but not here.

Review. Kouzlo Sachoveho Diagramu, or Zauber des Schachdiagramms
by F. J. Prokop, Prague 1968. The idea behind this collection is a novel one. The author is a famous composer, not only of studies, but of self-mates. He has paired off the two genres so that on every diagrammed page a study with a given white force appears at the top and a self-mate with the identical black force appears below. The aim seems to be to try to popularise the self-mate, but the result, for readers of E G, anyway, is a collection of little known studies, 73 of them, 37 by the author. The booklet may prove difficult to obtain, as I have not noticed it mentioned anywhere else and only have a copy through the courtesy of D. J. Morgan of Aberystwyth, who received a complimentary one from the author himself. Here are 4 samples, all by Prokop.

AJR
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C. P. Jolța (Romania)
1st Prize, Revista de Sah 1954

1. Kg1/1 Bxd6 2. Kxh1 g3 3. g6 Be4 4. a6 Bc4 5. g7 Bxg7
6. a7 Bd4 7. a8Q Bf2 8. Qa3
Kc2 9. Qd3 Rd2 10. Qd3 Rc1
11. Qe2 Rh1 12. Qd2 Ke1 13. Qc2 and W is sprung from
his prison, h2 being lost after
any move. i) 1. d7? Bc7
2. a6 Sg3f 3. Kf2 Sf4f 4. Kfl
Sf4f 5. Kgl Ba6f 6. Kh2 Sf4f
7. Kh1 Sf4f.

A. F. J. Prokop
El Ajedrez Argentino 1956

Qc2f Kd1 6. Qclt
Kf2 7. Qglf Kf1.

D. M. Henneberger
(Nazionalzeitung 1931)

Win 4
Ka5 Rg6f 14. Kb5 Rf6f 15. Ka5 Rg6f 16.
Kb5 Rf6f 17. Ke5 Rf5f 18. Kn6 Rh7f 19. Kg6 Rg7f

B. F. J. Prokop
Tidskrift för Schack 1949

Win 4
Qc2f Kd1 6. Qclt
Kf2 7. Qglf Kf1.

Very difficult.
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Review. Gallery of Chess Study Composers, by F. S. Bondarenko, in Russian. 304 pages, on very good quality paper, though on some copies the pages were on receipt already partially detached from the spine. Historical development up to the 19th century occupies 5 pages, the precursors of Troitzky and Rinck take a further 5, while the modern classics, including Mattison, the Platov brothers and Leonid Kubbel take us up to p. 48 and the first 60 studies. Part II is rightly devoted to Soviet composers, among whom it is interesting to note Sergei Mikhailovich Kaminer with a correct date of demise of 1943 (at the age of 35) compared with a date in the 1964 Soviet Dictionary of Chess of 1937, and this section takes us up to study 231. The third part is devoted to the remainder of the world, with up to 10 pages, but usually not more than 2 or 3, for Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Germany (East and West), Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, England, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, USA, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Lebanon, Israel, India, South Africa and Australia. Many passport size photographs or sketched portraits are included, and the selection of studies is very attractive. About 300 composers appear, with examples, and a few more by name only. E G gets a mention. There is a section on joint compositions, and a kind of postscript on personal collections of studies. We give 4 examples from this excellent book that is much more than a mere anthology.

(A small number of copies is available from AJR at 12/6d each, post free.)

AJR
Review. Soviet Chess, by International Master R. G. Wade. 1968, by Neville Spearman, publishers who appear to be new to chess but who are obtaining excellent authors. There is, they say in many languages, no discussion of taste. I found this book, which covers all aspects of Soviet Chess, highly informative and readable, succeeding in combining a work of reference with something one could enjoy on a journey. It received an extraordinarily poor review in the April 1969 Chess Life (U.S.A.). The American reviewer found it dull, attributing this to the description 'compiled', rather than 'written' or even 'edited', which here is an author being both modest and accurate, since he did not himself play any of the games or compose any of the studies or problems to be found in the book. Again, the American reviewer jibs at 'brief passages (no games) about Janovský, Rubinstein, Bernstein, Znosko-Borovsky, Tartakower, Nimzovitch and Bogoljubov', when the total time spent by all these players in Soviet lands was minute, Rubinstein being in any case universally deemed Polish. Again (again) the Chess Life account is followed by a review of The Chess Companion by (note the 'by') Irving Chernev, which consists 100% of compilations, yet the same reviewer is all praise in this case! The only good words for Soviet Chess come on the section devoted to the big names. Anyway, there is an appreciable section for the endgame study, over 30 of the 288 pages.

Review. Chess in Moldavia, in Russian. A mini-book, on poor paper, devoted to the history and personalities of this Black Sea corner of Europe. Only a few pages are devoted to composition, but notable names are F. Simkhovich (1896-1945), who lived in Bessarabia until 1925, V. Kuchuk and M. Bordenyuk, one study of each being given.

AJR
Wanted: Studies Editor for EG.
The job is no sinecure, if only because it is unpaid. It requires a methodical and energetic person who likes working with chess material. He must have a typewriter and should have at least some knowledge of German and chess-Russian. The job does not include most of the primary abstracting, which is mainly done by a small band of helpers, but it does include corresponding with the abstractors and editing their output. It also excludes proof-checking but includes taking detailed decisions on content that a proof-checker cannot take. Correspondence with J. R. Harman, "Spotlight" investigators, the printer and myself will be involved. Chess ability is required to select the best of the material submitted, but I am willing to give as much assistance as necessary with this. The appointment of a studies editor would leave me with the responsibilities of articles, reviews, subscriptions, magazine exchanges and general correspondence, and might even leave me time to compose something! "Job satisfaction?" That of making a major contribution to EG. Any offers?

AJR

EG STATISTICS

47 periodicals are currently monitored for material, and of these, 41 are received on an exchange basis. 4 more are seen selectively, but we do not do the selecting. For local Soviet tourneys we rely exclusively on the kindness of correspondents in the USSR.

- - - - - -

In the 12 months ending 19.vii.69 I have corresponded with 232 different people on EG matters, involving 865 items (received combined with sent). The figure excludes magazines received and sent.

- - - - - -

Up to 19.viii.69 the total of EG renewals received for EG 17-20 was 39. The total of subscribers for EG 13-16 was a quite satisfactory 185.

AJR

SOME QUICK SPOTLIGHT COMMENTS ON EG16


No. 764: N. J. Maclean. A simpler win is the immediate 1. Sb6f Ke5 2. Sd7f Kd5 (else 3. Bxh3f) and Sf6-g4-h2. (Nos 301/2 in "1234" are examples to follow.)

In the C. M. Bent sequence the following are faulty:

No. 766: No win. 4. .. Sd4 5. Bd6 Sf3 and Ph2 still falls.
No. 768: A simple alternative win is 2. Bd4f.
No. 772: Black wins by 2. .. Kh5, threatening 3. .. Bc7 and 4. .. Ssl mate. There is no satisfactory answer.

No. 774: A dual draw is 1. f5f Kxf5 2. e4f Kg4 (2. .. Kf4 3. Sd5f = )
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No. 781: G. M. Kasparian. My comment regarding the wrong corner was inappropriate with BK so far away. (AJR)

No. 782, 784, 787, 808 already appeared as Nos. 584, 588, 585, 563.

No. 786: B. V. Badaj. A printing defect. There should be a wP at h4.

No. 788: Al. P. Kuznetsov. In the line 2. ... g5 3. hgQf a win can be achieved by 7. Rg8. E.g. 7. ... Be3 8. Rxf7f Kh6 9. Rg8 f5 (9. ... Kf1 10. Rxf7f Kh7 11. Rxf5 etc.


No. 811: J. H. Marwitz. A bP needs to be added on f3. This amendment by the composer, which eliminates 1. Kf2 as a dual, was overlooked in the Award diagram. (Advised by F. A. Spinhoven.)


No. 820: C. M. Benda. Note (i) should read: 1. Sc8? Qc8 wins. In the line given with 1. ... Qg1 White wins by 4. Kf8.

No. 822: B. Cvejic. Black wins by 3. ... Sfd5 (instead of 3. ... Sfd3) 4. Kb2 Se3 which was threatened anyway, or 4. ... Sc2.


No. 838: M. N. Klinkov. After 9. Sf4 Bxb4 (instead of ... Bd6) not only draws but wins for Black.

No. 850: I. Vandecasteele. There recurs the same dual win 12. Ke7 Rd7f 13. Ke6 which marred Mr. Nistorescu's original and gave rise to his amended version in EG14, p. 405.

No. 856: M. N. Klinkov. 1. Bd2 avoids the loss of the wR and produces a simple win on material.

**DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS**

The Rubinstein Memorial Tourney attracted 149 entries by 87 composers from 11 countries. The Tourney was divided into two sections, the first being unrestricted and the second devoted to rook endings in memory of Rubinstein's virtuosity in over-the-board play with this force. Dr Max Euwe was president of an all-Dutch jury consisting of de Feijter, Marwitz, Mees, Selman and Spinhoven under the auspices of the "Alexander Rueb Foundation", a body which kindly donated a number of EG-subscriptions for EG9-12, but whose other activities in the endgame study field are unknown to me (AJR). The Rueb Foundation relates to the wishes of the first President of F.I.D.E. who devoted many years to his classification of studies frequently referred to in Mr Harman's "Anticipations".
i) 1. Sxb2? Sf8+ 2. Kf7 Rb7+ (and not 2... Rxb2, which is the main line, a draw) 3. Kg8 Rg7+ 4. Kxf8 Rg1= 5. Ke8 Rxf1 wins (no S-fork).  
iv) 6... Rg7+ 7. Kxf8 =.  
v) This time the other check would be fatal, 7. Rf2+? Ke3 8. Rd3+ Kf4 9. Rf3+ Kf5 wins. "Two 'desperado' R variations, in one of which it must be sacrificed on the rank and in the other on the file. The stalemate position is well disguised. A brilliant setting - undoubtedly the best entry."

iii) 11. .. Kd5 is met by 12. Bb5 Kc5 13. Ed3. "2 R sacrifices, underpromotions, very active play by the promoted men, and a surprise finale. Rather heavy construction."

i) 1... Re8 2. f7 aQf 3. Bxa1 Kc7 4. feSt.  
ii) 2. Bxa1? Kc7 with a fiendish mate.  
iii) 3. f7 Qx4.  
vi) 7. f8Q? Kd7.  
vi) 7. .. Kd7 8. f8St wins. "Great tension. W declines to capture bQ, and himself offers bB 4 times. The diagram is a little artificial, but the play and final position are extraordinary."
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No. 904: G. M. Kasparyan. 1. Qh1 Ka7/i 2. Qg1+ Ka8/ii 3. a6 Rb2/iii 4. Qd4 Rb8 5. Qc5/iv c6 6. a7 Rc8 7. Qf5 Rc7 8. Qe5 Rc8 9. Qe6 Rc7 10. Qd6 Rc8 11. Qd7 wins. i) 1. ... Kxa5 2. Qa8f Kb6 3. Qb8f Ka6 4. Qb5f Ka7 5. Qa5f. 1. ... Rc2f 2. Kb3 Rc5 3. Qa8f Kb5 4. Qb7f. ii) 2. ... Kb7 3. Qb1f Ka7 4. a6 Kxa6 5. Qb5f Ka7 6. Qa5f. iii) 3. ... Rd6 4. Qg2f c6 5. Qg7 wins. iv) 5. a7? Rb4f 6. Kxb4 c5f 7. Qxc5 Be7 =, or 7. Kxc5 Bb6f =. A 100% non-checking Q-stair! (AJR) See the remark to No. 795 on p. 496 of EG16. “A difficult theoretical ending, which W wins only by subtle manoeuvring.”

No. 906: S. Byelokon. 1. h8\textup{\texttt{=}} Kg5/i 2. Bh6\textup{\texttt{=}} Kxg4 3. Bd2 Kh3 4. b8\textup{\texttt{=}} e1Q/i 5. Bxel Be2 6. f8R Bd3 7. a8B wins. i) 1. \ldots Kh7 is not given, and I see no win, nor even a draw for W. The threat is 2. \ldots e1Q+i 3. Kxh2 Bc6 and mates. 2. b8\textup{\texttt{=}} is useless after 2. \ldots e1Q 3. Kxh2 Qf2+i 4. Kh3 Qxa7 5. Bd6 Qg1 6. Kh4 Qh2+i 7. Kg5 Qh6+i 8. Kf5 Qxg6. \"W minor promotion prevents Bl eP promoting. 4 successive minor promotions.\" (AJR).

The 3rd H.M., by Kasparyan, is wholly anticipated (JRH) by V. A. Sokov (1937), see No. 354 in Porreca's "Studi Scacchistici" (1967).

No. 907: S. Byelokon. 1. Bf1+i Kc3 2. Qh8 Bxh8 3. efQ Bd4 4. Qh8 Bxh8 5. feQ Bd4 6. Qh8 Bxh8 7. c8Q Bd4 8. Qh8 Bxh8 9. c7 Kb3 10. Bc4+i wins. \"Witty 4-fold frustration of mate.\" 


No. 907 S. Byelokon 4 H.M., Rubinstein Memorial Tourney 1967-8. Award in Szachy, iv.69
No. 908 Y. Zemlyansky and Al. P. Kuznetsov 5 H.M., Rubinstein Memorial Tourney 1967-8. Award in Szachy, iv.69
No. 909 M. N. Kleinkov 6 H.M., Rubinstein Memorial Tourney 1967-8. Award in Szachy, iv.69
No. 910 E. Dobrescu Commended, Rubinstein Memorial Tourney 1967-8. Award in Szachy, iv.69

\textbf{Win} 7 7 4 2
\textbf{Draw} 9 9 4 4
\textbf{Win} 2 2 4 4
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No. 910: E. Dobrescu. 1. Qe1+ Kg4 2. Qe2+ Kf4 3. Qd2+ Kf5 4. Bxa2 Kd6 5. Qe6+ Kg6 6. Qe5+ Kg7 7. Qf6 Bb1 8. Kg2 Be4 9. Kg3. i) By indirect threats to bRh8, capture of which would control a1, wQ has forced bK to block both f-file and white diagonal, so that Bl is deprived of a check by bR or bB.  ii) 4. . . Bg8 is the only reasonable alternative, 5. Qc2+ Kg5 6. Qc8 Kg6 7. Kg1 Kg7 8. Qc3+ Kh7 9. Qf6 Ba2 10. Qh4 K- 11. Qg4 and further checks will win (there are duals, e.g. after 11. . . Kf8 12. Qa3+ or 12. Qb8+ win, or 11. . . Kf7 12. Qf2+ or 12. Qc7+; or 11. . . Kh7 12. Qh2(c7)†).


Win
   .. Bb5. ii) Again threatening 2. .. Bb5. iii) Or 3. .. Kd2 4. Bb3 Kxe2
   5. Sd4+. 3. Sc4+ Kf2 would not have allowed 4. Bb3, while Bl's 2.
   .. Bc6 is directed against e2-e4 by W.  iv) 7. .. Bfl 8. Sc3 as main line.

   stalemate.

No. 917: A. Botokanov. 1. h6 Rb3+/i 2. Kc7 Rb5 3. Ra4+ Kg3 4. Rg4+
   c2/iv 11. Rc7 c1Q++ 12. Rxc1 Rxc7 13. Rh1+ wins.  i) 1. . . Rcl or 1.
   .. Rxf3 2. Ra4+ Kg5 3. Rh5 wins.  ii) 8. . . c3 9. Kxf6 c2 10. Rc7 similarly
   (stretched sideways across the board) to be seen in the diagram, for
   4. Ke6 Kg5 5. h7 Rb8 6. Ra7 Kg6 =.

i) the first of 3 triangulations. Of course, 5. Kh1, followed by 6. Kh2, here and later, is equally effective, but hardly counts as a dual.

ii) 9. .. Re8† 10. Kf2 wins much sooner than in the main line. W. Proskurowski points out that 2. Kf1, with g7 later, is possible, while a simple march of wK to h7, with wR playing on g-file, also seems a serious flaw. (AJR)

Review A very welcome reprint by Dover appears under the title 360 Brilliant and Instructive End-Games. This is the famous Troitzky "360" (see EG16 p. 516), but with one significant omission. The appendix analysing 2S's v P is not there. So, the original retains its value.

AJR

Computers. A significant weakness in computer chess so far has been the endgame, possibly because no one has yet discovered how to 'teach' computers chess the sensible way, that is by starting with mastering the elements and building up to the complicated positions. Now ex-World Champion Botvinnik predicts (from the vii.69 issue of the East German Schach, quoting Deutsches Sportecho) that in 1970 a computer will beat a grandmaster. Key figure in this prediction is Vladimir Butenko, computer programmer and player in the first category employed in the Academy of Sciences computer centre at Akademgorodok in Siberia. Other experts remain unconvinced that such a great advance in computer chess is possible so soon.

AJR
The Chess Endgame Study Circle.
Annual subscription due each July (month vii): £ 1 (or $3.00), includes
EG 17-20, 21-24 etc.

How to subscribe:
1. Send money (cheques, dollar bills, International Money Orders**) 
   direct to A. J. Roycroft.

** If you remit by International Money Order you must also write to 
AJR, because these Orders do not tell him the name of the 
remitter**

Or

2. Arrange for your Bank to transfer your subscription to the credit of: 
   A. J. Roycroft Chess Account, Westminster Bank Ltd., 21 Lombard St., 

Or

3. If you heard about EG through an agent in your country you may, 
   if you prefer, pay direct to him.

New subscribers, donations, changes of address, ideas, special subscrip-
tion arrangements (if your country’s Exchange Control regulations 
prevent you subscribing directly):

Editor: A. J. Roycroft.

Spotlight - all analytical comments.
“Anticipations”, and anticipations service to tourney judges: J. R.

To magazine and study editors: Please arrange to send the com-
plimentary copy of your magazine, marked “EG Exchange”, to: 
C. M. Bent, Black Latches, Inkpen Common, Newbury, Berkshire, 
England.

Next Meeting of The Chess Endgame Study Circle
Friday 3rd October 1969, at 101 Wigmore St., London W 1 (IBM Buil-
ding, behind Selfridge’s in Oxford St.). Time: 6.15 p.m.

Sydney Capsey: “Pawn Mates”.
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