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directed by W. Veitch and W. D. Ellison

A Multiple Phoenix

EG8, No. 289: K. Sczala. This study, White: Kh8, Pg6, Ph7 - Black: Kf6, Sh4, Pg3, was intended to be drawn by 1. g7 g2 2. Kg8 glQ 3. h8Q Qg5 4. Qh7 Sg6 5. Qh6 Qd5† 6. Kh7 Qf7 7. Qg5† Kxg5 stalemate, but WDE found that 3...Sf5 wins for Black by means of an interesting regrouping. Reversing the colours led to Al, solved by 1. Sh5 g2 2. g7 Kgl (2. ..glQ 3. Sg3† Qxg3† 4. Kxg3 Kgl 5. g8Q h1Q 6. Qa2) 3. g8Q (or first Sf4) h1Q 4. Sf4 Qh2 5. Qd5 (5. Qg4? Kh1 =) Kh1 (5. ..Qh4 6. Se2† Kh2 7. Qd5† Kh1 8. Qd1†) 6. Kg4 Qg1 7. Se2 Qh2 8. Sg3† wins. 1. Sf5? only draws as intended in No. 289.

A. J. Vandiest & WDE after K. Sczala

\begin{center}
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\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Win
1. as set
2. move Sg7 to d6
3. add bPc5 to 2.

By coincidence Mr. Vandiest had also been attracted by No. 289 at about the same time and had evolved twin studies from it. One of these was affected by WDE's discovery, but moving wS from f6 to d6 fortunately put this right to produce A2 and A3. Mr. Vandiest readily agreed to the suggestion that the triplets be united.

Solutions: A2. 1. Se4 (Again not 1. Sf5 of course) g2 2. g7 Kg1 3. g8Q h1Q 4. Qg4 Qh2 (4. ...Kh2 5. Qg3† Kg1 6. Sf6; or 4. ...Kf1 5. Sg3† Ke1 6. Qb4† Kd1 7. Qb1†) 5. Sf2 (not Sg3) Kf1 6. Qc4† and 7. Qc1 mate.

A3. 1. Sf5 (Not now 1. Se4 g2 2. g7 Kg1 3. g8Q h1Q 4. Qg4 Kf1! 5. Sg3† Ke1 =. 6. Qb4† being impracticable) g2 2. g7 Kg1 3. g8Q h1Q 4. Qg4 Qh2 (4. ...Kh2 5. Qg3† Kg1 6. Sh4 c4 7. Ke2; or 4. ...Kf1 5. Qc4† Kg1 6. Qxc5† Kh7 7. Qe5† Kg1 8. Qe1† Kh7 9. Qg3† Kg1 10. Sh4 5. Sg3 Qh8 6. Se2† Kf1 7. Qxg2† Ke1 8. Qgl† Kd2 9. Qc1† Kd3 10. Sf4† Kd4 11. Qb2(a1)† winning.
Seeing further possibilities, Mr. Vandiest then composed the more elaborate B1, solved by 1. Sh5 with three lines of play: a) 1. ... g2 2. Kxf3 etc. as in A1. b) 1. ... Sg5 2. Ke3 g2 (2. ... Kg2 3. Sxg3 Kxg3 4. g8Q h1Q 5. Qxg3+ Kh2 6. Qh5+ Kg2 7. Qg4+ Kh2 8. Kf2 3. Sg3+ Kg1 4. g3Q h1Q 5. Sxf2+ Kf1 (5. ... Kh2 6. Qb8#) 6. Qf8+ Sf3 7. Qxf3# Ke1 8. Qf2# Kd1 9. Sc3# and 10. Qd2 mate. c) 1. ... Sd2 2. Kf4 g2 3. Sg3# (3. g8Q? g1Q =) Kg1 4. g8Q winning, e.g. 4. ... Sf1 5. Se2+ Kf2 6. Qg2 and threat of Sd5 wins, or 5. Kh1 6. Qd5 etc.; or 4. Kf2 5. Qa2 etc.; or 4. h1Q 5. Sxh1 Kxh1 6. Qh7# Kg1 7. Kg3 Sf3# 8. Kh3. Unsuccessful tries are: 1. Kxf3? Kg1 =; 1. g8Q? g2 =; 1. Sg4? Kg1 2. Sxh2 Sf3#.

Finally, B2 gives independent existence to a dual which at one time bedevilled B. The win now is: 1. Sg4 g2 2. Sf2# Kg1 3. g8Q Kxf2 4. Qa2# (4. Qa8#? Kg1 =) Kg1 (4. ... Kg3 5. Qa3# Kh4 6. Qe7# Kh3 7. Kf3 g1S# 8. Kf2 5. Qa(b)1# Kf2 6. Qb2# Kg1 7. Qe1# Kf2 8. Qe3# Kg1 9. Kf3 g1S# 10. Kg3 Sf3# 11. Kh2 Sf2 12. Qc1#.

So Sczala's No. 289 has already far surpassed the legendary phoenix; from its ashes have arisen not one but five new studies!

EG 17, No. 911: V. Kalandadze. The study is correct (see EG 18, p. 35), for after 1. ... Kc5 2. Sb3# wins easily. My worst mistake yet, I expect, and many thanks to the composer writing to point it out. (WV)

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1953

**Win**
1. Qh6# Rf8# 2. Ke7 Rxh8# 3. Qe7# Rb8 5. Qd1 Kc1 6. Qd1 mate.

i) 1. Qe7? Rb8 2. Ke7 Rxh8 3. Qe7# Kc1 and draws.
ii) 1. Qe7 is very startling.

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachblätter, 1938

**Draw**

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1953

**Win**
1. Qh6# 2. Ke7 Rxh8# 3. Qe7# Rb8 5. Qd1 Kc1 6. Qd1 mate.

i) 1. Qe7? Rb8 2. Ke7 Rxh8 3. Qe7# Kc1 and draws.
ii) 1. Qe7 is very startling.

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachblätter, 1938

**Draw**

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1953

**Win**
1. Qh6# 2. Ke7 Rxh8# 3. Qe7# Rb8 5. Qd1 Kc1 6. Qd1 mate.

i) 1. Qe7? Rb8 2. Ke7 Rxh8 3. Qe7# Kc1 and draws.
ii) 1. Qe7 is very startling.

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachblätter, 1938

**Draw**

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1953

**Win**
1. Qh6# 2. Ke7 Rxh8# 3. Qe7# Rb8 5. Qd1 Kc1 6. Qd1 mate.

i) 1. Qe7? Rb8 2. Ke7 Rxh8 3. Qe7# Kc1 and draws.
ii) 1. Qe7 is very startling.

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachblätter, 1938

**Draw**

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1953

**Win**
1. Qh6# 2. Ke7 Rxh8# 3. Qe7# Rb8 5. Qd1 Kc1 6. Qd1 mate.

i) 1. Qe7? Rb8 2. Ke7 Rxh8 3. Qe7# Kc1 and draws.
ii) 1. Qe7 is very startling.

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachblätter, 1938

**Draw**

---

P. Heücker
Deutsche Schachzeitung, 1953

**Win**
1. Qh6# 2. Ke7 Rxh8# 3. Qe7# Rb8 5. Qd1 Kc1 6. Qd1 mate.

i) 1. Qe7? Rb8 2. Ke7 Rxh8 3. Qe7# Kc1 and draws.
ii) 1. Qe7 is very startling.
C. A. S. Kakovin  
Competition to celebrate the Moscow Tourney 1936  
Commended 7

1. f4t Kd5 2. f5 Bxf5 3. Sf4f Ke5 4. Rd1 c6 5. Rd5t exd5 6. Sd3f exd3 7. f4 mate.

D. A. S. Kakovin  
Shakhmaty 1940  
Win 5


No. 926: F. S. Bondarenko & Al. P. Kuznetsov. This improvement on No. 266 in EG8 is still unsatisfactory as after 2. . Ba8 W has the dual draw of 3. Bgl Kc6 4. Bh2=. This is the manoeuvre mentioned in Note (i) where however 2. f8Q is much stronger still.

No. 929: V. Neidze & V. Kalandadze. To avoid a dual, better 6. . Kf8 immediately. 6. . Kg8 instead also allows 7. f8Sf Qxf8 8. Qh5f Kh6 9. Qxh6 Ke7 10. Qe6f etc., or 6. . Kh6 7. f8Qf etc.

No. 930: J. Koch. The final position is not stalemate. B1 mates in 3 by 4. . Kc8 and 5. . Qa5. One assumes that a bBc8 has been omitted. Cn the other hand bPb7 is superfluous.

No. 938: P. Joita. I shall try and understand this study some day! (WV).

P. 42, 'S. Kozlowski', in the third line from the bottom the bracket should read “(K7 and K20)”, not “(K20 and K21)”.

P. 59 V: A. P. Kazantsev. No win. 2. . Kxh7 (instead of 2. . Qd4) 3. Rg5 Qh1 4. bxc3 d4=+. 23 years lie between studies V and XV, which suggests that Kazantsev worked even longer on this theme than indicated in the comment on the latter. (Yes. 23 years, not 15. AJR). Two further entertaining P-mate studies to end with:- C and D.

Obituary  
Paul Heuücker, probably the best known study composer from Germany since the days of Kling and Horwitz (most of whose composing took place in England) died on 10.vii.69, I learn with great regret from Schach-Echo of vii(2).69. He was born in 1899 and his total of studies was well over 100. On p. 66 are two examples, taken from Dr. Staudte's Aus der Welt der Schachstudie, of unexpected moves in simple looking positions.  

AJR
Genrikh Moiseievich Kasparyan was born on 27.ii.10 and appears to have lived most of his life in Tbilisi and Erevan, major towns in the southernmost republic of the U.S.S.R., Armenia, bordering on Turkey and Iran. He has composed about 300 studies, of which some 10% have won First prizes, not to count the many other prizes, honourable mentions and commendeds in awards. Beyond these bare facts it is extraordinarily difficult to say anything about Kasparyan that does not sound trite. 'He is unquestionably the greatest living study composer, and ranks at least equal with the most stylish and deep of past composers, such as Réti, Mattison and Liburkin, all of whom in any case he exceeds in quantities of studies produced.' ‘His soundness is nearly absolute, as one would expect from a master player who has participated in several U.S.S.R. Championship finals and semi-finals.’ If these statements are true, they tell far less than the studies themselves. Can something more constructive be deduced from playing his compositions through? Hardly - at least I find the task beyond me. He has himself written about aspects of composing with great authority and clarity. One may observe that he has, for instance, 'refined the mating study to a new standard of excellence,' or that 'his technique is such that he can conceal imaginative ideas behind quite normal looking settings,' or that 'he has mastered as no other the art of non-capture play.' As regards predilections, one may note a slight preponderance of minor piece studies and Zugzwangs, but there are no holes in his armoury - even to think of such a thing seems absurd! No. These eulogies are shallow and soon become tiresome. There is no alternative to the studies themselves. I have brought along 24, of which only one is taken from the collection of 150 published in 1959 with an Introduction by Botvinnik. They are given in chronological order. The analytic notes are nearly all those of the composer, but some of the comments may well be mine. Let us play through as many as we can until we are exhausted!
Draw


K4. White is well off for material. except that a2 and h8 are both


K6. White is well off for material. except that a2 and h8 are both


K6. 1. Bd4†/i Kd5 2. Ke2 h2/ii 3. Ra1 f1Qf 4. Kxf1/iii Kxd4/iv 5. g1/v Sg3† 6. Kg2 h1Qf/vi 7. Kxg3 and with eighteen squares to choose from, the black queen is helpless against exchange, at best for the white rook.
The text threatens \textup{iii}) 4. \textup{Rxfl? Sg3f. iv) 4. ... Sg3f 5. Kf2 h1Q 6. Rxh1 Sxh1f 7. Kg1. The threat is again \textup{... Sg3f. v) 5. Ra4f? Ke5 6. Rh4 Sg3f 7. Kf2 h1Q 8. Rxh1 Sxh1f 9. Kf3 h5. vi) The position after this check is the point of the whole study. It is a perfect illustration of the principle of balance in a study. The preceding play is quite difficult and deep, with its own attractive points, but unless there is a climax, then the study lacks something. The climax could be a complex manoeuvre, but here it is effectively a single move. Black queens with check, and the queen can be taken by an undefended rook. Surely there is no choice? But the actual move, not capturing the queen, is so stunning that the balance with the lead-in play is perfect.


K8. i) \textup{Rxd8? g1Q 2. Bb2 Kh7 escapes, or here 2. f7 Qf2f. 1. Rg7? Bh7t 2. Kc1 Bxb1 3. Rxd8 Ec4 4. Rg7 Bd5 5. Bb2 Rf8 6. f7 Rc8f 7. Kd2 Bxf7 draws. 1. f7? Rc8f 2. Kd2 Bxf7 draws. The only move left to try is 1. \textup{Bb2 Re8f/i 2. Kd2/ii g1Q 3. f7f Qg7 4. fgQf Rg8 5. Ba1/iii h3 6. Be4/iv a4/v 7. Ke3/a5/vi 8. Rf7/vii b4 9. Kf7/viii a3 10. Bg6 b3 11. Be3 a4/ix 12. Kg5 a2 13. Rxg7 Rxg7 14. Kh6/x a3 15. Bxg7f Kg8 16. Bxc3f a1Q 17. Be4 mate, but not 17. Bxa1? b2. Clearly the mate is quite irrelevant to the grandiose idea.}\n\textup{i) 1... g1Q 2. f7f Kh7 3. fgQf Kg8 4. Ba2f Kf8 5. Ba3f Ke8 6. Re7f Kf8 7. Re1f wins. ii) 2. Kd3f Bf7 3. Bd4 g1Q 4. Bxg1 Bxf6 5. Kd2 Bxb1 6. Bd4 Kg8 draws, but not here 2... g1Q? 3. f7f Qg7 4. f6Q wins. iii) Black's queen is immobilised by the concealed threat of f8Q mate. But Black could evade the bind by a rook check or by \textup{...QxB, provided that were also check. Given that the a- and b-pawns are also menacing, how is White to win? By marching the king to a2? That would indeed win, but Black can prevent it, 5. Bf6? b5 6. Bd3 a6 (else Rxa7) 7. Rc7 b4 8. Kc2 b3f and as White may neither play 9. Kxb3? Rb8f, nor 9. Kb2? Qxf6f, Black draws by \textup{...a4-a3-a2 and \textup{...b2, if necessary preceded by the advance of the remaining a-pawn. No, the win is a spine-chillingly slow preparation of Rg7f, for which purpose the white king must march to g5. iv) Had the white bishop been on f6, then \textup{...Qxf6f would have rescued Black. ix) The threat of \textup{...b2 has forced White to spend another bishop move (with no choice of square). White's attack is agonisingly slow. x) A single tempo decides. Black would even win here with his pawn on a3 by playing 14... a1Q 15. Bxa1 b2.}}


ii) The square b3 is needed for the knight.

K10  1. Se7† Kf8(h8)/i 2. g7† Kxg7 3. Kg7/i Sf5/v/v 6. Rf7† Kg7 7. Kg7/i Sf5 Rxe6 9. Rf8 mate.

i) 1... Kg8. ii) 3. Sf5† Kf6. iii) 3. Kg7. iv) 5. Rxe7 Kg7, but not 5... Bg7. 6. Rf8†. 5. Sf5? h3 6. Kg1 h2 draws.


   i) 1. Bf3f Rd6 2. Bh5 Kf6 3. h4 or Kxh6 Rd4 and Black wins. ii) 1. .. Rd6 2. Bg6. iii) 3. h4f Rd4 4. h5 Kg5. iv) 5. h4f? Kf6 6. h5 Kf7 and wins.

   i) 1. .. Rf1 was threatened as well as 1. .. Rxg8. ii) 1. .. Re1 2. Bd1 saves White’s material, but not 2. Sd1f Rh1 3. Bg4 Rg1 4. Bf3 Rf1 5. Be2 Re1. iii) 6. Bb5f? Kb5 7. Be6f Ke4.
K15. Black has two (defensive) threats, 1. . . Re8 and 1. . . f5 2. g7
Rg6. To meet these White plays 1. Ba5f Ke3 2. Bd5/i Re8f 3. Kb7
A model mate from a most natural setting, but the fact that White
has threats (Bh6 or a tempo move Bc1 or Bd3) after 8. Kd5 where mere
Zugzwang would do, suggests that more might be made of this.
i) To go to f7 and then play g6-g7. This accounts for Black's defence.
ii) If the black king were not so close, White would win simply by
playing his bishop to h6 or f8.

Kd2 Bf4/xii 15. Re6 and the position is the same as after the 7th move.
i) 1. . . Rd4 2. Be5 Rxc5 3. e7 is in White's favour. ii) 2. Kf4?
Rxe5 wins. iii) 2. . . Rd4f 3. Ke3 and Black must repeat. iv) 3.
Rb8f? Ka7 4. Bc5f Rxc5 5. e7 a1Q 6. Ra8f Kd7 7. Rh8f Kxa7 8. Re8f
8. e7 Re2f and wins. Black's purpose in driving the king to d1 is less
to make it vulnerable to a promotion on b1 than to allow the crucial
and thematic manoeuvre on the fifth and sixth moves. vi) 6. Ke2?
Black to play.
White draws

Draw

K17
G. M. Kasparyan
1st Prize
Shakhmaty v SSSR 1959
1st Place VI USSR
Composing Championship (1963)

vii) This interference on the cutting-point of the lines of action of a rook and bishop is known as a Novotny, named from a well-known problemist. It is one of relatively few problem ideas readily adapted to the study. Normally it leads to a win. Kasparyan not only presents it as a fantastic draw, but gives us a double Novotny (see later) and a complete repeating mechanism. viii) 8. Ke3 Bxf2† 9. Kf3 Rf5† 10. Ke2 (10. Sxf5 Bxc6† and 11. ... Kb7) 10. ... Bd1† 11. Kd2 Rd5†. ix) 8. ... Bb3†? 9. Kf3 Rf5† 10. Kg4 Be2† 11. Kh3 is now possible and wins, with the black bishop on g1 (compare the previous note) preventing a promotion on that square. x) This is the second Novotny. xi) 12. Ke3? Bxf2† 13. Kf4 Rd4† 14. Kg5 Bxh4† 15. Kh6 Bg5† 16. Kg7 Bf6† 17. Kxf6 Rf4† 18. Kg6 Rf5†. This and similar lines are not too hard to follow if one realises that the king must avoid squares where promotion on a1, b1 or g1 would be check. After 18. ... Rf5†, for instance, 19. Kg6 Bh5† 20. Kh6 Rc5 wins, or 19. Kh6(h4) Rh5†. xii) 14. ... Bh5 15. Sg6 Rd5† 16. Kc2 Bd1† 17. Kc1 Re5† 18. Kd2 Ba4 19. Rc6 Rd5† 20. Ke2 Bd1† 21. Ke1 and so on. xiii) 3. Sd2 alQ 4. Rb8f Ka7 5. Sxc4 Qdlf 6. Kxg2 Qg4f 7. Khl Be4f 8. f3 Bf2 with mate. xiv) 4. Ke3 Bxf2† 5. Ke2 Re5f 6. Kc2 Bblf 7. Kcl Rc5f 8. Kd2 a1Q wins. 4. Kg3 Bxf2† 5. Kxf2 Rxc5 6. e7 Rc2†.

K18
G. M. Kasparyan
3rd Prize
Italia Scacchistica 1963

Draw

Black to play.
White draws

Rf5†.

K19
G. M. Kasparyan
3rd Prize
Shakhmaty v SSSR 1960
1st Place VI USSR
Composing Championship (1963)


K19  G. M. Kasparyan  
1 Hon. Men. 
Shakhmaty v SSSR 1963

K20  G. M. Kasparyan  
4th Prize Reti Memorial 
Tourney 1965


i) 1. Se7? is a very subtle try. 1... Kc5 and now:


   iii) With the black king on b5, the bishop must be kept from d6.


   4. ... Qe3 5. Sf3f Ke4 6. Sg5+ Ke5 7. Sf3f draws.

   i) A rook's pawn on the sixth attacking a knight cannot normally be stopped. If the black knight on d1 or a4 is taken, 1... Kxd3.

   ii) White is a whole queen down.
K23. 1. f7/f Se5 2. f8Q/i ii Sg6 3. Kg4 Sxf8 4. Sh5 Ra8 5. Sc7 Rh8 6.
Sa6 Ra8 7. Sc7 Ra7 8. Sh5 Ra8 9. Se7 Ra3 10. Sb5 draw.

i) 1. Rh4? 2. Rxh1 Sgl wins. 1. Rd8? Ka7 2. Rd1 would rob White
of a bishop check later, see (v), while 2. Rh3 here allows f2 3. Bh5 Bf3
and wins, as a knight check on d4 follows capture with the rook.
ii) 2. Kf5, see (v).  iii) 3. a6? b5 wins, but not 3. ..b6? 4. Bc4, nor
f1Q 5. Rxf1 Bxf1 6. a6 b6/viii 7. Kg5 Sg3 wins as there is no tempo-
gaining check on d5. Or 1. Rd1 Bg2 2. Kg5 f2 3. Kg4/ix Sd4/x 4. a6
ix) 3. Be4 f1Q 4. Rxf1 Sg3 wins, but not 4. ..Bxf1 5. a6 b6 6. Kg4
as main line.  x) 3. ..f1Q 4. Rx£1 Bxf1 5. Be4 Ka7 6. a6 b6.
AT WORK WITH THE J. R. HARMAN INDEX

To spend a weekend at the home of Mr & Mrs Harman is not simply to have the pleasure of unbounded hospitality. It affords a memorable occasion. The following notes are the spontaneous expression of a revelation.

My misfortune in missing John Harman’s talk to the CESC on “The Classification of Endgame Studies”, reported in EG 7, has been turned to great advantage by the privilege of an invitation to go to see for myself how the index works.

For those uninitiated I will recount that John Harman, having retired after a career in the Patent Office where no doubt his methodical ways were developed, offered in the cause of the endgame to undertake the daunting task of forming a content-classified index of all known studies. So far as was known, or is known, no other such undertaking exists. There were those who thought the task insuperable.

Today after more than four years of patient unremitting application the filing cabinets in the room where he works cover one of the walls to the extent of three men standing side by side. In every one of the forty eight cabinets are cards, each with a diagram, solution and notes and bearing coded tags of many colours. They lie closely packed together, mute symbols of the work of composers past and present the world over. Every definable area of composition has a section to itself, and if their compositions have a factor in common the names of the little known are juxtaposed with the immortals.

Little by little additions are made. Daily the total swells as John works his way through publications of ever increasing rarity. He is as remorselessly absorbing the past as he is keeping up to date with the present. If a source is not immediately available he will go out in search of it. And the cost of all materials, which is considerable, he bears himself. The work itself he finds agreeable. His is the zeal of a man with a mission. Here is a true enthusiast. Here all is order and method such as would delight the heart of Hercule Poirot. Here being performed on a small table in one room is classification as painstaking as the tabulation of finger prints at Scotland Yard.

But the test of a system is the efficiency with which it functions. The compiler took from my proffered bunch of originals a random sample to test for anticipation. Murmuring some mystic numbers he pulled out a drawer. His fingers, every one of them an index finger, flashed deftly over the cards with their coloured emblems and within seconds he laid before me seven studies representing five different composers spanning a period of forty-four years. Here was the computer personified. He then gave me and appraisal of the degree of anticipation, pronounced a verdict of absolution and demanded further samples. We discussed the anticipation element at length, agreeing that it is almost always present in some part of every study if not in the main concept, and that it was generally all a matter of degree. Related themes and case histories from the files - all were discussed. He seemed on intimate terms with every card he touched and I marvelled as one does on observing the performance of an expert at work.

Let no one doubt the efficacy of the confidential service John Harman provides. It is offered gratis to anybody anywhere who wishes to avail himself of information relating to matters of precedent in composition. John Harman’s work has not yet received the recognition that it deserves. He will not expect our acclaim, nor would he wish to have it, but I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my admiration for an achievement on an international scale of something which is unique. He has created an institution.

C. M. BENT
The Championship of Scandinavian Chess Composers, usually dominated by Finland, with Sweden second, had in 1967 one of its four sections devoted to studies. The theme demanded 'Symmetrical Star-ring Positions with Asymmetrical Solution'. The judge was Dr. H. Staudte, whose award in Stella Polaris March 1968 was confirmed in the December 1968 issue. Finland also won this section; of the 10 places Sweden took Nos. 3 and 8, Norway No. 6, Denmark No. 7, Finland won the other 6. The remarks quoted below are from the award.


No. 941: V. Hynonen. 1. Rg6 Sxg6 2. Re6f Kg8 3. Kf5 4. Rg4f Ke5 5. Re6 f Ke5 6. Re6 f Ke5 7. Re6f Kb4; 8 Re4f Ka5 9. Ra4 and. . . Kb6 - c5 - b4 - a3 - b2 - c3 - is answered by Ra6-c6-c4-a4-a2-c2-c4, never allowing b5 to interpose. Draw. i) 1. Re6f Sxe6 2. Rg6f Ke5 (7) 3. Rxg6 Ke4 4. Re4f Kc5 5. Re4f Kb5 6. Rd4f Kb6 wins. 1. Rg4f? Sf5 2. Rxg5f Sxf5 wins. ii) 2. Rf4f? Sf5 wins. “Nearly equivalent to the previous study. The uniformity of the solution - and the choice between 1. Re6 and 1. Rg6 - arises from the fact that W cannot allow the bB's long diagonal to be opened. Even though not really new in comparison with similar stalemate studies, the good construction justifies the 2nd place.”
No. 942: C. Jonsson. 1. Ka8/i c6 2. a5† Sxa5 3. bxa5† Kxa5 4. Kxa7 cxb5 5. c5 b4 6. c6 b3 7. c7 b2 8. c8Q b1Q 9. Qa6† Kb4 10. Qb6† wins. i) 1. Kc8? a6 2. c5† Sxc5 3. bxc5† Kxc5 4. Kxc7 axb5 5. a5 etc. only draws as bQ will not now be lost. (If here instead 2. bxa6 c5 3. b5 Ka7 4. Kc7 Sa5 draws. WV) “This entry justifies its high placing by its noteworthy originality and the good, far from obvious introduction”.

No. 943: I. Saren. 1. Qe8f/i Qd8 2. Qe6f Kc7/ii 3. Qf7f Kc6 4. Qf3f Kb6 (else S-fork) 5. Qb7† wins. i) 1. Qa6f? Kb8 (d8) = ; or 1. Qe6f? Kb8 2. Kb5 Qc8 3. Sa6f Kb(a)7 4. Qb6f Ka8 5. Sc7† Qxc7 =; or 1. Qa8f Qb8 2. Qa6f Kc7 3. Se6† Kd7 5. Sc5† Ke7 =. ii) If 2. . . Kb8 3. Qc6 Qc8 4. Sa6f Ka7 5. Qxc8 (not 4. Sd7? Ka7=). “Though there are endings in plenty with this material, this entry with the four-fold choice at the beginning has a special thematic interest, the three tries providing sufficient content.”


No. 945: N. G. G. v. Dijk. 1. Qe8f/i Qd8 2. Qe6f Kc7/ii 3. Qf7f Kc6 4. Qf3f Kb6 (else S-fork) 5. Qb7† wins. i) 1. Qa6f? Kb8 (d8) = ; or 1. Qe6f? Kb8 2. Kb5 Qc8 3. Sa6f Kb(a)7 4. Qb6f Ka8 5. Sc7† Qxc7 =; or 1. Qa8f Qb8 2. Qa6f Kc7 3. Se6† Kd7 5. Sc5† Ke7 =. ii) If 2. . . Kb8 3. Qc6 Qc8 4. Sa6f Ka7 5. Qxc8 (not 4. Sd7? Ka7=). “Though there are endings in plenty with this material, this entry with the four-fold choice at the beginning has a special thematic interest, the three tries providing sufficient content.”
No. 946  O. G. Lauritzen  
7th Place -  
Scand. Championship 1967 -  
Stella Polaris 1/68  

No. 947  J. Knoppel  
8th Place -  
Scand. Championship 1967 -  
Stella Polaris 1/68  

No. 948  P. Perkonaja  
9th Place -  
Scand. Championship 1967 -  
Stella Polaris 1/68  

No. 949  J. Hannallas  
10th Place -  
Scand. Championship 1967 -  
Stella Polaris 1/68  

Kd2 = or 8, S3c2 Kb2 =, i) 1... Sc5† 2. Kxe5 b6† 3. Kc6 Rd8 4. Sh3 Kc1 5. Sg5 Rf8 6. Kb7 Kb2 7. Kxa7 wins. iii) 2. Ke5? Rd8 3. axb7 Sd3† 4. Kxe5 =. "Like the 3rd placed study an original work. The refutation of the try 1. axb7 (Sa1 lacking the equivalent of the square h3) is in the classic mould."

No. 945: N. G. G. van Dijk  

No. 946: O. G. Lauritzen  
No. 950: H. Hultberg
Tidskrift för Schack 1940
(Amended by WV)

I: Win
II: 

No. 951: N. D. Grigoriev
Tidningen "64" 1936

I: Win
II: wRc2, bKg6. Win

No. 952: H. A. Adamson
Chess Amateur 1924
(Amended by WV)

I: Win
II: 

No. 953: A. Hildebrand
Springaren 1950

I: Win
II: 


An earlier article by A. Hildebrand in Stella Polaris 1/67 also dealt with the subject of symmetrical studies with asymmetrical solution. There are plenty such problems, he wrote, but very few such studies. As it is the modern idea to have “studies with a thematic try”, more of the kind might be expected, for the very structure of asymmetry embodies a thematic try. Of 11 samples given, 3 seem to be hopelessly cooked, the rest follows.
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No. 950: H. Hultberg. 1. exf5 wins. Not 1 exd5? Kxe2 2. d6 f4 3. d7 f3 4. d8Q f2=. (The position quoted in SP has wP (e2) at e3 and bK at e2, but then after 4... f2 5. Qd1 wins.) Even simpler, same author and source, W: Ke6, Pc3 B: Ke1 Pd4 Pd4. White draws by 1. exf4.

No. 951: N. D. Grigoriev I: 1. Kg4/i Kg6 2. f4 f6 3. f5† Kf7/ii 4. Kg4 (3) Ke7 5. Kf3 (4) and B can no longer stop wK from penetrating either via e4 or g4. i) 1. Ke4? Ke6 2. f4 f6 3. f5† Kd6 4. f3 Ke6 (5) = ii) 3. Kh6 4. f3 Kg7 5. Kf7 in 6. Ke4 wins. II: Here the symmetry does not exist initially but arises during the solution. 1. f4 Kf6 2. Kg3 Kf7 3. Kg4 etc. as in I.

No. 952: H. A. Adamson. The original study (2nd/3rd Prize, Chess Amateur 1924) had wK at e4 and bK at e1. The solution: 1. h4 etc. on the lines of the following. The try 1. b4 Kd2 2. Kd5 Kc3 3. b5 Kb4 4. Kc6 g5 5. Kxe7 Kxb6 6. Kd6 Kb6 only draws as bK reaches f6 which is enough against a RP. However W can improve by 2. Kd4 g5 (If 2... Ke7 h4 and bK will no longer reach f6. If 2... Ke2 3. b3) 3. h3 g4 4. Ke4 Kc3 5. Kf4 Kb4 6. Kxg4 Kxb3 7. h4 c3 8. h5 c4 9. Kf4 (The snag, wK is in the square) c3 10. Ke3 Kc4 11. h6 Kb3 12. h7 c2 13. Kd2 Kd2 14. h8Q check.

The amended setting after 1. b4 allows 1... Kd3 preventing 2. Kd4. As a bonus the new symmetric try 1. Ke6? is defeated asymmetrically by 1... Kd3 Not 1... Kf3? 2. b4 Kg2 (. . . Kg4 - h3 is too slow) 3. h4 Kh3 4. h5 Kh4 5. Kd4 Kxh5 6. Kxc7 g5. Both sides queen, but 11. Qh8† wins, an added feature.

No. 953: A. Hildebrand. 1. Bc8 (1. Be8?) The wK needs h7.

No. 954: A. Hildebrand. Initially diagonal asymmetry: 1. Ka4 Kc6 2. Ka5 Kb7 3. Kb5 Ka7 4. a7 Ka8 5. b5 a8Q 6. Ka7 Kb8 7. Kb6 Kb6; now vertical asymmetry, well-known of course, 8. Ka8 (not 8, Kc8?) winning Mr. Hildebrand adds: Primitive, but as far as we know, the only example of double asymmetry in a study.

The last study quoted is E. Pogosjants, No. 867 in EG 17, where asymmetry again arises during the solution, i.e. on the 10th move. Not quoted is A. S. Seleniev, see p. 82 of EG 4, in many ways the best of the kind (W: Ke5 Be6; B: Ke3 Pb4 Pb4; Drawn by 1. Kd8 Kd4 2. Kc6 Kc3 3. Kd6 b3 4. Ke4 b2 5. Ba2=).
No. 955: C. M. Bent. A recent other example with asymmetry during the solution. 1 Bg3† Kh3 2. Kxh7 Rd3/i 3. Kxg6 Rxg3 4. fxg3 Kxg3 5. Kf5 wins. Not 5. Kh5? Kh3 6. g6 g3 7. g7 g2 8. g8Q g1Q 9. Qxg1 stalemate. i) 2. . . Kg2 3. Kxg6 Rd2 (f8) 4. Kh5 etc. wins.

It will be appreciated that in all these positions symmetry is, and must be, merely visual. With perfect symmetry there could be no asymmetrical solution, there must be an eccentric factor on which the latter is based. In all but two of the studies above this factor is the limited space that there is to the one side as compared to the other. The peculiarities of the pawns, that they move forward and not sideways and promote etc., motivate the diagonal asymmetry in the Hildebrand study and the Hannelius study. Castling short (0-0) can also readily be made the factor; castling long (0-0-0), possibly not, nor en passant captures. This, I expect, exhausts the possible factors on which asymmetry can be based. (WV)


AWARD in LOMMER JUBILEE TOU RNEY

It is a great pleasure to note that Harold Lommer, in honour of whose 65th birthday in xi.69 this tourney was announced, is composing as actively as ever, even if some of his activity has been recently devoted to series helpmates rather than to studies! (The series helpmate is a fairy chess genre in which Black makes every move except the last, with which White delivers the mate.)

The quality of the entries was in general not high, unfortunately, and the quantity, 16 (from 9 composers), was also disappointing. This may be partly because it is only the second tourney that E G has announced, but other contributory factors may well have been the number of other tourneys being run concurrently, and the fact that the announcement in E G 15 was of unusual length, this being due to the set theme of 'Repetition'.

The judge has to thank the following for their invaluable assistance. J. R. Harman, for vetting the entries for anticipations, and for a generous contribution towards the prize fund.
P. Perkonoja, for testing.
P. S. Valois, for receiving, recording, transcribing and rendering anonymous.

1st Prize. No. 957: A. Hildebrand (Uppsala, Sweden). A beautifully simple-looking display of counter-punching by the white rook, once with a left hook to a3, and once with a right hook to h3, the alternative in either case being neatly blocked.

2nd Prize. No. 958: V. A. Bron. (Sverdlovsk, U.S.S.R.). The repetition mechanism may have a familiar air, but no close anticipations have been identified. The introductory exchanging combination is not very attractive, but the repetition theme of the drawing play is emphatic; one might tell the time from the final quivering quartz crystal clock.

3rd Prize. No. 959: Prof. L. Kopac (Liberec, Czechoslovakia). The gross blemish to be compensated for is the promoted white bishop on g4, but this compensation does exist. It is a gyroscope, or an orbiting satellite. The black king blasts off in the Northern Hemisphere but, in trying to elude the Earth’s attraction, he is shunted by two booster rockets discovered checks into a parallel orbit in the Southern Hemisphere!

1st Hon. Mention. No. 960: E. Ofiate (Valencia, Spain). Envisiably complex manoeuvres in main play and tries. A simpler setting, with in this judge’s opinion, richer play, is to be found in K. Raima’s 1st Prize in the Rumanian Championship, 1950 (No. 244 in Bondarenko’s ‘Gallery’).

2nd Hon. Mention. No. 961: A. J. Sobey (Hindhead, England). Multiple sacrifices to secure queening of the white pawn. There are partial anticipations by Weenink, 1917 (No. 649 in ‘1234’), Halberstadt, 1938 (No. 50 in Cheron) and Prekes, 1948 (No. 198 in his ‘Kniha’).

Commendeds: No. 962: C. M. Bent (Newbury, England), and No. 963: L. Kopac.

Since the studies have already been vetted for soundness and anticipations, the confirmation time for the award will be short. Claims and comments must reach the judge by i.v.70 to have any effect.

A. J. ROYCROFT
London, 25.1.70.
   iii) Threatening 4. Rf3f.
   iv) The fine echo is 3. ..Sb7(e6) 4. Rh3(vi) Bxa4(g4) 5. Rh4 draws.
   v) 4. Rh7? Bg4 5. Rh4 Sf5 draws.

   ii) One wonders if in any other study the black or white king visits both his own and his opposite number's palace? e8 and e1.

No. 959  L. Kopac
3rd Prize,
Lommer Jubilee Tourney

No. 960  E. Onate
1 Hon Men,
Lommer Jubilee Tourney

No. 961  A. J. Sobey
2nd Hon. Men,
Lommer Jubilee Tourney

No. 962  C. M. Bent
Commended,
Lommer Jubilee Tourney

ii) 4. Bxe6 5. h7, or 4...bc 5. h7. Or 4...Be2 5. Bxb7 Kc5 6. Be4.
point about the main line 7...Kxd5 is that 8. b7? fails to 8...Kc6
and 9...Kxb7.

No. 961: A. J. Sobey. 1. c6/i Rx a2/ii 2. c7 R f2/iii Kg6/iv Kg7/v
Bf5/vi Rxb2/vii Ra2/viii Be7/v


Kc5 5. Se6? Kb8 6. Sd8 (6. Sd4 not given, but needs analysis) 6...Ra8
7. Sf7/v (7. Be8 Ra8) 7...Kd5 8. Sc8 Kd6. On move 2 here, 2. Sc6
Kd8 (Rc8), or 2. Sc2 Rf3, or 2. Sa2 Rb2 3. c6 Rf2/v 4. Kg6 Rg2/v 5. Bg4
Rxa2 draws. ii) 1. ...Ra6 2. Sb4 Rb6 3. Be6 Rxb4 4. c7, or here 2.
iv) 3...Rf8 4. Kg7 wins, but 3. Kg7? Rf8 = . v) The last of the piece

offers.
No. 962: C. M. Bent. 1. Qc8\+ Bg8 2. Qh3\+ i Qh6/ii 3. Qxh6\+ gh 4. f7\+ Kh7 5. f8Q mate/iii.
i) 2. f7? Qe7\+. ii) 2. ..Bh7 3. fg f 4. Qe6 mate. iii) The repetition occurs if White promotes to queen, for then Black produces the identical mate: 5. f8Q? Sc2 mate.


F I D E. Album 1965–1967

E G-readers will be aware that the ‘tourney’ for selection for a FIDE Album relates only to published work, not to originals. There are two judges for each section, and a third to decide when the first two do not agree on the selection. A key factor is the size of the volume, which, printed in Yugoslavia, is not under the control of the FIDE directly, 111, or 16.6% of the 665 study section entries (from 19 countries and by 133 composers) are to be selected. Over half the submissions in the study section are from the U.S.S.R. The object is to select the best. The study judges are Dr G. Grzeban (Poland) and A. J. Roycroft (England), with Walter Korn (U.S.A.) as referee judge and Harold Lommer as Director.

AJR

Leonard Barden in his column in The Guardian of 21.xi.69 described E G as ‘the lively quarterly magazine which is probably the best available source of endgame analysis in the world.’
AWARD for SPECIAL THEME PRIZE, LOMMER JUBILEE TOURNEY

Only three entries were received for this curious theme, which many composers may well have felt was as artificial as retrograde analysis. No entry approached the ultimate of this idea, which is certainly impossible to achieve, namely that every alternative move to each drawing king (whether by White or Black) move is met by mate in one. The judge would have liked to have had the task of choosing between relatively natural positions with rather loose mates (like the mates by Black in the worthy prize winner) and more artificial positions with purer mates. Alas, it was not to be. One entry was quite unsound, and a second succumbed to alternative draws by Black. The prize goes unequivocally to the third entry, which has a most ingenious black queen and pawns mechanism on the king's side. Prize: No. 964, W. Veitch (London).

A. J. ROYCROFT
London, 25.1.70


Study solving as part of an entrance examination! For over three years there has been a chess faculty in the Central Institute for Physical Culture and Sport in Moscow. Those who pass the course are much in demand as teachers and trainers. To qualify to take the course requires participation in a simultaneous display, an oral examination in chess theory and history, and the solving of three endgame studies.

NOVY TEMY This Yugoslav magazine is the organ of the problemists of Macedonia. It publishes originals and has an informal tourney. Its periodicity is uncertain.


No. 969: W. D. Ellison. 1. Kg1 Ke3 2. Kf1 Be2½/i 3. Ke1 g4 4. Bc6 g3 5. e8Q g2 6. Qg6. i) 2. ..Kd2 seems to need more analysis, 3. Kf2 Be2 4.?


No. 971: A. J. Sobey. 1. Bb7† Ke5 2. Bxa8 Be4 3. Sg4† Kf5 4. Sc3† Ke5 5. Sc4† Kf4 6. Sc5† Kf3 7. Sc6†.


JRH: No. 468a in EG11 is typical of many similar processes.
No. 974: W. D. Ellison. 1. f3 Bxb4\textsuperscript{i} 2. Sxb4\textsuperscript{i} Ka5 3. Sc6\textsuperscript{t} be 4. fe.
\textsuperscript{i} 1. .. Sf2 2. Ke2 Bxb4 3. Sxb4\textsuperscript{i} Ka5 4. Sd5 Sh1 5. g4 Kxn4 6. f4 wins, but 6. Kf1\textsuperscript{t} draws only.

No. 975 I. S. Prusin. 1. Se7\textsuperscript{i} g5 2. Sf5\textsuperscript{t} Kg4\textsuperscript{ii} 3. Sd4\textsuperscript{iii} Kh3 4. Sb3/iv Bc3 5. Sc5 g4 6. Se4 draws, for example, 6. .. Ba7 7. Sf2\textsuperscript{t} and 7. .. Kh4 8. Se4. If 6. .. Bf4 7. Kg1 Bb8 8. Kh1 drawn.
\textsuperscript{i} 1. Kg2? Kg4 2. Sh6\textsuperscript{t} Kg5 3. Sc4\textsuperscript{t} Kf5 4. Sg3\textsuperscript{t} Kg4 5. Se4 Bb2 6. Sf2\textsuperscript{t} Kf5 7. Sh3 Be3 with a slow, sure, win. \textsuperscript{ii} 1. .. Kh3 3. Sd6/v g4 4. Se4 drawn. \textsuperscript{iii} 3. Sg7? Bb2. \textsuperscript{iv} 4. Se2? Bb2/vi 5. Kg1 Kg4 6. Kf2 Kf5 7. Sg3\textsuperscript{t} Kg6 8. Se4 g4 wins. \textsuperscript{v} 3. Sg7? Bb2 4. Sxh5 Kg4.

No. 976: C. M. Bent. 1. Rd3\textsuperscript{i} Rxd3/ii 2. Qe1\textsuperscript{t} Kd4 3. Qh4\textsuperscript{t} Ke5 4. Qe7\textsuperscript{t} Kf4 5. Qh4\textsuperscript{t} Ke6 6. Qe1\textsuperscript{t}. \textsuperscript{i} 1. Re1\textsuperscript{t} Kd4 2. Rd1\textsuperscript{t} Ke5, or 2. Qd1\textsuperscript{t} Rd3. \textsuperscript{ii} 1. .. Kf4 2. Qe1\textsuperscript{t} Kg4(g3) 3. Qg1\textsuperscript{t} Kf4 4. Qe1\textsuperscript{t}. \textsuperscript{iii} 1. .. Kf4 2. Qe1\textsuperscript{t} Kxe4 3. Qe4\textsuperscript{t} Ke5 4. Qe7\textsuperscript{t} Ke6 5. Qe4\textsuperscript{t} Kf5 6. Qf4\textsuperscript{t} Kg4 7. Qg6\textsuperscript{t}, and wQxd8 will follow.

There is a Kasparyan (No. 31 in his collection published in 1959) that is related, but with the black queen in the centre and black rooks on the edge.


iii) 5. .. Kxa4 6. a6 wins.


No. 978: J. C. Infantozzi. 1. Be5/i ef 2. Ra7 h2 3. Ra2\f Kg1 4. Kh3\f h1Q\f 5. Kg3 wins. i) 1. Rxe7? f5\f 2. Kh4 g5\f 3. Kxg5 h2 draws.

ii) 4. Kg3? h1S\f 5. Kf3 e4\f 6. Kxe4 Sg3\f.


i) 2. .. Sxa3 3. h5 wins.


No. 981  Dr. J. C. Infantozzi  
El Plata (Uruguay) 1967

No. 982  V. Kovalenko  
1st Prize, Komsomolskaya Pravda 1968  
Award 7.viii.68

No. 983  A. Frolovsky  
2nd Prize, Komsomolskaya Pravda 1968  
Award 7.viii.68

No. 984  N. Kralin  
3rd Prize, Komsomolskaya Pravda 1968  
Award 7.viii.68

i) 3. Rxb2?? stalemate.  
iv) 6. Re1? Qxc1f draws, or 6. Rh4? Qb4f.  
Judge: An. G. Kuznetsov.

ii) 5. Ba6f? Kd8 6. b7 Qd1f perpetual check.  
iii) 6. .. Kxa6 7. Sc5f Kb6 8. a5f Kxa5 9. Sb3f wins.  
iv) 8. c5f Qd5 9. Bc8 f3 10. a5 Qe4 11. a6 Qf4f perpetual check.  
v) 9. f3 10. c6 Qf4f 11. Ke8 wins.  
vii) 10. c6? Qxa8f.  
No. 984: N. Kralin. 1. Kg8/i Bxc5/ii 2. Bd1 B- 3. c5 Bxc5 4. c4 B- 5. c5 Bxc5 6. c4 B- 7. c5 Bxc5 8. Ba4/iii and wins the c6 pawn, explaining White's second move!  
i) 1. Kg7? Bxc5 2. Bh3 Be7 3. c5 Sg4 4. Be8 Se5 and wins. The same
No. 985: A. Bor.
Win

No. 986: Y. Dorogov.
Draw

No. 987: A. Bondarev.
Win

No. 988: N. Husainov.
Draw

follows 1. Kg6? See also (iii).  

No. 985: A. Bor. 1. Qd5† Kxd5 2. e4† Sxe4 3. Bc4† Kxc4 4. d3† Ke6/i 5. e4† Kf7 6. f4† Ke6 7. Kg7† Kf6 8. Qf7† Kg6 9. Gh4 mate.  


No. 988: N. Husainov. 1 Hon. Men.  

A fairytale study.” (Judge).


No. 988: N. Husainov. 1 Hon. Men.  

A fairytale study.” (Judge).
No. 987: A. Bondarev. 1. Qg8† Ke7 2. Qg7† Be7/i 3. Qxe7† Kb6 4. Qf6† Kb7 5. Qc6† Ka7 6. Qc7† Ka6 7. Qe8† Ka5 8. Sd7 Qe5/ii 9. Sxe5 f1Q 10. Qe7† Ka8 11. Sd7 Qh1† 12. Kg7 Qb7/i 13. Qd8† Ka7 14. Qa5† Qa8 15. Qe7† Qb7 16. Qc5† Ka8 17. Qf8† Ka7 18. Qa8† Qa6 19. Qe8† Ka6 20. Qc8† and mates or wins bQ next move.

i) 2. .. Kb6 3. Sd7f and 4. Qxal. ii) 8. .. Qh1† 9. Kg7 Qa1† (9. .. Qe5 is less effective now wk is on g7, as new bQ cannot check on h1) 10. Kg8 Qa2f 11. Kh7 wins. iii) 12. .. Qa1† 13. Kg6 Qa2† 14. Kh7 wins.

No. 988: N. Husainov. As printed in Kom. Pr. the 4 wP's fo, g4, h6, h7 are missing. We hope they are correctly restored (AJR). 1. Be1/i ba 2. Ba5 alQ 3. b4 Be6 4. fef Kg6 5. Kg6 Qe1 6. h8Sf Kxh6 7. Sf7 with perpetual check. i) 1. ab? gh 2. b4 h3 3. b3 h2 4. g5 Bxf5 5. g6† Kxg6 6. Kg6 Be6† 7. Kh6 Bc4 8. bc Kf7 9. e5 h1Q 10. c6, Black mates in 2.


i) 1. h7? h1Q 2. h8Q Qa6† 3. Kg7 Qg2† draws, and here 2. f5† Kxf5 also leads to a perpetual check.
No. 990: A. Bondarev. 1. Kg2 (1. Kxh2? Rxh3† mates) 1...Rxh3 2. Re4† Sg4 3. Rc4 Be8 4. Rc8 Sf6 5. Rc4† Sg4 6. Rc8 Bh5 7. Rc4 (repeats position) 7...Rh2† 8. Kg1 Kh3 9. Rc3† Kh4 10. Rc4 Rh3 11. Kg2 and the position is drawn, loose though the noose may seem. 11...Ra3 12. f3 -- note that wRb4 would allow 11...Rc3 12. f3 Rxc2† 13. Kgl Kh3, or 13. Kfl Rh2†.

   i) 1...a5 2. Sxh7 a4 3. Sf6 a3 4. Sd5 a2 5. Sb4 a1Q 6. Sc2† draws.
   ii) 4...a5 5. Ke4 a4 6. Kd3 a3 7. Ke3 Kf1 8. Sh2† Kg2 9. Sg4 Kg3 10. Se3 with the same standard draw as in the main line but this time mirrored on the other side of the board.


No. 995: Y. Rupchev. As given in Kom. Pr. there are both white and black P’s on a4, and nothing on a5. It seems clear that the diagram is the composer’s intention. 1. Sg5 h2 2. Se4 Ke1 3. Sg3 Kf2 4. Sh1† Kg2 5. Ke2 Khx1 6. Kf1 e6 7. a6 e5 8. a7 e4 9. a8R e3 10. Re8 e2† 11. e1Q† Rxel mate.


i) A fine move just when White seemed to be out of steam.


Award in Gaz.Cz. 6.ii.69. Judge: S. Limbach.

No. 998: L. Maslanka. 1. Kc2 g4 2. Sa5 g3 3. Sb3† Ka2 4. Sc1† Bxc1 5. b7 g2 6. b8Q Bb2 7. Qg8† wins.

No. 999: L. Maslanka. 1. Kf4 Qh8 2. Bf8† Kh7 3. e5 Kg8 4. h4 f6 5. e6 wins.


No. 999  L. Maslanka
1 Hon. Men.,
Gazeta Czerstochovska
1967-68

No. 1000  V. A. Bron
2nd Prize,
Birnov Memorial Tourney
1969 ("Volgograd Pravda")

No. 1001  V. Kovalenko
and Y. Bazlov
3rd Prize,
Birnov Memorial Tourney
1969 ("Volgograd Pravda")

No. 1002  M. Bordenyuk
1 Hon. Men.,
Birnov Memorial Tourney
1969 ("Volgograd Pravda")

No. 1003  A. Sadykov
1. Sg6† Bxg6 2. Rb8† Kh7 3. f8Q Kh6 4. g5† Kh5 5. Se6 Qa7 6. Rh8† Bf7 7. Rxg7† Qxg7 8. Kg3 and wins.

No. 1003: A. Sadykov
No. 1004: I. V. Chuiko

Birnov Memorial Tourney 1969 ('Volgograd Pravda')

No. 1005: E. L. Pogosants
No. 1006: V. Obraztsov

Birnov Memorial Tourney 1969 ('Volgograd Pravda')

No. 1007: F. Barash
No. 1008: M. Bordenyuk

Birnov Memorial Tourney 1969 ('Volgograd Pravda')

No. 1009: S. G. Belokon

Birnov Memorial Tourney 1969 ('Volgograd Pravda')

i) It seems to me that this, in itself quite simple move, somehow typifies Pogosjants' sharp style. Everything is en prise and in an elementary position originality yet shows through. (AJR)


No. 1007: F. Barash. 1. Ra7f Kxc8 2. Sc4 b1Q 3. Sd6† Ke8 4. Sf7† Ke7 5. Sd6† Kf8 6. Rf7† Kg8 7. Kh6 and will draw by perpetual check.

i) 1. . . . Kh5 2. Sf4† Kxh4 3. Rh6† and wins bR in a couple of moves.

No. 1009: S. G. Belokon. 1. Bd4 c6† 2. Kb4/i Qh6 3. g5 Qh7 4. Ra7† Ke6 5. Rg7 Qh8 7. Rc7† wins, a most original means of setting up a bishop/rook battery to win the queen. 5. Rxh7? is stalemate.
No. 1007: F. Barash
No. 1008: M. Bordynuk
No. 1009: S. G. Belokon
No. 1010: T. B. Gorgiev

No. 1011: A. van Tets.


or to prevent S→g3→h5 3. .. Kf3 4. Sd4† Ke4 5. Se2 Kf3 6. Sd4† Qe3 7. Sf5† Kf3 8. g7 =.
C. 1. .. Qh2 2. Kf6 Qe5† (Qh8 see B.) 3. Kf7 Kf5 4. g7 Qf0† 5. Kg8 Kg6 6. h8Q Kf5 7. Sg3† Ke6 8. Sh5 Qg5(h6) 9. Sg6 =.

iii) 2. h8Q? loses the queen after Qd2† or Qe3†. iv) 2. .. Qb7† 3. Kf6 Qf2† 4. Ke7 Qh4† 5. Kf8 Qf6† 6. Kg8 Qe6† 7. Kf8 =. v) 3. Kg6? Qf5† 4. Kh6 Qf6†.
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No. 1014: A. P. Maximovskikh and A. I. Malyshkov. 1. h7 Sc5†/i 2. Kb2 d2 3. Kc2 Sc4 4. h8Q d3† 5. Kd1 d5 6. Qh5 Kf2 7. Qh3 Kg1 8. Qf3 Kh2 9. Qf1 Kg3 10. Qxd3† wins, only because it is check.
The event was for military composers. Judge: F. S. Bondarenko. Award published in 'The Soviet Soldier' in 1968.

No. 1015: M. N. Marinov. 1. Se4 Kh7 2. Sg5† Kh6 3. Sf7† Kh7 4. Kf4 Be7† 5. Ke4 Bb8 6. Kd4 g6 7. h6 g5 (a counter-attack is essential, 7. . . Ba7† 8. Ke5 being hopeless) 8. Sg5† Kxh6 9. Sxe6 Kg6 10. Kd5 Kf6 11. Ke6 Kxe6 12. Kb7 wins. As the composer is from Bulgaria, one assumes that the tourney was open to military personnel anywhere. The black B is obtusive.


No. 1020: V. Kamensky. 1. Kb6 Re6 2. Kb7 Re7† 3. c7 Ke6 4. Kb8 Re8† 5. c8R Re7 6. Rc6† Kf7 7. Rc7 forcing the exchange of rooks and winning.


No. 1022: E. Pogosjants. 1. g8S Kg6 2. Sg7† Kf6 3. Sd5† Kg5 4. Sf4† Kf6 5. Sh5† Ke6 6. Shg7† Kf6 7. Sg8† Ke6 8. Sc7† Kf6 9. Sxa8 wins.
No. 1023: M. Gordman. 1. Sd5 bc 2. Sf2† Kh4 3. Sxd1 Rxd1 4. g6 Re1† 5. Se3 cd 6. g7 d2 7. g8Q d1Q 8. Bxe7† Bxe7 9. Qg4† Qxg4 stalemate.


Judge: F. S. Bondarenko. The First Prize was No. 300 in EG11.

   ii) 1. .. Sxc2 2. Bc5.


i) 1. Rg4? Rf7f 2. Kg6 Rf3 is given as drawn, but 3. Bxd6 Rxe3 4. Kf7 Rh3 5. Bf4 Kh7 6. Kf8 (AJR) looks like a win for White,


No. 1034: D. N. Arsenich. 1. Rg7/i f4 2. Kg8 f3 3. ef e2 4. Be7 Kg1 5. Rxe2 h1Q 6. Re1f wins.
i) 1. Rg8f f4 2. Kg6 f3 3. ef Kg2 4. Kf5f Kxf3 5. Rh8 e2 wins.
No. 1035: E. L. Pogosjants
Prize, Pravda Severa
(Archangel) 1969

1. Se5† Kf2 2. Sg4† Kf1 3. Se3† Kf2 4. Sd1† Kg2 5. Bb7† c6 6. Bxe6† Kf1 7. Se3† Kf2 8. Sg4† Kf1 9. Bd5† Qe4 10. Se3† Kf2 11. Bg1† and wins.

The tourney had a compulsory theme: avoidance of capture of bQ in a study to win. Judges: V. Kovalenko and Kakovin. The tourney appears to have been informal, which is very rare (unique?) for a theme event. JRH: see Rinck No. 105 in his '1414'.

No. 1036: V. A. Yakovenko
1 Hon. Men.,
Pravda Severa 1969

1. c7 Qd7 2. Be7† Kg3 3. Sd6 Qxc7 4. Sxf5† Kh2 5. Bd6† Kh1 6. Sg3† Kh2 7. Se4† Kh1 8. Sf2 stalemate.

JRH: Not anticipated, but Nazanyan 1937, No. 307 in Porreca's "Studi Scacchistici" in nearest.

No. 1037: E. L. Pogosjants
2 Hon. Men.,
Pravda Severa 1969

1. Qf6 Qg4† 2. Kh2 Qg3† 3. Kh1 Qg4 4. Qf7† Kh6 5. g8Q† Kg5 6. Qf6† Kh5 7. Qh6 mate.

No. 1038: S. Lissy
1 Commend,
Pravda Severa 1969

1. Bc4† Kf2 2. Bxb3 Rb1 3. b8Q Rxb3 4. Qxb3 d1Q 5. Qf7† Qf3† 6. Kh2 Ke1 7. Sg3 Qe3 8. Qf1† wins.

No. 1039: F. S. Aitov
No. 1039  F. S. Aitov
2nd Place,
Pravda Severa 1969

No. 1041  V. Yakimchik
2nd Place,
Match Krivoi Rog v Kazakhstan, 1969

No. 1040  I. Prashcheruk
1st Place,
Match Krivoi Rog v Kazakhstan, 1969
Win

No. 1042  L. Topko
3rd Place,
Match Krivoi Rog v Kazakhstan, 1969
Draw

Bxf5 11. Kxf6 gxf6 12. Kxf6 wins. First and third places in this match
were taken by Krivoi Rog composers. Judge: F. S. Bondarenko.

Ke4 7. Kxd6 Sf6 and ... Sb7t follows, with a draw.  iii) 4. ... Bh7 5.
10. Ke7 is avoided only by 8. ... Sf6t 9. Bxc6 Bxc6, but 10. Rb4 Bb7 11.

Kd1 Kh4.

JRH: “Of interest is Herbstman 1955, No. 2078 in Kasparyan’s ‘2,500’.”
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No. 1043: L. F. Topko
Prize, Leninskoye Plemya (Nikolayev) Award 2 x 6

L. F. Topko


No. 1044: F. S. Aitov
Hon. Men., Leninskoye Plemya Award 2 x 6

F. S. Aitov


No. 1045: E. L. Pogosjants
Hon. Men., Leninskoye Plemya Award 2 x 6

E. L. Pogosjants


No. 1046: E. L. Pogosjants
Hon. Men., Leninskoye Plemya Award 2 x 6

E. L. Pogosjants
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Obituary
Frank Grimoldby, in ii.69, aged 87. EG subscriber from the beginning.

Eustachy Wolanski, Polish problemist, died aged 65. He composed a few studies, including two First Prizes in "Revista de Sah" before the Second World War. (See No. 1233 in '1234').

Obtaining Secondhand Books

1. V. A. Bron's 1969 'Selected Studies and Problems' is available from AJR at 7s6d. each. Only three copies left.

2. The 1948 Finnish collection '111 Suomalaista Lopputehtavaa' is available from British Chess Magazine, 9 Market Street, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Sussex.

3. 'CHESS' (Sutton Coldfield, England) runs postal auctions, with reserve prices and suggested minimum offers. Endgame study books are occasionally available. Titles are advertised on the cover pages of 'CHESS'. For postwar literature the 'minimum offer' suggested prices are very inflated, but for older books they are reasonable. For example, p.v. of the ii.70 issue (527-8) suggests 22s.6d., for Kasparian's 1959 'Selected Studies and Games'. This is at least twice the price available from other sources (see 4).

4. Monsieur Julien Guisle runs a bookshop specialising in chess, situated by the church of St. Severin, just to the east of the Seine end of the Boulevard St. Michel (13 Rue Saint-Jacques, Paris V) for anyone with the time to spare in the French capital. It is very good indeed.

5. As good as the Librairie Guisle, but a little less accessible, is the 'Skakhuset' of Captain Albert Neess in Copenhagen (Studiestraede 24, 1453 Copenhagen K, Denmark).

6. There is, I am sure, no equivalent in the British Isles for 4 and 5 above.

Informal tourney of Tidskrift for Schack, entries in duplicate to Eric Uhlin, Ivar Claessons gata 7A, 44200 Kungälv, Sweden.

German Demokratische Republik (DDR). This country is even less study-conscious than the German Federal Republic. Therefore it is very encouraging that the governing DDR chess organisation has announced a tourney, apparently a formal one. Originate should be sent to

Turnierleiter Kurt Galke, 87 Löbau, Innere Zittauer Strasse 18, German Demokratische Republik - DDR
Closing date: 30.vi.70.
Judge: Hans Vetter.

Entries marked 'Section 6 - Studies', on diagrams with the numbers of the pieces noted. The judge has been giving examples of studies in his column in Schach for over a year following the establishment of an exchange arrangement with EG. The result has been a small number of East German originals, which it is hoped this present tourney will improve on.
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

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 subscription arrangements (if your country's Exchange Control regulations prevent you subscribing directly):

Editor: A. J. Roycroft.
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To magazine and study editors: Please arrange to send the complimentary copy of your magazine, marked “EG Exchange”, to: C. M. Bent, Black Latches, Inkpen Common, Newbury, Berkshire, England.

Sydney Capsey: “Pawn Mates”.

Next Meeting: 3.iv.70, at 101 Wigmore St., London W1 (behind Selfridge's), 6.15 p.m. Solvers' evening: please bring a study to be solved (but you must know the solution!).
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