directed by Walter Veitch

For most of this column we are indebted to the Russian magazine "64" (No. 39 of 1970), which decided to subject to close analysis the studies provisionally placed in the latest USSR Championship. Far in excess of their expectations, they found that 11 out the top 26 , including 8 of the top 10, called for comment (not all busts), proving as they wrote that there is more than a little truth to the old joke: "There are no correct studies, only unbust ones".

EG3, No. 116: V. A. Korolkov. Black draws cleverly, as shown in "64", by 3. ......e2 4. c7 Kh7! (4. ......e1Q? 5 . c 8 Q wins) 5. c8Q Sg6 $\dagger$ 6. Kf7 $\mathrm{Sh} 8 \dagger=$ ! So white tries 5. Bg3 when follows 5...... Bc5 $\dagger$ 6. Kf7 e1Q 7. Bxe1 Sf5 8. Ke6/i Se7 9. Bf2 Bb4 10. Bg3 (preventing ......Ba5) Sc8 11. Be5 Kg6 12. f4 Ba5 13. f5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 5$ 14. Bf6 $\dagger$ /ii Kg4 15. Bd8 Sd6 16. f6 Bxc7 17. Bxc 7 Se 4 18. $\mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{Sg} 5 \dagger=$. i) 8. Bg 3 Se 7 9. Be5 Sc8 10. f4 Kh6 etc. draws similarly ii) 14. f6 Kg6 15. f7 Bb4 16. Kd7 Kxf7 17. Kxc8 $\mathrm{Ba} 5=$; or here 15. $\mathrm{Kd7} \mathrm{Bxc} 716$ Kxc 7 Sa 7 17. Kb6 Sc8 $\dagger$ 18. Kb7 Sd6 $\dagger=$ iii) 16. Be7 Bxc7 17. f6 Sf7 = . An excellent bust, but unfortunately of a very attractive study.
The intended win was: 1 . c5 f 4 2. c 6 f 3 3. ef $\mathrm{Sg} 6+4$. Kf7 Se 7 5. Bxe7 Bh2 6. f4 Bxf4
 Qe3 10. Be5t Qxe5 11. c8Qt.

EG8, No. 816: An. G. Kuznetsov. This position won 2nd Prize in the 1966 Troitzky Memorial Tourney, but a dual draw was shown on p. 244 of EG9, and A. Kopnin moreover proved a Black win as reported on p. 381 of EG13. There too we quoted the composer's new version of the study, No. 316a, which was published in Shakmaty v SSSR and was awarded 1st Prize in its 1967 Tourney.

This amended version has now also been shown to be a win for Black after 1. Sf3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf4}$, instead of $1 . \ldots . . . \mathrm{Kg} 4$, and this in two different ways. Harry Rombach plays after 2. Kc2 Re1! Now if 3. Rd3 or 3. c4 d1Q $\dagger$ wins, e.g.: 3. c4 dlQ $\dagger$ 4. Rxd1 Rxc4† 5. Kd2 (5. Kd3 Rd4†!) Re8 6. Bd5 Rc5 7. Bb7 Rc7 8. Bd5 Rd7 wins. As 3. $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{S}) \mathrm{xd} 2$ is suicidal there remains 3. Kxd2 Bxe $3 \dagger$ 4. Kc2 Bf6 $\dagger$ 5. Kd2 Ral. Now if 6. Rb8 Ra2 $\dagger$ 7. Kd1 Rh7 8. Rf8 Rd7 $\dagger$ 9. Ke1 (9. Kc1 Rc7 $\dagger$ 10. Kd2 Ke3 etc.) Ke3 10. Re8 $\dagger$ Be7 11. Kfl Rel $\dagger$ 12. Sel Rxel $\dagger$ 13. Kxel Ral mate, a line which also serves to overcome 6. Rf8 or 6. Rg8. The alternative left is 6 . Re8 Ra2 $\dagger 7$. Kd1 Be7 (threat ......Rd7 and ...... $\mathrm{B} \dagger$ ) 8. Rb8 Rd7 $\dagger$ 9. Kc1 (9. Kel Bd6!) $\mathrm{Ba} 3 \dagger$ 10. Kb1 Re2 11. Ka1 Rd1 $\dagger$ 12. Rb1 Bb2 $\dagger$ 13. Ka2 $\mathrm{Bf} 6 \dagger$ wins.

The alternative Black win, given by Master A. Khachaturov in " 64 ", is after 2. Kc2 Bxc3 3. Sxd2 Rh2! 4. Kd1 Ra7!, and now essentially either 5. Sb3 Rb2 6. Sc1 Rxa8, or 5. Sb1 Bf6 6. Rf8 Kf5 7. Be4 $\dagger$ Kxe4 8. Rxf6 Rd7 $\dagger$ 9. Kcl Rc7 $\dagger$ 10. Kd1 Rh1 $\dagger$, or 5. Rf8 $\dagger$ Kg4 6. Bf3 $\dagger$ Kh4 7. Sb3 $\dagger$ Re7.

The easiest way out of this difficulty is simply to cut out the first move of the solution ( $1 . \mathrm{Sf} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ ) and to start by $1 . \mathrm{Kc} 2$. Little is lost, and one hopes that the study with its quite remarkable end position is then correct.

EG9, No. 383: L. Mitrofanov. "64" reports that the best study, which was by this composer, was bust by Master Kuindshy with a line as dazzling as the author's original solution.
Presumably No. 383 is the study in question. Can any reader supply details, please?

EG10, No. 386: A. G. Kuznetsov \& N. Kralin. This study, previously wrongly criticised by us, seems faulty after all. Black draws by 3 , ......Sa2 (instead of ......Ka5) 4. Be6 b4 5. Bxa2 Kb5 6. Be3 Ka4. "64" now finds no win: If 6. Kd3 Ka3 7. Be6 b3 8. Kc3 b2 9. Bf5 Ka2; if 6. Kd2 b3 7. Bb1 Kb4 8. Kd3 b2 9. Kc2 Ka3 10. Kc3 Bd5, or 8. Bf5 b2 9. Kc 2 Ka 3 .

EG15, No. 736: V. N. Dolgov \& Al. P. Kuznetsov. EG gave the solution clockwise, pointing out the anti-clockwise possibility. In the latter there is however a dual at a point most rapidly reached by: 1. Kc5 Se4 $\dagger$ 2. Kd4 Sf2 3. Ke3 Sg4 (going anti-clockwise) 4. Kf4 Sf6. Now instead of 5 . Ke5 etc. there is also 5 . Kg5 as 6 . Kh6 will draw. To what extent this fact, pointed out in " 64 ", damages the study I would not care to say. Clockwise the solution is all right.

EG 21, No. 1123: A. Herbstman \& L. Katsnelson. Black wins after all by 3. .. d6, but after 4. Ba3 Rbl! (not 4. .. Bd7 $\dagger$ as previously suggested) 5. Bxd6 $\dagger$ Kxd6 6. $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger \mathrm{Se} 7 \dagger$ 7. Qxe7 $\dagger$ Kxe7 wins. P. Perkonoja, who gives this in Stella Polaris $1 / 71$, adds that later on in the main line Black again wins by 8. . Bb5 (instead of 8. .. Bd7?) for if 9. Bxg7 Sxg8 wins, while if 9. Ee6 Rh7 10. Bg8 Rh8 11. Bxe7† Kc6 wins.

No. 1140: L. Kopac. From New York J. E. Peckover writes to prove that my 3. ......Rb7 (even if better) still loses to 4. Sa7† Kd7 (4. $\ldots . . . \mathrm{Kd} 8$ 5. Sc6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 6. Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd7}$ 7. Se5 $\dagger$ ) 5. Re1 Ba6 (5. ......Kd8 6. Sc6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 7. Re8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd7}$ 8. Re7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 9. Sa7 $\dagger$ ) 6. Re3 (waiting) Kd8 7. Sc6 $\dagger$ Kc8 8. Sb8 winning at least bB. He adds that Herbert Thorne, also of New York, has compiled a 3-page analysis to show that 2. ...... Be 4 too can be overcome by 3 . Rel etc. All this however merely tends to confirm the criticism that the solution which was given cannot qualify as the main line and that the position was not adequately explored.


EG23, No. 1214: V. Nestorescu. The diagram here shows the amended version mentioned in EG23. The solution begins. 1. Sc $6 \dagger$ Kf6 2. Be $5 \dagger$ Kxf5 3. Sd $4 \dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Ke 4 4. Sc3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 3$ 5. Bf4 $\dagger$ /ii $\mathrm{Kxf} 4 / \mathrm{iii} . \mathrm{i}) 3$. Be 2 ? Qg1t or 3. Bf3(e8)? Bh6 favour Black. ii) Now if 5. Sd5†? Kf2 6. Sf6(4) Qg1 $\dagger$ 7. Kd2 Qe1 $\dagger$ 8. Kd3 Qe3† 9. Kc4 Sb6 $\dagger$ etc. iii) The position now is identical with the solution on p. 194 after 3. ......Kf4 and continuing 4. e7 Qg1† etc.

No. 1221: E. Pogosjants. Black wins, as shown in " 64 ", by 9. ......Bf8 10. Kg8 (10. Se6 Bxe6 11. d8S Bc4 12. Kg8 Be7 13. Kh8 Bf6 $\dagger$ 14. Kg8 Bxd8) Be7 11. Kh8 Bf6 $\dagger$ 12. Kg8 Bxd8 13. Kf8 Bh4 14. d8Q Bxd8 15. Ke8 Bh4 16. $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{~S} \dagger$ (a further promotion tto wS, but still to no avail) Kf6 17. Sh (d) $7 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 18. Sf8 Bb5 $\dagger$ 19. Sd7 Kh-wins.

No. 1227: V. I. Neishtadt. How can such a S fork be new?' Moreover, there is no win. 3. ......Kg7 immediately, and if $4 . \mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q}^{\prime} \mathrm{Qc} 5 \dagger$ wins $\mathrm{Qf1}$, while 4. Qf7 $\dagger$ Kxf7 5. d8S $\dagger$ no longer suffices to win.
Perhaps wPa3 should be at a4, preventing ......Qb5.
(AJR: When JRH wrote "Apparently a new formation for this wS promotion fork", he intended the word "formation" to be interpreted in the sense of '"forming", "lead-in play", and overlooked the other meaning as in, for example, "aircraft formation".)

No. 1232: V. S. Kovalenko. Another win is 2. Kg5 Kh2 3. Qe2 Kh1 4. Qe4 h3 5. Kh4 Kh2 6. Qg4 etc.

No. 1252: B. Brekhov. Quicker is 9. Qh5 $\dagger$ Kg2 (9. ......Ke4 10. Qh7 $\dagger$ ) 10. Qe2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 3$ 11. Qxe3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 12. Qg5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf} 3$ 13. Qh5 $\dagger$ (again) Kg2 14. Qg4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf1} 15$. Qf5 $\dagger$ and only ......Qf3 saves a mate in 2.


No. 1273: V. Khortov. 1. Sc3 $\dagger$ Kxf5 2. Sxe2 Rd5 $\dagger$ 3. Kc6 Rc5 $\dagger$ 4. Kxd6 Ra5 5. Bc8 $\dagger$ /i Kf6 6. h7 Rh5 7. Sg3 Rxh7/ii 8. Se4 $\dagger$ Kf7 9. Sg5 $\dagger$ Kg8 10. Be6 $\dagger$ Kh8 11. Sf7 $\dagger$ Kg8 12. Se5 $\dagger$ Kf8 13. Kd7 Rh6 14. Kd8 g5 15. Sd7 mate. i) 5. Bd3 $\dagger$ ? Kf6 6. h7 Rh5/iii 7. Sg3 Rxh7 8. Se4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf5}$. ii) 7. . . Rh6 8. Se4 $\dagger$ Kf7 9. Be6 $\dagger$ and 10. Sg5 will win in a few moves, a line indicated by Danny Cohen. iii) 6. . . Ra8 may also be adequate, but we are concerned only with refutation of a white try, so there is little point in looking for a 'black dual'.
No. 1274: L. I. Katsnelson. 1. Sh5/i Bb1 2. f7 Rc8 3. Sf6/ii Bg6/iii 4. Se8 Rxe8 5. feQ Bxe8 6. Sd3 Bh5 7. g3 Be8 8. g4 wins, or 6. ... Kb3 7. a5 Ka4 8. a6 Kb5 9. a7 Bc6 10. g4 Kb6 11. Se5 Bb7 12. a8Q Bxa8 13. g5 Bb7 14. Sd7 and the gP promotes. i) 1. f7? Rf6 2. Sd3 Bb1 3. Se5 $\dagger$ Kb4 4. Sh5 Rxf7 5. Sxf7 Bg6. ii) 3. Sf4? Bf5 4. Scd3 Rf8 5. Se5 $\dagger$ Kb4. iii) 3. ... Rf8 4. Sd7 Rxf7 5. Se5†.

No. 1275: T. B. Gorgiev. 1. c7 Kxc7 2. Ka7 b4 3. Ka6 c3 4. Rf4 Bf7 5. Rxf7 $\dagger$ Kc6 6. Rf6 $\dagger$ Kc5 7. Rf5 $\dagger$ Kc4 8. Rf4 $\dagger$ Kd3 9. Rxb4 c2 10. Rb3 $\dagger$ Kd 4 11. Rb4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 5$ 12. Rb5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd6}$ 13. Rb6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 7$ 14. Rb7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 15. Rb5 clQ 16. Rc5 $\dagger$ Qxc5 stalemate. The latest in a long lineage of finishes like this. JRH: See Bron (1929), No. 13 in his collection.
No. 1276: G. Afanasiev and E. Dvizov. 1. Se4 b1Q 2. Sc $6 \dagger$ Ka3 3. Bd6 ${ }^{\dagger}$ Kb 2 4. $\mathrm{Bo} 5 \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{Kc} 2$ 5. Sc3 Qa1 6. Sa2 Qb1 7. Sc3.


No. 1277: V: Neidze. 1. Bf7 $\dagger /$ i Kf8 2. Kg2 Re1 3. Kxh2 Rh1 $\dagger$ 4. Kg3 Rh3 $\dagger$ 5. Kg4 Rh7 6. Bf6 Rxf7 7. Ra8 mate. i) 1. Bd7†? Kd8 2. Kg2 Re7 3. Bf6 h1Q $\dagger$ 4. Kxh1 stalemate.

No. 1278: V. Sekov and V. Yakimchik. 1. c7 Qh5 $\dagger$ 2. Sg4 Qxg4† 3. Kf2 Qe6 4. c8S/i Qg6 5. Sed6 $\dagger$ Kd5 6. Se7t, or 4. ... Qa6 5. Scd6 $\dagger$ Kd5 6. Sc7†. i) 4. c8Q? Qb6 $\dagger$ 5. Kf1 Qb1 $\dagger$ 6. Ke2 Qxc2 $\dagger$ draws,

No. 1279: V. Dolgov. 1. Rg7 Sc5/i 2. Kc6 Se4 3. Kd5 Sf6 $\dagger$ 4. Ke6 Se4 5. Rg4 Sf2 6. Rh4 $\dagger$ Bh2 7. Se1 h5 8. Rxh5 Kg1 9. Sf3 $\dagger$ Kg2 10. Sxh2 Sh3 11. Kf5 wins. i) 1. ... h5 2. Rxb7 h4 3. Rh7 Bg3 4. Se3 Kh2 5. Kc4 h3 6. Kd3 Bf4 7. Sf1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 2$ 8. Ke2 h2 9. Rg7 $\dagger$ Kh3 10. Sxh2 Kxh2 11. Kf2 Kh1 12. Rg1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 213$. Rg4 wins. The 3-5 Commend pieces are not readily available.

No. 1280: V. Dolgov. This position was the winner of a composing competition (Shakhmaty vi. 68) to find interesting studies where whoever moves wins (or draws). White: 1. Sd3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 22$. Sb4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 23$. Qh8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 14$. Qh7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 2$ 5. Qg7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 6. Qg6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 2$ 7. Qf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 8. Qf5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 2$ 9. Qe $5 \dagger$ Kb1 10. Qe1 $\dagger$ Kb2 11. Sd3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 12. Qxd2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 3 / \mathrm{i} 13$. Qb4 $\dagger$ Kc2 14. Se1 $\dagger$ Kd1/ii 15. Qb3 $\dagger$ Kxe1 16. Qe3 $\dagger$ and 17. Qg1 $\dagger$. i) 12. ... Kb1 13. Qc1 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 14. Sb4†. ii) 14. ... Kc1 15. Qc4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 2$ 16. Qd3 $\dagger$. With B1 to play: 1. ... Qa8 $\dagger$ 2. $\mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Qa} 7 \dagger$ 3. $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qb} 7 \dagger$ and so on to $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 4 \dagger$ 11. Kh2 g3 $\dagger$ 12. Kgl Qxel†.


No. 1281: A. P. Kazantsev. 1. Kg6 Sd6/i 2. f8Q $\dagger$ Kxf8 3. h7 Sf7 4. Bd5 Sh8 $\dagger$ 5. Kh6 f1S/ii 6. g6 Sxe3 7. g7 $\dagger$ Ke7 8. g8S $\dagger$ /iii Kf8 9. Sxf6 Sxd5 10. Sxd5 Kf7 11. Kg5 Kg7 12. h6 $\dagger$ Kxh7 13. Sf6 mate. i) 1. ... f1Q 2. $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{fg} 3 . \mathrm{Bf} 3$, ii) 5. ... f1Q 6. g6 Qf5 7. g7† Ke7 8. g8Q wins by $9 . \mathrm{Kg7}$ and $10 . \mathrm{Kxh} 8$. iii) 8. g8Q? Sf5 mate. 8. ghQ? Sf5 $\dagger$ 9. Kg6 Sh4 $\dagger 10$. Kg 7 Sf5 $\dagger$ 11. Kg8 Sh6 $\dagger$ perpetual. Judges. Herbstman and Neidze. The occasion was the 150th anniversary of a Georgian poet and the organising body was the Chess Federation of the Georgian Republic of the U.S.S.R.

No. 1282: G. A. Nadareishvili. 1. Kd2 Kf3/i 2. Bxc4 elQt/ii 3. Kxe1 h2/iii 4. Be2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 2$ 5. Bf1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 6. Bg2 Rxg2 7. Sf5/iv h1Q 8. Rh6 Rh2/v 9. Rg6 $\dagger$ Rg2 10. Rh6 draw. i) 1. ... h2 2. Rxc4 $\dagger$ and 3. Rc1. ii) 2. ... Re5 3. Se4 Rxe4 4. Rf6 $\dagger$. iii) 3. ... Re5 $\dagger$ 4. Kd2 h2 5. Sf7 h1Q 6. Sxe5 $\dagger$ Ke4 7. Re6 draws (if Bl thinks he might lose, then 7. ... Qh2 $\dagger$ and 8. .. Qxe5!). iv) 7. Sf7? h1Q 8. Rh6 Re2† 9. Kxe2 Qe4- wins. v) Now 8. ... $\mathrm{Re} 2 \dagger$ 9. Kxe2 Qe4 $\dagger$ 10. Se3 draws. 8. ... Qxh6 9. Sxh6 Rg5 10. Ke2 draws.
No. 1283: I. M. Kriheli. 1. Sc6 Rxc6/i 2. d7 Rd6 3. b6 Qxd7 4. Rf8† Qd8 5. Kh7 Rd7 6. Re8 Rd6 7. Rf8 drawn, as ... QxR is at any stage stalemate, bPg6 and bPg7 being controlled alternately by bQ and bR!

i) 1. ... bc 2. d7 Qxa7 3. d8Q $\dagger$ Rb8 4. Rf8 Rxd8 5. Rxd8 $\dagger$ draws, or here 4. ... cb 5. Qxd5 $\dagger$ Qb7 6. $\mathrm{Qa} 2 \dagger$ draw.

No. 1284: L. A. Mitrofanov. 1. f4/i Kg3/ii 2. Se2 $\dagger$ /iii Kf3 3. f5 Ke4 4. Sg3 $\dagger$ Kf4 5. f6 Kg5 6. Se4 $\dagger$ Kf5 7. f7 Ke6 8. Sg5 $\dagger$ Kf6 9. f8Q $\dagger$ Rxf8 10. Sh7 $\dagger$ and 11. Sxf8 wins. i) 1. Kc7? Rf8 2. b8Q Rxb8 3. Kxb8 Kxg1 draws. ii) 1. ... Ke3 2. Sh3 and W has gained time for 2. ... Kf3 3. Kc7 R 4. f5 and wins (with a little care). 1. . . Kxgl 2. f5 a5 3. Kxa5 wins. iii) 2. f5? Kf4 3. f6 Kf5 4. f7 Kf6 5. Kc7 Rf8 6. b8Q Rxb8 7. Kxb8 Kxf7.

No. 1285: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. Sf7 $\dagger / i \operatorname{Kg6} 2$. h8S $\dagger$ /ii Kh5 3. Rxa2 Ra4 4. Sg6/iii Rh4 $\dagger$ 5. Kg3 Rg4 $\dagger$ 6. Kf3. Rxg6 7. Rh2 mate. i) 1. $\mathrm{Rg} 2 \dagger$ ? Rxg2 2. h8Q Rh2 $\dagger$ 3. Kxh2 Rh4 $\dagger$. ii) 2. h8Q?? Re3 $\dagger$ 3. Kg4 Ra4 $\dagger$ mates. iii) 4. Rxa4? stalemate, while now 4. ... Rxa2 5. Sf4 mate.

No. 1286: V. S. Kovalenko. 1. Rd8 Kxf7/i 2. Rd7 $\dagger$ Kg8 3. Rd8 $\dagger$ Kg7 4. Rd7 $\dagger$ Kh8 5. Rd8 $\dagger$ Qg8 6. Kh6 Qxd8 stalemate, at last explaining the choice of square on the first move. i) 1. ... B- 2. Rh8 Qxh8 3. Sxh8 Kxh8 4. Kxg6. JRH: Kakovin in Magyar Sakkelet 1968 had wKb5 Ra6, e2; bKb7, Qb8, Ba5, Pa7, b6. 3/5=. 1. Re7† Ka8 2: Raxa7† Qxa7 3. Re8 $\dagger$ Qb8 4. Ka6.

No. 1287: V. A. Bron. 1. Sc4† bc/i 2. Rxc4 Sd4 $\dagger$ 3. Rxd4 alS $\dagger$ /ii 4. Kc3 ed $\dagger$ 5. Kc4 f1Q 6. Ra8 Ka2 7. Rxab $\dagger$ Kb1 8. Rb6 $\dagger$ 'Sb3 9. Rxb3 $\dagger$ Ka2 10. Rb5 Qe2/iii 11. Ra5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 1$ 12. Rb5 $\dagger$ draw. i) 1. .. Ka4 2. Sdb2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 4$ 3. Sd3†. ii) 3. ... ed 4. Rb3 $\dagger$ Ka4 5. Sc5 $\dagger$. iii) There really is nothing better, bQ being unable to escape the indirect attentions of $w R$ and wS.

No. 1288: V. A. Evreinov. 1. Qc6 Rh7 $\dagger$ 2. Kg6/i Rg7† 3. Kf6 Rf7 $\dagger$ 4. Ke6 Rh7/ii 5. Sb5 $\dagger$ Kd8 6. Qd5 $\dagger$ Rhd7 7. Sd6 Re7 $\dagger$ /iii 8. Kf6 Rbd7 9. Qc5 Rc7 10. Qd4 Rcd7/iv 11. Qb6 $\dagger$ Rc7 12. Sb5 Rf7 $\dagger$ 13. Ke6 Re7 $\dagger$ 14. Kd5 Rd7 $\dagger$ 15. Sd6 Ke7 16. Ke5 Rc3/v 17. Sf5 $\dagger$ Ke8 18. Ke6 Rcd3 19. Qb8- Rd8 20. Qe5. i) 2. Kg5? Rbxc7. ii) 4. ... Re7 $\dagger$ 5. Kd6 Kb8 6. Sa6† Ka7 7. Qa4 Kb6 8. Sb8. iii) 7. ... Ra7 8. Sf7 $\dagger$ Kc8 9. Qc6 $\dagger$ Kb8 10. Sd6 Rac7 11. Qb5 $\dagger$ Ka8 12. Qa4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 8$ 13. Qb3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 8$ 14. Qf3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 8$ 15. Qf8 $\dagger$. 'iv) 10. ... Red7 11. Qd5. v) 16. ... Rc2 17. Sc8-Rxc8 18. Qf6 $\dagger$ Ke8 19. Qh8 $\dagger$ 16..... Rc1 17. Sf5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 8$ 18. Qg6 $\dagger$ wins.


JRH finds only 2 studies in his whole collection with this particular material: Kling and Horwitz (1851), No. 904 in Tattersall, and Rinck, No. 26 in the Appendix to his ' 1414 '.

No. 1289: F. S. Bondarenko and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. d8Q $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Kxd8 2. g4 Sf6 $\dagger$ 3. Kf4 Sxh6 4. g5 Sh5 $\dagger$ 5. Kf3 Sf5 6. g4 Sh4 $\dagger$ 7. Kf2 Sf4 8. Kg3 Shg2 9. Kf3. i) 1. g4? Sd6 $\dagger$ 2. Kd4 Sf6 3. g5 Sh7 4. hg Sf5 $\dagger$ 5. Kc5 Sxg7 6. Bd3 Sf8 7. Bxg6 Sxg6 and will win with (eventually) two S's against sP on 4th rank.

No. 1290: S. Pivovar. 1. Rxa2 $\dagger$ Kb1 2. Rb2 $\dagger$ Ka1 3. Rxf2 c1Q $\dagger$ 4. Rbc2 Qb1 5. Kc5/i Qg1 6. Kb6 Qg6t/ii 7. Ka7 Kb1 8. Rce2 Qg1 9. Kb7 Qc1/iii 10. Kb8 Kal 11. Rc2 Qb2 $\dagger$ 12. Kc8 Qh8 $\dagger$ 13. Kb7 Qb2 $\dagger$ 14. Kc6 Qb1 15. Kc 7 and now B1 has no checks or pins and is in Zugzwang. i) 5. Ra2†? Qxa2 $\dagger$ 6. Rxa2 $\dagger$ Kxa2 draws only. ii) 6. ... Kb1 7. Ka7 Ka1 8. Kb7 Qh1 $\dagger$ 9. Kb8. iii) $\Omega$... Qh1 $\dagger$ 10. Kc7 Qc1 $\dagger 11$. Kd7 Qd1 $\dagger$ 12. Ke7 wins. JRH: 'Of interest is Prokes (1942), No. 559 in his '623' book.'


No. 1291: D. Godes. 1. Se6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 6 / \mathrm{i}$ 2. Sd4 $\dagger$ Kb6 3. a5 $\dagger / \mathrm{ii}$ Kxa5 4. Kc1 e5 5. Bxe5 Ka4 6. Kb2 Sb3 7. Se6/iii and mates.' i) 1. ...'Kb6 2. Bc7† and 3. a 5 wins. ii) 3. ab? b3 4. Kc1 Sc2. Or 3. Bg1? ba 4. Sb3† Kb5 5. Sxa1 b3 is given as drawn, but after 6. Kxcl Kb4 7. Bd4 a3 8.: Kb1 surely W wins? (AJR). iii) Mate follows, but not 7. Sxb3? stalemate.

No. 1292: V. P. Vlasenko. 1. Sb2 Ka5/i 2. Kc5 e2 3. Sc4 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 4$ 4. Bf3 elQ 5. Bd1 $\dagger$ Qxd1 6. Sb2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 3$ 7. Sxd1 a5. So it's not all over with the Sfork! What now? 8. Kd5 a4 9. Kxd4 a3 10. Sc3 Kb4 11. Sa2 $\dagger$ Kb3 12. Sc1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 4 / \mathrm{ii} 13$. Kd5 Kc3 14. d4 Kc2 15. Kc4 Kxcl 16. Kb3 wins. i) 1. ... e2 2. Sc4 e1Q 3. Bb7 mate. ii) 12. ... Kb2 13. Kc4 wins.
JRH: Compare Ellison, No. 857 in EG16.
No. 1293: R. L. Tavariani. 1. Rb5 f3 2. Rxb3 f2 3. Rf3/i d3 4. Ke4† Ke6 5. Kxd3 g4 6. Ke2 gf $\dagger$ 7. Kf1. A natural setting for an old final draw. i) 3. Rb1? d3 4. Kxg5 Ba5 wins. JRH suggests comparing with Krushkov (1925), No. 1979 in Kasparyan's ' 2,500 '; Duras (1926), No. 679 in '1234'; and Korteling, (1942), E on p. 16 of EG17.


No. 1294: L. A. Mitrofanov. 1. Sh3 g2 2. Sf2 $\dagger$ Kg1 3. Ke2/i hlQ 4. Sg4 Qh6 5. Sxh6 f5 6. Sxf5 Kh2 7. Rxc8 glQ 8. Rh8 $\dagger$ Kg2 9. Sh4 $\dagger$ Kg3 10. Rg8 $\dagger$ Kh2 11. Sf3 $\dagger$ Kh3 12. Sxgl $\dagger$. i) 3. Rcl? h1S draws. JRH: for the termination, see Rinck (1936), No. 171 in his '1414'. The 5th Commend in the 'Merani' tourney went to A. G. Korovlyansky, but JRH points out that the mirrorred position, by the same composer, was No. 576 in EG13!

No. 1295: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. d8S $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 7$ 2. a7/i Ba6 $\dagger$ 3. Sb7 Ke8 4. a8B/ii Kf7 5. Kd7/iii Bb5 $\dagger$ 6. Kc8 Ba6 7. Kd7 draw. i) 2. Sc6†? Kd6 3. Sxe5 Bxa6 $\dagger$ wins. ii) 4. a8Q? Sg6 and mate next. Every composer will envy the simplicity of the underpromotion. iii) 5 . Kd8? Se $6 \dagger 6$. Kd7 $\mathrm{Bb} 5 \dagger$ 7. Kc8 Ke7 8. Sa5 Sd8 9. Sc6 $\dagger$ Bxc6 wins. The award refers to a partial anticipation by Vlasenko in Shakhmaty v. 67.

No. 1296: T. B. Gorgiev. 1. Sd3 $\dagger$ cd 2. Sd1 Bxc1 3. Bd8 g5 4. Bc7 gh 5. Bh1 h2 $\dagger$ 6. Kg2 g4 7. Bd8 g3 8. Bc7 Kd2 9. Ba5 mate, or 8. ... Bb2 9. Ba5 $\dagger$ d2 10. Bc7 and mates by Bxg3. EG readers will be familiar with the composer's style, but he has certainly excelled himself this time! He wrote an article 'The Grotesque Form of the Study' published in Shakmaty in vi. 69.

No. $1299 \begin{gathered}\text { G. Afanasiev } \\ \text { and }\end{gathered}$
Original 11


No. 1300 V. A. Bron
Dedicated to A. J. Roycroft


No. 1297: L. F. Topko. 1. Rd5 $\dagger$ Sxb1 2. Rxd1 Sa6 $\dagger$ 3. Kb6 Kf7 $\dagger$ 4. Ka5 $\mathrm{Sa} 3 / \mathrm{i} 5 . \mathrm{Rc} 1 \mathrm{Ke}$ 6. Ka4 Rh3 7. Ka5 Sb 8 (to avoid the repetition). 8. Kb4 Kd6 9. Rc3 Sc6 $\dagger$ 10. Ka4/ii Rxc3 stalemate. i) 4. ... Sc3 5. Rd6 Rxd6 stalemate. ii) 10 . Kb3? Sd4 $\dagger$ 11. Kb4 S (either) c $2 \dagger$ and wins on material. A little depth is added (AJR's comment) to Hildebrand's (1963-5) No. 292 in EG8 (JRH), which has the same main idea.

No. 1298: V. S. Kovalenko. 1. Sgf6 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Kh8 2. Kf7/ii Qg7 $\dagger$ 3. Ke8 Qa7 4. Kf8 Qg7 $\dagger$ 5. Ke8 Qg6† 6. Kf8 Qh6 $\dagger$ 7. Kf7 Qg5 8. Se7 Qg7† 9. Ke6 Qh6 10. Kf7/iii Qg7 $\dagger$ 11. Ke6 Qg3 12. Kf7 Qc7 13. Kf8 Qc2 14. Kf7. i) 1. Sdf6†? Kh8 2. Kf7 Qc7† 3. Kg6 Qe7 4. Kh6 Qf7 and bK emerges to win (though not all that easily). ii) 2. Kf8? Qg6 with the same Zugzwang result as in the previous note. iii) 10 . Sf5? Qh3 11. Ke5 Qb3 12. Kf4 Qe6 13. Kg5 Qf7 14. Sh5 Qg8 $\dagger$ 15. Kh6 Qe6 $\dagger$ 16. Kg5 Kg8 17. Sf6 $\dagger$ Kf7 wins, the published analysis ending with 13. ... Qf7. The award mentions that the drawing idea ( bQ blocks bK's escape) is due to the late Z . Birnov.

No. 1299: G. Afanasiev and E. Dvizov. 1. Bb7 Bxb7 2. a8Q/i e4† 3. Kd4 $\mathrm{Be} 3 \dagger$ /ii 4. Ke5 Bd4 $\dagger$ /iii 5. Kf4 Be5 $\dagger$ /iv 6. Ke3 Bf4 $\dagger$ and so on. i) 2. Bxa8 would now be stalemate, and the play consists of B1 trying to lift the stalemate, only to create another one every time! ii) 3.... e3 4. Qxb7 draw. 3. ... Be5 $\dagger$ 4. Ke3 and so on. iii) 4. ... Bf4 $\dagger$ 5. Kd4. iv) 5. ... Bxb2 6. Qxb7. This 'repetition theme' study is a version of one originally entered for the Lommer Jubilee tourney.

No. 1300: V. A. Bron. 1. e5 $\dagger$ Qxe5 2. Rd7 $\dagger$ Kc5/i 3. Rc7† Kb5 4. Rc5 $\dagger$ Ka4 5. Ra5 Kb 3 6. Ra3 Kc 4 7. Rc3 3 Kb 5 8. Rc5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 4$ 9. Ra5 $\dagger$ with a merrygoround draw. i) Naturally, 2. ... Ke6 3. Re7 $\dagger$.


No. 1301: P. Perkonoja. 1. h7 Kd7 2. Sc5t/i Kxe7 3. Kg4/ii f5 $\dagger$ 4. Kh4 Rxe2 5. Kg3/iii f4†/iv 6. Kh3 Re1 7. Kh2/v f3 8. Sd3 f2/vi 9. Sxf2/vii Bf4† 10. Kg2/viii Be5 11. Sd3 Re2 $\dagger$ 12. Kf1/ix Rh2 13. Sxe5 Rxh7 14. Sc6 $\dagger$ K- 15. Sxd4.
i) 2. Kg4? f5 $\dagger$ 3. Kh4 Ba3 4. h8Q Bxe7 $\dagger$ 5. Kh5 Rh3 $\dagger$, or here 4. Sb8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 7$. If 2. Sc7? d3 3. e8Q $\dagger$ Rxe8 4. Sxe8 Bb2. ii) 3. Kh4? Rxe2 4. Kg3 Bf4 $\dagger$ 5. Kxf4 Rh2. iii) 5. Kh3? Bf4 mates. iv) 5. ... Bf4 $\dagger$ 6. Kxf4 Rh2 7. Kxf5 Rxh7 8. Ke5. v) 7. Kg2? f3 $\dagger$ 8. Kh2 Bf4 $\dagger$ 9. Kh3 Rh1 $\dagger . \quad$ vi) 8. Bf4 9. Sxf4 f2 10. h8Q Rh1 $\dagger$ 11. Kxh1 f1Q $\dagger$ 12. Kh2 Qxf4 $\dagger$ 13. Kg2. Or here 10. ... f1Q 11. Qg7 $\dagger$ Ke8 12. Qg8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd7}$ 13. Qd5 $\dagger$. vii) 9. h 8 Q ? f1Q 10. Qh4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd7}$ 11. Q/Sxe1 Bf4†. viii) 10. Kh3? Be5 11. Sd3 Re3†. ix) 12. Kf3? Re3†.

No. 1302: V. Kalandadze. 1. a7 Bd1 $\dagger$ 2. Ke4/i Bc2 $\dagger$ 3. Kd5 Bb3 $\dagger 4$. Kc6/ii $\mathrm{Ba} 4 \dagger$ 5. $\mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \dagger$ 6. Kd5 Bb $3 \dagger$ 7. $\mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 3 \dagger$ 8. $\mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Bc} 2 \dagger 9$. Ke 3 (f4) $\mathrm{Bd} 2 \dagger$ 10. Kf3 Bd1 $\dagger$ 11. Kg2 h3 $\dagger$ 12. Kg3.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ ? $\mathrm{h} 3 \dagger 3 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Bxc} 7 \dagger$. ii) 4 . Kc 5 ? $\mathrm{Bb} 6 \dagger 5$. Kxb6 Bd 5 .

Robert Brieger (Houston, U.S.A.) claims a cook by 7. Ke4 Bc $2 \dagger$ 8. Kf3 $\mathrm{Bd} 1 \dagger 9 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~h} 3 \dagger 10 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 6 \dagger$ 11. f 4 and wins. It is 'only' the doublestep of wPf2 that makes this possible!

No. 1303: W. Issler. 1. Kf7/i Be2/ii 2. Ke7/iii Bh5 3. Be8 g4 4. Bxh5 g3 5. Bf3/iv Kxf3 6.f7g2 7. f8Q $\dagger$.
i) 1. Ke7? Bg6 2. Be8 g4 3. Bxg6 g3 4. Be4 Kxe4. 1. Be6? g4 2. Kg7 (Bxg4? Kf4) g3 3. Bd5 Be4. 1. Bg4? Kd4 2. Kg7 (2 Be6 g4) Bc4 3. Bh5 g4 4. Bxg4 Ke5. ii) 1. ... Kd4 2. Be6 g4 3. Bxg4 Ke5 4. Be6 Be2 5. Kg7. Or. 1. ... Kf4 2. Ke7. Or 1. ... g4 2. Bxg4 Kf4 3. Be6 Kg5 4. Ke7. iii) 2. Be6? Bh5 3. Kg7 Ke4. iv) 5. f7? g2 6. f8Q g1Q.

No. 1304: A. H. Branton. 1. b6/i Ke7/ii 2. Kb4/iii Rc8/iv 3. g3/v Rc1 4. f6 $\dagger$ Kf7 5. Kb5 Rc3 6. b7/vi Rc1/vii 7. e6t/viii Kxf6 8. Kb6 Rb1† 9. Kc7 $\mathrm{Rc} 1 \dagger$ 10. Kd8 Rb1 11. e7 Rxb7 12. e8Q Rb8 $\dagger$ 13. Kd7 Rxe8 14. Kxe8 Ke5 15. Kf(e) 7 Kxd5 16. Kf6 Kd6/ix 17. Kf(g) 5 Ke 7 18. Kxg4 Kf6 19. Kh5. i) 1. e6? Ke7 2. Kd4 Rb8 3. Kc5 Rc8 $\dagger 4$. Kb6 Rd8 5. Kc6 Rc8 $\dagger 6 \mathrm{~Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rd} 8$ 7. b6 Rxd5 8. Kc6 Rxf5. 1. Kd4? Kd7 (a) 2. e6 $\dagger$ Kd6 3. f6 Rb8 4. e7 Kd7 5. Kc5 Rc8 $\dagger$ 6. Kb6 Rc2 7. d6 Ke8 8. g3 Rc3 9. Kb7 Rxg3 10. b6 Rc3 11. a6 g3 12. b7 Rb3 13. Ka7 g2 and Bl wins. (a) Ke7? 2. d6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 7$ 3. Kd5 Rb8 4. e6 $\dagger$ Ke8 5. f6 Rxb5 6. Kc6 R-7. d7†. 1. Kb4? Rg5 2. b6 Rxf5 3.

b7 (a) Kc7 4. e6 Rxd5 =, (a) 3. d6 Kd7 (Rxe5?) 4. b7 Rf8 5. Kc5 Ke6 6. Kc6 Kxe5 7. Kc7 Ke6 8. d7 Ke7 =. 1. f6? Kd7 2. Kd4 (a, b, c) Rb8 3. e6 $\dagger$ (d) Kd6 4. f7 Ke7 5. Kc5 Rc8† 6. Kb6 Rd8 7. Kc6 Rc8 $\dagger$ 8. Kb7 Rd8 9. b6 $\mathrm{Rxd} 5=$. (a) 2. b6 Rb8 3. e6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 64 . \mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{Ke} 7=$. (b) 2 . f7 Re8 $\dagger$ 3. Kb 4 Ke 7 4. e6 Rd8 5. Kc5 Rc8 $\dagger$ 6. Kg6 Rd8 =. (c) 2. e6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 6$ 3. Kd4 Rb8 4. e7 Kd7 5. Kc5 Rc8 $\dagger$ 6. Kb6 Rc2 7. d6 Ke8 8. g3 Rc3 9. Kb7 Rxg3 10. Kc6 Rc3 $\dagger 11$. Kd5 g3 12. b6 g2 13. b7 Rb3 14. Ke6 Re3 $\dagger$. (d) 3. Kc5 Rc8 $\dagger$ 4. Kb6 Rb8 $\dagger$ 5. Ka6 Ra8 $\dagger$ 6. Kb7 Ra5 7. Kb6 Ra2 8. e6 $\dagger$ Kd6 9. f7 Rf2 10. Ka5 Rf5 11. Ka6 Ke7 12. b6 Rxd5 13. b7 Rd8 14. Ka7 Kxe6 15. b8Q Rxb8 16. Kxb8 Kxf7 17. Kc7 Ke6 $=$ or here $10 \mathrm{Kb7}$ Kxd5 11. e7 Rxf7 $=$.
ii) $1 . .$. Kd7 2. Kb4 Rg5 3. e6 $\dagger$ Kd6 4. b7 Kc7 5. f6 Rxd5 6. f/e7. 1.... Rg5 2. b7 (a, b) Kc7 3. e6 (c) Rxf5 (d) 4. e7 Re5 5. d6 $+\mathrm{Kxb7}$ 6. d7. (a) 2. Kc4? Rxf5 3. d6 Kd7 (Rxe5?) 4. b7 Rf8 =. (b) 2. Kd4? Rxf5 3. b7 Kc7 4. e6 Rf8 5. e7 Rb8 6. Kc5 Kd7 (Kxb7? 7. d6) 7. Kb6 Kxe7 8. Kc7 Rxb7t = (c) 3. d6†? Kxb7 4. e6 Kc6 5. d7 Kc7 6. f6 Rf5 7. f7 Kd8 8. Kd4 Ke7 = (d) 3. ... Rg8 4. f6 Kd6 5. f7 Rb8 6. Kd4 Ke7 7. Ke5 Rxb7 8. d6 $\dagger$ Kf8 9. Kf6. iii) 2. Kd4? Rb8 3. Kc5 (a) Rc8 $\dagger 4$. Kb5 Rc3 (else g3) 5. f6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf7}$ 6. b7 Rb3 $\dagger$ 7. Kc6 g3 (b) 8. e6 $\dagger$ Kxf6 9. Kc7 Rc3 $\dagger$ 10. Kd8 Rb3 11. e7 Rxb7 12. e8Q Rb8 $\dagger$ 13. Kd7 Rxe8 14. Kxe8 Ke5 15. Ke7 Kxd5 16. Kf6 Kd6 17. Kf5 Ke7 18. Kf4 Kf6 19. Kxg3 Kg5 =. (a) In Main line 2. ... Rb8 3. Kb 5 \& Bl cannot check at c8, thereby gaining time. (b) Necessary to draw, since with bPg 4 rather than bPg 3 W gets the R for 4 Ps as in main line but wins the K \& P ending. 2. f6 $\dagger$ ? Kf7 3. Kd4 (a) Rc8 4. Ke4 Rb8 5.Kf5 Rxb6 6. e6 $\dagger$ Ke8 7. Ke5 Rb5 8. Kd6 $\dagger$ Rb2 9. f7 $\dagger$ Kf8 10. Kd7 Re2 11. d6 g3 12. Kc7 Rxe6 13. d7 Re7 14. Kc6 Rxd7 15. Kxd7 Kxf7 16. Kd6 Kf6 17. Kd5 Kf5 18. Kd4 Kf4 19. Kd3 Kf5 (Ke5?) 20. Ke3 Ke5 21. Kf3 Kf5 22. Kxg3 Kg5 =. (a) 3. Kg4 Re8 4. d6 Rxe5 5. b7 Re8 6. d7 Rh8 7. Kc5 Kxf6 8. Kd6 g3 9. Kc7 Ke7 10. b8Q Rxb8 11. Kxb8 Kxd7 wins. 2. Kc 4 ? $\mathrm{Rc} 8 \dagger$ 3. $\mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 3=$.
iv) 2. ... g3 3. d6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd7} 4$. Kc5 Rc8 $\dagger$ 5. Kd5 Rc2 6. e6 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke8} 7$ 7. f6 Rxg2 8. d7† Kd8 9.f7 Rf2 10. b7. v) 3. g3 is only move to win. It prevents g3 for Bl as in (iii). 3. Kb5? Rc3 4. b7 Rb3 $\dagger$ 5. Kc6 Rc3 $\dagger$ 6. Kb6 Rb3 $\dagger$ 7. Kc7 Rc3 $\dagger$ 8. Kb8 g3 9. f6 $\dagger$ Kf7 10. Ka7 Ra3 $\dagger$ 11. Kb6 Rb3 $\dagger$ 12. Kc7 Rc3 $\dagger 13$. Kd 8 Rb 3 14. e6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxf6}=.3$. f6 $\dagger$ ? Kf7 4. g 3 ( $\mathrm{Kb} 5 \operatorname{Rc} 3=$ ) Re8 5. Kc5 (a) Rxe5 6. Kd'6 Re8 7. b7 Kxf6 8. Kc7 Rh8 = (a) 5. e6 $\dagger$ Kxf6 6. Kc5 Ke7 7. Kc6 Rc8 $\dagger$ 8. $\mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rd} 8=. \quad$ vi) 6. e6 $\dagger$ ? Kxf6 7. b7 Rb3† 8. Kc(a) $6 \mathrm{Ke7} 9$. $\mathrm{Kc}(\mathrm{a}) 7 \operatorname{Rc}(\mathrm{a}) 3 \dagger=$. vii) 6. .. Rxg3? 7. Kc4. viii) A slight flaw as P sacrifice can be transferred to move 10. i.e. 7. $\mathrm{Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rb} 1 \dagger$ 8. $\mathrm{Kc} 7 \mathrm{Rc} 1 \dagger$ 9. Kd8 Rb1 10. e6 $\dagger$. ix) 16. ... Ke4 17. Kg5 Kf3 18. Kh4 wins.


No. 1305: J. Rusinek. 1. Exd7 $\dagger$ Sxd7 $\dagger$ 2. Sxd7 Rh8 $\dagger$ 3. $\operatorname{Sf} 8 \dagger / \mathrm{i}$ and now a, b, c, d. a) 3. . Sxf8 4. c8Q. b) 3. . . Rxf8 $\dagger$ 4. c8B $\dagger$ /ii Kd6. c) 3. .. Kd6 4. c8S $\dagger \mathrm{Kc5} 5$. Sd7 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Bxd7}$ 6. Kc7. d) 3. . . Ke7 4. c8R/iv Bh2 $\dagger$ 5. Rc7 $\dagger$ Bd7 stalemate, or 5. .. Ke8 6. Sxg6 d4 7. Sxh8 d3 8. g6 fg 9. Sf7 and 10. Sd6 (AJR). i) 3. c8Q? Bh2 $\dagger$ 4. Se5 $\dagger$ Kxe5 5. Kc7 Kd4 $\dagger$ 6. Kc6 Se7 mate. ii) 4. c8Q Kd 6 5. Qxf8 Sxf8 6. g6 Bh2 7. g7 Kd7 mate. iii) 5 . Kc7? Rh2 $\dagger$. iv) 4. c8Q? Bh2 $\dagger$ 5. Qc7 $\dagger$ Bd7 6. Qxh2 Rxh2 7. Sxg6 $\dagger$ (d7) Kd6.

No. 1306: C. M. Bent. 1. Sf7 $\dagger$ Ke4 2. Bg2 $\dagger$ Kf5 3. Bh3 $\dagger$ Qxh3 4.f3 Bf8 5. b4 Bxb4 6. Sh6 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke}$ (g) 5 7. Sf7 $\dagger$ Kf5 8. Sh6 $\dagger$.

No. 1307: A. Wotawa. 1. Rc2 $\dagger$ Kxb6/i 2. f3/ii h2/iii 3. Rc7 a5 4. Bf $2 \dagger$ Kxc7 5. Bg3 $\dagger$ - 6. Bxh2. i) 1. ... Kb7 2. Rc7 $\dagger$ Ka8 3. Ra7 $\dagger$ Kb8 4. Rg7 h2 5. Bd2 (c3, b4) g(h)1Q 6. B $\dagger$. ii) 2. Ba5 $\dagger$ ? Kb7 3. Rc7† Ka8. 'iii) 3. Rxg2 was threatened.

No. 1308: J. Rusinek. 1. Sc5/i Sc7 $\dagger$ 2. Kb8/ii Rb6 $\dagger$ 3. Sb7 $\dagger$ Rxb7 $\dagger$ 4. cxb7/ iii and now a, b, a) 4. ... Sxb5 5. a8B/iv Sd4/v 6. Ka7 Sc6† 7. Kb6 Re6/ vi 8. b5 Sb8 $\dagger$ 9. Ka7 Sxd7 10. b8Q $\dagger$ Sxb8 11. Kxb8 Rb6 $\dagger$ 12. Ka7. b) 4. ... Kxd7 5. a8S/vii Sxb5/viii 6. Sb6 $\dagger$ Kc6 7. Ka8/ix Re1 8. Sc4/x Sc7 9. Ka7. i) 1. Pxa6? Rxb4 and 2. ... Sc7†. ii) 2. Kb7? Rxb4 3. Sxa6 Rxb5 mate. iii) 4. Kxb7? Rxb4 5. b6 Rb1 puts W into Zugzwang.

iv) 5. a8Q? Kxd7 6. Q- Re8 mate. 5. Ka8? Kxd7 6. b8Q Sc7† 7. Kb7 Rxb4 mate. 5. a8S? Re6 Zugzwang. v) 5. ... Kxd7 is stalemate. vi) 7. ... Kxd7 8. b8Q/S Sxb8 9. Bxe4. vii) 5 . a 8 Q ? Sxb5 and mates. 5. a8B? Re8 $\dagger$ (Sxb5?) 6. Ka7 Sxb5 $\dagger$ 7. Kb6 Sd4 8. b5 $\mathrm{R}-8$ wins. viii) 5. ... Re8 $\dagger$ 6. Ka7 Sxb5 $\dagger$ 7. Kb6 Rb8 8. Kxb5 Rxb7 $\dagger$ 9. Kc5, or 7. ... Sd4 8. Sc7-9. Sa6. ix) 7. S-? Rxb4. x) 8. b8Q? Ra1† 9. Qa7 Rxa7 wins.

No. 1309: J. J. van den Ende. 1. Sc4 $\dagger$ /i Ke7/ii 2. Re5 $\dagger$ Kd8/iii 3. Rxe8 $\dagger$ Kxe8 4. Ra1/iv Bd3 5. Re1t/v Kf8 6. Se5 Bh7/vi 7. Rh1 Sg5 8. Rh5 Bg8 9. Rxh8 Sh7 10. Sd4/vii Kg7 11. Sf5 $\dagger$ Kxh8 12. Sg6 mate.
i) 1. Rd4†? Ke6 2. Rg3 Ra8t.
ii) Kd7 2. Rd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke7} / 6$ for if 2. ... Kc7 3. Sb6 wins or 2. ... Kc6 3. Sb6. iii) ... Kf8 3. Rh5. Or 3. Rxe8 $\dagger$ obviously as in main line (WV). iv) 4. Sd6†? Kd7 5. Rd4 Sg6. 4. Kb6? Sg6. 4. Scd2? Bf5. 4. Sbd2 Bc2. 4. Ra1 threatens 5. Rh1. v) 5. Se5? Be4 6. Re1 Bd5. vi) 6. ... Bc2? 7. Sd4. vii) 10. Sg6†? Kg7 11. Sd4 Bf7. Brieger (U.S.A.) claims draw by playing the main line until 4. . Bh7 5. Rh1 Sg5 6. Rh5 S8f7 and so on. The composer agrees.

No. 1310: C. M. Bent. 1. g7† Qxg7/i 2. S8xg7/ii Se2 3. Bb2 Bc8/iii 4. Sf5 $\dagger$ Kh7 5. Sf6, $\dagger$ Kh8 6. Se4 $\dagger$ Kh7 7. S5d6 Ba6 8. Sc5. i) 1. ... Kg8 2. S8f6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf7}$ 3. g8Q $\dagger \mathrm{Ke7}$ 4. Ba3 $\dagger$ Qb4 5. Bxb4 mate. 1. ... Kh7 2. S5f6 $\dagger$ Kg6 3. g8Q $\dagger$ Kf5 4. Sd6 $\dagger$. ii) 2. S5xg7? Se2 3. Bb2 Bc8 4. Sf5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 8$. iii) 3. ... Bg4/d7 4. Se8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 8(\mathrm{~h} 7)$ 5. S8(5) f6 $\dagger$. 3. ... Bf1 4. Sf $\dagger \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 75$. Sf6†-6. Se3.


No. 1311: C. M. Bent. 1. Sd6 $\dagger$ /i Kf8/ii 2. Sg6 $\dagger$ /iii Kg8 3. Sf4 Ba6 4. Kc5 Kf8/iv 5. Sg6† Kg8 6. Sf4 Bf1 7. Kc6 Ba6 8. Kc5 Kh7 9. Kc6 Kh6 10. Sf7 $\dagger$ Kh7 11. Sd6 Kg8 12. Kc5.
i) 1. Sg 6 ? Bg 2 2. $\mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Sb} 6 \dagger$ 3. Ke 5 ( Kd 4 Se 6 or Kc 5 (6) Bxe4) $\mathrm{Sd} 7 \dagger$, and now 4. Kd5 Sf6 $\dagger$, or 4. Kd4 Sf5 $\dagger$, or 4. Kf4 Se6 $\dagger$ 1. Sf6 $\dagger$ ? Ke7 2. Sd5 $\dagger$ Kf8 3. Sg6 $\dagger$ Kg8 wins. ii) 1. ... Kd8 2. S6f7†- 3. Sxh8, 1. ... Ke7 2. $\mathrm{Sg} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Ke} 6$ 3. Sxh8 $\mathrm{Bg} 2 \dagger$ 4. Kc5. iii) 2. Kb7? $\mathrm{Bg} 2 \dagger . \quad \mathrm{iv})$ 4. ... Sc7 5. Kb6.

No. 1312: E. Dobrescu and V. Nestorescu. 1. Sg5 Ra5 $\dagger$ 2. Kg6 Rxg5 3. Kxg5 h3 4. Kh6/i Ra8 5. Ra1 Rb8 6. Rb1 Rc8/ii 7. Rc1 Rd8 8. Rd1 Re8 9. Re1 Ra8 10. Rfe6 wins. i) 4. Rh6? Rf3 5. Ra1 Ra3 6. Rb1 Rb3 7. Rc1 Re3 8. Rd1 Rd3 9. Re1 Re3 10. Rg1 Rf3 and draws. ii) 6. ... Ra8 7. Rfb6 is the winning manoeuvre that is eventually forced, Judge: J. Rusinek (Poland).

No. 1313: E. Pogosjants. 1. d7 Ba5 2. c7 Bxc7 3. Sxc7 Rd3 4. Sd5 Bxd5 5. d8Q Be4 $\dagger$ 6. Kh8 Rxd8 stalemate, or 5. ... Bxg8 $\dagger$ 6. Kh8 Rxd8 again with stalemate, but not, of course, 6. Qxg8? Sf6 $\dagger$ wins.


No. 1314: A1. P. Kuznetsov and A. Motor. 1. c7 d2/i 2. Bb5 $\dagger$ Kf8 3. Ba4 Kg8 4. Bc2 Bc8 5. Kb1 Bf5/ii 6. Ka1 Kh8 7. Bb1 Kg8 8. Bc2 Bd7 9. Kb1 positional draw. i) 1. ... Kd7 2. Bxd3 Bxd3 3. c8Q $\dagger \mathrm{Kxc} 8$ stalemate. ii) W. Proskurowski, late of Poland but now living in Sweden, asks whether 5 . Bb1 is not a serious dual possibility?

No. 1315: L. Katsnelson. 1. Se5 f2 2. Sed3 $\dagger$ Ke2 3. Sxf2 Kxf2 4. Sa4 b5 5. Sc3 b4 6. Sa2 b3 7. Sc1 b2 8. Sd3† draws, or 1. ... Ke2 2. Sxf3 Kxf3 3. Sc 4 b 54 . Sa3 b4 5. Sc2 b3 6. Sd4†. To draw in one variation by Sa4 and in another by Sc4 gives the composition its originality: (AJR).

No. 1316: M. Banaszek. 1. f6 Rh3/i 2. Bf3 Rxh6 3. Kf5 c6 4. Bh5 a4/ii 5. Kg5 Rxh5 6. Kg6/iii Rf5 7. Kxf5 Kf7 8. Kg5 a3 9. Kh6 a2 10. Kh7 a1Q 11. $\mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger \mathrm{Kxf6} 12$. Qh8(g7) $\dagger$ wins. i) 1. ... Rg1 2, $\mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Re} 1 \dagger$ 3. Kd 3 Re 5 4. Be4 Rh5 5. h7 $\dagger$ Rxh7 6. Bd5 mate. ii) 4. ... Rxh5 5 . Kg6 Rf5 6. Kxf5 Kf7 7. Kg5 a4 8. Kh6 wins. iii) 6. Kxh5? Kh7.
JRH: 'The nub is shown in Grigoriev ('64', 1929), p. 268 of his collection.' W. Proskurowski supplies the following additional analysis: 1. Kf4? Rxg7 $\dagger$ 2. hg Kxg7 3. Bxb7 a4 4. Kg5 a3 5. f6† Kf8 6. Bd5 c6 7. Ba2 d5 8. Kf5 Kf7 9. Ke5 Kf8 draw. In the main line WP indicates: 3. . . Kh7 4. Ke6, but not 4. Bd5? Rg6 5. Bg8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 6$ and.. Rxg7; and lastly, as a nearly symmetrical thematic variation, 6. . Rg5 $\dagger$ 7. Kxg5 Kh7 8. Kf5 a3 9. Ke6 a2 10. f7.

No. 1317: V. Neidze. 1. Sc6 $\dagger$ Kc7/i 2. Sxb4 Re6 $\dagger$ /ii 3. $\mathrm{b} 6 \dagger$ Rxb6 $\dagger$ 4. Kxa7 Rb7 $\dagger$ 5. Ka8 Bxg3 6. Sd5 $\dagger$ Kc8 7. Se7 $\dagger$ Kc7 8. Sd5 $\dagger$ Kc6 9. Se7 $\dagger$ Kb6 10. Sd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 6$ 11. Sb4 $\dagger$ draws, ... RxS being always stalemate. i) 1. ... Kc8 2. Rg8 $\dagger$. ii) 2. .. Bxg3 3. Sd5 $\dagger$.

No. 1318: L. Kopac. 1. Sc6 Re4 2. Bb3 Sxf2 3. Sc3 Sg4/i 4. Sxe4 Se3 5. Sd6 f2 6. Be6 Sd5 $\dagger$ 7. Bxd5 f1Q 8. Be6 wins. i) 3.... h3 4. Sxe 4 Kb5 5. a6, or here 4. ... h2 5. Sxf2. JRH: 'There is a similar mate by Rinck (1928), No. 431 in his '1414'.


No. 1319: M. Czerniak and W. Proskurowski.

1. b7/i Rg2 2. Kc8/ii Rxg7 3. b8Q Rg8 $\dagger$ 4. Kb7/iii Rxb8 $\dagger$ 5. Kxb8 Kb6 6. Kc8/iv Kc6/v 7. Kd8/vi Kd6 8. Ke8/vii Ke6/viii 9. a5/ix Kd6 10. Kf7 Kc5/x 11. Ke6/xi Kb5 12. Kd5 Kxa5 13. Kc4 wins. This is the first and only study by the Israel International Master. The correction consists of the addition of all the rather ugly P's on the h-file. i) 1. g8Q? Rd8 $\dagger$ 2. Qxd8 stalemate. Or 1. g8R? Kxbs = .ii) 2. Ka(c) 7? Rxg7( + ) 3 . K-Rxb7 4. Kxb7 stalemate again. Or 2. Ka8? Rxg7 3. b8Q Ra7† 4. K (Q) xa7 stalemate. iii) 4. Kc7? Rc8† 5. K (Q) xc8 stalemate. iv) 6. Ka8? Ka5 7. Kb7 stalemate, 6. a5†? Kxa5 7. Kxc7 Kb5 8. Kd6 a5 9. Kd5 a4 10. ab Kxa4 11. Kc4 b3 12. Kc3 Ka5 13. Kxb3 Kb5 14. Kc3 Kc5 15. Kd3 Kb4 16. Ke4 Kb3 17. Kf5 Kxb2 draw. v) 6.......a5 7. Kb8 wins. vi) 7. a5? Kb5 8. Kd7 Kxa5 9. Kc6 is stalemate, or 9 . Kd6 as in (iv). vii) 8. a5? Kc5 9. Ke7 Kb5 10. Kd6 Kxa6 draw. viii) 8......Ke5 9. Kd7 Kf4 until 16. a7 a2 17. a8Q wins. ix) 9. Kf8? Ke5 10. Ke7 Kf4 until 17. a6 h2 and B1 may win. Or here 10. Kg7 Ke4 11. Kxh7 Kd3 until 15. h5 Kxa5 and 18. h8Q b1Q draw. x) This is where the flaw and correction can be explained. Without hP's 10 . Kd7 would draw, but here this move is met by $11 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ winning. xi) 11. Kg 7 ? Kd4 draws as in (ix). xii) Note that the wP advance a4-a5 is good only when the K's are on e8 and e6, so that wK reaches c 4 (and not just c 5 or c 6 ) when B1 plays ......Kxa5.

No. 1320: M. N. Klinkov. 1. h7 Rf8 2. g6 Kf6 3. Be5 $\dagger$ Kxg6 4. h8Q Rxh8 5. Bxh8 Kf5 6. Bd4/i Ke4 7. a7 Kf3 8. Kh2 Ra1 9. Bg1 b3 10. Kh3 wins a fine surprise, 10. b6? failing to 10. ......Ra5 11. Bc5 Ra1 with a draw by repetition. i) $6 . \mathrm{Kxg} 2$ ? Ke 4 and ......Kd5.
JRH: "See Fritz, 1961, No. 628 in appropriate FIDE Album, and L. Prokes, 1926, No. 662 in ' 1234 ' for the closest."

No. 1321: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. c7 Sb5/i 2. c8S $\dagger$ Kc6 3. Se7 $\dagger$ Kd6 4. Sc8 $\dagger$ and so on. i) The alternative defence is $1 . . . . . . \mathrm{Sc} 4$ 2. c8S $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 6$ 3. Sa7 $\dagger / \mathrm{ii}$ Kd6 4. Sc8 $\dagger$ Kc̄6 5. Sa7 $\dagger$ Kb6 6. Sc8 $\dagger$ Kb5 7. Sa7 $\dagger$ Kb4/iii 8. Sc6 $\dagger$ with perpetual check or win of the rook, an echo to the main line. ii) 3. Se $7 \dagger$ ? Kb5 wins. iii) The point, very nice when appreciated, is that whether bS is situated on b 5 or on c4 there is a crucial blocking of a square to which bK would like to go (i.e. B1 would win if the square were available).
The tourney was informal, and entries totalled 12. Judge was V. Korolkov, Leningrad.


No. 1322: Z. Kadrev. 1.Ra3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 7 / \mathrm{i}$ 2. Rab3 Rd4 $\dagger$ 3. Kxe5 Re4 $\dagger$ 4. Kxf5 Rf4 $\dagger$ 5. Kxg5 Rg4 $\dagger$ 6. Kxh5 Rh4 $\dagger$ 7. Kg5 Rg4 $\dagger$ 8. Kf5 Rf4 $\dagger$ 9. Ke5 Re4 $\dagger$ 10. Kd5 Rd4 $\dagger$ 11. Kc5 and wins a bR. i) 1....... Ra4 2. Rab2 comes to essentially the same thing. The judge refers to Mandler and König (Wiener Schachzeitung, 1924, No. 530 in '1234') and to Korolkov (5th Prize, Lelo, 1951) for similar ideas, but he points out that Kadrev has doubled the idea in that the crucial pin by $w R$ occurs on both aand $b$-files.
JRH: "Lommer, No. 356 in EG9, is closer than those quoted by the judge."

No. 1323: W. Proskurowski. 1. Kf3/i Kg5 2. Ke4 Kf6 3. Kd5 b6 4. Kc4 Ke5 5. Kb3 Kd4 6. Ka4 Kd3 7. b3 c4 8. bc Kxc4 stalemate. i) 1. Kf2? Kg4 2. Ke3 Kf5 3. Kd3 Ke5 4. Kc4 Kd6 wins.

No. 1324: 'E. Dobrescu. 1. c7 $\dagger$ Kb7 2. cdS $\dagger$ Kxb6 3. Sb3 Sf3 $\dagger$ 4. Kd1 Sd4 5. Sal Sc2 6. Sxe6 Sxa1 7. Sd4 Sc2 8. Sb3 Sd4 9. Sal Sxa1 10. Sf5 Sxa1 11. Sd4 Sc2 12. Sb3 Sd4 13. Sa1 Sc2 14. h6 Sxa1 15. h7 Sc2 (b3) 16. h8Q a1Qt 17. Qxa1 Sxa1 18. g5 and wins.
Judge in this informal tourney: G. M. Kasparyan.


No. 1325: V. Nestorescu. 1. Bb3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 6$ 2. h8Q Rxh8 3. Rb6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{i}$ 4. Be7t/ii Kf4 5. Bd6 $\dagger$ /iii and so on. i) $3 . . . . . . \mathrm{Kh} 54$. Bf7 $\dagger$ and so on. Or 3. .. Kh7 4. Rb7: $\dagger$ leads into other variations, or a perpetual by wR , as does 3....... Kf5 4. Rb5t. ii) 4. Rb5 $\dagger$ ? Kh4 5. Be7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 3$ 6. Bd6 $\dagger$ Kf 2 7. Bc5 $\dagger$ Kf1. iii) For example, 5. ......Ke3 6. Bc5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 2$ 7. Bb4 $\dagger$ Kxe2 8. Be4 $\dagger$ Kf3 9. Bd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg4}$ 10. Be6 $\dagger$ Kh5 11. Bf7 $\dagger$ Kg4 12. Be $6 \dagger$ Kf3 13. Bd5 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 2$ 14. Bc4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kdl} 15$. $\mathrm{Kb} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 1$ 16. Rc6 $\dagger$ is given (16. ...... Kb 2 17. $\mathrm{Bc} 3 \dagger$ ), but 16. $\mathrm{Ba} 3 \dagger$ seems just as efficacious.

No. 1326: V. Kalandadze. 1. Rc7 Ra8 $\dagger$ 2. Kb5/i Rb8 $\dagger$ 3. Ka5/ii Ra8 $\dagger$ 4. Kb4 Rb8 $\dagger$ 5. Kc3 Rc8/iii 6. Rxc8 $\dagger$ Kg7 7. Rg8 $\dagger$ Kh6/iv 8. Rd8/v Kg6/vi 9. Kc2 Kh6 10. Rh8 $\dagger \cdot \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 11. Rg8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 612 . \mathrm{Se} 4$ (d5) wins. i) Choice of square dictated by necessity to avoid B1 promoting with check. 1. Kb7? Ra7†. ii) 3. Kc4? Rc8 and wK is not close enough to dP. iii) 5. ......d1S $\dagger$ 6. Kd2 Rd8 $\dagger$ 7. Kcl wins. iv) 7 ......Kxf6 8. Kxd2 wins, compare (ii). v) 8. Kxd2? g1Q 9. Rxg1 or 9. Sg4 $\dagger$ draw. vi) 8. .. glQ 9. Rh8 $\dagger, 10$. Rg8 $\dagger$ and 11. Rxg1, or 8. . d1Q 9. S $\dagger$ K- 10. Rxd1. Or 8. . . d1S $\dagger$ 9. Kd2 Se3 10. Rg8 wins.

No. 1327: C. M. Bent. 1. Bf6†/i Bg5 2. Bxg5t/ii Kh5 3. g4 $\dagger$ Sxg4 4. Sh3 h1S 5. Kc5 a6 6. Kd4 a4 7. Kc3 a3 8. Kb3 wins.
i) Bxh6? Sxg2. Or 1. g3†? Kh5 2. Sf6† Kg5. ii) 2. g3†? Rh5 3. B(S) xg5 Sf5 $\dagger$ and 4. ..... Sxg3.
For 2 Hon Men., also by Bent, see C10 on p. 56 of EG18.
No. 1328: H. Aloni. 1. h4 Bd7 2. Rxf7 Rc7/i 3. Kh2/ii a3 4. Bf5 Bxf5 5. Rxc7 6. Rc1 Bb1 7. Rg1 alQ 8. f7 Qa3 9. Rg8 Qd6† 10. Kg1 Kxh5 11. f8Q Qxf8 12. Rxf8 Kxh4 13. Kf2 Kg4 14. Ke3 wins. i) 2. ......a3 3. Bf5 Bxf5 4. Rxa7 Bd3 5. Rg7 a2 6. Rg1 Bb1 7. f7 wins. ii) 3. Bxd7? a3 4. Rg7 a2 5. Rg1 Rxd7. 3. Rxd7? Rxd7 4. Bxd7 a3. 3. Bf5? Rc1 $\dagger$ escapes the bind.

No. 1329: B. Cvejic. 1. Se7 Bb3/i 2. Sc6 $\dagger$ /ii Kb7 3. Sa5 $\dagger$ /iii ba 4. Be4 $\dagger$ Kb8/iv 5. Bxa8 Kxa8 6. Kd2 draw. i) 1. ......Bf7 (e6) 2. Sc6 $\dagger$ Kb7 3. Sd8 $\dagger$, or 2. ......K- 3. Sxa7. If 1. ......Ba2 2. Sc6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb7}$ 3. Be4 and even 3. ......Bb1 fails to 4. Bxb1 Kxc6 5. Be4 $\dagger$. ii) 2. Be4? Ba4 covers c6. iii) 3. Be 4 ? Ba 4 4. $\mathrm{Sb} 4 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 85$. $\mathrm{Sa} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 8$ 6. $\mathrm{Bxa} 8 \mathrm{Bb} 5 \dagger$ wins. iv) 4. ......Kb6 5. Bxa8 a4 6. Kd2 a3 7. Kc1 Ba2 8. Bd5 Bxd5 9. Kb1 draw.

U.S.S.R. Team Championships for Chess
Composition Composition
The first event of this kind took place in 1956-7, when 8 teams of 8 boards participated. It was won by Latvia. There were 2 boards for studies. Each 'board' had a set theme. A system of points was used, but the judging method is unclear. In 1957-8 there were 10 teams (also 8 boards), and in 196011 teams on 9 boards. At present the 7th Championships are in progress, the director being G. Shmulenson, through whose kindness EG will be giving the award of the 6th event shortly, and the 7 th when known. It is not clear where the awards have been officially published. The teams and their placings (but not the composers' names) may be found on p. 592 of the Russian Chess Dictionary (1964).

No. 1330: J. Lazar. 1. Bg1 g5 2. Kc8 g4 3. Sg5 (f4) g3 4. Be3/i g1Q 5. Se6 and mates. i) With the neat point of covering el against check from bQ.
JRH: See Troitzky, 1900; on p. 15 of Vol III of Rueb's Schaakstudic.

No. 1331: P. Rossi. As far as I have been able to discover, the solution has not been published in the magazine. Presumably (AJR) 1. Kg1 Rh6 2. c7 Kh5 3. c8S g6 4. Sb6 ab 5. a7 ba 6. a8Q(B) a4 7. Qd5 ed 8. e6 d4 9. e7 d3 10. e8S and mates.


Magazine news (see also p. 239)
Tidskrift för Schack (Sweden). ix.69, "Staircase Manoeuvre with threat of Elack Stalemate", by O. Voit. v.69, "Compositions with a Single Pawn", by Dr A. Mandler. iii.71, "Grotesques", by A. Hildebrand.
Schakend-Nederland, i.70, "K, B and S v K, S and P", by C. J. de Feij. ter ( 34 examples).
Ajedrez (Argentina). Since xi. 69 this monthly magazine has had a regular column run by José Mugnos, the renowned Argentinian composer of whom little has been heard for a number of years. The column often runs to 4 or more pages. Most space is devoted to native composers, such as Zoilo R. Caputto, Mateo Gianolio, Pedro Fastosky, Oscar J. Carlsson, Luciano W. Camara, but other composers and analytical material are not ignored.
Deutsche Schachzeitung. The relatively small amount of space devoted to studies is edited by Dr Werner Speckmann, a very good friend of EG. Since the sad death of Dr Wotawa, we wait with interest to see if DSZ will find another source of originals.
Schweizerische Schachzeitung. xi.70, an article-cum-interview with André Chéron celebrating his 75th birthday. (By Gion Clopath and Didier Maerki.) xii.70ः"L'Affaire Barbier et Saavedra", by Harold Lommer, giving a full account of what is known concerning the antecedents of the famous "Saavedra" study (wKb6, wPc6; bKa1, bRd5: Win).
Canadian Chess Chat. Endings column of this monthly is run by "C. Hess", which actually appears to be a genuine name! Originals in demand (no composing tourney, just solving) by: C. Hess, P.O. Box 312, Station "B", Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.
Suomen Shakki, Finland. 8 issues per annum. Endings column by Csmo Kaila, mixed with problems.
Shakhmatny Bulletin. i.70, "Towards the Theory of Queen Endings", by Robert Fontana ( $\mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{hP} \mathrm{v}$ Q). vi.70, "Knight or Bishop?", by A.' Kremenetsky (some practical winning possibilities with a 'bad' bishop). vii.70, "Q + SP v Q", by N. Novotelnov (also in British Chess Magazine, iii.71). iii.70, article including 16 studies, on A. V. Sarychev (b.1909), whose twin brother (initial K.) died in 1950. x.70, "Difficult Analysis", by M. Dvoretsky ( $R+2$ P's $v R+2 P$ 's, from a game).

Magazine news
It is sad that the 19-year-old Oesterreichische Schachzeitiong has ceased publication, due to lack of financial support from regional associations. Austria now has no national chess magazine.
The studies pages of the Swedish Tidskrift för Schack are now in the joint hands of Alexander Hildebrand and Pauli Perkonoja, after an extended period of being run by Dr Eric Uhlin.
Several magazines have been forced to seek cheaper production methods: among them, two of the oldest, Deutsche Schachzeitung (founded 1846, the oldest surviving chess magazine) and the British Chess Magazine (1881). At the end of 1969 the two United States magazines Chess Life and Chess Review combined to form Chess Life and Review, with a composing page conducted by Pal Benko.
"1357"
All study enthusiasts either possess or want to possess Lommer and Sutherland's '1234 Modern Endgame Studies', the anthology that was published in London in 1938. It is wonderful news that Harold Lommer is now gathering material for a '1357' anthology covering the years '1936 to the present day.' The contract for publication is apparently signed. Harold Lommer is currently in the U.S.A., and invites composers to send published studies to him as below:
Harold M. Lommer, 182 Mayhew Ave., BABYLON, New York 11702, U.S.A. Please send diagrams accompanied by full solution and detailed first source (date and place of initial publication). Please use typewriter, and type on one side of paper only. (HML expects to remain in the USA until the end of 1971.)

## Correspondence

From 19.i.71 Great Britain had an almost complete stoppage in postal deliveries and collections. The stoppage was due to a strike of the Post Office workers. The strike lasted 7 weeks, and disruption continued for several weeks thereafter, especially with mail coming from abroad. During the period of the strike British currency was decimalised ( $£ 1$ now consists of 100 'new' pence) and postal rates were increased. Further increases must be expected. Delays to correspondence should, however, no longer be occurring.

## Correction

On p. 215 of EG23 we stated that there were two judges of the latest announced 'New Statesman' tourney. There are in fact three, and we apologise for having omitted the name of Dr H. H. Staudte, eminent West German composer, columnist and study judge. He has also reached the distinguished age of 60 years, and so joins the ranks of other recently 'promoted' personalities in the study world such as G. V. Afanaziev and T. B. Gorgiev.

Tourney announcements
"In Memoriam Paul Farago". Entries to Ing. G. Teodoru, Str. Petre Cretu 22, Bucuresti 33, Roumania. Closing date: 1.xii.71. Formal.

Sachové Umenie (incorporated in Ceskoslovensky Sach). Entries to Prof. L. Kopac, Liberec 1, Na Okruhu 10, Czechoslovakia. Informal, 1971 and 1972. Judge: Dr G. Grzeban.

The Chess Endgame Study Circle.
Annual subscription due each July (month vii): £ 1 (or $\$ 3.00$ ), includes E G 25-28, 29-32 etc. If renewing late (after November, month xi), please identify the EG-year (EG 25-28, or EG 29-32, etc.) of your payment. To avoid misunderstandings, renew EARLY!

How to subscribe:

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

Or
2. Arrange for your Bank to transfer your subscription to the credit of: A. J. Roycroft Chess Account, National Westminster Bank Ltd., 21 Lombard St., London EC3P 3AR, England. (IMPORTANT: The payingin slip should quote your full name. Cn Bank Giro forms this should appear in the "Paid in By" section.)

Or
3. If you heard about $\mathrm{E} G$ 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):
A. J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, London England, NW9 6PL.

Editor: A. J. Roycroft.
Spotlight - all analytical comments.
W. Veitch, 7 Parkfield Avenue, East Sheen, London England, S W 14, 8 DY.
"Anticipations", and anticipations service to tourney judges: J. R. Harman, 20 Oakfield Road, Stroud Green, London, England, N4 4NL.

To magazine and study editors: Please arrange to send the complimentary copy of your magazine, marked "EGExchange", to: C. M. Bent, Black Latches, Inkpen Common, Newbury, Berkshire, England.

Next meeting of The Chess Endgame Study Circle: Friday, 2nd July 1971, at 101 Wigmore Street, London W1 (behind Selfridge's, in IBM building), 6.15 p.m.

Printed by: Drukkerij van Spijk - Postbox 210 - Venlo - Holland

