South of the harsh, bleak and spectacular Caucasus Mountains, half-way between the Black and Caspian Seas, set in an ancient valley, lies the city of Tbilisi, capital of Georgia. North of the snaking river Kura the town is flat, but the southern bank is hilly and dominated by a great bluff reached only by aerial car. The visitor can easily lose his bearings, as few of the streets are straight, but this is one of Tbilisi's attractions. In Gruzia, which we call Georgia, chess is an industry, or so it appears. Imagine a small edition of the Royal Festival Hall and you are imagining the Tbilisi chess pavilion, but the auditorium is not big enough for the Women’s World Championship match between Nona Gaprindashvili and Nina Alexandria, both Tbilisi-ennes, and this will be held in the circular concert hall a hundred yards away. Even at the sparsely populated heights of study composing there is an incredible concentration here: Gia Nadareishvili, Vazha Neidze, David Gurgenidze, Revaz Tavariani and Velimir Kalandadze are the composers that I know live in Tbilisi, while Joseph Krikheli, Revaz Dadunashvili, Djemal Makhadzhe, Elgudje Kvezereli and others live either there or not far away. And in neighbouring republics, quite close at hand, are the Grand Old Men Alexander Sarychev and Genrikh Kasparyan. Such richness cannot be coincidence, but how to explain it? The five mind-bending days I spent there have not provided an answer, just a very tentative possibility. When a small nation with ingrained artistic traditions has to survive for centuries, and succeeds in surviving, and is further isolated from the rest of the world by a strange language with an idiosyncratic, but very beautiful, curvilinear, scorpion-tailed script (Mkhedruli), cultural miracles may be expected. Israel, too, has these characteristics, and study composing is strong there also.

What about the FIDE Commission meeting? Well, it was important enough, with the prestigious and rare title of Grandmaster of Composition being awarded to Korolkov, Bron, Fritz, V. Pachman and N. Petrovic, while the Master title went to Kazantsev, Kopnin and Unnov. (Omitted here are awards with no studies interest.) The award of these titles is linked to publication of the FIDE Album collections every three years, on a points basis. The new rules are that henceforth 25 “points” secures the Master title and 70 “points” the GM title, irrespective of the number of Albums in which the points are gained. We can expect publication soon (the Finns are such superb and methodical organisers) of the WCCT compositions (the USSR was easily the winner of this team event, Britain was tenth of the 27 participating countries). The FIDE Albums will continue to be published, though never easily. Every two years Soviet composers have their own meeting, and this was also held in the “chess pavilion”. A “blitz”
composing tourney was held, with 99 entries, and judged on the spot. All remarkable memories. But still as nothing compared to the hospitality and appreciation (I have come away with the impression that EG is genuinely famous in Tbilisi and Georgia - remember those anagrams? What about AN EG ORGY = GEORGYAN?) of our hosts.

John Roycroft

STUDIES STATISTICS FROM THE FIDE ALBUMS (1914-1964)

Hannu Harkola of Finland has placed all the positions, sources and composers’ names in the published FIDE Albums in computer storage. The primary purpose is to aid the FIDE Commission to avoid error in computing the points accumulated towards Master and Grandmaster titles. But this has enabled other statistics to be easily obtained, and he has kindly provided some of them for EG. Of the 7007 compositions, 1141 are studies. The vast majority have from 3 to 6 W men, and from 3 to 6 Bl men. No study has 1, 15 or 16 men, whether W or Bl. The vast majority show the W + Bl total within the range 6 to 11, with the “average” study displaying 4.58 W men and 4.63 Bl men, for an “average total” of 9.21 men per diagram. The percentages of studies published in each year are also available (ie 51 years). I observe a peak (3.77%) in 1928 and another peak (5.00%) in 1955. Each of these years is exactly 10 years after the conclusion of a World War. There is, of course, a comparative boom in studies apparent since 1946, with practically every year over the 2.00% mark, but prior to this only 5 years reach this arbitrarily chosen figure (1925, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1936).

AJR

WHEN THE ECHO RESONDS

In EG33 John Beasley reproduced a study of his (G1) along with another (G2). It was irksome that the author did not succeed in showing the R-promotion in miniature form. A slight modification of the configuration allowed me to incorporate the second variation with echo-play (G3). The dual on move 5 (wK to b6 or a8)
G3   D. Gurgenidze
Original, after J. D. Beasley

Win
1. f8R (f8Q? Qf2t) 1. ... Qg2f
2. Ka3 Qg3f 3. Ka4 Qg4f 4. Ka5 Qg5f 5. Ka6 wins.
Or, the echo line, 1. ... Qh2f

“Very pleasant nice”, says J.D.B.

My thanks to all and sundry, far and wide, for Christmas and New Year greetings received.

AJR

AMERICA: 2
Congratulations to British emigrant Neil McKelvie and other enthusiasts, on the first meeting (of many, we hope) of the New York Endgame Circle. This took place on Edmund Peckover’s 79th birthday (15.xi.75) at the Manhattan Club. Some 20 Club members were there, which augurs well.

AMERICA: 3
Congratulations also to Walter Korn on the appearance of his new book American Chess Art, dealing with study composition in the Americas.

Review on p. 302

DEMOLITIONS
Why does EG not run a series on unsound studies? This is a frequent question from correspondents. Even if there were the space, though, there are, I believe, several strong reasons for not running such a series. First, it would tend to ‘take over’ the magazine, since there are so many (and horrendous complications of versions, corrections and misprints); second, we have SPOTLIGHT to try to keep abreast of contemporary compositions, in themselves a formidable field; third, ‘when is a demolition proved?’ is a question to which there is no tidy answer; fourth, who will run the column?; fifth, and to my mind the clincher, EG would merely be adding to the diaspora that is characteristic of the subject, when what is really needed is a dedicated multi-lingual, non-composing strong analyst - cum - cook - hunter - cum - friend - of - the - study with time and motivation and access to every source who will begin to compile all cooks and busts in order to put them on a central, computerised data base for access by all. We are many years away from achieving this, alas. It will not be AJR who does it!

AJR
YOU DON'T NEED FORMULAE

by G. M. Kasparyan
(translation by Paul Valois)

Recently attempts have been made to evaluate studies and judge tourneys using formulae with points scales. One of these systems is the notorious 15-point scale*. It has failed entirely to justify itself. Another, similar, system is suggested on pages 235-6 of EG41. This system has a scale of 11 points. Like all other attempts to evaluate studies on the basis of contrived formulae using points scales, this one, in my opinion, is also harmful. Let us examine the various points of this system.

1. **Naturalness of position.** Ill-defined: different judges might give different estimates of naturalness or otherwise.
2. **Number of pieces.** You might have a study losing a point for having 8 pieces as opposed to 7, which would be unfair.
3. **Dynamic play.** It is difficult to express this in numerical terms. Here too judges can give different evaluations.
4. **Economy of use of material.** A rather arguable co-efficient if you consider that studies in different styles make different use of material.
5. **Presence of introductory play and finale.** A study might have a feeble introduction with mechanical piece exchanges and score 3 points.
6. **Length of solution.** The division is very formal and does not relate to the idea being expressed in the study. 15 moves scores 3 points, but 16 scores 2.
7. **Difficulty of solution.** Who can say exactly what is average or great difficulty? These very dubious definitions of difficulty or ease of solution and the points awarded might well harm a study’s chances.
8. **Originality of conception.** One of the most important points on the scale. But you cannot express originality in figures.
9. **Complexity of theme.** Who can exactly define simplicity or complexity of theme? I think judges would vary in their opinions here.
10. **Degree of counterplay.** Counterplay by Black is desirable, but not obligatory for all studies. Some studies have no counterplay but are extremely interesting as to content. So one cannot approach all studies equally from this viewpoint. You cannot judge a study’s worth on the basis of: counterplay - very good, no counterplay - poor.
11. **General artistic impression.** An important determinant, which depends on the judge’s taste.
12. **General evaluation.** The sum of points awarded in sections 1-11. Point 12 is the final sentence on the study. It is the sum of a variety of different determinants. And let us hope that a judge will not deliberately or mistakenly award the wrong mark! A study challenging for a top place might suffer badly from this. The mechanical totting-up of a number of very dubious and varied co-efficients might lead to a distortion of the truth. It borders on an eclectic approach to the question of evaluating the worth of a composition. The conclusion is obvious: no system of evaluating studies with points scales can determine a study’s worth, because you cannot judge art using formulae.

The following are the important and real criteria for judging studies: 1. Originality and progressiveness. 2. Beauty. 3. A high degree of technique. These are the criteria (without, of course, any points scale) that judges should use. At the same time, one must not forget that studies on different scales and in different styles will mean varying numbers of pieces, length and difficulty of solution, varying mobility of pieces and so on. And this multitude of varia-
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bles should not in any case influence the general assessment of the composition as a whole. This is the only fair way of judging a study's quality. Formulæ are unnecessary - they will only lead to confusion and distort reality.

* Note. This was a system propounded by A. Kalinin in Shakhmaty v SSSR (i.71 and x.72). As the table below shows, there are plus and minus scores, the net total being subject to a limit of 15. On top of this it was suggested that points allocated should depend on the number of pieces, the number of exchanges, and so on. Several USSR events, culminating in the 1972 USSR Team Championships and the XI USSR Individual Championship, used the system, in the last case "as an experiment". FIDE Grandmaster of Composition Kasparyan and other leading composers have strongly objected to this system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Scale of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>+4 to —4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Originality of conception and construction</td>
<td>+4 to —4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Complexity and fullness of expression of theme</td>
<td>+3 to —3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>+2 to —2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Difficulty of solution</td>
<td>+1 to —1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Impression created by first move</td>
<td>+1 to —1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maximum 15 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEWCOMERS' CORNER**

*N C 8*

by J. D. Beasley

**NC8.1**

J. Moravec

28 Rijen, 1928

![Chess board NC8.1](image)

Win 4+2

At first sight NC8.1 (J. Moravec, win) looks hopeless for W, in view of 1. b7 Bxc6 (pinning wP) or 1. c7 Bc6† 2. Kb8 Bb7 3. c8Q (for the only alternative is 3. b5† Kxb6 with a dead draw) Bxc8 4. Kc7 (hoping for 4. . . Bb7? 5. b5† Kh7 5. Kxd6 (nothing better) Kxb6. With so little choice, however, it should not take long to find 1. c7 Bc6† 2. b7! Now after

**NC8.2**

V. Halberstadt

Tijdschrift, 1949

![Chess board NC8.2](image)

Win 3+2

2. . . Bxb7† 3. Kb8 Kb6 4. b5 Bl is in zugzwang and W wins. Strategically, the purpose of 2. b7 is to lose a crucial tempo, the P being doomed in any event.

Zugzwangs are to be expected in S endings, but that in **NC8.2** (V. Halberstadt, win) is better hidden than most. Bl threatens 1. . . Sg6†, and wK must go for b5 since lines
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like 1. Kg4 Sg6 2. e6 Kb8 give W no hope. So try 1. Kf5 Kf7 (counter-attack on wS) 2. Kg6 (the imaginative solver might try 2. Sd7 Sxd7 3. e6, but 3. . . Sb6 4. e7 Sc8 5. e8Q Sd6+ defends it) Kb6 3. Kg7 Kxc5 4. Kxf8 Kd5 draw, or 1. Kg5 Ka7 2. Kf6 Kb8 and again 3. Sd7† Sxd7 4. e6 fails to win. The main line in fact goes 1. Kg5 Kd8 2. Kg6 Kb8 3. Kf6 (Kf7) 3. Sd7† Sxd7 4. e6 Se5 5. e7 Sb7 (hoping for 6. e8Q? Sd6†) 6. Kc5(6), and the point is this. Remove wS, put bS on d7 and wP on e6, and consider what Bl can do. If wK does not control f6 then... Sb8 draws. If wK is on f7 or g6 then .. Se5 and ... Sc6 draws. If wK is on g7 or f6 then .. Sc5; e7, Sb6†; K—, Sc7 draws. Finally, if wK is on f5 then .. Sb6; e7, Sc6; e8Q, Sd6† draws unless bK is on b6. So W can play the manoeuvre Sd7, Sxd7; e6 only when wK is on f5 and bK on b6, and all is clear.

NC8.3 W. A. Shinkman and O. Wurzburg
Pittsburgh Gazette Times, 1918
Mate in 16
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Strictly speaking, NC8.3 (W. A. Shinkman and O. Wurzburg, mate in 16) is out of place here because of the requirement to mate in a given number of moves, but the strategy is that of an endgame study and the fact that the main line takes precisely 16 moves is not of importance. Indeed, if W fails to keep the tight grip on Bl necessary to secure immediate mate then he may well forfeit the win altogether. I certainly propose to take it for granted that W cannot allow Bl to get either bB into play (a few trial variations should convince on this point), so that he must proceed with checks and with mating threats which cannot be fended off by a bB; and it is simplest to go straight down the main line, since the early Bl alternatives can be easily dealt with by the readers afterwards. So we start with 1. Re7† Kd8 2. Rd7† Ke8 3. Re7† Kb8 4. Bb7† Ka8 5. Ra7† Kc8 6. aRc7† Ke8 7. Rd7 (and checks are not going to get us very much further. The most obvious try now, perhaps, is the double threat 7. Rg7, but 7. Qa2! kills it and 7. Re7 leads to 7. . . Kb8 8. aRc7† (or aRb7† Ka8) Kc8 and W is making no progress. This leaves only 7. Re7. The forced reply is 7. . . Kb8, and now comes 8. aRd7! (lovely move - 8. aRe7 instead would allow 8. . . Bg4 stopping both mates). There follows 8. . . Ke8 9. dRe7 (same motif) Kd8 10. Rb7 and W has gained some space. Now comes 10. . . Ke8 11. Re7† Kd8 12. Rg7 (playable now since bQ can no longer stop both mates) Ke8 13. bRe7†! (as before - 13. bRf7? Bg5 14. Rxe5 Qh1†) Kd8 14. eRf7 Ke8 15. Rb7 and bK can resist no longer.

NC8.4 L. I. Kubbel
Riga Tageblatt, 1914
Win

The first and almost the only problem in NC8.4 (L. I. Kubbel, win) is to keep bK away from wP. This
leads almost immediately to 1. h3
(1. Sg5? Kg4 2. S-- Kg3 3. Sg5 Kf4 4. Kg2 5. Kg3 6. Ke3 etc.)
2. Sg5 Kf4 3. Se4 Kf3 4. Kg4 Kf4 (4. . . Kg2 5. Sg5 Kg3 6. Ke3 etc.)
bK will have to move one square further. The only route is by the superficially remarkable 6. Sf2!,
after which comes 6. . . Kf4 7. Se2 Kf3 8. Sg1 Kg2 9. Ke4! (W must
be able to meet . . Kxgl with Kf3, keeping bK out of f2 - care is still
necessary even at this late stage) Kxgl 10. Kf3 Kh2 (f1) 11. Kg4 and
wins. Surprisingly forced play in a simple-looking position.

With reference to NC5.1 (Anufriev), Per Olin sends NC8.5 (H.
Lilja, draw). 1. Qe4 if (not 1. h3?? ab 2. Qxh1 b2 and a Bl win can be
shown) Ka1 2. Pc3? Bxc3 3. Rc3 Qxe4+i 4. Re1+ Qb1 5. Rxd1 Sc5 6.
Re1 Qxe1 stalemate. i) 3. . . Qh8 4. Qd4 Qf8+/i 5. Re5+ Rxd4 stale-
mate. ii) 4. . . Qxd4 5. Re1 Qxe1 stalemate. 'Not so economic as
Anufriev,' he says, but there are obvious compensations.

EDITOR'S ITEMS

The EG40 "Appeal for Money". Positive response, at times mo-
ing, but always gratifying, has come from: UK, Finland, Spain,
Holland, France, USA, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Australia,
Canada and Jamaica. Let no one doubt that EG is international!
The total of money received ensures EG's financial survival un-
til at least EG48, despite the disappointing number of subscribers
(a ceiling of 250, a floor of 150) and the total printing of 450. Thank
you, everyone! (Why don't you donate an EG subscription to the
Chess Club at your local school?)

CODEX...

At Tbilisi a new Sub-Committee for Codex matters was formed,
with the admirable Bedrich For-
manek (Czechoslovakia) as Chair-
man. Their task is to consider
what, if anything, should super-
sede the Codex of 1958, which was
drawn up at the (first) World
Congress of Chess Composers at

Piran, that delightful little har-
bour town on Yugoslavia's Istrian
peninsula. The solitary major de-
velopment since then has been the
USSR's preparation, and their
adoption in 1974, of the "USSR
Code for Chess Composition". It
consists of 30 articles, and covers
both studies and problems. A cer-
tain amount of publicity in the
world's problem magazines has
been given to the principles be-
hind it. No doubt the Sub-Com-
mittee will consider how the
USSR Code might be re-drafted as
a basis for the full FIDE Commis-
sion to make a recommendation to
its 22 member countries. If such
a recommendation is made I am
nevertheless sure that countries
will be encouraged to modify (add,
delete or alter) the various arti-
cles according to prevailing local
conditions.

I hope that this will happen. Al-
though no mere Code can affect
the quality of studies composed, it
could well improve the quality of
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judging, of accurate writing, and of general understanding. If study composing is no more than a private hobby, then a code is superfluous. If, as I believe, it is potentially an art and science (albeit thinly-populated) that can span the world and bring that world closer together, then a code is far from superfluous.

I believe that there should be parallel codes for studies and problems. Experience in the FIDE Commission, in discussions with problemists, in reading the Piran Codex, in SPOTLIGHT (retro compositions, especially), has convinced me that communication between problem and study enthusiasts, however friendly it may be, is strewn with hazards. Decisions may be, and are, taken in good faith, but are wrong. Interpretations are assumed to apply to studies as well as to problems, and frequently they should not. Now we have a great opportunity to reduce future misunderstandings. The opportunity is provided by the 1974 USSR Code. It can provide the basis for two codes. One for studies, and another for problems. These separate codes would, however, each have the same organisation (division into parts, sections and articles) and any proposed change would then be considered separately, and either adopted or not, but separately. Taking the 30 articles of the USSR Code and selecting (sometimes adapting) those that can apply to studies only, and eliminating those that are clearly peculiar to highly organised countries like the USSR, a code that might be considered internationally would have the following general shape. (Headings only are given, but with a few suggestions.)

PART THE FIRST
Nature of, and provisions for, the composition of Studies

Section I: PURPOSE OF STUDY COMPOSING

Article 1: **Definitions** (Relationship with the game; stipulation; solution; main line; other lines; idea; formal and artistic conditions.)

Article 3: **Studies, a department of “orthodox” chess**

Article 6: **Special types.** (Retrograde analysis compositions and those with irregular stipulations should not compete with “orthodox” Studies.)

Section II: FORMAL CONDITIONS

Article 7: **Essential conditions** (The three as set out in Art.s 8, 9 and 10.)

Article 8: **Legality of the initial position**

Article 9: **Existence of a solution**

Article 10: **Uniqueness of the solution**

Section III: ARTISTIC CONDITIONS (as guidelines, not rules)

Article 11: **Fundamental principles**

Article 12: **Quality of expression of the idea**

Article 13: **Economy of form**

Article 14: **Beauty of solution** (This might list, without priority, features frequently observed in studies that have been highly regarded over a long period; the list would not pretend to completeness.)

Article 15: **Duals**

Section IV: PUBLICATION AND PRIORITY

Article 16: **Publication**

Article 17: **Priority**

Article 18: **Anticipations and versions**

PART THE SECOND
Competitions relating to chess Study compositions

Section V: COMPETITIONS FOR THE COMPOSITION OF STUDIES

Article 20: **Tournaments** (formal, informal, announcement, duties of organisers.)

Article 23: **Rights and duties of competitors**

Section VI: FOR THE SOLVING OF STUDIES
Review

THE CHESS ENDGAME STUDY IN THE GEORGIAN REPUBLIC, by Ghia Nadareishvili, Tbilisi, 1975. A short review would merely record that this was a Russian-language collection of 293 studies, mainly by Georgian composers. The would be correct, but misleading. Personally I have never before encountered a chess book from Eastern Europe (readers who consider Tbilisi as belonging to Western Asia must forgive this slight geographical solecism) that compares in quality of paper and appearance favourably with the better Western productions. The paper is glossy, the cover attractive, there are both hard and semi-stiff backed editions, and it was produced with astonishing speed as it includes nearly a dozen studies published in 1975. Indeed this speed may be the cause of the occasional smudgy diagram. The colophon records “Delivered for composing 4.vi.75. Despatched to print 26.viii.75”. The book must have had a high priority! It was a worthy showpiece during the FIDE and Soviet composers’ meeting. The edition is in 20,000 copies and the Soviet price is half a rouble. (At the “official” rate of exchange that is about half the postage to mail a copy from England! For the unofficial rate, if such exists, replace “half” by “one-sixth”.)

There is a long and highly informative introduction by Vazha Neidze, from which one learns of the blossoming of Georgian study composers in the last 30 years, of the part played in this by Nadareishvili, and of the surprisingly large number of periodicals and organisations that have been prepared to sponsor tourneys. This latter aspect indeed provides the background to the first 184 studies, all of which were published in Georgian tourneys, and in which we see both local and non-local composers vying for honours. The remainder of the studies show Georgian composers competing abroad.

Quite a few studies will be new to even the most assiduous EG-reader, and it would be superfluous to say that the quality is high, often very high.

AJR

ABOUT AN IDEA

by Ignace Vandecasteele, Belgium

This idea appears for the first time in a study VI in Schach-magazin 1948: W offers his B to capture bR a few moves later.

1. b7 Re1 2. Be4 Rx e4 3. b8Q Be5†
4. Kd5 Bxb8 5. Kxe4 =

Wotawa adds to the value of the study by an echo:

1. b7 Rg5 2. Bf5 Rx f5 3. b8Q Be5†

Ten years later, Peckover received 1st Prize in Problem 1958-59 for V2, a study with the same mate-

V1

A. Wotawa

Schach-magazin, 1948

Draw

3+3
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rial. In this a beautiful repeat of the idea is shown:


The question now arose: is it possible to combine both studies, so that the idea could be repeated in each echo?

The Russian composer A. Grin succeeded with V3 in 1965.


And on the other side:


Very meritorious, but there is a bPa6. Why? Well, because 1. Bb2† Kh6 2. Ke6 Bh7 3. Kd5 Re1 4. Be1† Kh5 5. Be3 would fail on 5. . . Ra1 if there was no bPa6.

Bl would win by taking the diagonal a8 - h1 under control with the bB, and pushing wK to the edge with the bK and bR with threats of mate or loss of a piece.

Using only the thematic material, I think I have found (V4) a better form for the idea. That is, without bPa6.

1. a7 Rd1 2. Bd4 Ph7 (2. . . Rxd4 3. a8Q Pd5† 4. Kc5 Bxa8 5. Kxd4)

3. Kd5 Re1 4. Be3† Rxe3 5. a8Q
or:
1. a7 Rh5 2. Be5 Bh7 (2. .. Rxe5
3. a8Q Bd5† 4. Kd8 Bxe8 5. Kxe5)
3. Kd5 Rh4 4. Bf4† Rxf4 5. a8Q
Be4† 6. Kc5 Bxa8 7. Kxf4 =
Put what happens after 1. a7 Rh1
2. Bd4 Rei†!! Simply 3. Kd7!!
The wP threatens to promote,
and there is no good check. After

To close, a study of Korolkov, V5,
where the idea is repeated three
times, yet without a echo.
1. e5 Bxe5† 2. Ka2 Bd4 3. Bb3 Kc4
4. Ra5 Ec5 5. Ba4 Kd5 6. Ra6 Bb6
7. Rxb6 h1Q 8. Be6† Kc6 9. Bxh1
Kxb6 10. h4 and wins.
Who can do better?

DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS

No. 2457: A. P. Maximovskikh 1st Commend,
Thèmes-64, 1972-3

Win I: Diagram
II: b5a8 to d3.

Win: Diagram
4+3

No. 2457: A. P. Maximovskikh. I.
1. g8Q/i Kd6/ii 2. c8Qf Kc7 3.
Sxb6 Kh7 4. Sf7/iii Sb6 5. Sd8/v
Kc7 6. Se6b Kb7 7. Sc5f Kc7 8.
Sxb6 wins. i) 1. g8Qf Kb6 or
Sxc7f. ii) 1. Kb7 2. Sxb6f, or 1.
K -- 2. c8Qf and 3. Sxb6. iii)
Kb7/vi 1. Sd6f, draw only. iv)
But not 6. ... Kd7? 7. Sc6f wins.
v) 5. Sd6f Kc7. II: 1. g8Q/vi Qb6f
2. Kb6-xi Qc5f/xv 3. Kb6f Qxf4
4. Ke6 and 5. Qg6f wins. vi)
Threatening 2. g6Q. 1. g8Qf Kd6
2. c8Qf Kc7 3. Sxb6 Se5 4. Se7/vii
Kb7 5. Sae8 \ Se6 6. Sd6f Kc7 7.
Se5 Sd6f 8. Sxd4 Kxd6. vii)
Threat was 4. ... Se6. 4. Sb6 Kb7
Sb6f/ix Sb6 8. Se8f Kd6. viii)
5. Sc6f Se6. ix) 7. Sc6f Sb6. x)
5. Se8f Sc6. xi) 2. Ka(c)6? Sb6f
3. Kb7/xii Qc5f 4. Kc6f Sd5f, or
2. Kc4? Qc5f 3. Kxd3 Qc7f, or
2. Ka4f Sc5f 3. Ka3 Qh3f 4. Kg2
(a2)/xiv Qh2f 5. K -- Qc7f Kd8f
xiii) 4. Kb8 Sa6f 5. Sc8 Qa8 mate.
xiv) 4. Kb4 Sa6f. xv) 2. .. Qh6f
3. Sc6f. xvi) 3. Ka7f Qd6f/xvii
4. Kb6f/xviii Qc5f 5. Sc6f Qc7f.
xvii) But not 3. ... Sc8f? 4. Kg7f.
xviii) 4. Ka5 Qxc7f, or 4. Kb7f
Sc5f 5. Sc8f Qd6f 6. Kb8 Sa6f
7. Kb7f Qc7f, xix) 5. Kb8 Sa6f,
or 5. Ka8 Qc7f 6. Qg6f Kd8.

'On top of the aesthetic twin is the
(rare) analysis of 3S v S, first
investigated, I believe, by Trolitz-
ky in Novoje Vremja in 1895.'

No. 2458: E. Dobrescu 2nd Commend,
Thèmes-64, 1972-3

Win: Diagram
6+6

No. 2458: E. Dobrescu. 1. Bf4t/i
Kd3 9. Bc1 Ke2 10. Sg1f Kf2 11.
g6. i) 1. Se4f? Kd1 2. Sc3f Kd2f
3. Se4f Kd1. ii) 1. ... Ke1(2) 2.
Sh3 Sf2 3. b6 Sxh3 4. Bh2 Sf2 5. b7 Sd4 6. b6 Q. i) Threatening 6. ...
Sb5† and 7. ... Sd2. ii) 5. Se2† Ke4 6. Be3 Se3 7. Bg1/vi Kd3 8.
Sc1† Kd2. vi) Sg1 Kxb5 8. Kb2 Se4† or 7. Sc1 Sd3 8. Se2 Se5 9.
Sg1 Kxb5 10. Kc2 Ke4 11. Kxc2 Kd5 followed by ... Ke4 and ...
Kf7 and 14. ... Sc5, or 6. g6? Sxg6 7. b6 Se5 8. b7 Sd7 9. Ka3 Ke4 10.
Ba3 Sb4† 10. Ka1 Sd3 threatening 11. ... Kb3. ix) The threat was 10. ...
Bc1 Kd5 and 15. ...
Bf6 Ke4 15. Kxc2 Kd5 and 16. ...
Ke6, or 12. Ka3 Sa6, or 12.
Bf4 a3†, or 12. Bc1 Sa6 13. Sh3.
xiii) 6. ...
Sc(g)4 7. Bc1 Se5 8. b6 Sd3 9.
Ba3, or 6. ... Kd3 7. Bc1, or 6.
... Ke3 7. b6 Kd5 8. b7 Sd7 9.
g6 Ke6 10. Bc1 Kf6 11. Ba3 Kg6 12.
Kh2 and 13. Bd6, or 6. ...
Sf3 7. Sx(f)3 main line.
g7 Se7 11. Ka2/xy Kd4 12.
Kxa3 Ke5 13. Kb3 Kf6 14. Bb2†
Kf7 and 15. ...
Sc5, or 7. g6? Sxg6 8.
Bd2† Kc5 and 12. ...
Bb6. xv) 11. Bxa3 Kd2. xvi) 7. ...
Kxb4 11. Kb2. 'The b8 fights and
dies like Porthos in the Dumas
novel.' P. Perkonja adds the in-
teresting variation 5. ...
Sb4† 6. 
Kxa5 Sxb5 10. g6 Sd4 11. g7
Kd7 Sg8 15. Bb2 Sh6 16. Sh3(e2)
Kf7 Kg3 20. Sf4.

No. 2459: P. A. Petkov. 1. Rd6/i
Sf1/i 2. Rc5 Bd5 3. Rxd5/iii g5†
4. Rxc5 d1Q 5. Rxd5† Kg6 6.
Rcg5† Kxf6 7. e8S/i/iv Ke7/v 8.
Re5† Kf8 9. Rh8 mate. i) 1. e8Q?
Bxe8 2. Rd6 Bb5 3. Re8 g5† 4. Kg3
Be2 5. Rd8 Sf3, or 1. Rd4? Sf3†,
ii) Threat 2. ...
g5 mate. iii) 3.
Rxd5† d1Q 4. e8Q Qd4† 5. Rxd4
g5 mate. iv) 7. e8Q? Qd4† 8. Rg4
Qf2† and 9. ...
Qxg3 mate. v) 7.
... Ke6 8. Re5† Kd7 9. Rd5†. 'A
Plachutta - by Black.'

No. 2460: A. Koranyi. Dr Jenő Ban
judged this event, which was in
honour of the late Dr Lorand Nyevi-
yczkey, one of Hungary's eminent
composers. JRH vetted the award.
This study is a superbly econo-
mical example of one of the two WCCT themes, namely the reversal of a battery.

1. Ke8 Bd4 2. h8Q! Bxh8 3. Bf8† Kh7 4. Rb7† Kg8 5. h6 Bf6/i 6. Bg7 a1Q 7. h7† Kxh7 8. Bxf6† Kg8 9. Rg7† (Bxa7?) 9. ... Kh8 10. Rf7† Kg8 11. Rf8† Kh7 12. Bxa1 wins.

i) The main line satisfies the WCCT theme, with the battery operating on moves 8 and 10, but here it goes again: 5. ... Bb2(c3, d4, e5) and continue as in main line until 8. Bxb2 (c3, d4, e5)† and 10. Rg2 (g3, g4, g5)†.


No. 2462: J. Lazar. 1. a6†/i Ka8/ii 2. Sc6 Bd6 3. h7 Bh8 4. h8S/iii wins, for example, 4. ... Bh6 5. Sg6 Bg5 6. Ke2 and wSg6 will reach d5 in a few moves, after which wSc6xBa5 (d8), Ka7; Sb4 wins. i) 1. h7? Be5 2. a6† Kb6 3.

No. 2463: G. Grzeban. 1. c8R/i Qxc8/ii 2. Rd7 Qa8† 3. f3 Qa1† 4. Rd1 and mate with wB follows.

i) 1. c6Q? Qd5† 2. f3 Qd1(xf3)† 3. BxQ is stalemate, as wQc8 immobilises bPe6. ii) 1. ... Qxf2 2. Rc3† wins.

The tourney was formal, and for
No. 2464

V. Dolgov
Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974
Award: Sportivna Gazeta (Ukraine)
28.xii.74 (corrected later)

Win 4+3

No. 2465

D. Gurgenidze and V. Kalandadze
2nd Prize, Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Win 4+3

No. 2466

L. Mitrofanov
Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Win 4+3

No. 2467: S. Sakharov
1 H.M., Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Draw 4+3

No. 2468: L. Mitrofanov
2 H.M., Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Win 4+3

miniatures. 8 studies in the printed award were later eliminated (including the leading entry, by Belokon), as kindly notified by the judge, Mr. T. B. Gorgiev. There were 3 other sections, for problems.

No. 2465: D. Gurgenidze and V. Kalandadze

No. 2466: L. Mitrofanov and E. Pogosjants
No. 2469: V. Bratsev

3 H.M., Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Draw 3+3


No. 2471: R. Tavariani and V. Kalandadze

5 H.M., Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Win 3+4


JRH: cf. Horwitz (1181), No. 412 in '1000'.

No. 2470: V. Dolgov

4 H.M., Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Win 4+3


No. 2472: V. Grischenko

Comm., Lokker Memorial Tny (Ukraine), 1974

Win 5+3


JRH: Distinct from Halberstadt (1936) in '1234' Appendix by bP eliminating Zugzwang.
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No. 2473: L. Lyubovsky. 1. d6 h2 2. Sg3 Kg2 3. Sh1 Kh1/i 4. d7 Sf8 5. d8Q Se6t 6. Ke3 Sxd8 7. Kf2. i) 3. ... Kf3 4. d7 Sf5 5. d8S.


No. 2475: M. Gorbman. 1. Rc5 f2 2. Re5† Kd7 3. Rxe2 f1Q 4. Re7† Ke6 5. Rc7† Kb6 6. Rb7†.

No. 2477: V. Evreinov. 1. Bf3† Kf2 2. Be2† Kxe2 3. Rh4 a1Q 4. Rh2† K - - 5. Rh1†.
JRH: Prokes (1941), No. 351 in '62'.


No. 2480: D. Gurgenidze and V. Kalandadze. Judge: A. S. Kako-
JRH: Gorgiev (1934), No. 122(a) in his collected studies (1959) shows avoidance of the same stale-
mate but by a different method.


JRH: Cf. Gurvitch (1927), No. 1201 in '1234'.


JRH: Cf. Troitzky (1906), No. 405 in his ‘500’, Kivi (1959), No. 44 in ‘123 Suomi’ and Prokes (1948/37), Nos. 325/6 in his ‘Kniha’.


JRH: The grand tour of the S is well known, and I have three other examples by these composers (cf. 1990 in EG35 and 1528 in EG28). The earliest grand tour in my collection is Troitzky (1912), No. 994 in ‘1234’.


No. 2489: A. Yaroslavtsev. In view of the threats of . . Sxh7; or . . alQ; not to mention . . h1Q; to be guarded against, W seems to be in some trouble. 1. Qe4 alQ+ 2. Sa7 h1Q 3. Rb7+ Sd7 4. f8Q+ Rxh8 5. Sd8+ Qxe4 stalemate, or 5. . . Kd6 6. Qe6+ Ke5 7. Qe4+ drawn.
No. 2490: A. Bogomaz. 1. Rd7† Kg6
2. R×h7 K×h7 i 3. Sg5† Kg6 4.
S×e6 Sh5† 5. K×g4 E×c8 6. Kh4
B×e6 stalemate. i) 2. . . gh 3.
R×h3 Sf5 4. Ke5 Be4 5. Rf3 Bd5 6.
Rf1 Kg5 7. Rg1† Kh5 8. Rg6† K×g5
stalemate.

No. 2491: N. I. Kralin. 1. Re2† Kf6
2. Rf8† Kg7 3. Rf3 Qb1 4. Re7† Kg8
5. Re8† Kg7 6. Re7† Kh8 7. Re6†
Qg6 8. Re6 Kh7 9. Rc7† Qg7 10. Rb7
Kh8 11. Rb8† Qg8 12. Ra8 Kh7 13.
Ra7† Qg7 14. Rb7 Kh6 15. Rb6†
Qg8 16. Re8 draw.
Judge: F. S. Bondarenko.
The award is given here in its final
version, as advised to me by the
judge, except that a Special po-

dition, a retrograde analysis com-

position, is here omitted. (AJR)

No. 2493: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. d4†
cd 2. Re2† Kd5 3. e4† Rxc4 4. Re5†
K×e5 5. Sc4† Kd5 6. Sxb6† Ke5 7.
Sxd7† K×f5 8. Sxf8† Ke3 9. Sxg6†
Kd5 10. Sxf4† Ke5 11. Sd3† Kd5 12.
Bb7† Ke6 13. Sc3† K×e7 14. Sxb3
wins.


JRH: Berger (1888) showed the mate in the International Chess Magazine. Nearest seems to be Kasparyan (1955), No. 343 in TTC.


No. 2497: V. V. Yakimchik. 1. Rg4† Kh6 2. Bf4† Kh5 3. Rg5† Kh4 4. f3 a1Q† 5. Kf2 Qa2† 6. Kg1 Qb1† 7. Kf2 Qc2† 8. Kg1 Qd1† 9. Kf2 Qc2† 10. Kg1 Qb1† 11. Kf2 Qb2† 12. Kg(1) a3 13. Rg4† Kh3 14. Rg3† Kh4 15. Rg4† Kh5 16. Rg3† Kh6 17. Rg4† Kh7 18. Rb4† Kg7 19. Rg4† Kh6 20. Bg5† Ke5 21. Bf4† Kf6 22. Bg5† Kg6 23. Bf4† Kh5 24. Rg5† Kh6 25. Rg4† draw.
No. 2498: Al. P. Kuznetsov and V. Dolgov.


No. 2500: S. P. Sakharov and L. A. Mitrofanov.


JRH: Cf. Prokes (1943), No. 139 in his ‘623’.

No. 2499: L. I. Katsnelson and D. Gurgenidze.


No. 2501: I. L. Kovalenko.
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No. 2503: A. M. Bogomaz. 1. c8Q+ Qxc8 2. Sf6+ Kd8 3. Rxc8+ Kxc8 4. g6 hg 5. Se4 g2 6. g5 g1Q 7. Sb5 Qe3 8. Sbc3 draw. The commended studies were not further ranked.

No. 2506: V. A. Razumenko. 1. g7 Bb7 2. de Bxe4 3. g8Sf Kh5 4. Sf6+ Kh4 5. Sxe4 b2 6. Sd2 g4 7. c6 g3 8. c7 b1Q 9. Sxb1 g2 10. Sd2 Kg3 11. Se4+ Kf3 12. Sg5+ Kg3 13. Sh3 wins.

JRH: "S-promotion to fork bK+bB was used by Kubbel (1909) p. 40 of Rueb IV, and wS-offer to hold Bl promotion-square and al-low wP=Q is shown by Badaj (1966) in Problem.


No. 2509: game position Baker vs. Haldane. What actually happened was 59. . . h3 60. Bf1! (Baker was awarded a prize for „a well played endgame": Judge AJR)

Would anyone like to work this idea into a study?
No. 2510: A. J. Roycroft. 1. Bg3 Rd1† 2. Be1 h4 3. Rh1 g3 4. Rh3 Rxe1† 5. Kxe1 Kg4 6. Rh1 g2 7. Rxh4† Kg3 8. Rg4† Kxg4 9. Kf2 Kh3 10. Kg1 Kg3 stalemate.
i) The alternative 4. .. Kg4 leads to a near-echo stalemate, with bR acting as the "edge" of the board.
5. Kg2 Rxel 6. Rxg3† hg stalemate.

i) 1. Qh6† Ka2 2. Qg8† Rc4.
This was the 15th tourney, celebrating the 30th anniversary of the journal. Judges: F. S. Bondarenko and D. Kanonik.


ii) 4. .. h2 5. Bb7† Ke6 6. Bf8 h1Q† 7. Kg7 Qxg1† 8. Bg8. iii) 6. .. h1Q(R) stalemate.

No. 2514 E. Pogosjants
1st Hon. Men.,
Chervony Girnik, 1974
Win
7+7

No. 2515 I. Kovalenko
2nd Hon. Men.,
Chervony Girnik, 1974
Win
8+6

No. 2516 L. Mitrofanov
and V. Razumenko
3rd Hon. Men.,
Chervony Girnik, 1974
Draw
2+4

No. 2517 M. Gorbman
1st Commend,
Chervony Girnik, 1974
Win
4+3

No. 2518 R. Margalitadze
2nd Commend,
Chervony Girnik, 1974
Win
4+3

No. 2516: L. Mitrofanov and V. Razumenko.
1. g7+ Kg7 2. Se6+ Kf7
Kxc7 e1Q 7. d8Q mate. i) 1. d7?
Bxc7 2. Kxc7 e2 3. d8Q e1Q.

No. 2517: M. Gorbman.
1. Re8+ Ka7 2. Rc7+ Kb6 3. Rc1 Sc3+ 4.
Kd3 Sb1 5. Kc2 a1Q 6. Rxb1+.

JRH: Cf, the same composer's No.
1826 in EG32 (1970) and Koppelo-
mäki (1961, No. 1691 in
EG31.

No. 2518: R. Margalitadze.
1. g6 Bxd3 2. Bc7+ Kh4 3. Bf5 Bc4 4. Be6
Bd3 5. g7 Bh7 6. Bxb3 Kg5 7. Bf7
No. 2519: M. Gorbman. 1. Rc7 Ka6

No. 2520: I. Kovalenko.
1. Sc7 Kb6
2. Sxa8 Kb7 3. Bf6 Sf5 4. Sf7 Sg3
5. Kf3 Sf1 6. Bg5 Sh2 7. Kg3 Sf1
8. Kg2 wins.

1. Qc2 Kg5 2. Qd2 Kh4 3. Qf4 Qg4 4. Qh6 Qh5 5. g3 Kg4 6. f3 Rxh3 7. h3 Qxh3 8. Qg6 mate.
i) 3. . . Kh5 4. Qf5 Qg5 5. Qh7 Qh6 6. g4 Kg5 7. f4 Rxf4 8. h4 Qxh4 9. Qg7 mate.

With many USSR tourneys confusion can easily arise when there is more than one way to describe the source: there may be the 'event' (a jubilee, memorial, anniversary and so on), the organising body (a sports club, a 'trade union', and so on), and the publication in which the studies are published. In this case, Lelo is the newspaper, but strictly the tourney should be called after Burevestnik, the sponsoring body. AJR

No. 2522: A. Belenky and E. Pogosiant. 1 H.M., Burevestnik (Tbilisi), 1973

JRH: After the R-exchange the idea is essentially as old as Calvi (1845), No. 2151 in '2500'.
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Review AMERICAN CHESS ART, subtitled '250 portraits of endgame study' (sic), by Walter Korn (Pitman, 1975, £5.95).

I approached this book with a high expectation of discovering exciting studies, with a hope of making acquaintance with new facts, figures and faces, and with a vague idea that some more or less coherent pattern to American studies might emerge. After all, not since AMERICAN CHESS-NUTS appeared over a century ago has there been, I believe, any sizeable collection of American studies, with or without problems. My expectation and hope were in the event satisfied by the diagrammed Sven Almgren study, and by
the sporadic illumination elsewhere of a move or an idea. But my vague idea was probably doomed to disappointment. Walter Korn in effect says just this in his concluding remarks: there are no grand riches buried in the American past, so let us work towards creating riches in the future. 154 of the 200 or so studies in AMERICAN CHESS ART are by: Almgren (6), Branton (13), Brierger (11), E. B. Cook (24), Efron (6), Frink (9), Korn (22, including 3 originals), S. Loyd (9, probably all that there are), Peckover (19), Reichhelm (12), Rombach (Canada, 6), Shinkman (8), and Weinberger (9). Most of the difference between 200 and the 250 'portraits' is made up of either studies by non-Americans or non-studies by Americans. Incidentally, no evidence is given for including H. Otten as an American - surely the 'Boys Own Paper', where a couple of his best studies were first published, is part of England's, not America's, folklore? The author promises that "In this book the basic ingredients of a composition will be explained gradually and leisurely and the reader will thus absorb and learn to appreciate the aesthetics of chess artistry." This promise is only partially kept, and the reasons cannot be just the shortcomings of the material. The author's style has self-defeating characteristics. It is strong on metaphor (p.341, "a demoniacal vice in a primeval landscape"), weak on technical description (p.3 confuses maximumpens, a fairy chess type, with multi-movers), and weak also, alas, on fact (example, the Piran Codex). Layout, with at most one diagram to a page, is uncluttered, but despite evidence of considerable care inexcusable diagram and stipulation errors have been left uncorrected. (I cannot supply this book)

AJR

Obituary
F. Jaeck. EG subscriber and New Statesman solver, died in 1975. Dr. G. Paros (28.iv 10–15. xii.75), Hungarian problemist, regular attender at FIDE Commission meetings, composer of at least one study, Good friend of EG.

Other British publications
1. British Chess Magazine. From x.73 to i.75 I wrote a studies column, succeeded in the latter month by C. M. Bent, whose first contribution bore the typical heading "Bust 34, Waste 22."

2. New Statesman. Not the composing tournament, nor the regular solving ladder, but a special competition for schoolchildren, run in 4 successive weekly columns. Despite nearly 1,000 enquiries, from schoolteachers, there were disastrously few entries. Perhaps the competition was too complex, involving game positions, studies to solve, and comments to be made, over a relatively long period.

3. The Times. In vii.75 the "ap-
pointments pages” of the London TIMES ran a chess competition. With a single prize, a holiday to the maximum value of £500. In view of the prize, the apparent simplicity of the competition, and the wide publicity in posters on London Transport and British Rail platforms, it is not surprising that over 1,000 entries were received. The competition wording was: “Write down on a sheet of paper the continuation moves that force a win for White and accompany it with a composed game or position using a similar checkmating idea. The prize will be awarded to the sender of the entry that in the opinion of the judge contains the complete, correct solution together with a composed game or position with the continuation moves that best illustrate another application of the idea employed by White in winning from the diagram . . . .” The judge: Harry Golombek.

The competition was presumably a great success, and the winning position unquestionably deserved the prize. (It is gratifying that the winner, who is a strong player, is primarily a problemist, indeed he edits the 3-er section of The Problemist.) However, from a strictly composer viewpoint the conditions were unclear, especially in one respect: it is not anywhere stated that entries had to be pre-

1. Qh4 and B1 resigned, as 1. . . Qg8 2. Rf8 wins, while 1. . . Q(B)xh4 2. Kh1 makes no significant difference.

Out of the 1,000 entries only some 8% failed to find the exactly correct continuation. (The source was not, of course, identified in the announcement.) Although nowhere stated, the “idea” is presumably a Q-sacrifice in conjunction with an edge-board mate, with all major variations also concluding in checkmate.
viously unpublished, though from the judge’s remarks in the award it is clear that he discounted published positions that he recognised. (In the event, 2 consolation prizes, each consisting of The Times Atlas of the World Comprehensive Edition, were awarded: your editor was one winner, the other was Stephen W. Dilke.)

4. Games and Puzzles. This well-produced monthly, edited by David Pritchard (well-known player, married to the pre-war girl prodigy Elaine Saunders), now includes a considerable section on chess, run by W. H. Cozens, who can be relied on to mention studies frequently.

5. CHESS. This twice-a-month magazine still has no studies (or problems) section. There is, however, an occasional mention of a study, either at "Christmas Quiz" time or in the correspondence pages.

AJR

Review "Queen and Pawn Endings", by Y Averbakh. Published by Batsford, and hence in English. 143 pages, for £3.15, which makes TTC seem cheap. (Not available from me.

AJR

The EG42 book auction, p. 249. There were no bids for the Kasparian, and only two other bids, one from France and the other from Spain. These bids were very generous, and thanks to them, and to the initiative of Mr Daniel de Mol (Wetteren, Belgium), EG will benefit considerably. But the experiment is hardly one that I shall want to repeat.

AJR

THE PROBLEMIST celebrates its 50th anniversary in 1976 with a celebration day in London on 27. iii.76. Anyone wishing to attend, please write to: A. S. M. Dickins, 6a Royal Parade, Kew.

Obituaries

† Dr György Paros, the Hungarian help-mate maestro and tireless protagonist of the genre, died in Budapest (in xii.75) just two months after being present at Tbilisi for the FIDE Commission’s award of the Grandmaster title. His name at birth was Gernamic, but he changed it in the war years, deliberately adopting a name that he knew no one else would already possess. He was very proud of his baby grandchild, he was a firm believer in flying saucers -- and had composed at least one endgame study.

† S. Segenreich, Israel -- see No. 1411 in EG26.

Tourneys

FIDE ALBUM 1971-1973
Submissions of good studies published in these 3 years should be sent to:

HAROLD M. LOMMER,
PICTOR STCLZ 46, 3a
VALENCIA 8
SPAIN

Closing date: 30.vi.76. Whith full solutions preferably in 3 copies.

ISRAEL CHESS FEDERATION announces a tourney for the Olympiad year 1976. There is no set theme. Judges for the studies section: M. Milesie and H. Aloni.

Closing date: 30.vi.76. Maximum 3 per composer.

Address:
THE ISRAEL CHES
FEDERATION
P.O. BCX 2143
OLYMPIC TOURNEY FOR
CHESS COMPOSITION
TEL AVIV
ISRAEL

POLISH CHESS FEDERATION announces an informal tourney to celebrate its 50th anniversary. Entries to SZACHY-PROBLEMY, 00-887 Warszawa, Wspolna 61, POLAND. Judge: J. Rusinek.
Index to book titles frequently abbreviated in EG by the number of studies the work contains, or otherwise

‘111’ 111 Suomalaisia Lopputehtävää, by A. Dunder and A. Hinds, Finland, 1948


‘123a’ Toiset 123 suomalaista lopputehtavaa, a supplement to Suomen Shakki, 1971

‘269’ Etyudy, by G. M. Kasparian, Moscow, 1972

‘293’ Shakhmatny Etyud v Gruzii, by G. Nadareishvili, Tbilisi, 1975

‘500’ 500 Endspielsstudien, by A. Troitzky, Berlin, 1924

‘555’ Etyudov Miniatur, by G. M. Kasparian, Erevan, 1975

‘623’ Knih Sachovych Studii, by L. Prokes, Prague, 1951

‘636’ Etyud v Peshechnom Okonchani, by F. S. Bondarenko, Moscow, 1973

‘650’ Sovyetsky Shakhmatny Etyud, by A. P. Kazantsev and others, Moscow, 1955


‘1414’ 1414 Fins de Partie, by H. Rinck, Barcelona, 1952

‘2500’ 2,500 Finales, by G. M. Kasparian, Buenos Aires, 1963

‘T1000’ A Thousand End-Games, 2 vols., by C. E. C. Tattersall, Leeds, 1910-11


‘Fritz’ Sachova Studie, by J. Fritz, Prague, 1954

‘Gallery’ Gallereya Shakhmatnykh Etyudistov, by F. S Bondarenko, Moscow, 1968 (this could be known also as ’508’)

‘Rueb (B)’ Bronnen van de Schaakstudie, 5 vols., by A. Rueb, ’s-Gravenhage, 1949-59

‘Rueb (S)’ de Schaakstudie, 5 vols., by A. Rueb, ’s-Gravenhage, 1949-55


The Chess Endgame Study Circle and EG (4 issues p.a. EG 41-44)

Annual subscriptions due each July (month vii): £ 2.00 (of $ 6.00). If renewing late (after November, month xi), please identify the EG-year 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

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):
A. J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, London England, NW9 6PL.

Editor: A. J. Roycroft.

‘Spotlight’ — all analytical contributions:


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

THE CHESS ENDCGAME STUDY CIRCLE

Next meeting: Friday 2nd April, 1976, at 6.15 p.m. At: 101 Wigmore Street (IBM building, behind Selfridge’s in Oxford Street).

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