INTRODUCTION

EG has scant space for reprinting the classics, but the commented selection by the Georgian composer came at an opportune moment, for the Sargon 2.5 chessplaying machine was on hand. The old could be combined with the new. How would Sargon fare in solving these ten, selected as they were without reference to Sargon? It would be an objective test of the machine’s capabilities, albeit tough on the machine, since it was not intended for study-solving but for chessplaying. In the outcome Sargon solved well, finding 46 white moves out of 92 at "Level 2", and 61 at "Level 3". At the higher, and slower, levels (namely, 4, 5 and 6) its performance did not significantly improve, as illustrated by the example of K2, Sargon’s one disaster. The reader who wishes to compare the main line solution with Sargon’s choice can look at the "SL2" and "SL3" moves (for Sargon Level 2 and Level 3), where either the move chosen by the machine is given, or else just the move number (when Sargon chose the main line move). In every case, after Sargon had chosen its white move, I fed in the black response (if necessary after correcting Sargon’s selection). As a computer and studies specialist I am bound to express the opinion that Sargon was impressive.

New versions of the machine can only improve its performance - and new versions are promised.

(AJR)

The art of chess composition did not attain its present level all at once - the development path has been long. Many of the most interesting study ideas have needed decades to acquire that final polish. Ideas that were first shown in classic studies found new life in later works, even forming the basis for masterpieces. At times the opposite transpired: some were so perfect that composers of following generations could not enrich them substantially.

Today such works still attract us with their unfading brilliance. K1 by the (Czech) Grandmaster Richard Réti was a sensation when it appeared, and for us it has retained its paradoxical centre. We are astonished, then delighted, by the depth and originality of the main theme.


Sargon’s W Moves. SL2: 1, 2, Kg5, c7, 5.

SL3: 1, 2, Kg5, 4, 5.
The idea of K1 was used in many works, but all were weaker than the original. It was only in 1928 that the Sarychev brothers published a study that can be considered a creative development of Réti's idea. In K2 the development is even more paradoxical and unexpected, an excellent example of creative enhancement of the heritage of the classics.

**K2**

A. and K. Sarychev 1928

**Sargon's W Moves**


**SL.3:**

1. Kd8, Kd8, c8Q, Ke7, Kf6.

2. c8Q, Kb6, 4, 5, Kc3, 7.

(The machine has currently no capability for automatically choosing an underpromotion.)

Emanuel Lasker's K4 is one of the immortals. Lasker created here a basis for interesting manoeuvres in the type of composition known as "systematic movement of pieces". His study has great practical and theoretical value. And it is realised in miniature form.

**K4**

G. Barbier and F. Saavedra 1895

**Sargon's W Moves**

SL.2: Rh8, 2, 3, Rh8, Ka8, Rxh2, Ka6, Ka7, Ra5f, Rxh2, 11, Ra4f, 13.

SL.3: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Ra6f, Kb8, 8, Ra5f, Rxh2, 11, 12, 13.

K5 by the British player Van Vliet expresses a significant chess idea and is also reprinted regularly. The WQ sacrifices itself several times, forcing bQ to squares on the diagonal and file where she becomes a victim of the newborn wQ on b8. All this is so elegant and unexpected that it leaves a long-lasting impression.
K5: 1. Qb4 Qd5 2. Qa4† Kb6 3. Qb3† Qxb3 4. b8Qt.

Or 1. ..., Qh1 2. Qa3† Kb6 3. Qb2† Kc7 4. Qh2† Qxh2 5. b8Q

Sargon's W Moves
SL2: Qa2†, Qe7, Qb4†, 4.
SL3: 1, Qb2, 3, 4.
SL2: Qd6†, Qa7†, 4, 5.
SL3: Qa4†, Qd6†, 4, 5.


Sargon's W Moves
SL2: Sc7, Kb2, 3, Kxa2, Kb2, Kc3, Kd4, 8, Kh5, 10, 11, 12.
SL3: Se7, 2, 3, Kxa2, Kb2, Kc1, 7, 8, Kh5, 10, 11, 12.

Also very popular is K7 by the French composer Villeneuve-Esclapon. After subtle and attractive play there arises a laconic and crystal-clear position in which b5 and bR are powerless to win against wB. The idea is so paradoxical that to begin with one doubts the position’s correctness, but the doubt soon dissolves and we see that it is real chess masterpiece. That this idea has been repeated in subsequent works does not diminish its brilliance.


Sargon's W Moves
SL2: Kg5, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, Bg1, Bf4, 11.
SL3: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, Bg1, Bf4, 11.
Mitrofanov’s K8 won wide recognition on its publication. After natural and unconstrained play, W unexpectedly sacrifices wQ and on the board appears a unique position where bQ and two pieces can do nothing to stop the passed cP winning. The innovation and extravagance make this study one of the wonders of chess art.

K8: 1. b6† Ka8 2. g7 h1Q 3. g8Q† Bb8 4. a7 Sc6† 5. dc Qxh5† 6. Qg5 Qxg5† 7. Ka6 Bxa7 8. c7 Qa5† 9. Qxg5 Bxa7 (Note: 9. ..., Bxb6† 10. Kxb6 S-)10. ba

Modern composers exhibit great interest in R-studies. This becomes understandable when one realises that the rook permits the 'personification' of various systematic and geometrical movements, with numerous traps. In 1972 the Georgian author of this article published a study, in which wRR are sacrificed to neutralise a strong B1 passed pawn.

Then the Czech Grandmaster, Dr. Jindrich Fritz, composed a study where the passed pawn is stopped via sacrifice of wQ. The author succeeded in combining these two ideas in K9, published in 1979.

K9: 1. Kh3 Rh4† 2. Kxh4 Rb1 3. Ra2† Kxa2 4. Rc2† Rb2 5. Rc1 Rb1 6. Rh1 Rh1 7. h8Q Rg1 8. Qa8† Kb2 9. Qh1 Rh1 10. b7 and really wins, easily.

Finally, Somov-Nasimovich present us with the dazzling play of his K10. This is the epitome of the attractive, hard-fought contest, the epitome of drama in chess composition.

K10: 1. e5 Qxe5 2. f8Q† Kg1 3. c3 Qe1† 4. Bb1 Qxc3 5. Rg7† Bxg7 6. Qf1† Kxf1 7. Bd3† Ke1 8. bc Kd2 9. Bc2 Kc1 10. Bb3 Bxb3 stalemate.

It may be that a first impression from these studies is that they have nothing to do with the normal chessplaying struggle, but in reality they tell us about the most fundamental chess laws, and they do so in the language of artistic chess composition.

JRH: Cf. Gurvich (1953), No. 272 in Porreca.

No. 4165: E. Asaba and N. Kralin. 1. g8Q + Kg7 2. Sxh6 Bxh6 3. Rg8 + Kh7 4. Rg7 + Kg7 5. e8Q + Kh8 6. Sf6 + Kg6 7. Se8 + .

i) 1. Rf8 + ? Kxg7 2. Rg8 + Bxg8 3. e8Q Bh7.


No. 4168: V. Razumenko. 1. Comm., 64, 1977


JRH: The mate is known, e.g. Forth in Cheron I. 435, but this approach seems new.


i) 4. ..., Kf4 5. Rxf2+ Re3 6. Rf7, this possibility explaining the first move.


A position of reciprocal zugzwang.

No. 4173: G. Slepyan (v.78)
3rd Prize, 64, 1978

1. e4, with 2 lines: 1. ..., g6 2. e5 h6 3. c4 dc 4. e6 c3 5. e7 c2 6. e8S c1Q + 7. Be2 Qxc2 + stalemate.

ii) 1. ..., Ral 2. b7 Kb6 + 3. Kb8 Se5 4. Rc7 Rd6 wins.

iii) 5. ..., de2. d5 e3 6. d8Q e2 7. B(Q)xdl stalemate.

No. 4174: Y. Zemlyansky and V. Kovalenko (iv.78)
=4/5 Prize, 64, 1978


iii) 5. ..., d4 6. b5 + Rxb5 7. Rxd4 Sxd4 stalemate.


No. 4175: V. Israelov and A. Sarychev (v.78)
=4/5 Prize, 64, 1978


ii) 1. ..., Ral 2. b7 Kb6 + 3. Kb8 Se5 4. Rc7 Rd6 wins.


A position of reciprocal zugzwang.

No. 4176: K. Sumbatyan (iii.78)
H.M., 64, 1978

i) 7. ..., Kf7 8. Rg8 Kxe7 9. Rxg2.


No. 4180: A.P. Kazantsev. 1. c5 g5 2. d4 g4 3. d5 g3 4. d6 ed 5. cd g2 6. d7 g1Q 7. d8Q Qc5 + 8. Ke4 Qxc3 9. Qg5 + Kxg5 stalemate.

JRH: The final mating sequence is well known, but the successive promotions are unique and amusing.
No. 4181: N. Kosolapov (ix.78)


No. 4182: G.A. Nadareishvili (iv.78)

1. g6+ Kh8 2. Kh6 Bd5 3. f7 Bxf7 4. g7 + Kg8 5. Bd3 Bg6 6. Bc4 + Bf7 7. Bd3 Sg5 8. Bh7 + Sh6 stalemate.

No. 4183: A. Ivanov (vii.78)


No. 4184: D. Gurgenidze (x.78)


Composed following the sudden mate-in-three finale of the 17th World Championship Match game in Baguio.


1. a7 Ra5 2. e6 Bxe6 (Bb5;Rc5) 3. Re4 Bc1 + i 4. Kg3 Ra3 + 5. Kf2 Ra2 + ii 6. Kg3 Rg2 + 7. Kf3 Bb5 8. a8Q Bxa8 stalemate.
No. 4185  J. Rusinek (ii.78)
1st Prize, Szachy, 1978
Award: xii.79 and i

No. 4186  V.A. Bron (vi.78)
2nd Prize, Szachy, 1978

No. 4187  Em. Dobrescu (ix.78)
3rd Prize, Szachy, 1978

No. 4188  G.M. Kasparyan (vi.78)
1 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1978

No. 4189  A. Pittuk (iv.78)
2 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1978
ii) 4. e7? Kxc7 5. e8Q Bd7 + .

No. 4190: E.I. Dvizov (x1.78)

3 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1978

No. 4190: E.I. Dvizov. 1. f6 Bf8 2. b6 c3 3. b7 c2 4. b8Q c1Q 5. Qxf8 + Kg6 6. Qh6 + Kxh6 7. f8Q + Kg5 8. Qh6 + Kxh6 9. Sf7 mate.

No. 4191: V. Nestorescu (ix.78)

4 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1978


No. 4192: J. Dankiewicz (v.78)

Commended, Szachy, 1978

ii) 3. ..., Kf7 4. Sd6 + cd 5. g8Q + Kxg8 stalemate.
iv) 5. ..., Bxc6 stalemate. Or. 5. ..., Rc-, a pin stalemate.

A cook is 1. Qc6 + Qc6 2. Rh6 + Kxg7 3. Rxc6 Rd8 4. a6 or 4. Sg5. This was published with the solution in ii.79. No correction was supplied. The only reasonable explanation for the survival of the study in the award (provisional award, admittedly) is that the judge (who is a regular solver in Szachy) did not look at the solution as published (being such a strong solver himself!) and the column editor did not draw his attention to it. If the cook is defeated, there is no mention in the pages of Szachy. The editorship of the studies in the Polish magazine has passed from the hands of Dr. Grzeban (Grzegory Bagdasarian) to those of Jan Rusinek. Dr Grzeban ran the column for over 20 years.

i) 1. ..., Kxbl 2. Bg6 leaves Bl stalemated.


No. 4194: E. Janosi. 1. Rg8 Sh3 + 2. Kf3 Rg5 3. g4 Ke7 (e6) 4. Kg3 Sg1 5. Kf4 Sh3 + 6. Kg3 Kf7 7. Ra8 (b8) Sg1 8. Ra7 + Ke8 9. Ra8 + Ke7 10. Ra7 + Kf6 11. Ra6 + Kf7 12. Ra7 + Kf8 13. Ra8 + Kg7 14. Rc8 Ra5 15. Kg2 Ra1 16. g5, positional draw.


   i) 2. d7 Sc6 3. e5 Sd8.

No. 4198: A. Maksimovskikh and Y. Makletsov.  

Commended, Sachy, 1978

No. 4199: G. Zakhodyakin.  

Commended, Sachy, 1978

No. 4200: M. Sindelar.  

Judge of this annual informal competition of the composing supplement to the monthly Ceskoslovensky Sach was Bohuslav Sivak of Banska Bystrica.  

1. Bc3 Qg2 (for ..., Qg8 +; and stalemate) 2. Bf7 (for Bf6 and Bg5 +) 2. ..., Qg4 3. Be5 Qg3 4. Bg6 Qc5 5. Be8 Qg3 6. Bf7 Qg4 7. Bg6 and wins, as BQ can no longer play to c3.
No. 4201: Vladislav Bunka. 1. f6 (Kb6? Bd4 +;) 1. ..., e4 2. f7 Bg7 3. f8Q+ Bxf8 4. Kb6 Bc5 + 5. Kxc5 Ka7 and now the originally published (ix.78) solution runs (it works, but it's very uninteresting) 6. Kb5 f3 7. Bxe4 g4 8. Ka5 (why not a wB move?), while the solution given with the award runs 6. Kd4 e3 7. Kd3 g4 8. Ke2 g3 9. Kf3 wins, which also works. Therefore a plain cook. Why the Second Prize? Indeed, why publish it at all?

JRH: Cf. Troitzky (1925), No. 91 in the Korolkov and Chekhover collection (1959).

No. 4202: L. Kopac (v.78 and x.78) 3rd Prize, Sachove Umenie, 1978


JRH: The mate at g4 is known -- Liburkin (1933), No. 68 in Bouwmeester's book.

No. 4204: V.V. Novikov (vi.78) 2 Hon. Men., Sachove Umenie, 1978


JRH: The mate is known -- Gurvich (1972/9), No. 719 and Kasparyan (1936), No. 396, both in 2500.


ii) With a mating plan involving bB playing to b7-a6-f1-g2.


No. 4209: E. Janosi. 1. Rf6 + Kxf6
d1Q +.
ii) 2. ..., Kxe7 3. Sb2, or 2. ..., Sf5 + 3. Kc3.
iii) 3. e8Q? Sf5 + 4. Ke4 Sd6 +, winning with bSSS.

in Schakend Nederland: wKb3, wRf3, wBa6,b8; bKg2,bRa6, bPb4,g5. 1. Rg3 + Kh2 2. Rg2 + Kh1 3. Rh2 +
Kg1 4. Rh1 + Kf2 5. Rf1 + Ke3 6. Rf3 + Kd2 7. Rd3 + Ke1 8. Bb5

Re5 + Kd4 10. Bf2 + wins.
i) 1. ..., Kd5 2. Rc5 + Ke4 3. Re5 +
JRH: Cf. Fritz (1951), No. 239 in his collection, and Vandecasteele (1971)

No. 4212: Y. Makletsov. 1. hSf5 Rh6 + (against Sd4 + ) 2. Sh4 +
Bc6 + 6. Se4 + (Kh2?Bg2;) 6. ..., Kf1 7. Bg3 Bxg3 stalemate.
i) 2. ..., Kf2 3. Se4 + Kg1 4. Bxc7
Bxd7 + 5. Kg3.
JRH: Cf. Kaiev (1932), No. 1719 in 2500.
No. 4213: M. Matous. 1. Sc1 + Kd2
2. Sb3 + Kd1 3. Rd8 + Bxd8 4. Qf8
Qxf8 5. b8Q Bf6 + 6. Kb1 Qe7 7.
Qb7 Qxb7 stalemate.

No. 4214: V.A. Bron. 1. Ra8 + Kxa8
2. g8Q + Ka7 3. Qb8 + Kxb8 4. dc +
Ka7 5. Bb8 + Ka8/6. Bd5 + Rxd5 +
7. Kxe2 and now, 7. ..., Rf5 8. Kf2
Rf8 9. efS wins, or 7. ..., Rdl 8.
Kxf2 Rd8 9. edS.


No. 4215: E. Asaba. 1. d7 + Qxe7 2.
b4 + Kxb6 3. Sxd5 + Kb5 4. Sxe7
Rd2 + 5. Kxc1 Rxd7 6. Rg5 + Kxb4
7. Sd5 + Kb3 8. Rg3 + Ka2 9. Sba +
Ka1 10. Ra3 mate.

No. 4216: V. Kichigin. 1. Qf8 + Kh7
2. g6 + Kxg6 3. Qf5 + Kxf5 (Qxf5; Sh4 +)
Kb2 Kd3 7. Sd4 Kxd4 8. a7 wins.

No. 4217: Cs. Meleghegyi. I: 1. Sf7
Bb4 5. Kd7 Kd5 (Kc3; Sd6) 6. Sxa5
winds.
Bf8 4. Sxa5 Kc3 5. e7 Bxe7 6. Kxe7
i) 2. ..., Kc3 3. b4 Kxb4 4. Sc8.
JRH: For II, see Berger, No. 98 in
T1000.
No. 4218: A. Melnikov. 1. Sg5 Qf4/i 2. Qe5+ f6 (Qxe5;Sf7+) 3. Qxf4 a1Q 4. Sf7 + Bxf7 5. Qb8+ Bg8 6. Qb1 Qa7 7. Qg6 Qe7 (Qf7;Qxg8 + ) 8. Qf7 g1Q 9. Qxg8 + - stalemate, or 1. ..., f6 2. Sf7+ Bxf7 3. Qg3 Qxg3 stalemate, or 1. ..., f5 2. Qc3 + e5 3. Qf7 draw.


No. 4220: E. Maidanik, late of the USSR, now Israel (temporarily resident in UK). 1. Rg5/i with two variations:
i) 1. Rd5? Be6 2. Sd8 + Kc7, or 2. Rg5 Bd4.
iii) 4. Rxd7 +? Kc6 and wR is dominated!
iv) 2. ..., Be8(e6) 3. Sa8 + . 2. ..., a5 + 3. Ka3.
vi) 4. ..., a5 + or 4. ..., Be5 + 5. Kc4 and all is protected.


i) If Bl takes one of the pawns the draw is clear.
ii) 1. ..., Sb5 2. Kh3 Bh2 (Kg1; Rxe7)

iii) 2. ..., Sb5 is met by either 3. fg or 3. Kg3.

iv) 3. Kg3? Bxe7 4. fg Bd6 + , or 3. ..., Sxe7 and 4. ..., f5 +.

---


---

No. 4222: Em. Dobrescu and P. Joitsa

1st Prize, Jubilee Tourney of Soviet Armenia, 1980

Award: x½ in Bulletin (Erevan) of 1st Division Championship of USSR
(Published by Shakhmatv Nikoladze)

Draw


"The idea of perpetual stalemate is expressed in a very interesting manner: in analogous studies it is usual to find bSS playing the main role, but here we have bB also."

---

No. 4223: V. Nikitin

2nd Prize, Jubilee Tourney of Soviet Armenia, 1980

Win


"Victory is attained as a result of sustained and artful manoeuvres of wK."

---

No. 4224: V. Nestorescu

3rd Prize, Jubilee Tourney of Soviet Armenia, 1980

Win


"Victory is attained as a result of sustained and artful manoeuvres of wK."

399

No. 4225: V.A. Bron 4th Prize, Jubilee Tourney of Soviet Armenia, 1980

   i) ... Qc1 + 6. Sf4 + Qxf4 + 7. Kxf4 Kxg2 8. Kf5. "Sharp play allows wbP to promote to wQ."

No. 4227: Y. Bazlov 5th Prize, Jubilee Tourney of Soviet Armenia, 1980


iii) A study by A. Gurvich has arisen. It won 4th Prize in Ceskoslovensky Sach in 1947.

wKf2 wSb1 wSc2 wPf3; bKb2 bRb3 bSh2 4 + 3 =.


No. 4231: J. Vandiest. 1. Se8 + Kb7 2. Sd6 + Ka8 3. Qa1 + (Qh1? Qa6;)
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No. 4233: A. Koranyi. Draw (see also No. 4232)

+ HAROLD LOMMER

It was Harold who told me the shocking fact that there was no magazine for studies enthusiasts, and who, when I expressed astonishment, said, "Why don't you do it?" The challenge was accepted, and EG remains as a kind of memorial to him. There is continuity. It was Harold who turned me into a temporary journalist in Yugoslavia in 1958, so that I joined the privileged parties touring with the Grandmasters and other VIP’s (Tal, Fischer, Olafsson among them), when I would otherwise have been left out. It was Harold who gave me a 'sine die' membership of his Soho club, the Mandrake where, when I knew it, a call-girl operation worked incongruously alongside the chess. It was Harold who carefully and constructively criticised my early studies. It was Harold who on many occasions interpreted in several tongues at sessions of the FIDE Composition Commission’s meetings. Indeed, it was because of the exhausting labour of these multi-lingual translations that he declined in later years to attend these annual get-togethers, since he felt he would be expected to translate all the time. But he retained the non-voting position of "Expert" to the Commission on the subject of endgame studies, a post now held by the non-linguist FIDE Grandmaster Gia Nadereishvili. It was Harold who wrote articles for EG, regaled us with reminiscences, wrote long and detailed letters about FIDE matters, about chip-hers, about nearly anything. He always seemed the same age, ever young. He leaves a widow, but no children. I cannot believe that he has gone.

David Hooper writes:
Harold Maurice Lommer, b. Islington, 18 November 1904, d. Valencia, 17 December 1980; International
Judge of Chess Compositions (1956), International Arbiter (1962), International Master of Chess Compositions (1974). Of German parentage he considered himself to be English; and he was, undoubtedly, the leading British study composer. He moved to Geneva when he was four years old and his enthusiasm for studies was kindled at the age of twelve when he was shown the Saavedra study; but he began composing only in his late twenties after settling in England. At first he specialized in promotion tasks, and among his several achievements in this field was his prize-winning allumwandlung study in 1933 ("1234" No. 1197). He was the first to achieve this task which Rinck said would not be realized if a composer were offered a million francs. His prize, however, was twenty francs. In later years Lommer also composed problems, fairy and orthodox, becoming one of a handful who achieved the Babson task. His approach was always artistic and he considered the mere achieving of a task to be worthless if it were not well done. An example of his search for perfection was his economical rendering of star flights ("1357" No. 1344), the result of several attempts. From the end of the Second World War until 1961, when he retired to Valencia, he was joint proprietor of the Mandrake club in Soho, where chess boards and men were always available and where he revealed the art of studies to many players (myself included): we could not have had a better teacher. Of quiet, generous, and unassuming character he made friends all over the world, tolerating patiently both the efforts of beginners and the egotism of such experts as Rinck and Chéron. Lommer will also be remembered for his two great collections: "1234" Modern End-game Studies (1939, revised edition 1967) (in collaboration with M.A. Sutherland), and "1357 End-game Studies" (1975). Both became classics, and together they contain 2,615 studies composed up to 1973. Casting a wider net than was possible for the editors of the FIDE Albums (1,504 studies from 1914 to 1973) he also gave more detailed solutions.

**DVH**

+ **ANDRÉ CHÉRON**, 25.ix.95-12.ix.80. We hope to do justice to the life-time achievements of the Chéron phenomenon in a later issue. Just a few weeks after his departure, Madame Chéron, his widow, also died.

**Anthony Dickens** writes: It was in 1942 that I first went to the newly-opened "Mandrake" - tea and coffee only, two and three pence respectively, in the one room, before they started burrowing underground. After the War they opened the bar - and then some time later they pick-axed their way through to the wine-vault that was used for chess. Many famous names were to be found there O. Bernstein, Mieses, Keres, Wade, the cartoonist 'Vicky', Willie Winter, B.J. d'Andrade, Friedrich Samisch, for a few, along with the poets, writers and artists, Dylan Thomas, Colquhoun and Macbride, David Gascoyne, Tambimuttu, Costi (the escaped Russian artist), and countless others. A wonderful international intellectual concourse of free spirits living la vie de Boheme under the magic wand of Harold (Prospero!) Lommer, while his wife Valyne served us the curries and the omelettes. And so the magic spell lasted until 1956 when Prospero retired to Spain and the whole enchanted fabric fell to airy nothing, and nothing like it has been seen since - or ever will be seen again, to the world's loss. And now Prospero himself has gone too - and only Valyne remains, among many, many treasured memories.
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Addresses of magazines and bulletins that run annual (or biennial) international informal tourneys for original endgame studies. The studies editor’s name, if any, is in brackets. (In an address, a comma generally indicates the end of a line.)

**THE CHESS ENDGAME STUDY CIRCLE**

Next meeting: Friday 3rd April, 1981, at 6.15 p.m. At: 101 Wigmore Street. (IBM building, behind Selfridge’s in Oxford Street.)