



ournament chess, I think your knowledge of the chess world. How could you have with practically no experience believe that a power move is enough to win correspondence tournaments?

Do you give it a try? Believe me, it goes far. Of course, armed with the best tools (opening books, engines, tablebases etc) you will draw most of your games. At a high level you will also lose a lot of them. I've made a living out of the game to positions that are difficult to judge, and even if it's difficult to do, we are far from giving up when this will no longer

is often underestimated by top board players, because their decisions are usually decided by short-term calculations that computers are able to do in a few seconds, so they believe they have enough power and time, they will be able to find everything. In correspondence chess it's not like that, you heavily misjudge a material imbalance, a pawn on a long term pin, a fortress, then your error in calculating power can

words can't convince you, I know the results will. I've won 49 of the games I've played till now, and in most of my opponents used the best tools they could put their hands on. And, brace yourself, my opponent is a tremendous 9-year-old with two cores, practically a genius, plus a mediocre 5-year-old. Correspondence chess has completely changed in the past ten years, but I don't believe they will ever come to pronounce it dead. It's a mix of sport, science and art, with different time controls highlighting these components. Bullet chess is all about instinct and speed; blitz is about selectivity and initiative; tournament chess requires stamina, knowledge, memory, calculation and many other qualities; correspondence chess is unique in that it requires precise

organization of work, but is also artistic if you try to find unconventional plans.

Let me make a final comparison to running. There are many running distances, from 100 metres to the marathon. The sprinter has very different qualities from the middle distance and marathon runner. But nobody would say that the latter is not a real runner, because he's a terrible sprinter. Enjoy the sprint and the middle distance, Mr. Short, but please respect those who want to run the extra mile.

Tiziano Mosconi
Italy

Deeply disappointed

I was sincerely surprised and deeply disappointed to see that in *New In Chess* 2018/2 you published Nigel Short's article with the provocative title 'Obsolescence'. If the purpose was to offend the entire correspondence chess community, then you brilliantly succeeded in this.

If somebody does not understand a particular type of human activity, but presents his point of view publicly, it is the responsibility of the editors to recognize this (unless they themselves share the presented point of view).

One thing that Nigel Short fails to recognize is that correspondence chess is first of all a research laboratory for chess. Without it many brilliant ideas (such as the recent novelty in the Aroonian-Kramnik game) may never see the light of day. The argument that correspondence chess is drawish, because the human 'blunder' factor is virtually eliminated from the game, is complete nonsense. It is similar to saying that scientists should not use computers in their research, because that undermines their achievements. Chess may be purely a sport for some people, but it is also art and science for others.

Kirill Oseledets,
Chicago, IL, USA

Editorial postscript:

Needless to say, we do not necessarily share Nigel Short's views or opinions. As a columnist he is free to express

them in our pages. Just as our readers are free to vent their agreement or disagreement. We aim to be an open platform where there is room for differing views.

It is also tempting at this point to refer you to GM Erwin I'Ami's new column in our *Yearbook*, in which he presents interesting opening ideas from the world of correspondence chess. Here's a quote from his first column in *Yearbook* 126: 'Google's Alpha Zero may have destroyed Stockfish, but it wouldn't stand a chance against the best correspondence players out there.'

Socrates or Plato

According to Saravanan (*New In Chess* 2018/2), Vidit says he found it difficult to read Homer ('Tough!'), Aristotle and Socrates ('Too tough!!'). Reading Socrates isn't just tough – it's impossible. He wrote nothing. Our knowledge of Socrates comes mainly from Plato, but we have no idea how accurate Plato's version is.

Chris Holmes
St. Maur des Fossés, France

COLOPHON

PUBLISHER: Allard Hoogland
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:
Dirk Jan ten Geuzendam
HONORARY EDITOR: Jan Timman
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR: Anish Giri
EDITORS: Peter Boel, René Olthof
ART-DIRECTION: Jan Scholuis
PRODUCTION: Joop de Groot
TRANSLATORS: Ken Neat, Piet Verhagen
SALES AND ADVERTISING: Rimmelt Otten

PHOTOS AND ILLUSTRATIONS IN THIS ISSUE:
Alina I'Ami, Maria Emelianova,
Lennart Ootes, Neal Preston, Berend Vonk
COVER PHOTO: New In Chess

© No part of this magazine may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

NEW IN CHESS
P.O. BOX 1093
1810 KB ALKMAAR
THE NETHERLANDS

PHONE: 00-31-(0)72-51 27 137
SUBSCRIPTIONS: nic@newinches.com
EDITORS: editors@newinches.com
ADVERTISING: otten@newinches.com

WWW.NEWINCHESS.COM