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Space in **EG** is at a premium. Computer-related news and contributions show no sign of drying up. There is a serious backlog of awards - over 30. This poses a dilemma. Some awards are of poor quality, whether of the studies themselves or the judging thereof, and frankly do not deserve propagation in our pages. And, aside from their poor quality they take up further space (and Jürgen Fleck’s valuable time) in *Spotlight*. But to report selectively goes against the foundation policy of **EG** which has always been to reproduce awards with no omissions.

In good time some of these problems will find electronic solutions but what can be done *now*?

One option is drastically to curtail book reviews. In the past we tried to cover as much as possible that was newly published - on studies and on endgame material generally - in most major languages. We can no longer do this. For one thing, electronic media are too many and, let’s face it, often too ephemeral, to be covered at all.

So, book reviews will be severely curtailed. However, we do not intend to abandon them altogether. We shall be selective, with the selection being highly subjective with any lengthy review, and being otherwise curt.

Finally - for the moment, anyway - we hope to resume before long the irregular series of English translations of Russian articles published in the Soviet era and recommended in a list prepared for us by Genrikh Kasparyan shortly before his death. AJR welcomes suggestions (with accurate references, please) from any quarter for other articles to be translated.

One space problem **EG** does not have is a plethora of correspondence!

AJR

---

In another attempt to save space, **EG**'s editors decided to "publish" the zugzwang lists in electronic format. We apologize to those of our readers who don’t have a computer and can not read the diskette accompanying diskette. Printing the lists would take about as much paper as one year of **EG**, it simply wasn’t an option. On the diskette the files starting with K are sorted on (white) King position, the files starting with S are on Solution depth. The files contain lines of the six pieces followed by the results with WTM/BTM and a reference number to identify equal positions in the two sort orders.

**EG** wishes to thank Ken Thompson for supplying these zugzwang lists.

EvdG
Obituary

† Anatoly Grigorevich Kuznetsov (1932-2000) died in Moscow on his 68th birthday, July 23rd. There was never anyone quite like Tolya. Colourful and outspoken in his award judgements, in his annotations, and in his criticisms, he could be provocative and didactic, not to say insistent to the point of confrontation, in any situation that challenged him, and there were many such. But his motivation was the love of studies, to which he brought great knowledge, indefatigable dedication and formidable talent. His proselytising columns over many decades in Shakhmaty v SSSR (where he first attracted readers' attention in 1954 - distinguished from his namesake Al.P.Kuznetsov by his town name being in brackets), in Bulletin of the Central Chess Club of the USSR and in Shakhmatny Bulletin (and probably elsewhere) is the stuff of legend in his own country, though his minimal acquaintance with foreign languages and his reluctance to travel abroad or contribute to non-Soviet journals tended to stifle the legend's propagation. Just as he himself was influenced and nurtured by Science Academy's Boris Sakharov - they composed many studies together in the 1950s - so he in turn fathered and furthered the talent of pupils such as Kralin and Sumbatyan, from whom he received both admiration and loyalty. He was the natural captain of the victorious Soviet team (the Soviet organiser was Viktor Chepizhny) in the match against the Rest-of-the-World (to which EG134 was devoted), but could not resist intervening, if not actually interfering, as éminence grise to Yuri Averbakh's award (the IGM was one of the four judges), which was ludicrously delayed in being forwarded to Sweden, where the match was hosted. Such unilateral initiative may have been in the interests of good quality - at least in Kuznetsov's opinion - but it could also have influenced his non-selection as Soviet delegate to the FIDE PCCC. He lacked the desirable qualities of diplomacy present in those actually selected (prior to the present incumbent Ya.Vladimirov, namely Boris Sakharov, Igor Lyapunov, Viktor Chepizhny and Gia Nadareishvili. It is possible also that his work (nature unspecified) and residence location in Reutov, adjacent to Moscow on the eastern side and a restricted military zone, had some relevance. In any case his presence at the FIDE gathering at Tbilisi in 1975 was as unofficial as it was rare.

Tolya suffered increasing ill health in his last years. A large part of his stomach was removed in an operation from which he was not expected to recover. He did recover, but worse was to follow. He was fully aware of the deadly prognosis, but was witty to the last, remarking that if the grand design study he had been working on with Sumbatyan for five years (it is still unpublished) proved unsound despite all efforts by humans and computers, then at least he would be spared the disappointment of witnessing the demolition.
An all-male group of composers and solvers at the VIII Odessa Festival of Chess Composition held in 1990. Front row: Sergei N. Tkachenko, Valery Khortov, Leonid Topko, Anatoly Kuznetsov, Konstantin Sukharev, Nikolai Rezov, Viktor Razumenko. Standing: R.Ibulaev, Arkady Khait, Nikolai Mansarliisky, A.Davranyan, Nikolai Ryabinin, Vladislav Tarasiuk, Vladimir Vinichenko (and son). [Photographs of or including Tolya Kuznetsov are scarce. We thank S.N.Tkachenko for this one.]
The 43rd FIDE PCCC met at Pula (Croatia) 2-9ix2000

informal minutes of Studies subcommittee

The sub-committee met twice during the week 2-9ix2000, in the lobby of the Palma Hotel, Pula. Present: Yochanan Afek, Alexander Hildebrand, Nikolai Kralin, and John Roycroft (speaker). David Gurgenidze joined for the second meeting.

Agreement was reached on a 'study of the year' (selected for its potential for gaining new adherents) for 1995, 1996 and 1997, based on the 586 submissions for the current FIDE Album. Each judge had provided AJR with three candidates (Dobrescu and Hlinka beforehand, Kralin at Pula), and it was these that were evaluated by the subcommittee. Here are the selections, which it is hoped all chess journalists will give maximum publicity to in their outlets.

Study of the year - 1995
G. Slepian (Belarus)

Study of the year - 1996
O. Pervakov (Russia)

Study of the year - 1997
M. Matouš (Czech Republic)

Study of the year 1995, G. Slepian


Study of the year 1996, O. Pervakov
Rc7! Ba5/i 2.Bh8! a1Q+ 3.Bxa1 Sb3+ 4.Kxe2 Sxa1 5.Ra7 Bc3 6.Kf1 Kh2 7.Ra2/i and now:
- Be5 8.c3+ Kg3 9.Rxa1 Bxc3 10.Ra3 wins, or
- Kh1 8.Ra3 Ba5 9.Rxa5 wins, or

i) This move is the drawing reply to two alternative moves of the white rook on move 1, such as 1.Rg3? or 1.Rd3?
ii) This is claimed by the composer to be a position of 'reciprocal zugzwang', ie whoever has the move wishes he hadn't!
The studies should appear on several web sites - the more the merrier.
Several members of the sub-committee also agreed to respond as individuals
to a request from another subcommittee for suggestions for suitable theme for
the 7th WCCT, to be announced early in 2001. Any suggestions will be
provided by 30x32000.

**Situations**

or: Croatian **SNIPPETS**

1. 25 countries were represented in the FIDE PCCC by delegates. There were
no real controversies, though discussion did slow down towards the end.

2. The week - longer than a week for several participants - ran with practised
smoothness. An impression printed (with a few excusable errors!) in the
bulletin distributed at the final banquet should have read:
**Ten days in Pula is not enough. It is not enough for many reasons. A stroll up the coast (from the Histria Hotel) takes you in and out and up and down past a pleasantly confusing, but never tiring, assortment of coves, alcoves and sea vistas. And then there is Brijuni, with its trees oozing golden droplets of sap from between solidly reassuring ripples of bark. Brijuni is a place to sigh for. But I came to take an active part in an international gathering of the odd and esoteric clan of enthusiasts for chess composition. Such people delight in working hard. How does Pula suit them? The answer depends on the preparation and the welcome. The former was unostentatiously considerate, and the latter warm on every side. I shall be sorry and sad to leave.**

3. Pula has an imposing Roman amphitheatre. While we were being shown
round it I could have sworn I heard our informative guide refer to 'the pointed end of Roman Emperors'. It was only by paying more attention that I discovered she had said 'amphorae'.

4. An item to look forward to in Wageningen (Netherlands) in 2001 will be a
discussion of whether, in applications for the title of FIDE judge, any of the
six international judgements required in support of an application may be a
'quick composing' tourney award. The rules which the 'Qualifications'
subcommittee are bound by do not at present define 'international'.

5. The Open Solving and World Team Solving Championship events were
both run by Brian Stephenson (Sheffield) - and helpers - without a serious
hitch. Germany won the team event and Michel Caillaud, who admits to
being weak on studies, took the individual title.
6. No specific titles relating to studies were awarded.

7. There was one quick tourney for studies - a thematic tourney for fights of pawns against pieces - but the award (by Selivanov) did not get into the banquet document. It seems that the five honoured entries will be in a forthcoming issue of *Uralsky problemist*.

8. The venue in 2002 will be Portoroz (Slovenia), and in 2003 it will be Truskavets, a health resort in the Carpathian foothills of Western Ukraine. The PCCC, which has a reputation for conservatism, is certainly taking a plunge this time.

9. † Milenko Đukic 1923-1997. A composer of some hundred studies, and a violinist. He lived alone and died of natural causes in war-torn Osijek (Croatia) on the very last day of the year.

10. † Aleksandr Vasilevich Frolovsky 1947-1999. His modest output of around 20 studies was due to the care and attention he devoted to his hobby, and not to any paucity of creativity, attested by his high placings in both themes of the USSR vs Rest-of-the-World match.

11. FIDE Album 1995-1997 (studies) - see EG135 p123
The following batches were delivered to the section director (AJR) on the undernoted dates. The closing date was 30xi1999.
1ii2000 (postmark 22jan2000, Kharkov) Batch No.98 Samilo [3]
11ii2000 (postmark 22nov99, Erevan) Batch No.100 Amiryan [26]
23ii2000 (postmark 22nov99, St Petersburg) L and V Katsnelson etc. Batch No.101 [16]
6ix2000 (by hand at Pula) Batch No.102 Neidze [2]
Batches 99, 100 and 101 appear to have come by surface mail. Batch 102 had been mailed earlier but never arrived. The above five batches raise the total from 586 to 640. One of the three judges was present at Pula and agreed to accept them all for the triennial selection tourney, and on that basis AJR accepted them also on behalf of the other two judges. Thanks to the presence at Pula of reliable *ad hoc* couriers from Slovakia and Romania, all 640 entries should have been safely with the judges by the end of September. Let this not be a precedent!

AJR
19ix2000

204
Many thanks to Spotlight’s contributors Marco Campioli (Italy), Noam Elkies (USA/Israel), Luis Miguel González (Spain), Guy Haworth (Great Britain), Harold van der Heijden (Netherlands), Christopher Lutz (Germany), Axel Ornstein (Sweden), Alain Pallier (France), Jose Miguel Quesada (Spain), Michael Roxlau (Germany), W.G. Sanderse (Netherlands) and Peter Schmidt (Germany).

**EG 127**

No 10821, O. Pervakov. A dual: 6.Kd3 (PS) wins, too. The black bishop runs out of safe squares on the long diagonal after both 6.... Bf6 7.Rf7 Be5 8.Rf5 and 6.... Be5 7.Ra5 Bf6 8.Rf5. Now Black must play 8.... Bb2, but this allows 9.Rb5 Bf6 10.Rb1+ Kg2 11.c3 and wins. So Black should take on c2 at some point (it’s best to play 6.... Sxc2 straight away), but the database assures us that the arising ending rook vs knight is won for White.

**EG 135**


**EG 136**

M3, p.97, I. Alyoshin, B. Sevito. Unfortunately Noam Elkies’s attempt at saving this study by moving wK to g8 and adding a bS on g7 (see Spotlight EG 137) fails, as after 1.Be3 d1S 2.Bd2, Black draws by 2.... Kg6.

No 11499, B. Gusev. Spotlight’s editor’s analysis 2.... Kg7 3.Rh4 Kg6 (draw?) was quite off the mark: 4.Sd3 Kg5 5.Rh8 is a simple win for White.

No 11506, S. Radchenko. Unsound, there is a dual win by 1.h7 Kg6 2.Rg8+ Kh6 3.Rd8 (MQ), e.g. 3.... Rxa7+ (3.... f5 4.Kg8 Rxh7 5.Rd7 wins; 3.... Kg6 4.Kg8 Rg7+ 5.Kf8 Rxa7 6.Ke8 wins) 4.Kg8 Re7 (4.... Kg6 5.Rd7 Rxb2 6.Rg7+ Kf5 7.fe wins) 5.Rd6 Kg6 6.Kf8 Rh7 7.Ke8 Rh8+ (7.... Rxh2 8.e7 Rh8+ 9.Kd7 Ke7 10.Ke6 wins) 8.Kd7 Ra8 9.Rd5 and Black is left without counterplay, while White promotes his e-pawn (9.... Ra7+ 10.Ke8 Ra8+ 11.Rd8).
EG 137


No 11576, V.Dolgov. A dual: 6.Kh5 Ra2 7.Kh6 Rh2+ 8.Kg7 Nf5+ 9.Kg8 picks up the h-pawn and draws. It doesn’t help to make 4.... Rh2 the main line, as after 5.Re8 Rh3+ 6.Kg4 Re3 7.Rh8 Re4+ White has 8.Kh5, too (please note the tricky line 8.... Kg2 9.Rxh7 Kg3 10.g6? Sg8!, and all of a sudden Black wins). Moreover, there is no win for Black after 7.Ra8, when surprisingly Black has no constructive moves: 7.... Sf5 8.Ra5; 7.... Rh5 8.Ra1+ Kh2 9.Kg4; 7.... Rh4 8.Ra7; 7.... Kh2 8.Ra2+ Kh3 9.Ra1 and finally 7.... Rh3+ 8.Kg4 Re3 9.Rh8, which leads back to the intended solution.

No 11581, V.Razumenko. There is the dual 2.Kc8 g3+ 3.Kc7 Kf8 4.Bc4 Qh7+ 5.Kc8 Kh3+ 6.Kd8 and wins. However, AP draws attention to 82.5761 by the same author (wQa7 and bKe8, 1.Qb8+ Ke7 2.Qe5 etc), which looks like a correction.

No 11584, J.Rusinek. A misprint: the solution should read 5.... Ka1.

No 11587, N.Kralin. No solution, 1.... Qxf4 draws (2.e8Q Qg5+ 3.Kc8 Qc1+ etc.). It was the composer’s intention to play 2.Se5, but after the strong reply 2.... Qd4 I can’t see anything better than 3.Sd7, when Black has at least a draw by repetition.


No 11589, E.Dvizov. This is anticipated by A.Sadikov, «64» 1967 (22.1187) and «64» 1970 (29.1614). Unfortunately both studies were found unsound. Some years ago Spotlight’s editor tried to find an attractive and sound setting for the Sadikov, a task that turned out to be more difficult than expected, and after considerable analytical effort I came up with this: a4e3 0406.10 f5g3eh7.a6 3/4 = (Schuch 1997), 1.a7 (There are the tries 1.Rf7 and 1.Rc5, whose difficult analysis I spare to the readers) Rg1 (1.... Sxa7 2.Rf7 draw; 1.... Rg8 2.Rf7 Sg5 3.Rg7 draw) 2.a8Q Ra1+ 3.Kb5 Sd4+ 4.Kc4 Rxa8 5.Re5+ Kf4 6.Re7 Ra4+ 7.Kd3 Sf6 8.Re4+ Sxe4 stalemate.

No 11594, B.Jamnicki. Virtually identical with 116.9873 by the same author.

No 11608, J.Fleck/C.Lutz. A dual: 11.Rg8 (instead of the flashy 11.Rc7) wins, too. The study can be saved by promoting the line 10... c2 to the main line. After all, it is this line that makes the difference between 10.Kh6 and 10.Kh4.

No 11626, D.Gurgenidze. No solution: 2.... Kb8 draw.


No 11638, V.Kondratev. Many duals at the end: 6.Sg6; 7.Sg6 and 7.Sc6 all win.


No 11643, M.Hlinka. There is the dual 9.Kh2, but this does not look like a serious flaw to me.

VI-V6 p188ff. Vlasenko’s article was met with some amazement, as all the answers to his questions can simply be looked up on the Internet. Noam Elkies’s column in EG 136 mentions the two relevant Web sites by Ken Thompson, which form an inexhaustible source of interesting and curious information.

V3 p190 Y.Bazlov (#46.2804). The only study from this article that fell a prey to the 6-man-database. There are dual wins by 5.Se1 (27 half-moves) and 5.Sh4 (143 half-moves) and, well, the final mate in one is not unique, too.

U4 p194, Gh.Umnov. Completely anticipated by G.Amiryan, Sachove Umenie 1982, 2nd prize (81.5730), which arrives at Umnov’s initial position after 4 introductory moves.
As recently reported in this column and elsewhere, a growing list of 6-man endgame oracles can now be consulted on the Web, courtesy of Ken Thompson. This will surely produce a stream of cook reports affecting classic as well as recent studies. But the oracles can also help rebuild what they destroy, by confirming the soundness of corrected versions.

Consider Gorgiev’s classic study:
N1 T. Gorgiev, 1929

White to play and win

One of the less well-publicized results of Lewis Stiller’s 1992 work on six-man studies is that GBR class 0143 is a general win (and in at most 98 moves) with the Bishops on opposite colors. Many studies that depended on the assumption that this is a draw are thus cooked. With the 0143 oracle now available on the Internet, it turns out that the same-colored case, though generally drawn, can still be more dangerous for the weaker side than was realized. For instance, in N1, the intended solution 1.Bf6+ Kh7 2.Rg7+ Kh6 3.Rf7 Kg6 4.Rf8 Sc6 5.Bxd8 Kg7 6.Re8 Kf7 7.Rh8 Kg7 8.Bf6+ is the shortest win but not, it transpires, the unique one. 1.Ke2 also wins, though it takes White 18 more moves to reach a favorable conversion against best play (which starts 1...Sc6 2.Bf2! Kh7 3.Kf3 etc.). White can also play Ke2 at move 2, lengthening by 13 moves instead of 14.

There does not seem to be an easy correction of N1: the wK is needed on f1 to stop 1.Rd1(el) with an easy win. Many years after Gorgiev composed N1, the following improvement appeared:

N2 E. Pogosyants, 1985

White to play and win

Quite aside of the cooks of N1 (which were not known in 1985), the Pogosyants study improves on
Gorgiev's setting, using the same material to construct introductory play as clear as Gorgiev's but longer and more varied: 1.Bd4+ Kh6 2.Rf8 Se7 3.Rg7 Bd8 4.Bf6, and now Sc6 5.Bxd8 Nxd8 6.Rd7 and the Knight falls, so Kg6 and we reach Gorgiev. Black's alternatives at move 1 are easily dealt with, but lend further interest: 1...Kh7 2.Rf7+, or 1...Kg6 2.Rg1+ and 3.Rg7+. Alas the oracle finds a new cook: 2.Rf7. Black holds on for a while with 2...Bd6 (Bg3/a5 3.Rg7 Bf2/b6 4.Ba1 is easy), but then 3.Kg2 (unique move) wins, albeit 14 moves later than the intended solution with best play (which begins 3...Kh5 4.Rg7 Se7 5.Be3 Sg6 6.Kf3 Se5+ 7.Ke4 Sg4 8.Bd2(c1) Bf8 9.Rg5+ Kh4 10.Ra5(b5)).

Fortunately, this time the cook is easy to remove. wK needs to be on a light square far from the scene of action; h1 is just barely not far enough, but bl is safe. There is one difficulty: like Gorgiev, Pogosyants used wK to block wR, and shifting the wK allows a new, easy cook: 2.Rh1+ Kg6 3.Rg1+ Kh7 4.Rg7+, as in the side-variation 1...Kg6. But here this is easily fixed: put wR on f2, so the h-file check is prevented by Bc7, and then move the wK to b1. According to the oracle, the resulting study is sound. Net-connected readers may check this for themselves, starting from the URL

http://plan9.bell-labs.com/magic/eg/wkb1wrf2wbc5bkg7bbc7bng8
At each step of the main line, all White’s alternatives get a 9999, the code for a drawn position.

Now that the position is correct, it remains only to describe its authorship -- is it “Pogosyants 1985, after Gorgiev, version by NDE/*C* 1999”?

Prygunov sends a study culminating with a model mate administered by K+3S:

No 11645 V.I. Prygunov, Original (1998)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{e6f3} 0012.23 6/4 \text{Win}
\end{array}
\]


The composer gave no variations; the following analysis, and the soundness of the entire study, are confirmed as usual by Harold van der Heijden:

i) Acquiescing in the elimination of the h2-pawn in order to get play with the a-pawn. If 1...Ke3/g4
2.Sf1+e4 is easy. 1...Ke2 2.Se4 Kxe1 3.Sg3 Kf2 4.Sh1+ Kg2 5.Sxf wins, or here 3...a3 4.Sxf6 a2 5.g7 a1Q g8Q and if Qa2+ 7.Kf5 Qxg8 8.Sxg8 then 9.Kg4 holds the Sg3. Finally 1...Kg2 2.Sxf6 h1Q 3.g7 Qxe1+ (Qh3+ 4.Kf7 and Black is already out of checks) 4.Sfe4 and Black is helpless against 5.Qg6. ii) For 6.Sd4? Kxg6, drawn since W cannot both block f-pawn and capture a-pawn for a Troitzky win. Moves other than 5...Kh5 lose quickly to 6.Sd4. iii) Not yet 7.g7 Kg4! and White cannot hold on to both Knights: 8.Sd4 a1Q 9.Sxf6+ Kh3 10.Qg8Q Qxd4, or 8.Sd2 a1Q 9.Sxf6+ when simplest is Kf5 (HvdH) 10.Qg8Q Qe6+ drawing. iv) 9.Qg8Q Qa2+ draws, while 9.Sg4+ Kh5 10.Sf6+ Kg6 makes no progress. As with Pogosyants’s N2, the conclusion is known -- also with g5 self-blocked rather than held by a third Knight -- but the introductory play, and final position with minimal Black force, give Prygunov’s study an independent existence. Compare with the following two examples, extracted by HvdH from his database of studies. One, over a century old, is a miniature by P.Farago ("Pesti Naplo 1899(?)):

Kf7,Se4,Se7,g7/Kh6,Qh3,Bc8; Win by 1.g8Q Kh5 2.Sg6+ Kh6 (Kh4 3.Sg6#) 3.Seg8#, curiously with Sg8 not the promoted Knight.

Unfortunately, 1...Kh7 gives White several ways to force mate on move 3, and the bBe8 looks superfluous (even without it 1.g8Q? Kb3+ is a draw). The other example is G.Zakhodiakin’s study ("Shakhmaty Listok 1930 (2500#0274)"):

Kb8,Se2,b6,b7/Ka6,Bd1,d3,f4; Win by 1.Sc3 f2 2.Kc7 flQ 3.b8K + Ka5 4.Sc6+ Ka6 5.b7, and to compensate for the extra Black men, Black here has a free move, but still has no good way to stop 6.b8K#.
- if they had a 'favourite' piece, it was there on the board, and if they preferred draws to wins they could choose a draw. For his part the judge imagined that he could see, compare and contrast, from the studies submitted, the minds of composers at work on a challenging task. The judge hopes that composers themselves, both those who competed and those who did not, will also be able to imagine themselves transported into the working minds of others. A final thought: this event, which the judge was most pleased to be invited to play a part in, provides good evidence that the miniature study is far from exhausted.

It is in vi2000 not clear how much of the judge's award has already been published. The question of 'ownership' and 'publication rights' of studies entered for formal competitions arises acutely in this case. It is therefore possible that some of the studies below should have been, and may have been, returned to their composers - but AJR considers this unlikely. EG's aim in publishing this complete award is to highlight this question for discussion and even, resolution (!). Simplest would be for an award to be published (somewhere) in full and distributed to all participants. This was the 1993 recommendation by the FIDE PCCC Studies Subcommittee (see EG11 supplement, 1994). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, unpublished submissions revert (for preference, sent physically) to their composers.

The judge's placings of all 17 distinct and undemolished entries were as follows, with his comments.

First:

No 11646 Yuri Roslov

```
\text{\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
a7g8 & 3133.10 & 3/4 Draw \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}}
```


"All men participate (thereby interpreting the theme as the theme-setting judge hoped it would be) and the whole board is used - throughout the eventful play. Everything is fresh. As the composer points out, at the end neither side can afford to accept the proffered sacrifices."
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Second:

No 11647 Oleg Pervakov

- Qg4 4.Sb3+ (Rd4? Qg1;+ Kc2(5.Sc5+ Kc1 6.Sd3+ Kd2 7.Sf2(Se5)+ and 8.Sxg4, or

"Again the whole board is used and there are touches of originality. We hope that the composer's claim of a positional draw (see second diagram) will hold water under the computer's microscope."

Third:

No 11648 Sergei Tkachenko

  i) Black threatens to play Qf6+;
  i) 1.Kxg8(Kg7)? Qg5+ 2.Kh8 Qf6+. 1.Bh5+? Qxh5, and 2.Rxg8+ Kf7 3.Rg7+ Kf6 4.Rf7+ Kg6 5.Kg8 Qd5 6.h8=S+ Kh6 wins, or 2.Rg5 Qh4 3.Rg4 Qh3 4.Rg3 Qh2 5.Rg2 Qe5+ 6.Kxg8 (Rg7,Sc6) Qe7 7.h8=S Qe6+ 8.Kg7 Qe5+ 9.Kh7 Qe4+ 10.Rg6 Kf8 wins.

iii) 5.Kg7? Se7 6.Rd6+ Kxd6 7.h8Q Sf5+ wins.


"The vivid interaction of the pieces cannot fail to impress. The only drawbacks when comparing with the two studies placed ahead of it are (a) that the whole board is not used, and (b) a piece is sacrificed on the first move. A tempting try compensates for the capture, but some supporting variations are not as straightforward as one could wish."

Fourth:

No 11649 N.Mansarliisky and S.Tkachenko

```
g6d2 3131.10 4/3 Draw
```


i) 1.Rxg1? Qg8+ 2.Kf6 Qxg1? 3.c7 Qc5 4.Ke6 Kc2 5.Kd7 Qxd5+ 6.Kc8 is indeed a draw, but 2...Qxd5 wins!


iii) As David Sedgwick was quick to point out at the CESC meeting in October 1999, this is a position of mutual zugzwang. 5.Ke6? Kd4 6.Kd7 Qxd5+ 7.Kc8 Ke5 8.Kb8 Kb6 wins.

iv) Qc6?? 6.Sb4+. Or Kc4 6.c8Q Qxc8 7.Sb6+

"A very good study, and with an excellent try, but the early capture disappoints from the thematic standpoint."

Fifth:

No 11650 Leonard Katsnelson

```
b1a5 1331.01 3/4 Win
```


i) 1.Qd5?? Kb6 2.Qd6+ Kb7 3.Qxh2 (Qc7+;Ka8;) Rb4+ 4.Kc1
Bxe8. "b7 and a8 are drawing squares for bK."

ii) Ka6 2.Sc7+ and 3.Qxh2.


iv) Ka4 3.Qxh2 Bxe8 4.Qa2+ picks up a piece.


"Two captures militate (in this thematic tourney) again against the all-board play."

Sixth:

No 11651 Nikolai Veliky and Evgeny Samotugov

f6d8 3113.01 3/4 Draw


i) Ke8 3.Re7+ Kf8 4.Rf7+ Kg8 5.Rg7+ Kh8 6.Rh7+ draw.


"An unexpected domination finale (6.Ra8!) has to compete against captures and forced checking play."

Seventh:

No 11652 Ivan Bondar

h5a5 3113.10 4/3 Draw

No 11652 Ivan Bondar (Brest region) 1.Bc7+ Ka4 2.Ra6+ Kb5 3.Rb6+ Kc4 4.Re6+ Kd3 5.Rd6+ Ke2 6.Re6+ Kf1 7.Re1+ Kg2 (Kxe1;Bg3) 8.Rg1+ Kxg1 9.Bb6 Qxb6 10.f8Q draw.

"Very neat - wB supplies an echo with 8.Bg3! and 9.Bb6! - in fact the best of the entries that invoked serial R-checking. bSh8 spectates."

Eighth:

No 11653 V.Sichev

h7f1 3111.01 4/3 Win

No 11653 V.Sichev (Minsk) 1.Rf7+ Kg1 2.Se2+ Kh2 3.Bg3+ Kh3 4.Rg7 Qb1+ 5.Kh8 wins.

"All men participate in a coordinated manner. The Sf4 checkmate is satisfying."
Ninth:
No 11654 N.Rezvov and S.N.Tkachenko

h1d7 3311.10  4/3 Win

No 11654 N.Rezvov and S.N.Tkachenko (Odessa) 1.e8Q+ Kc7 (Kxd6; Ba3) 2.Qf7+ Kb6 3.Bd4 Qxd4 4.Qb3+ Kc5 5.Sb7 mate.
i) 2.Qe7+ Kb6 3.Qa7+ Ka6 4.Qc5+ Kb6

"The very pleasing checkmate picture does not quite make amends for the succession of checks and the queen promotion spoiling the thematic impression."

Tenth:
No 11655 V.Bartosh

No 11655 V.Bartosh (Minsk)
1.Sc7+, with:
- Kd6 2.Ra6+ Ke5 3.a8Q Qf8+

"The minus is the early promotion in the first line, disrupting the set theme; the plus is the gymnastic black queen and the protracted manoeuvre for escaping the checks."

Eleventh:
No 11656 Aleksandr Frolovsky and Andrei Zhuravlyov

c8e6 3131.10  4/3 Win

No 11655 V.Bartosh

No 11656 Aleksandr Frolovsky and Andrei Zhuravlyov (Tula) 1.Sc4 (for Ra4+) Ka2 2.Ke6, with:
Ka8 9.Sb6 mate, or
- f2 3.Se3+ and mates, not
i) 3.Sd2+? Ka3 4.Rh3+ Ka4
"The checkmating potential of
unaided rook, bishop and knight
against a restrained king is well
illustrated. Unfortunately, however
accurate such play is, it is usually
short on artistic flavour. The study
placed eighth is therefore preferred.
We envy the echoed bat-
tery-creation with 2.Be6 and
7.Be7."

Twelfth:
No 11657 Aleksandr Frolovsky

![Diagram](image)

e3h8 3111.01 4/3 Win
No 11657 Aleksandr Frolovsky
(Tula) 1.Sg5, with:
- Qc8 (Qg4;Sf7+) 2.Sf7+/i Kg8
- Qg3 2.Rh7+/iii Kg8 3.Be4+
Kf8 4.Rf7+ Ke8 5.Bb5+ Kd8
and Ka8 9.Sc7+, or Kc8 9.Rg7+
wins, or
- Qg2 2.Rh7+ Kg8 3.Bc4+ Kf8
Kc8 7.Ba6+ Kb8 8.Rb7+ Ka8/v
9.Sc7 mate.
ii) Kh8 4.Rh7 mate is the first of
several pure checkmates.
iii) 2.Sf7+? Kg7?? 3.Sd6+ Kf8
4.Rb8+ and 5.Sf5+, but also
2...Kg8 3.Sh6+ Kf8 4.Rb8+??
Qxb8.
iv) Kg8 5.Rd7+ and Kh8 6.Rh7
mate, or Kf8 6.Sh7+ Ke8 7.Sf6+
Kf8 8.Rf7 mate.
"See remarks on the ninth
placement. No judge likes to be
asked to choose between versions
of the same idea from the same
composer or composers."

Thirteenth:
No 11658 S.Abramenko

![Diagram](image)
b1e8 1313.10 4/3 BTM, Win
No 11658 S.Abramenko
(Volgograd) 1...Rb2+ 2.Kc1
(Ka1,Rb1+; Rb1+ 3.Kc2 Rb2+
Rb1+ 7.Kf2 Rfl+ 8.Kxf1 Sd2+
"One cannot point to much
originality here, but the overall
effect is of a nice study in three
neat phases. Thematically, the exchanges work negatively."

Fourteenth:
No 11659 V.Maksaev

No 11659 V.Maksaev (Volgograd)
1.Sd5+ Kf3 2.Rc3+ e3 3.Rxe3+ Kg2 4.Kg4, with:
   - Qa2 5.Rg3+/i Kh2 6.Rh3+ Kg2
   7.Sf4+/ii Kf1 8.Rh1 mate, or
   - Qf7 5.Sf4+/ii Kf1 6.Rf3+ Ke1
   7.Sd3(Sg2) wins.
   i) 5.Sf4+? Kf1 6.Rf3+ Ke1 7.Sd3+ Kd1
       8.Rxa2 stalemate.
   ii) 5.Rg3+? Kh2 6.Rh3+ Kg2
   "Too many checks for a higher placing. But not a bad study!"

Fifteenth:
No 11660 S.Latish

No 11660 S.Latish (Murmansk)
1.f8Q/i Sxf8 (Qc6+;Rg6) 2.Be5+ Qxe5 3.Rh1+ (Rg2+? Kh3;) Kg2
   4.Rg1+ Kf2 5.Rf1+ Ke2 6.Rf1+ Kxe1 stalemate.
   i) 1.Kg7? Qf4 2.Ba7 Qf6+ 3.Kg8 Qa6 wins. 1.Rg4? Kh3 2.Kg5 Sf8
       3.Rf4 Sh7+ wins.
   "Old-style sacrifices previse a desperado rook finish."

Sixteenth:
No 11661 S.Latish

No 11661 S.Latish (Murmansk)
1.b6+/i Qxb6 2.Bd4 Qxd4 3.Ra8+ Kb7 (Kb6;Rb8+) 4.Rb8+ Kc7
   5.Rc8+ Kd7 6.Rd8+ Kxh8 stalemate.
   i) 1.Bd4+? Kb7 2.Kb4 (Kb2,Se2;)
   "See the remarks to the study placed twelfth."
Seventeenth:

No 11662 Nikolai Veliky and Evgeny Samotugov

h2g4 3131.10 4/3 Draw

No 11662 Nikolai Veliky and Evgeny Samotugov (Kiev) l.Rd4+ (Rxc8? Qe5+;) Kh5 2.Rd5 Bf5 3.Rxf5 Qxf5 4.g4+, with Qxg4 5.Sf6+ or Kxg4 5.Sh6+.

"In the style of the early 19th century English composer Bone. But one cannot help liking it - the whole supporting cast vanishes in the course of the action on stage!"

John Roycroft
London, 8x99 and 23vii2000

Bron-90MT, 1999

This formal international was judged by Viktor Kalyagin (Ekaterinburg).
The award is published in Uralsky problemist 3(23)/2000 vii2000.
36 studies by 27 composers entered. Judge's report: "In my view those who maintain that there never were composers in the past, just as there never were diplomats, are right. Bron was not only a human being with a capital H, but a personality all in capitals. He was the sort whose excellence is patent and benevolent. Study composers like Bron are as basic to us as air. His studies had a grounding in Russia in which can be heard remote and eternal resonances - in the contemporary study one has to whirl like a propeller to come up with anything the least bit piquant. The sensational is largely history, it's so rare now. .... As regards the award, it was so hard to separate by standard that the decision was taken to split into two sections - wins and draws." AJR: A coward's way out - and artificial, failing to address the core judging dilemma when facing the evaluation of non-overlapping qualities. AJR apologises for blemishes in his translations of the judge's hyper-idiomatic Russian.

I: section for wins

No 11663 M.Roxlau (Germany)
1st prize Bron-90MT

h5h8 4334.63 9/8 Win

No 11663 Michael Roxlau (Germany) "Looks like a typically tiresome middle-game. But we are

i) Qb8 6.e3 Bb1 7.Qd5 wins.


iii) "One gets away with bare-faced impudence only if tempered with a dose of caution."

iv) 12.f5? Bf3 13.Qf7 Qd8+ 14.Ke5 Qb8+ is a draw. "The volte-face has been so sudden that Black must have felt like having a tooth pulled. The monster middle-game has been transformed sweetly into nothing more intimidating than a pawns endgame. It only remains to congratulate the German composer on his first rate achievement, both in the competitive and creative contexts."

No 11664 Nikolai Kralin (Moscow)
1.Rb1+? Ka8 2.Kxa4 Rxe5 is a draw. 1.Qb4+ Ka8 2.Qxa4 Qf7/i 3.Kb6+ Kb8 4.Qa8+ Kxa8 5.Sb4+/ii, with:


ii) "The softening-up artillery barrage has left behind a couple of neat craters..." iii) Qa7+ 6.Rxa7+ Kb8 7.Sc6+ Kc8 8.Rc7+.

iv) The judge comments: "We don’t envy the solver having to find this move!"

No 11665 V.Vlasenko
3rd prize Bron-90MT

No 11664 N.Kralin (Moscow)
2nd prize Bron-90MT
5/6 Win

No 11665 Valery Vlasenko
both 10...Sa7 stalemate? and 10...Sd4? Sc8+, while 11...KxS wins against 10...Sc6 and 10...Sb5.


i) "A bishop gets the better of the opposition with great economy of effort."

No 11666 A. Bezgogkov
1st honourable mention Bron-90MT

No 11667 V. Kalashnikov
2nd hon. mention Bron-90MT

No 11668 M. Roxlau
3rd hon. mention Bron-90MT

---

Anatoly Bezgogkov (Ukraine). Not 1.Sg3+? Sxg3 2.Ba8 Be2, but 1.Sf2+ exf2 2.Ba8 Be3+


---

Michael Roxlau "It's no easy task to ram through the Great Wall of China, as we can see from:

Kxa7 2.Rxh5 Kb7, or 1.Rb3? Kxa7
drawing every time." So to the
solution: 1.Ra3 Rxh3 2.Bb8 Sc4
3.Sd5 Kb7 4.Kd8 a4/i 5.a8Q+
and ll.Sc6 mate, finally clearing
up the matter of the choice of first
move.

No 11669 E.Iriarte
special hon. mention Bron-90MT

No 11670 A.Bezgodkov and
V.Samilo
commendation Bron-90MT

Kxa7 2.Rxh5 Kb7, or 1.Rb3? Kxa7
drawing every time." So to the
solution: 1.Ra3 Rxh3 2.Bb8 Sc4
3.Sd5 Kb7 4.Kd8 a4/i 5.a8Q+
and ll.Sc6 mate, finally clearing
up the matter of the choice of first
move.

No 11669 E.Iriarte
special hon. mention Bron-90MT

h8a8 4681.64 11/10 Win
No 11669 Eduardo Iriarte
(Argentina) 1.Be4 Rf8+/i 2.Kg7
Rg8+ 3.Kh6/ii Rh8+/iii 4.Kg5
Rg8+ 5.Kh4 Rh8+ 6.Kxg3 Rh3+
Rh2+ 10.Kc1 Rh1+ 11.Kb2 Rh2+
17.Ke1 Rbl+ 18.Kf2 Rb2+
19.Kg3/iv Rg2+ 20.Kh4 Rh2+
i) d5 2.Bxd5 Rf8+ 3.Kh7 d6+
4.Kh6 Rh8+ 5.Kg5 Rg8+ 6.Kf4
Rf8+ 7.Kxg3 Rf3+ 8.Kh4 Rh3+
9.Kg5 wins.
ii) A tough choice. Consider:
6.Bxb7+ Rxb7+ 7.Kf8 gxh2, or
iii) Rg6+ 4.Kh5 d5 5.Bxd5 Rc6
21.Kg3 Rh3+ draw.
"The Argentine composer took this
honour for the best analytical study
submitted."

No 11670 A.Bezgodkov and
V.Samilo
commendation Bron-90MT

No 11670 Anatoly Bezgodkov and
Vladimir Samilo (Ukraine). 1.Rh2+
Bg2 2.Rxg2+ Kfl 3.Bh5/i Bxg5+
Kd3 7.Rd5+/ii exd5 8.d7 Rh1+
Re1+ 12.Kd6, and victory at long
last.
Rh1+ draw.
"This corrects the composers' 1996
piece in III S.Belokon MT by shif-
ting the final position one file to the right."

No 11671 A.Manyakhin
commendation Bron-90MT

a5a1 0110.02

No 11671 Aleksandr Manyakhin
(Lipetsk). To hurdle stalemate
obstacles White fabricates a
2.Kxc4+ Kc1, but: 1.Ka4 c3 2.Kb3
c2 3.Rc7/ii Kb1 4.Bd3 (Rxc2?
a1S+;) a1Q 5.Rxc2 Qd4 6.Rc3+
Kc1 7.Rc1 mate, "and bK has
failed to give White the slip despite
two underpromotions in tries."

i) Kb1 3.Bd3+ c2 4.Bxc2+ Ka1

ii) 3.Ra7? c1S+, but not c1Q?

No 11672 M.Pastalaka
commendation Bron-90MT

No 11672 M.Pastalaka. 1.Bh1 e4
2.a6 Bxa6 3.Sxa6 e3, after which
the rest is straightforward - and
familiar: 4.Sc5+ Ke2 5.Se4 Kfl
6.Sd5 Kg1 7.Sg3 e2/ii 8.Sf4 e1Q
9.Sh3 mate.


Il: section for draws

No 11673 B.Olympiev
1st prize Bron-90MT

c4c8 0700.10 3/3 Draw

No 11673 Bronislav Olympiev
(Russia). 1.h7 Rh6 2.Kb5/i Rh5+
Rh5+ 6.Kc6 Rh6+ 7.Kc5 Kd8
8.Rf8+ Kc7 9.Rf7+ Kc8 10.Rg7
Kd8 11.Rg8+ Kc7 12.Rg7+ Kc8
15.Kb6 Rh6+ 16.Kb5 Rb8+
Kd8/iv 20.Rf8+ Kc7 21.Rf7+ Kc8
22.Rg7 Kd8 23.Rg8+, "and it turns
out that the kernel of this positional
draw is rock solid while the web of
its articulation is irreproachable. All
in the composer's best style!"

i) 2.Kb4? Rh5 3.Rg7 Rb8+ 4.Kc4
Kd8 5.Rg8+ Kc7 6.Rg7+ Kb6
7.Rg8 Kb7 8.Rg7+ Ka8 9.Kc3 Rh4
Rh8 wins.
ii) 13.Re7? Ra8 14.Kb5 Kd8
15.Rg7 Rc8 16.Rg8+ Ke7. And
13.Ra7? is no better: Kd8 14.Rg7
(Kd5,Rb5+) Rc8+ 15.Kd5 Ke8
16.Rg8+ Kd7 17.Rg7+ Kd8 18.Rf7
Ke8 19.Rg7 Rd8+ 20.Ke5 Kf8
21.Rg8+ Ke7 22.Rg7+ Ke8 23.Ra7
Kf8, "when this fascinating sys-
tematic movement of four pieces
has worked out with Black on top -
an out-of-this-world example of
Urals tracery ornamentation
splintered only by White’s main
line move 13".
22.Ke5 Re1+ 23.Kf5 Rh6 24.Rg8+
is a draw.

No 11674 V. Vlasenko
2nd prize Bron-90MT

b2g6 0441.23 6/6 Draw

No 11675 Vl. and L. Katsnelson
3rd prize Bron-90MT

"Fanned by the distinctive creative
spirit of the fraternal duo, the con-
cept takes us aback with the
audacity of the treatment."

Sa6+ 5.Kb6 Sc4+, with one of
those technical wins.
"As so often with V. Vlasenko there
is a good idea with fine construc-
tion and elegant play, all in superb
disguise."
**No 11676** E. Eilazyan
4th prize Bron-90MT

(Left Diagram)

*game 2c6 0741.11 5/5 Draw*

**No 11676** Eduard Eilazyan
(Ukraine).


"Despite White's 'electric knight' doing his own, not-so-simple, positional draw thing - even threatening checkmate after three moves - after move 7 Black is intriguingly left with an extra rook."

**No 11677** A. Manyakhin
1st honourable mention Bron-90MT

(Right Diagram)

*game a3e1 0440.11 4/4 Draw*

**No 11677** Aleksandr Manyakhin.


The judge's allusion: "In the spirit of Fantomas!" eludes us - is this a cartoon character?

**No 11678** P. Rossi
2nd hon. mention Bron-90MT

*game b3e7 4040.11 4/4 BTM, Draw*

**No 11678** Pietro Rossi (Italy).

doubt of interest to specialists in such things! 


iii) 11.Kc2? Kg3 12.Kf1 Kxf3. "We like wB’s surprise démarche. The forlorn wP, scornfully left standing by Black in the overture, gloriously makes his mark later on."

No 11679 B.Sidorov 
3rd hon mention Bron-90MT

b2b5 4633.28 4/4 Draw

No 11680 M.Kalashnikov and M.Kormiltshev (Russia) 1.Qc5+ Kxc5 2.c8Q+ Kd4 3.Qc3+ dxc3+ 4.Ka1 Qf3 5.exf3 Rg1 6.f4 Rg5 7.fxg5 Rg1 8.gxf6 Rg7 9.fxg7 c1Q 10.gxh8Q+ Kd3 11.Qd4+ Kxd4 stalemate.

No 11681 A.Sadykov commendation Bron-90MT

b7g4 3270.20 6/4 Draw

"A smart position that is Nadareishvili's trademark, but shifted one rank down, revealing new possibilities."

"Celebrating his 65th anniversary the composer pursues with astonishing zeal his favourite finales, inching and winching up the lock-gates of black defensive bastions."

[Don't blame AJR for this, he's only the translator!]

No 11682 B.Sidorov
commendation Bron-90MT

\[\text{e6d8 3111.15 5/7 Draw} \]

No 11682 B.Sidorov. 1.Sb7+ Kc7
2.Rf7+ Kc6 3.Sa5+/i Kb5 4.g5
Qxg5 5.Rb7+ Kxa5 6.Bb6+ Kb5
Kb5 10.Rb7+ Kc6 11.Rc7+ Kb6
12.Re7+, positional draw. The two white batteries set up during the play - indeed, they are reversed - are worth a second look.

i) 3.g5? Qxg5 4.Sa5+ Qxa5.

No 11683 S.Tkachenko
commendation Bron-90MT

\[\text{g3a8 0610.44 6/7 Draw} \]

No 11683 S.N.Tkachenko (Odessa), not S.I.Tkachenko, we presume.

1.c7 Rc8 2.h8Q Rxe8 3.Bxe8 Ra6+ 4.Kh3 Rg8 5.b6 Rxh8 6.Kh4 d6

i) 4.Kh4? Rg8 5.b6 Rxh8, puts the zugzwang where Black wants it.

No 11684 A.Jasik
special commendation Bron-90MT

\[\text{d5h1 4174.01 5/6 Draw} \]

No 11684 Andrzej Jasik (Poland).

EG corrects the initial 'F' in the source. White, pushed for something better than: 1.Rh8+? Sh3
2.Qd1 Qtf7+ 3.Ke5 Qg7+ 4.Kf5
Qg5+ 5.Ke6 Qg6+ 6.K- d1Q wins,
finds: 1.Sb4 b1Q/i 2.Bc6, with:
- Qb6 3.Kd6+ Qe4 4.Rh8+ Sh3 5.Rxh3+ Bxh3 6.Qh2+ Kxh2 stalemate, or
- Qc7 3.Kc5+ Qe4 4.Rxg1+ Kxg1 5.Qf2+ Kxf2 stalemate.
i) Qf7+ 2.Kd6 Qxg8 3.Bc6+ Bg2 4.Qh6+ Sh3 5.Qxh3+ Kg1 6.Qe3+ Kh2 7.Qh6+ Kg3 8.Qe3+ Kg4 9.Bd7+ and White is OK!
"A pair of sculpted stalemates. Of course this is not so novel and there are blemishes obvious to the naked eye. The 'special' honour is for audacity in tackling something so complex."

Zadachy i etyudy, 1996

This tourney was judged by A.Hildebrand (Sweden). 18 studies entered, of which 8 were found defective

No 11685 P.Arestov prize Zadachy i etyudy 1996

"To my mind this was the only contender with content satisfying today's requirements. True, a pure mate is no longer a requirement, but just an embellishment. What counts here is the tactical construction: black counterplay, forks, a battery, stalemate avoidance, sacrifice and counter-sacrifice, and so on. To add to this is the play is lively, despite some passivity on the part of the black force."

No 11686 B.Sidorov
1st HM Zadachy i etyudy 1996

Not complex, but the construction with its two thematic variations is mid-board mate.
"To my mind this was the only contender with content satisfying today's requirements. True, a pure mate is no longer a requirement, but just an embellishment. What counts here is the tactical construction: black counterplay, forks, a battery, stalemate avoidance, sacrifice and counter-sacrifice, and so on. To add to this is the play is lively, despite some passivity on the part of the black force."

No 11686 B.Sidorov
1st HM Zadachy i etyudy 1996

1) Kg7 3.Bf7 Kxf7 4.Sh6+ Ke6 5.Sg4 Sb6 6.Sf2 draw, or
"Not complex, but the construction with its two thematic variations is
pleasing. The minor promotion and the try trim it out. A successful piece by the composer from Krasnodar.

No 11687 B. Sidorov and V. Shanshin
2nd HM Zadachy i etudy 1996

No 11687 B. Sidorov and V. Shanshin (Kirgizia)
1. Rb6+ Ka4
Bc5+ 5. Kd3 a1Q 6. Sc3+ Ka5
7. Rb1 Qa3 8. Rb3 Qc1 9. Rb1 Qa3
10. Rb3 Qxb3 stalemate, the pinning of the knight being the result of the far-seeing 2. Rb1!
i) 2. Rxb7? would fail because without Bg3 there is nothing for White to take advantage of.
ii) Bc5+ 3. d4 Bxa7 4. Rxb7 draw.
"A study with a familiar logical effect - the bSg3 lure and the stalemate finale with pinned knight. Not at all bad. And there are white moments (2. Rb1!). Sad that there is no black counterplay."

No 11688 S. Berlov
1st comm Zadachy i etudy 1996

No 11688 S. Berlov (St Petersburg)
1. Sc3/i h5/ii 2. Ke5, with:
- g2 3. Se2 g1Q 4. Sxg1 Kxg1
5. Kf4 Kg2 6. e5 h4 7. e6 h3 8. e7 h2
9. e8Q h1Q 10. Qe2 wins, or
g2 6. Se2 wins.
i) 1. Se3? g2 2. Sxg2 Kxg2 3. e5 h5
4. e6 h4 5. e7 h3 6. e8Q h2 draw.
ii) g2 2. Se2 g1Q 3. Sxg1 Kxg1
4. Ke5 h5 5. Kf4 wins. Or Kg2
"Neatly constructed, with try and straightforward solution. I could not trace a serious anticipation, but I cannot rule out the existence of one. Partial anticipations, though, there are. As they say, 'where there's no fish a crab will serve'."

No 11689 L. Katsnelson (St Petersburg)
1. Rb6+ Ka4
(Kc4; Re6+) 2. Kxc2 g2 3. Kb1 g1Q+
4. Ka2 Qf2 5. g5/i e3 6. g6 exd4 7. g7
(Rb7? Qc2;) Qg2 8. Rb8 d3 9. Rb6/i
d2(e2) 10. b3 mate.
i) 5. Rb7? Qc2 6. g5 e3.
ii) Note the zugzwang. 9. g8Q?
Qxg8 10. Rxg8 Kb4.
"A focus theme. The solution has a forcing character with little black counterplay or other subtleties, so that the impression left is mechanical. A modest product from the respected composer."

**No 11689** L.Katsnelson
comm Zadachy i etudy 1996

```
c1b4 0100.35
```

Zadachy i etudy, 1997

This informal international tourney was judged by L.Katsnelson (St Petersburg). 35 studies by 21 composers entered.

**No 11690** A.Manvelyan
1st prize Zadachy i etudy 1997

```
a2a5 0340.13
```

**No 11690** A.Manvelyan (Armenia)
1.Bc7+ Kb4 2.b8Q/i Be4+/i

```
"A study with the quality of Armenian songs: maximum expression with minimum means. Black's counterplay is of interest and both sides prominently sacrifice. The building of the stalemate is unconstrained, and then White conjures it into checkmate."

**No 11691** V.Prigunov
2nd prize Zadachy i etudy 1997

```
h1f2 0314.53
```

**No 11691** V.Prigunov (Kazan)
1.f8Q Sf6/i 2.Qe7 Rh5 3.f7 Sxh4
4.Qe3+ Kxe3 5.Sxd5+ Rxd5 6.f8Q
Rd1+/ii 7.Kh2 Sf3+ 8.Kh3 Rh1+
20.Ba4 wins.
i) Re4 2.Qxd6 Sf3 3.Qc5+ Kg3
4.Qc7 wins.
"A two-phase study on the grand scale. In the first White just manages to sweep the feet from under Black's attack, at the cost of two promoted queens and a knight. The second phase is at a steadier pace - in it the bishop gets the better of the knight."

No 11692 G.Nekhaev
3rd prize Zadachy i etyudy 1997

No 11693 A.Manvelyan
1st HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997
black counterplay."

No 11694 Ivan Bondar
2/3 HM Zadachy i etudy 1997

\[ \text{b5d5 0500.11} \quad 4/3 \text{ BTM, Draw.} \]

No 11694 Ivan Bondar (Belarus)
1...Rb2+ 2.Ka4 a2 3.Rd2+ Ke5
(Rxd2;Kb3) 4.Rc2+ Kd5/i 5.Rd2+
Ke5 6.Re2+ Kf5 7.Rf2+ Kg5
8.Rg2+ Kh5 9.Ra5+ Kh6/ii
10.Ra6+, with perpetual check
using both rooks.

i) Kd4 5.Rd6+ Ke5 6.Rd1 draw.
ii) Kh4? 10.Rg4+ Kxh3 11.Rgl
Rh1 12.Rh5 mate.

"A peculiar battle of the wR-pair
against rook and passed pawn,
putting together perpetual rook
checks whose first series incor-
porates perpetual sacrifices."

No 11695 V.Kalyagin and
B.Olympiev
2/3 HM Zadachy i etudy 1997

\[ \text{hlb2 0163.00} \quad 2/4 \text{ Draw} \]

No 11695 V.Kalyagin and
B.Olympiev (Ekaterinburg)
Yes, wK is in check.

1.Kg1 Bg3 2.Rg4
Be6 3.Rg6/i Be4 (Bh3;Rgx3) 4.Rg4
(Rc6? Bd3;) with:
- Be6 5.Rg6 Be4 6.Rg4 Bh2+
7.Kh1 Bd5+ 8.Rg2= K- stalemate
with pin of wR, or
- Ba6 5.Ra4 (Rg6? Bd3;) Bd3
6.Rd4 Be2 7.Re4 Bf3 8.Re3 Sxe3,
a mirror stalemate.
i) Try: 3.Re4? Bh3 4.Re2+ Kc3
5.Rg2 Bb8 6.Kxf1 Ba7 wins.
"Fresh nuances in the conflict of
rook against three minors. The
variations slot together nicely. The
first move is perfunctory (wK is in
check and has only one move). It
would have been better to begin
with Black to play."

No 11696 V.Kovalenko
4th HM Zadachy i etudy 1997

\[ \text{d7g8 0000.53} \quad 6/4 \text{ Win} \]

No 11696 V.Kovalenko (Maritimr
province) 1.d5 e3 2.d6 exd6/i 3.e6
e2 4.e7 e1Q 5.e8Q+ Qxe8+ 6.Kxe8
d5 7.a4 d4 8.a5 d3 9.a6 d2 10.a7
d1Q 11.a8Q Qa1/i 12.Qd5+/iii
Kh8 13.Qd8 Qa7 14.Qf6+ Kg8
15.Qf8 mate.
i) e6 3.Ke7 e2 4.d7 e1Q 5.d8Q
mate.
ii) Qd6 12.Qa2+ wins. Qe2+
iii) 12.Qa1 stalemate? 12.Qd8?
Qf6 draw.
"The P-ending converts into a
Q-ending with wQ making a neat
and noteworthy geometrical pat-
tern."

No 11697 A.Sadykov
5th HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997

i) Qd6 12.Qa2+ wins. Qe2+
No 11698 D.Godes and
V.Neishtadt
special HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997

ii) 12.Qa1 stalemate? 12.Qd8?
Qf6 draw.
"The P-ending converts into a
Q-ending with wQ making a neat
and noteworthy geometrical pat-
tern."

No 11697 A.Sadykov
5th HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997

No 11698 D.Godes and
V.Neishtadt
special HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997

"Perpetual checks from each of two
promoted knights seem interesting,
but the barricade of immobile
pawns stopped this entry from
being placed any higher."

No 11697 A.Sadykov
5th HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997

No 11698 D.Godes and
V.Neishtadt
special HM Zadachy i etyudy 1997

"An enticing contest over the whole
board is tied up with a positional
draw and stalemate avoidance. So,
a special h.m. for a witty theme."
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No 11699 G. Amiryan
comm Zadachy i etyudy 1997

2.f7 b2 3.Sxb2 Rb3+ 4.Ka8 e2
5.f8Q e1Q 6.Qf5+ Kxb2 7.Qf2+
Qxf2 stalemate.
"Likable stalemate play with a
Q-sac."

No 11700 † Yu. Dorogov and
D. Pikhurov
comm Zadachy i etyudy 1997

1.Kd3 a5 2.Kc3 a4
3.Kb4 Kb1/i 4.Ka3 Kc1 5.Rh1+
Kd2 6.Rh3 Bc2 (Bd1;Rh4) 7.Kb4
Bd1 8.Rh2+ Kd3 9.Rh1 Bb3
10.Rh3+ Kc2 and 11.Rxb3 axb3
12.Ka3 draws.
i) Ka1 4.Ka3 Kb1 5.Rh1+ Ke2
"Quite subtle, with its intricate wK
manoeuvre."

No 11701 V. Katsnelson
comm Zadachy i etyudy 1997

1.Kd3 0301.12 3/4 Draw
No 11699 G. Amiryan 1.Sd3+ Kc2
2.f7 b2 3.Sxb2 Rb3+ 4.Ka8 e2
5.f8Q e1Q 6.Qf5+ Kxb2 7.Qf2+
Qxf2 stalemate.
"Likable stalemate play with a
Q-sac."

No 11700 † Yu. Dorogov and
D. Pikhurov
comm Zadachy i etyudy 1997

2. Bh3+ Kd6 2.Sf4 Ke5 3.Sd3+ Ke4
4.Sc5+ Ke3 5.Sxb3 (Kxb2? Bc4;)
Sf1/i 6.Bxf1 d3 7.Sd4, and after d2
No 11702 E.Kudelich (Tyumen region) 1.Sb3/i Sxf6 (Qb8,d8S+) 2.Re8 Sxe8 3.g8Q Qh4 4.Qg4/i Qxg4+ 5.Kxa5 Sd6/ii 6.d8S mate.
i) 1.Re8? clQ 2.Rxd8 Qxd2.
"A synthesis of familiar complex ideas, but the outward form leaves something to be desired."

Zadachy i etudy, 1998

This informal international tourney was judged by A.Sochnev (St Petersburg). 22 studies by 25 composers from 7 countries entered.
Judge’s report: After 7 were eliminated for assorted defects, 15 remained to be judged. This is rather few for such a respectable tourney, but the level of the residue is high enough for the tourney to be counted a success.

No 11703 N.Ryabinin
1st prize Zadachy i etudy 1998

a8h4 0710.51 8/4 Win
"A study of high technical quality, with a first move of beautiful subtlety and a try (1.Bb3? leaving wPe2 undisturbed, thereby obstructing any check on move 17!) in which queens lose out against rooks." We can append the admiring comment that 2.Bb3 offers wB to both bR, and with 13.Rb5 wR delivers a sacrificial echo with his remaining piece.

No 11704 L. and V.Katsnelson
2nd prize Zadachy i etudy 1998

hlg6 0440.20 5/3 Win
No 11704 Leonard and Vladimir Katsnelson (St Petersburg).
"White’s hopes are in his d7 pawn, but this is in peril." 1.Bd6/i Bb6 (Rxd6;Ra6) 2.Ra6 Rxh4+ii 3.Kg2 Rh7 4.Bc7 Kf7 (Rxe7;d8Q) 5.Rxb6 Rg7+ 6.Kh3/iii Kxe7 7.Rb8 Rh7+
i) 1.Ra6+? Kf7 2.Rd6 Rxb4+
6.Bc7 Rd8 and White has no win.
Bd8 4.Be7.
"A sharp combinative study with a
solution that is far from obvious.
There are sacrifices by both sides,
traps, and a thematic try, while the
bouquet of ideas is presentable and
the starting position natural."

No 11705 E.Eilazyan
3rd prize Zadachy i etyudy 1998

f7h5 0441.12
"With pieces hanging
White’s winning chances look
problematical." 1.Rb4, with:
- Rxg3 2.Bd1+ Kh6 3.Rxb1 Rxd3
4.Bg4 for 5.Rh1 mate, or
- Rxb4 2.Bd1+ (Sxb4? Kg4;) Rg4
- Ba4 9.Bxg4+ fxg4 10.Sc4
for 11.Sc6 mate, or
with 11.Be8 mate.
i) This is a zugzwang.

"The first move is excellent. The
interesting duel of bishops and the
three checkmates (by each of the
three white pieces) make a good
synthesis."

No 11706 A.Kuryatnikov and
E.Markov
1st HM Zadachy i etyudy 1998

h4a4 0433.43
"... White’s dP is his
only hope." 1.d6 Sg5 2.fxg5 hxg5+
d3+i 6.Kf2 d2 7.Kxd2 c3+
Kh5 11.Kf6 Ke6 12.Kf7 Be8
Be6 16.Ke7 Bf5 17.Kf6 Bc8
stalemate, otherwise a positional
draw.
i) 3.Kxh5? Rxh3 4.gxf3 c3 5.d7 c2
6.d8Q c1Q+ wins.
ii) c3 5.d7 Bd5+ 6.Kf2/iv c2 7.d8Q
c1Q 8.Qxd5 draws, for example
Qc2+ 9.Kg1 d3 10.Qxg5 d2
11.Qf4+ Kb3 12.Qe3+ Kb2
13.Qb6+ Kc1 14.Qe3+
iii) c3 6.d7 Bc4+ 7.Kf2, with c2
8.d8Q c1Q 9.Qa5+, a desperado, or

iv) 6.Ke2? Bc4+ 7.Kd1 Bb3+ and d3:
"The analysis is complex. In the first phase Black counters White's subtle play... the thread is unique, leading to a familiar finish."

No 11707 V. Prigunov
2nd HM Zadachy i etudy 1998

No 11708 V. Kondratev
3rd HM Zadachy i etudy 1998

No 11709 G. Amiryan
4th HM Zadachy i etudy 1998

e7h3 0116.23 5/6 Draw

No 11707 Vyacheslav Prigunov
(Kazan). 1.Rg8 f2 2.d8Q Sc6+
5.Rxg2/ii f1Q 6.Rg4+ Kh5 7.Rg5+
Kh6 8.Rg6+, and Sxg6 stalemate
(the 'ideal' variety), or Kh5
9.Rg5+.

i) Kh2 5.Rxg2+ Kxg2 6.Bd3, when
wPh4 is safe,

ii) 5.Rg4+? Kh3, and wR must take
on g2 and play wB to d3. Black
can then win at his leisure by using
bK to liberate both knights, or
more speedily by abandoning one
to manoeuvre the other to f4.
"A pleasing study with a beautiful
curtain. It is curious how all pieces
move into their final positions."

No 11708 Viktor Kondratev
Qxc5+ 3.Kxc5 b6+ 4.Kxb6 Bb7
5.a8Q+ Bxa8 6.Ka7 Kc7 7.c5
(Kxa8? Kb6;) Bb7 8.g5 hxg5 9.h5
gxh5 stalemate.

i) 1.a8Q+? Kc7 2.Qg8 Qxe3+
Qb1+ 6.Ka3 Qd3+ 7.Kb4 Qxc4+
"Nice. An effective first move is
succeeded by the sacrifice of both
black pieces and concluding balan-
cing denudation of two pawns,
yielding stalemate."

No 11709 G. Amiryan
4th HM Zadachy i etudy 1998

h8f7 0457.11 6/6 Win
   "An ideal mate with a pair of active self-blocks. The final position is away from the edge. The play is sharp, but somewhat clumsy."

No 11710 S.Zakharov
sp. HM Zadachy i etyudy 1998

b2b7 0400.22 4/4 Win

No 11710 Sergei Zakharov (St Petersburg). The special award was for the best piece of analysis submitted. 1.Ra4/i Rxa4/ii 2.f7, with:
   - Rxa5 3.f8Q Rb5+ 4.Ka2(Ka3) Ra5+ 5.Kb3(Kb4) Rb5+ 6.Ka4/iii and bPf4 will disappear, or
   - Rb4+ 3.Ka3 Rb5 4.f8Q/iv Rxa5+ 5.Kb4 Rb5+ 6.Ka4, and we are in the first line!
   i) 1.f7? Rc8 2.Ra4 Rf8 3.Rxf4 Kc6 draw.
   iii) "Without wPa5 wK must stay on the α-file."

iv) "With wPa5 wK must stay on the c-file."
   "A synthesis of two known positions done quite simply and without artificiality. The first move is a good one too."
AJR: Reference to Cheron Vol.III (No.1449 by Guretzky-Cornitz 1864 - lots of analysis) sorts out notes (iii) and (iv), once bPf4 is removed. With wKa4 the wPa5 rules out wK attacking bPa6, but wKc4 instead can march up the board, bR being deprived of b6. Without wPa5 wKa4 can threaten bPa6, but wKc4 instead can be held at bay by bR which now has access to b6.

No 11711 S.Osintsev
comm Zadachy i etyudy 1998

a4d8 0474.30 7/5 Draw

draw.
"A pleasing stalemate study with double-edged play and an interesting conclusion."

No 11712 V.S. Kovalenko
comm Zadachy i etudy 1998

f3f5 0071.21 5/4 Draw

No 11712 Vitaly Kovalenko
4.Se3+ Kg5 5.Sg2 Bh2 6.Kf1 Kf5
"Sparklingly simple - and a positional draw."

No 11713 N. Kralin and Yo. Afek
comm Zadachy i etudy 1998

a4b7 0140.22 5/4 Draw

No 11713 Nikolai Kralin
(Moscow), Yochanan Afek (Israel).
1.d8S+ Ka7/2 2.Rxa6+ Kxa6
i) Kb8 2.Rc8+ Ka7 3.Sc6+ Kb7
4.Sa5+.
"Nice - nothing complicated.
Underpromotion with two white sacrifices. The solution is rather too forcing."

No 11714 V. Kalyagin
comm Zadachy i etudy 1998

D4b8 0400.02 2/4 Draw

No 11714 V. Kalyagin 1.Ke5 (Ra1?
Rb5;) Rg7 2.Ra1 Rg6 3.Kd6 (Rg1?
Kc7;) g2 4.Rg1 Kb7 5.Ke7 e5/i
6.Kf7 Rg3 7.Kf6(Ke6) e4
(i) Kc6 6.Kf7 Rh6 7.Rxg2 e5 8.Kg7
11.Rg5 draw.
(ii) Rh4 9.Kf6 Kd5 10.Kg5 Rf4
11.Re2 Rf8 12.Re1 draw.
"wK's manoeuvre is the topic of
this study - not bad at all."
QUALIFIED STATISTICS
Guy Haworth

In his review of the chess material in Games Of No Chance (EG #136, pp. 114-118), John Beasley makes some excellent points about endgame statistics that are worth further illustration and emphasis. The ideal is that illegal positions should not be included in an endgame table (EGT) and each equivalence class of legal positions, equivalent in the sense that they can be transformed into each other by rotation and reflection of the board, should be represented by exactly one position.

However, illegal positions are included and legal positions sometimes have two representations. Consider the following:

\[ P1 = \{wKc3 \ wQc2 / bKal \ WTM\} \]
\[ P2 = \{wKc3 \ wQb3 / bKa1 \ WTM\} \]

\( P1 \) and \( P2 \) are equivalent but both are typically included in EGTs. Nalimov’s ‘2’ maximal Distance to Mate (DTM) btm 8000 wins for White are actually both equivalent to \( \{wKa1 \ wQf1g1 / bKg7 \ bQb5d5 \ BTM\} \) with DTM = 100 plies. \( P1 \) and \( P2 \) are also in fact unreachable as Black has no preceding move but both will be scored 1-0.

Other unreachable positions have featured impossible single or double-checks, e.g., from a single Pawn on its home square, from the side to move (Stiller, 1992) or from combinations of QQ, RR, NN or \( xP \). Karrer (2000) highlights the \textbf{4000.11} illegal position \( \{wKe6 \ wQc3 \ wPg5 / bKa4 \ bQe2 \ bPd7 \ WTM\} \), a maxDTM position for \( wP(g5) \) and \( bP(d7) \) assuming “P=Q promotions only”.

Readers will know of other types of unreachable position. These errors inflate absolute counts of positions and change %-densities of results slightly. Wirth removes from consideration one of two representations when both Kings are on a long diagonal in a pawnless endgame: Nalimov does not. Stiller is unique in not marking as illegal positions with the side to move giving check. The reachability of positions has not been completely confirmed by EGT authors to date. Thus, for \textbf{8000}, Stiller cited a density of 83% wtm wins for White while Nalimov gives 61.10% and Wirth the correct 61.07%.

Karrer now exhibits best practice by filtering extracted sets of positions, removing double-representations and some illegal positions.
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