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As we all know, Yochanan Afek is one of the most active persons in our field. As an active chess player and trainer he also manages to propagate our art to the general chess world. In this issue you will see some excellent examples of his activities (e.g. endgame study tourney announcements, and also see the originals section). For the last couple of months he has also had a website: www.afekchess.com.

The most important chess composition event of the year, the meeting of the World Federation for Chess Composition, took place in Italy. In this issue we have a report and the Study of the Year 2010.

René Olthof reports that Alexander Rueb (1882-1959) was included in the Dutch chess canon (see http://schaaksite.nl/page.php?id=3030 in Dutch). As members of the Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor Eindspelstudies (ARVES) will know, he was founder and first president of FIDE (for 25 years), and also famous for his collection and books about endgame studies.

Endgame study knowledge can be very helpful in o.t.b. play. This is a remarkable example:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
9-+-+-+0 \\
9wq-zP+0 \\
9-+-+-+0 \\
9+-+-+-+-0 \\
9-+-+-mK+0 \\
9+-+-+-+-0 \\
9-+-+-+0 \\
9+-+-+-+-0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Black to move

Black played 60…Ke5 and White resigned. It is very likely that White overlooked the fact that he could have set a trap: 60.Kd7 Kd5 61.Kd8 Kd6? 62.c8S+. The winning move 61…Ke6! 62.c8Q+ Kd6 is not so obvious (Tidskrift för Schack ii2011).

But even more interesting is the fact that White’s last move was 60.Kd7-d8?. The drawing move – not easy to see – was 60.Kc6!

Stop press! Yochanan Afek, yes him again!, informs me that he just received a positive response of the organizing committee of the famous Tata Steel Chess Tournament to his proposal to organize another endgame study solving event (January 28th, 2012, Wijk aan Zee, the Netherlands) (See also p. 340).
“Something old and something new”. In this column you will find some studies by new composers mixed in with studies by familiar names. We start with a study of one of the regulars: Mario Garcia.

No 17845 M.G. Garcia

1.Rf2+ and now:

i) cxd4 3.Rxa5 Ke1 4.Ra1+ Kxf2 5.Rxh1 wins.


Gerhard Josten is another composer whose work regularly features in this column.

No 17846 G. Josten

b3h3 0004.21 4/3 Draw


ii) Sf3 4.Sf1 Kg2 5.Se3+ draws.


Ilham Aliev also has shown studies in the column before, but his co-author is a new name to me. Ilham informs us that Gadir Guseinov is a 25 years young otb grandmaster.

No 17847 I. Aliev & G. Guseinov

b2c4 0400.56 7/8 Win


No 17846 G. Josten

i) 7.Re7? Kf6 8.Re8 Kf7 wins.

ii) Kg4 transposes to the main line after 8.Rf8 Kg3 9.Rf7 g6 10.Rf6.

iii) g6 is another transposition after 9.Rxc7 Kg3 10.Rf7.


v) 10.Kc3? Kg2 11.h5 gxh5 12.Rg7+ and White can only draw.

Back to Mario Garcia again who has composed a study in memory of his compatriot Oscar J. Carlsson who died on 28vi2011.

No 17848 M.G. Garcia
In memory of Ing. Oscar J. Carlsson

f7g5 3131.10 4/3 Draw

No 17848 Mario Guido García (Argentina) 1.Ra6 Qh5+ 2.Kf8 Qh3 3.Rc6 and now:
- Qf3+ 4.Sf6 Qxc6 5.e8Q Qxf6+ 6.Qf7 Qd8+ 7.Qe8 Bd6+ 8.Kf7 Qf6+ 9.Kg8 Be5 10.Qe7 Qxe7 stalemate, or:


ii) White’s 7th and 8th moves can be exchanged.

On 21vii2011 the Dutch chess organiser Huub van Dongen died at the age of 55.

ARVES webmaster Peter Boll decided to compose a study in memory of his old friend, who also was fond of endgame studies. Although I found a couple of studies by Peter in Harold’s database I believe this is Peter’s first appearance in this column.

No 17849 P. Boll
in memory of Huub van Dongen

d1b4 0320.12 4/4 Win

No 17849 Peter Boll (the Netherlands). 1.e7/ i and now:
- Rxd4+ 2.Bd3 Rxd3+ 3.Kc2 wins, or:


ii) after 2…a4 White has no problems, e.g.


iv) again 4…a4 does not worry White, e.g.

The last study in this column is also by a new composer, one who is just 12 years young (born 30iv1999). The great grandfather of this talented Dutch o.t.b. player, who is already of considerable playing strength (elo rating 2153), was three times Dutch champion Arnold van Foreest (1863-1954). Jorden maintains a homepage (including studies!) at: http:/ /stimp.home.xs4all.nl/jorden/index.html .

On studies his mentors are Bert van der Marel and Yochanan Afek.
No 17850 J. van Foreest

No 17850 Jorden van Foreest (the Netherlands).


iii) 2.e7? Rxa5 Kb3 draws.


vi) This move, allowing the white rook to get behind his pawn, is only available because of the first move and is the key difference between the thematic try and the solution.


Jorden van Foreest
(Photo: René Olthof)
Contributors: Yoichanan Afek (Israel/The Netherlands), Guy Haworth (England), Siegfried Hornecker (Germany), L’uboš Kekely (Slovakia), Marcel Van Herck (Belgium), Jaroslav Pospíšil (Czech Republic), Ignace Vandecasteele (Belgium), Timothy Whitworth (England).

Readers have reported some cooks: Yoichanan Afek brought the following example to my attention.


The next contribution comes from L’uboš Kekely: EG185 Supplement p. 278–284 reproduced the Mat-Plus 2009 award. Lubos refers to Iuri Akobia’s excellent site (http://akobia.geoweb.ge/) and points out that three of the endgame studies included in the preliminary award were incorrect. The relevant award (and numerous other awards!) can be downloaded from Iuri’s site. Mario M. García found the cooks – as usual. Two of these cooked endgame studies have been corrected and EG185 Supplement brings the corrections; cf. #17795 and #17799. The 1st prize-winner is however unsound. We enter the solution and add a diagram at the crucial point.

U.2. D. Hlebec
1st prize MatPlus 2009

The position arises after 10.Kxg6, and the solution ends with 10…Qxh8 stalemate. Black is however not forced to capture the wQ. He wins after 10…Qd6 11.Kh7 Sc6 12.g6 Se7 13.Qf6+ Kg3 14.Qg5 e5 15.Qe3+ Kxg4 16.Qe4+ Kg5 17.Qe3+ Kf6 18.g7 Qd4 19.Qh6+ Kf7 20.Qh5+ Ke6 21.Qh3+ Kd6 22.Qa3+ Kd7, and the bK has escaped from the checks. If White tries 15.g7 Qc5 16.g8Q Sxg8 17.Kxg8, he finds himself in a lost queen endgame in spite of the material balance; cf. EGTB. It is easy to understand how the composer overlooked this possibility (EG#17794).

The original setting of R. Becker’s 2nd prizewinner proved unsound. The position on p. 278 is a correction; cf. the comment on p. 279 (EG#17795). For comparison we bring the version cooked by Mario (see next page).

The cook occurs after 1.Qc5+ Kxh2. The composer plays 2.Rxf3 and adds an exclamation mark. The second solution 2.Qd6 leads to a quicker win. After Rc1 3.Rb3 Kg2 4.Qf4
b1Q+ 5.Rxb1 Rxb1 6.Kg4 or Re1 3.Rb3 b1Q+ 4.Rxb1 Rxb1 5.Kg4 Black loses all his proud pawns.

White has just played 3.Sf4. Black would like to free his queen and answers 3...Kd7, but 4.Sde6 puts an end to this hope: the bQ is imprisoned. In the refutation the bQ remains imprisoned, but Black can build a fortress after 3...Kc8 4.Sde6 c5 5.b3 Kb7 6.h5 Ka6 7.b4 (Kg4 Ka5) cxb4 8.cxb4 Kb7 9.Kg4 a5 10.b5 Kc8 11.Kf3 Kd7 12.Ke4 Ke7 13.Kd5 Kd7. In the final position in this line Black has three squares (d7, e7, e8) at his disposal so he will always be able to meet Kd5 with Kd7; e.g. 13.Kd3 Ke8 14.Kc4 Ke7 15.Kd4 Ke8 16.Ke4 Ke7 17.Kd5 Kd7. The alternative attempts 5.h5 c4 6.Kg4 Kb7 7.Kf3 Ka6 8.Ke4 Ka5 9.Kd4 Kxa4 10.Kxc4 a5 or 5.b4 cxb4 6.cxb4 a5 7.bxa5 Kb7 8.h5 Ka6 are no better.

The Problemist 2008–2009 award is reproduced in EG185 Supplement. Concerning no. 17831 by Siegfried Hornecker we read on p. 294: “It wasn’t mentioned, but it appears to be a correction of a 2004 study by the same composer which proved to be unsound”. Siegfried informs us that the endgame study referred to in the award is actually a work by his compatriot G. Sonntag.

After 1.Kd7+ Kg7 we witness typical staircase manoeuvres. By checking the bK White moves his queen up to d4, sacrifices his bishop on d5, returns to b3 and takes on g3 (13.Qxg3+). Black’s king is forced to move between g7 and g8 to protect his queen. The solution continues 13...Kf7 14.Qb3+ Kg6 15.Qd3+ Kf7 16.Qd5+ Kg6 17.Qg5+ Kf7 18.Qxh5+, and the remaining moves are identical to both endgame studies (The position of the a-pawns is the only difference). It should be added that Sonntag’s work is unsound as White also wins by playing 1.Kf5+.

As a subscriber to Schach Siegfried assumes that he must have used the idea subconsciously. He remembered Sonntag’s work when he saw the award. I have no objection to this explanation as the same thing has also happened to me and probably to many other composers.

Later the same year Sonntag published a correction that suffered the same fate as the original version (see next page).

Our readers will probably be able to find the intended solution after 1.Qa1+, but White also wins by playing 5.Bd1, 5.Be2 or 5.Bxc6. It is interesting that the composer has omitted
bPe7 although it is needed to prevent the dual Qf6+(instead of Qe5+) in the final phase.

Siegfried adds that he thinks it would be correct to regard Sonntag as co-author and put both names above the diagram, i.e. “S. Horneck and G. Sonntag”. In my opinion another possibility would be to write “S. Horneck after G. Sonntag”. Siegfried has of course improved the idea in a very fine way.

In EG184 we published a pawn endgame by Jaroslav Pospišil; cf. no. 17533 on p. 105. It looks very much like a refinement of the game Gulko–Short, Riga 1995, so we assumed that Jaroslav had been inspired by that game. The suspicion was aroused by the “mysterious move” 6.Kg6. Jaroslav informs us that he did not know the game in question when he composed his work. His endgame study was on the contrary inspired by the following little piece.

U.6. G. Sonntag
*Schach* 2004

d7g7 4040.24 5/7 Win

Jaroslav even had another version of the same idea in his file, but found it impossible to publish it, probably because of the nearness to Costantini’s setting. I include this version as it supports Jaroslav’s explanation.

U.7. C. Costantini *Italia Scacchistica* 1979

f2g8 0000.12 2/3 Draw


Jaroslav even had another version of the same idea in his file, but found it impossible to publish it, probably because of the nearness to Costantini’s setting. I include this version as it supports Jaroslav’s explanation.

U.8. J. Pospišil
*Original*

f1f8 0000.12 2/3 Draw


In EG185 p. 207-208 we challenged the readers to share with us their view about Ignace Vandecasteele’s miniature version (U.5.) of Kuryatnikov’s idea (U.4.). I received critical evaluations from Timothy Whitworth and Marcel Van Herck and a defence from Ignace to whom Marcel had sent a copy.

Timothy focuses his attention on the position that arises after 5...Bg8 in U.5. and writes: “How is White to win from here? The composer had in mind the sequence 6.Bb1 Ka6 7.Be4, after which the finale is easily perceived. A solver might find the sequence 6.Be4 Ka6 7.Sb4+ Ka5 8.Be2 c6 9.Sx6+Ka6 10.Be4 and could be forgiven for thinking that this must be the road to the finale. Yes, the two finales, after 7.Be4 and 10.Be4, are the same, except for the presence/absence of the black pawn. But the two routes to this finale are different and there is nothing in the longer route to show the solver that he has missed the shorter. So the study can be solved without the
solver ever seeing all that the composer intended. I think this is unfortunate. The move 6.Be4 looks to me like a dual rather than a harmless time-waster.”

Marcel thinks that Ignace just cuts the introduction of Kuryatnikov’s prizewinner. As a result the bK is confined to the corner region right from the start. Economy is important, but Kuryatnikov’s introduction was far from trivial. Marcel agrees with Ignace that 5.Be4, 5.Sd8, 6.Bc2 and 6.Sd8 are time-wasters, but he has serious doubts with 6.Be4, which Roger Missiaen and HH regard as a cook. The disappearance of bPc7 is one problem, the way White controls a2 is another. In the main line this is done by the bishop (Bb1), in the line 5.Be4 by the knight (Sb4). Marcel concludes that 6.Be4 is a cook and he would have disqualified the study if he had acted as judge. And then he adds: “On the other hand, it is interesting to note that John Nunn seems to attach little importance to this ‘cook’. His comments in Endgame Challenge imply that he considers Be4 a mere postponement of the final zugzwang. Anyway, cook or not, it should not happen in a perfect study.”

In his response to Van Herck Ignace states that he would have disqualified Kuryatnikov’s endgame study because of the cooks 9.Be4 (referring to the view of Missiaen, HHDIV and Van Herck) and 11.Bf5. This seems strange to me. If 9.Be4 is a cook in Kuryatnikov’s work then it is reasonable to regard 6.Be4 as a cook in Ignace’s miniature as well. And Ignace himself has proposed the improvement 10...Be6 11.Bd3+ Kb7 12.Sd8+ in Kuryatnikov’s study. This means that the second cook can be removed by altering the solution.

Ignace points out that his version is a refinement of the following endgame study. This miniature is obviously based on the assumption that Kuryatnikov’s work is incorrect and the cook and the improvement of Black’s play have now become the solution.


U.9. I. Vandecasteele & R. Missiaen
Flemish Miniatures 1998

Ignace compares this joint effort with his own version and underlines the fact that he has saved one man and that the solution runs with quiet moves and without captures. Ignace concludes that his study is correct. I admit that I am inclined to share the view of Timothy and Marcel.

After I had finished this section of Spotlight I received another email from Timothy that I permit myself to reproduce in extenso: “A further thought occurs to me regarding Vandecasteele’s study. How much is it worth in comparison with Halberstadt’s study of 1937 which I quote in the attachment? Halberstadt’s miniature presents essentially the same finale after flawless introductory play that is packed with interest. Indeed, one could ask the same question about Kuryatnikov’s prizewinner. What the judges of the Sarychev MT 1988 wrote about Kuryatnikov’s piece could almost as well have been written about Halberstadt’s: ‘A minor piece ending in the spirit of Sarychev. Play covers the whole board, Bl has counterplay, and there is a central zugzwang. There is a good, if not unfamiliar, finale.’ This was quoted in EG97, page 620, and was followed by David Hooper’s comment: ‘Surely we’ve seen this sort of thing before?’”

This is Halberstadt’s prizewinner:

1.Sc6 Bf7+ 2.Bd5! (2.Kc5? Bxg8 3.Be4 e5 zz gives Black a draw.) 2...e6 (If 2...Bxd5+, then 3.Kxd5 e5 4.Sb4+ Ka5 5.Sc2 e4 6.Se3 wins, the pawn having been blocked just in time.) 3.Be4 e5+ (If 3...Bxg8, then 4.Se5 Kb6

Finally, I received a short comment by Guy Haworth on the game Lautier–Piket (not Piket), Dortmund 1995. EG185 BK.3. p. 223 gives the best play for both players whereas the game ended much quicker. Guy writes: “While Piket could have postponed the conversion for 92 moves, he in fact capitulated in 4 moves by allowing the exchange of Queens with 50...Ke6? Only 50...K(f/g)6 put up a defence”.

This comment made me think of the future. In some years we shall be able to check all endgame studies with seven or eight men, and we shall probably find that many of them are unsound. This is positive of course, but there is also a negative aspect: I fear that the main line of future compositions will be supported by long, incomprehensible variations. So far we have only seen the tip of the iceberg. Or am I being too pessimistic?
54th World Congress of Chess Composition

BY HAROLD VAN DER HEIJDEN

In Jesi, Italy, the 54th meeting of the World Federation for Chess Composition took place from 20vii2011 to 27vii2011. Marco Bonavoglia and his team (e.g. endgame study composer Enzo Minerva) did an excellent job. Luckily, the 4 star hotel was air conditioned, because even the Italians were suffering from the extreme outside temperatures (35-40°C) as we saw on RAI Uno. The advice was to eat gelati, so we did when we risked a mission in downtown Jesi.

On the WFCC website www.sci.fi/~stniekat/pccdec11.htm numerous details about the conference can be found, including the decisions. This report deals with endgame study related topics only. Among the newly awarded composition titles, there were quite a few endgame study composers: International Master: Yuri Bazlov (Russia), Andrey Vysokosov (Russia), FIDE Master: Grigory Slepyan (Belarus), Karen Sumbatyan (Russia), Sergy Ivanovich Tkachenko (Russia) and Igor Yarmo

The world championship solving was won by Poland, in front of Great Britain and Serbia. Junior IM Kacper Piorun (Poland) defeated all the GMs and was crowned world champion. Earlier during the meeting he had also won the open championship. Arbiter Milan Velimirovic (Serbia) did an excellent job (all studies were correct…), but still in two cases official protests were forwarded to the appeal committee, in which I “voluntarily” had been appointed as the endgame study expert. One of the appeals was about an endgame study in which several composers had a different main line than intended by Velimirovic, ending in an echo stalemate. After examining the case I came to the conclusion that this study has two main lines. This was confirmed when I looked at the solution published in EG (#8952) via internet. As a consequence only the solvers that had written down both lines would get full points. Only four (Piorun, Murdzia, Mestel and Wakashima) of 83 participants had both lines, while another 28 solvers wrote down one of the two main lines. A very difficult study!

The endgame study subcommittee consisted of Ilham Aliev (Azerbaijan), David Gurgenidze (Georgia), Marcel Van Herck (Belgium), Oleg Pervakov (Russia) and Harold van der Heijden (the Netherlands). I was appointed as spokesman of the committee. Unfortunately, for a reason unclear to me, Oleg Pervakov was unable to attend the committee’s meeting. David’s son Tato was very helpful to act as translator.

My proposal was to improve the presentation of endgame studies. The current practice is that thematic lines (main line, thematic tries) are mixed up with analytical variations. An endgame study submission to a tourney or magazine should have: diagram (name and stipulation), a thematic solution section, and an analysis section. The latter will be used to convince the judge that the study is sound, while only the thematic part will be published in the award or magazine. Of course, the analysis could be made available otherwise (internet) to those who are interested. Apart from the improved presentation, this also helps to avoid unsoundness claims like second solutions in analytical lines. The thematic solution, of course, should be sound (e.g. a try is only a thematic try when there is a unique black refutation). The members generally liked the proposal. I will write an article about the proposal in a future EG, giving some examples.
I also proposed that the subcommittee should coordinate a group of experts to produce a handbook on endgame study themes, since such a handbook is nonexistent, would be useful, and is too big a project for a single person. This will also be announced in EG.

David suggested that it would be interesting to promote endgame studies by regularly publishing (e.g. in EG) a page with one of the classics accompanied with a picture of its famous composer. Another good idea!

Finally, the subcommittee almost unanimously selected the Study of the Year 2010 (see elsewhere in this issue).

I also joined the computer subcommittee. Thomas Maeder (Switzerland) stepped down as spokesman and was replaced by Roberto Stelling (Brazil). The most important topic discussed was the fact that the software for electronic submission of problems that has been under development for some years by one of its members, Ilja Ketris (Latvia), is now ready for testing. A group of experts (e.g. FIDE Album section directors, judges, composers) and non-experts (other composers) will be asked for testing. The tools have primarily been developed for FA submissions, but can be used for other tourneys as well.

Finally, the FIDE Album subcommittee also saw the chairman being replaced: Kjell Wildert (Sweden) was succeeded by Harry Fougiaxis (Greece). The subcommittee also discussed some endgame study related topics, e.g. WCCI judging and FA judging, the fact that some people entered all the studies they composed instead of only their best, the status of the FA 04-06 Album (currently being edited; the endgame study section index still has to be prepared by me as section director). For the 2010-2012 FA that will be announced next WFCC meeting, probably electronic submission will be possible in the endgame study section.
Oscar Jorge Carlsson was born in Montevideo (Uruguay) on 23iv1924 and died in Buenos Aires on 28vi2011. He achieved his doctorate as an industrial engineer in Argentina where he had resided since 1942. His passion for composition started when he met José Mugnos in 1958. A little earlier he had made the acquaintance of Carlos Alberto Peronace, who had won the Olympic Gold Medal in Helsinki in 1952. Mugnos inspired Carlsson to great efforts in composing studies. He began quite regular visits to Mugnos in the latter’s old house in the Federal Capital. On one occasion, after having shown Mugnos three studies he had sent to tourneys in France and Germany, all of which won tourney honours, Mugnos enthusiastically encouraged him to persevere, to develop his gift for this complex and beautiful creative activity.

Sadly, the health of the father of the study in Argentina compelled him to withdraw from chess. Mugnos and chess circles lost contact with one another for almost a decade, until, whether by coincidence or fate, Carlsson encountered Mugnos in the Chacarita cemetery at a memorial tribute to Roberto Grau, 25 years after the latter’s death. This time it was Carlsson who encouraged the senior composer to return to his old passion. He even offered to compose together, with the happy consequence that chess fans surely will know: in the second Mugnos book (*Endgame Art*, Madrid, 1976) there are several joint studies.

Many of Carlsson’s studies composed jointly with José Mugnos, Carlos Peronace, Luis Parenti, Zoilo R. Caputto and José Copié won tourneys. His total output is around 120 studies.

In the second volume of *El arte del ESTUDIO de ajedrez* (Buenos Aires, 1990) Professor Zoilo R. Caputto writes: “… His studies are at the same time subtle and sparkling, with amazing play, at times paradoxical, and frequent ’contradictions’ that seem to make fun of reality ....”

Carlsson published articles in scholarly journals. He financially sponsored the international jubilee tourney celebrating the 75th birthdays of “Caputto-Carlsson-Foguelman” (1998-2000), in which 44 composers from 23 countries across the globe participated. The celebrants themselves were the judges, involving the cooperation of the Dutch composer Harold van der Heijden and the Argentineans Eduardo Iriarte, José Luis Parenti and José Copié. A booklet was published containing the quality harvest.

Several of his works were selected for inclusion in FIDE Albums. In addition, Carlsson was a member of the judging trio for studies for the triennium 1998-2000, alongside
Oleg Pervakov and Gady Costeff, with section director Harold van der Heijden.


Composers and enthusiasts across the world will remember Mr. Oscar Carlsson for his beautiful chess compositions.

José A. Copié

It is my sad duty to report that Samir Badalov, in the prime of his life, passed away after surgery on the 26th of August. I knew him personally. We often got together in Baku and talked about chess, coaching and studies as well. Samir was a nice person to talk to. He wasn’t only one of the best chess coaches in Azerbaijan, but he also was a very good study composer, though as he wrote about himself in the book *A Study Apiece* by G. Josten (Germany 2010) he didn’t consider himself to be a true study composer. He always said that coaching didn’t leave him much time for composing which he enjoyed a lot. It is extremely hard to lose such a friend. He’ll always remain in our hearts. May his memory live forever! *Allah rehmet etsin* (God have mercy).

*Ihham Aliev (Azerbaijan)*

S. Badalov
sp. hm Azerbaijan 35 JT, 2006

Thanks to his career as a chess player at a high level, we know a little more about Mattison’s short life than we know about many other composers who lived at the same period. A few years after his death, a book about chess in Latvia, Šachs Latvijā līdz 1940. gadam, written by K. Bētiņš, A. Kalniņš and V. Petrovs was published in Riga (1940): it contains most of the information known about him, even if it remains very incomplete. Composer-players like Réti, Selesniev and Mattison also seem more familiar to us because we have seen photographs and pictures of them (note 2).

Here is the outline of Mattison’s short life: he was born in Riga, where his father, born in a family of land farmers, had come to work. When his father died, Herman was only 15. The teenager had to leave high school and to “join a firm as a trainee in its office” (V. Kirilovs, Riga 1994, translated by T. Whitworth). Kirilovs adds: “Subsequently, Mattison turned to chess journalism, which became the chief source of his livelihood”. During WWI he was a soldier and was wounded in 1917: he had to be treated in Russia (Soviet Union) during a long time, apparently 15 months (6 in Petrograd, now Sankt-Petersburg, and 9 months in Moscow for his convalescence). His activity as a chess player before his win in the first 1924 Latvian congress in Riga remains unknown (the 1940 Latvian book just mentions wins in other tournaments in Latvia from 1920 to 1923: “the Riga chess club championship in 1921 and 1923, as well as club tournaments in 1920, 1921 and 1922”). In 1924, Mattison won in Paris the so-called ‘World Amateur Championship’ that was held just before the foundation of FIDE, ahead of his compatriot Fricis Apšenieks (F. Apscheneek, 1894-1941) and Edgard Colle (1897-1932), the master from Belgium who could have won the event if he had been worth. Kirilovs adds: “Subsequently, Mattison turned to chess journalism, which became the chief source of his livelihood”. During WWI he was a soldier and was wounded in 1917: he had to be treated in Russia (Soviet Union) during a long time, apparently 15 months (6 in Petrograd, now Sankt-Petersburg, and 9 months in Moscow for his convalescence). His activity as a chess player before his win in the first 1924 Latvian congress in Riga remains unknown (the 1940 Latvian book just mentions wins in other tournaments in Latvia from 1920 to 1923: “the Riga chess club championship in 1921 and 1923, as well as club tournaments in 1920, 1921 and 1922”). In 1924, Mattison won in Paris the so-called ‘World Amateur Championship’ that was held just before the foundation of FIDE, ahead of his compatriot Fricis Apšenieks (F. Apscheneek, 1894-1941) and Edgard Colle (1897-1932), the master from Belgium who could have won the event if he had been

(1) According to Arpad Elo (The Rating of Chess Players, Past and Present, 1978), Mattison’s historical elo is reckoned to be about 2510 – to be compared with Réti and Selesniev, respectively 2550 and 2470. Jeff Sonas’ Chessmetrics give different figures: for him, Mattison’s highest rating reached 2631 (in September 1929), to be compared with Réti’s and Selesniev’s highest performances, respectively, 2710 and 2619.

(2) The well-known 1924 photograph of Mattison with his signature (reproduced in the second edition of Timothy Whithworth’s monography, but for those who don’t own this book, it can also be seen for instance on the Russian Wikipedia page devoted to Mattison). Another famous picture, reproduced several times, was on the front page of the very first issue of Belgian magazine L’Echiquier (January 1925): it was taken during the decisive game Colle-Mattison in Paris, 1924. It is reproduced, for instance, on the following webpage: http://www.chessbase.de/nachrichten.asp?newsid=7377

A less known group photograph with Treybal, Przepiorka and Euwe (against whom Herman Mattison is playing) illustrates p 403 of El Ajedrez Americano, October 1928. It has been reproduced by Edward Winter and can be seen in his Chessnotes where it is no.5637 (27vi2008): browse http://www.chesshistory.com/winter/archives.html.

Mattison’s obituary in Jaunākās Ziņas was illustrated by three other photographs, among which one represents Mattison as a child when he was a pupil in the gymnasium, and one shows him as a soldier.
able to defeat Mattison in the last round, who was defending a lost endgame (individual results were added up to produce a ranking per nations: Czechoslovakia won the contest. Latvia had only three players, instead of four in most of the other teams: with a fourth competitor, no doubt that the country would have finished at first place). Later, Mattison took part to a few international tournaments. He took part in no Latvian championship after 1924. But he was rarely invited in major tournaments and played in no more than two or three tournaments per year till his death (sometimes even fewer: for instance in 1927 not a single tournament). A player like Richard Réti sometimes took part in nine grandmaster tournaments per year. Maybe Mattison’s bad health was the reason for his rare appearances in tournaments: he died from pulmonary tuberculosis in 1932 (a ‘long illness’ in the Latvian 1940 book). His last great successes were his famous games won against Alekhine and Rubinstein during the 1931 Prague Olympiad.

Most of Mattison’s studies were published in local or national newspapers: only a small percentage was sent abroad in tourneys organised by chess magazines. Before WWI, his studies appeared in Riga, with the exception of a handful published in Germany (Deutsches Wochenschach) during WWI. This relationship between Mattison and the Latvian press was interesting: Kirilovs (see the quotation above) writes that “subsequently [but when?] Mattison turned to chess journalism”. In an article about chess study composition during WWI, (http://www.chesspro.ru/_events/2010/tkachenko.html), S.N. Tkachenko also writes that Mattison chose “the difficult path of chess professionalism, combining participations in tournaments with the job of chess journalist. Alas, the WWI amended a lot the young professional player’s life” (translation by S. Didukh) from the following Russian text: “выбирает нелегкий путь шахматного профессионала, совмещая участия в турнирах с работой шахматного журналиста. Увы, первая мировая война внесла большие коррективы в жизнь молодого профи…”). This is surprising. Does it mean that the young Mattison, at 19, was already a chess journalist, for instance for the Rigaer Tageblatt or the Rigasche Rundschau? Probably not. But his intention of living for chess was already strong.

By chance, I have been able to find a trace of his activity as a chess journalist in a Latvian daily newspaper. In January 2011, HH, in his editorial for EG183, reported that he had unearthed the digitized version of the Czech newspaper Bohemia, with its famous chess column. At the same time, I discovered the full digitized collection of the Latvian newspaper Jaunāks Zīnas. Each of its issues, from 1911 to 1940, can be downloaded from the website: http://data.lnb.lv/digitala_biblioteka/laikraksti/JaunakasZinas/index.htm

Before discovering this collection, I had no idea of what kind of newspaper Jaunāks Zīnas was, in which Mattison published no less than 7 original studies from 1927 till 1930. Of course, I can’t decipher the Latvian language, especially when it is written with gothic letters, but it is quite easy to recognize a chess column (especially with a diagram!).

The history of this newspaper is quite interesting. Jaunāks Zīnas (The Latest News) was the fruit of the association of two brilliant minds: Anton Benjamīns (1860-1939), a journalist who had worked as a reporter for the Rigaer Tageblatt and Emīlija Elks, born Simseone (1881-1941) who was at the same time an advertising agent and a theatre critic for the same Rigaer Tageblatt. They met in 1904 or 1905 and quickly joined together, both in their private life and their professional career. Their team was efficient (practically, they were running the Rigaer Tageblatt) and Emilija Elks, born Simseone (1881-1941) who was at the same time an advertising agent and a theatre critic for the same Rigaer Tageblatt. They met in 1904 or 1905 and quickly joined together, both in their private life and their professional career. Their team was efficient (practically, they were running the Rigaer Tageblatt) but their wish was to promote a newspaper in the Latvian language. With their enterprising mind, they succeeded in founding their own daily paper. She was the publisher, he was the editor-in-chief. At the beginning, in 1911, Jaunāks Zīnas was a modest newspaper, with no more than 8 pages, selling fewer than
10,000 copies, but Anton and Emīlija quickly attracted good Latvian speaking journalists who worked for other (Russian and German) newspapers; after WWI, during which they had to cease publication of Jaunākās Ziņas, the German intellectual predominance quickly lost ground and Jaunākās Ziņas quickly became, after Latvia’s independence in 1920, number one Latvian newspapers (the Benjamīns were lucky, since, after a short period abroad during WWI, they could recover their premises with the printing material, left by Russians with tons of paper allowing them to publish Jaunākās Ziņas for free for a whole year!). In 1939-40, they were selling more than 210,000 copies, a remarkable achievement for a small country like Latvia. Emīlija Benjamīņa was one of the richest people in Latvia, nicknamed the ‘Press Queen’. But the fall was to come quickly. Jaunākās Ziņas expressed a liberal democratic theme and couldn’t be suspected of any weakness towards totalitarianism. Anton Benjamīns died just before the outbreak of WWII and Emīlija refused to leave Latvia under the protection of the Nazis. On 17 June 1940, the Soviet invaded Latvia and incorporated it into the Soviet Union: there was no more space for Jaunākās Ziņas whose last issue was published on 9 August 1940: Benjamīns properties were nationalized. Emīlija died of starvation in a Soviet camp, near Perm.

Jaunākās Ziņas, as a general-interest newspaper, had little space for sports or chess but, nevertheless, from time to time, an article with chess results appeared. Mattison seems to have been in charge of the chess column in Jaunākās Ziņas from 1927.

The first column where his name appears (with his personal address, Jauneela 4, dj 9, Riga, given for solvers) is dated 26iii1927(1). A good example of a rich column can be found some days later in Jaunākās Ziņas no.75 (2iv1927): it contains no less than a commented game (Nimzowitsch-Alekhine, New York 1927), a pawn study by A.V. Kovalenko, reproduced from Shakhmatny Listok, some announcements of international tournaments, the results, with the round-robin table, of the Latvian university tourney (won by young hope Vladimir Petrovs) and the results of simultaneous displays by his colleague Apšenieks. But most of the columns were printed without Mattison’s name: only those presenting a composition for solving were ‘signed’, with Mattison’s own address. The other, around fifty in 1927, were only ‘news in brief’ – the shortest had only 3 lines!

On the whole, ‘rich’ columns were quite rare and their publication was not regular. But the most interesting feature is that Mattison chose to publish compositions in this column, including some original studies: within one month or so, he had already published no less than three originals (numbered 1, 3 and 5). The rhythm faded but nevertheless, by the end of 1927, 23 compositions (most of them studies, among which four originals by Mattison, but also some problems) had been presented in Jaunākās Ziņas. As far as studies were concerned, several were reproduced from Shakhmatny Listok, but there were also some oddities, like a little known 1927 study by F. Lazard, taken from Kagans Neueste Schachnachrichten.

In 1927 Mattison didn’t take part to any chess tournament. After this year, when he resumed competition as a chess player, maybe he had less time for chess journalism and his columns became scarce. Maybe, after one year of enthusiasm, he was disappointed by the lack of participation by readers/solvers?

---

(1) Mattison had no monopoly on the chess column in Jaunākās Ziņas. In 1924, for instance, the editor of Jaunākās Ziņas chess column was … Fricis Apšenieks, who reported the great Latvian success in Paris. In the very first issue of a Latvian chess magazine, Latvijas Sacha Vetnesis (in German: Lettlandische Schachzeitung), in December 1924, whose ‘responsible editor’ was Otto Tideman (Tiedemann), a text entitled ‘Jevadam’ (Introduction) was also signed Fricis Apšenieks. Mattison also contributed to this first issue of Latvijas Sacha Vetnesis but only as a composer: he offered an original study (that was reproduced on the front page) and also an original more-mover problem composed with Kārliis Betins (Karl Behting).
Three other original studies were published in the newspaper one in 1928, one in 1929 and the last in 1930, again with Mattison’s personal address. It should be noted that, as with the fourth of the 1927 studies, the three that followed were all published at the end of December, as a kind of Christmas gift for readers.

Of course, a full search should be made in Jaunākās Ziņas: for this article through lack of time not all issues of Jaunākās Ziņas have been perused. Other discoveries are possible. There were also other publications in Latvia that welcomed original compositions by Mattison. For instance, in November 1924, the Benjamīns created Atpūta (Leisure), a weekly illustrated magazine. Two original studies by HM were published there in 1930 and 1932. The Jaunākās Ziņas article about Mattison’s funeral mentions that he was also the chess editor for this publication. Finally, Ilustrēts Schurnals (or Žurnāls), Latvis are other post-WWI publications about which very little is known.

When he died in 1932, of course, there were announcements of his death in Jaunākās Ziņas (two on 17xi1932, by the Latvian chess federation and the ‘senioru klubs’), preceded by an obituary (on 16xi1932, i.e. the same day Mattison died) and an article about his funeral (on 21xi1932).

Today, it is strange to think that the most famous study ‘composer’ from Latvia is a certain A. Strebkovs... What a pity when you remember how brilliant the chess past of this country is!


(P.2.) 1.a6 Kh1 (b1Q 2.Rg2+ leads to stalemate; Sd6 2.Rh6+ Kg2 3.Rg6+ Kf2

---

### Appendix

In 1924, during his stay in Paris where he was playing the ‘tournoi international d’amateurs à l’occasion de la VIIIe Olympiade’ (considered as the first unofficial chess olympiad), Herman Mattison met Marcel Lamare (for information about this gentleman, see my article ‘The studies collection of Marcel Lamare (1856-1937)’ in EG121, July 1996. He gave him three studies he had recently composed: three diagrammed cards in Lamare’s collection have the same comment: ‘communiquée par l’auteur le 15 juillet 1924’.

Among the Lamare papers, I also found a small sheet with the handwritten positions,
without diagrams, of these three studies ([+0011.12c2e6] and [+0310.22d5b4], both published in *Latvis*, in 1923, and a third one [=3344.20 e8g7], composed with Kārlis Bētiš (K. Behting), and published in *Ilustrets Schurnalns (Žurnāls)*, in 1924. Lamare’s handwriting is easily recognizable but below the position of pieces, another handwriting can be distinguished (see document). Apparently, it is the same handwriting than the one that appears on the most famous of Mattison’s photographs.

**Special thanks** to Timothy Whitworth and Sergiy Didukh.

**Erratum:** in *Eg181* (July 2010), I wrongly gave the 20iii1883 date of birth: Frédéric Lazard, as Rainer Staudte pointed it out almost immediately, was born on 20ii1883. I apologize for that mistake.
In this second part we will discuss the 7-man endgames \textit{KBPP–KBP} and \textit{KBPP–KSP}. The endgames KBPP – KBP are divided into two sections – with same coloured bishops and with opposite coloured ones.

\textbf{KBPP–KBP} – same colour bishops (only Queen Promotions)

Compared to endgames with heavy pieces, bishop endgames are easier to calculate for human players because of the considerably smaller tree of lines. But nevertheless there are very difficult positions, and we have found a lot of mistakes in both endgame studies and o.t.b. games.

As usual, we will start with the record positions. The longest win in KBPP-KBPs has 78 moves; there are two similar record positions (Bg5 or Bh6).

\textbf{BK.1.} Bourzutschky & Konoval

the record position

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

b2e5 0040.21 White wins in 78 moves


The longest win in KBP-KBPPs has 38 moves. There are 15 record positions with the same pawn structure.


---

(1) Translated from Russian and edited by Emil Vlasák.

Now we give three examples from o.t.b. games.

**BK.3.** Kuzmin – Bouaziz
Riga izt 1979

![Diagram](BK.3. 178581176176694.png)
c3c1 0040.12 White wins in 38 moves

(BK.3.) 68... f3!! 69. Bb5 f2!! 70. Ke6 Ke5!! 71. Bf1! 71.d7? Bxd7+ 72. Kxd7 Ke4 73.a4 Be5 with a4-a5. But after 71... Kd4!! 72.a4 Bc4!! 73.d7 Bxf1 74.d8Q+ Ke3 Black could have held this position!

(BK.4.) The game continued 67. Ke7?? Bg3+?? 68. Kc8 Bh4 69.Bd8 Bf2 70.Bf6 Bb6 71.Bg5 Ka7 72.Bf4 and 1-0. Each side committed a fatal error during this short line. Black missed a nice way to draw with 67... Bf2!! And in the initial position White can win in many ways, for example 67.Bg1 Bg5 68.Kc7.

**BK.4.** Poluljahov – S. Ivanov
Russia (ch) 2000

![Diagram](BK.4. 178581176176694.png)
c6a6 0040.21 White to move is winning
69.e6 Ka3!! 70.e7 Bc6!! 71.Bb1 Be8!! 72.Kg5 Kb4! 73.Kf4 Ke3 More accurate was 73... Ke5! 74.Be4 Kd4! 75.Bb1 Bf7! 76.Be4 g5+ 77.Kf5 g4!! 74. Ke3 g5?? Black could still win after 74... Kb4! 75.Kd2 g5! 76.Kc2 Ka3!! 77.Kd2 Bc6! 78.Ke2 Kb4! 79. Be4 Be8 80.Kd2 g4! 75. Ke3!! Bf7 76. Ke3?? White could hold here: 76.Bf5!! Bxf5 (76...g4+ 77.Kf4, Ke3) 77.e8Q b1Q 78.Qe5+ (or even 78.Qh8+). 76... Ke4 Also 76... Kb4 77.Bf5 Bxf5 78.e8Q b1Q+ is possible. 77. Ke4 Ke5 78. Ke5 g4 79. Kf4 Ke3 80.e8Q Bxe8 81. Kxe4 Ke5 82. Kf3 Ke4 83. Ke2 Ke3 84. Ke3 Ba4 85. Ke2 Bc2 86. Ba2 Kb4 87. Kd2 Ka3 0-1.

We now show three cooked endgame studies. It is almost impossible to find a mistake in the first study without the EGTFB.

11. Kf3 draws.

But the nice Réti manoeuvre is refuted by 3... Bc3+!! 4. Kf7 d5 5. b6 d4 6. b7 f1Q+ winning in 36 moves. The best line runs:


But after 4... Ke4! 5. Bxh3 f5 Black holds.

**BK.7.** B. Sakharov

comm. *Shakhmaty v SSSR* 1954

f6h7 0040. 13 Draw?


**BK.8.** A. Herberg

*Schach-Echo* 1960

c8b3 0040. 21 White wins?

**KBPP-KBPo – opposite colour bishops (only Queen Promotions)**

It seems the opposite bishops endgame is easier for humans compared to same colour ones, but there are still errors in games and studies.

The record win in KBPP-KBPo has 52 moves. We have found 146 record positions with four different pawn structures and different winning methods. That is why we give here four examples.


**BK.6.** L. Nyeviczkey

comm. Hungarian Chess Federation Ty 1949

f6h7 0040. 13 Draw?


But after 4... Ke4! 5. Bxh3 f5 Black holds.


The record win in KBP-KBPPo has 24 moves. There are 38 record positions with the same pawn structure and an imprisoned Black bishop.

BK.13. Bourzutschky & Konoval
the record position

a1e5 0040.12 White wins in 24 moves


Now three examples from o.t.b. games.

(BK.14.) After 79...Bg6 White resigned, but in a drawn position! For example 80.Be7 Kc3 81.Ka2!! b3+ 82.Ka3!! Kc2 83.Bf6!! c5 84.Bg7 c4 85.Kb4!! Bd3 86.h7 draw.

BK.14. Makarichev – Ye Rongguang
Beograd 1988

a1b3 0040.12 Black to move cannot win

BK.15. Iskusnyh – V. Malakhov
RUS-ch Ekaterinburg 2002

c3e5 0040.12 Black to move cannot win

(BK.15.) The original comments are from Postny. 84...Ke4 85.Bf6 Kf5 86.Bg7 e5 The final stage of black’s winning plan is on. The second black passed pawn decides the game. 87.g4+ Kf4 88.Bf5 e4 89.Bg4 Kf3 90.Bf6 e3 91.g7 Kf2 92.Bg5 Bg6 It is important to notice, that the bB protects the Pb3 and prevents the promotion of the wP on the same a2-g8 diagonal. 93.Bh4 Kd1 Nice endgame technique by Malakhov. 0-1.

But White could have drawn, for example 93.Bh6 Kf2 94.Bg5!! e2 95.Bh4+!! Kf1 96.Kd2!! Bh7 97.Kc3 Bg8 98.Kd2!! Also possible was 97.Bg3 b2 98.g8Q b1Q 99.Qf7+ Bf5 but here White has to find 100.Qc4!!, the only saving move.

(BK.16.) 53.Bh2 Kg4?? 54.Ke3!! Kf5 55.Kd4!! Ke6 56.c4 Bf3 57.Kc5!! Be2 58.Kb4!! Bd3 59.c5 Kd5 60.Bg1 Bg6 61.Ka5 Be8 62.Ka6 Bd7 63.b6 1-0

– 325 –
Black had two ways to draw on his 53rd move:

53...Bc4 54.b6 Ba6!! 55.Kf3 Kg4. 55...Kg5!! 56.Ke4 Kf6!! 57.Kd5 Ke7 58.Kc6 Ke6!! mutual zugzwang or 53...Kg5 54.Ke3 Be4!! 55.b6 Ba6!! 56.Ke4 Kf6!! transposing into the first line.

We now show four unsound endgame studies with opposite colour bishops.

**BK.17. T. Breede**
*Libausche Zeitung* 1898

b7e6 0040.33 White wins?


But 7...c2!! 8.Bxc2 Kb7 saves the game.

1.a8Q+ Bxa8 2.Rg8+ Kxc7

The stalemate point is refuted by 4…Kc6!
5.Be5 g2 6.Bd4 Kd5 7.Bg1 Ke4 8.Kg4 Bd5!
9.h4 Be6+ 10.Kg5 Kf3 11.h5 Kg3 wins.

**KBPP-KSP**
*(only Queen Promotions)*

The record win in KBPP-KSP has 87 moves. There are 4 record positions very similar to each other.

**BK.21.** Bourzutschky & Konoval
the record position

(BK.21.) 1.Kb2!! Se2 2.g3!! Sd4 3.Ke3!!
Sg5 7.Kf4!! Sh3+ 8.Kf3!! Sg5+ 9.Kg4!!
Se4 10.Be3!! Kd5 11.Kf4!! Sd6 12.g4!!
Sc6 16.Kg6!! Se7+ 17.Kg7!! Sc6 18.Bg3 Sd4
22.Kg7! Sd4 23.Kg6!! Sc6 24.Bc7!! Se7+
Sc6 32.d4!! d6 33.Bb6!! Sb4 34.Kh7! Sd5
35.Bd8!! Sf4 36.Bg5!! Sh3 37.Kh6! Sf2
38.Kh5!! Se4 39.Bc1!! Kd5 40.Bb2!! Sf6+
41.Kg5!! Ke6 42.Be1!! Kf7 43.Bf4!! Ke6
44.Bh2!! Sg8 45.Kg6!! Se7+ 46.Kg7!! Sc6
47.Bg1!! Se7 48.Be3!! Sd5 49.Bd2 Se7
50.Kh7!! Kf6 51.Bc1!! Ke6 52.Bf4!! Sd5
53.Bg5!! Kf7 54.Bd8 Sf4 55.Ba5!! Se6
56.Bc3!! Sf4 57.Bd2! Se6 58.Be3!! Sf8+
59.Kh6!! Sg6 60.Bg5!! Sf8 61.Bd2 Se6
62.Bc3!! Sf4 63.Bb2!! Se2 64.Kg5!! Ke6
65.Ba1!! d5 66.Bb2 Sg1 67.Kh6 Sf3 68.Kg7
Ke7 69.Ba3+!! Kd7 70.Bc5!! Ke6 71.Bb6!! Sh4
72.Bd8 Sg2 73.Bg5!! Se1 74.Bh4 Sf3 75.Bf6
Sd2 76.g5! Se4 77.Kg6!! Sd6 78.Bh8 Sf7
79.Bg7! Sd6 80.Kh7! Se4 81.g6!! Sg5+
82.Kh6!! Se4 83.Be5!! Ke7 84.g7!! Kf7
85.Kh7!! Sg5+ 86.Kh8!! Sh7 87.Kxh7!! wins.

The record win in KSP-KBPP has 29 moves, from 4 similar positions. The starting positions are all impossible to reach in normal chess, but are reachable in Fischer Random Chess. We give one example.

**BK.22.** Bourzutschky & Konoval
the record position, FRC

(BK.22.) 1.Kb3!! Ke7 2.Kc4!! Kd6
10.Sh5!! Ke7 11.Kc5!! Ke6 12.Sg7+!! Ke5
22.Sd4!! h4 23.Kc2!! Kg3 24.Kf1!! h3 25.Kg1!!
Kh4 26.Se6 Kg3 27.Sc7 h2+ 28.Kh1!! Kh3
29.Sxa8!! wins.

The record legal position has 27 moves.

**BK.23.** 1.g6!! d5 2.Sd6!! Kb1 3.Kb3!!
Kc1 4.Kc3!! Kd1 5.Kd4!! Ke6 6.Ke3!! Bg4
7.Sc8!! Be6 8.Sh6!! Ke1 9.Sa4!! d6 10.Sc3!!
Kf1 11.Sb5 Bf5 12.g7!! Bh7 13.Sd4!! Bg8
17.Kh6!! Bg8 18.Kg6!! Ke1 19.Kg5!! Bh7
20.Kh6!! Bg8 21.Kg6!! Be6 22.Sd4!! Bg8
23.Sc6!! Be6 24.Kh7!! Bf5+ 25.Kh8!! Be6
26.Sd8!! Bg8 27.Kxg8!! wins.
From many o.t.b. games we have chosen four examples with interesting mistakes.

**BK.24.** L. Paulsen – Anderssen

Leipzig 1876

From many o.t.b. games we have chosen four examples with interesting mistakes.

**BK.25.** Kotov – R. Byrne

USA-URS, New York 1954

a3a1 0031.12 White wins in 27 moves

(BK.24.) 74...Bd4?? The only way to win was 74...Bf6!! 75.Sf3 Bxh4!! 76.Sxh4 Kg5!!.

75.Ke6 Bf2 76.Sf3 Bxh4

Finally Black has found the correct plan, but it is too late because the White king is closer now. 77.Sxh4 Kg5 78.Sf3+ Kf4 79.Sh4?? White missed three drawing moves 79.Sg1, 79.Sd4 and 79.Se5. 79...g5!! Now Black should win in 11 moves. 80.Sg6+ Kg3?? The last mistake.

80...Ke4!! had been correct, for example 81.Sa5 h4! 82.Sg4 Kg4! 83.Sf2 g4. 81.Kf5 h4 82.Sa5 h3 83.Sg4 draw.

(BK.25.) Averbakh includes an analysis of this ending in his book on Bishop vs. Knight endings, referencing analysis by Bondarevsky. This analysis suggests that Black had missed a win earlier in the game, but that the position in BK.25. is drawn. This analysis is also given in the *Encyclopedia of Chess Endings*.

h4c5 0031.12 Black to move is winning

102...Bf7?? 103.Sb7+ Kb6 104.Sd6 Bd5 105.f6 a5 106.f7 Bxf7 107.Sxf7 a4 108.Sf5 Kb5 and a draw was agreed.


**BK.26.** Spassky – Hübner

Bugojno 1982

h2b5 0013.21 White to move is winning

(BK.26.) White missed the win by playing: 58.Be2+?? Kc5 59.Kh3 Sc3 60.Ba6 e2 61.Bxe2 Sxe2 62.h5 Kd6 63.h6 Ke7 draw. Bad was also 58.Bf3?? Kc5 59.g4 Kd6 60.Kg2 Sf6 61.g5 Ke5!.

The only correct way was 58.h5!!+ 58...Kc5 59.h6!! Sf6 60.Be2!! Kd5 61.Kg3!! Ke4 62.Kh4 Kf5 63.Bd3+!! Ke5 64.g4!.
**BK.27.** Eljanov – Arutinian  
**EU-ch Dresden 2007**

```

h4f6 0013.21 White to move is winning

(BK.27.) White seems to be winning easily. But after 80.Bf5?? Kf7!! 81.Kh5 Kg7!! a nice mutual zugzwang was reached: 82.f4 Kh8!! An excellent idea! 83.Khx6 Se6! 84.Bb1 Sxf4 85.Ba2 Sg6 86.Bb3 Se5 87.g5 Sf7+ draw. Now the correct way is apparent: 80.Kh5!! Kg7 81.Bf5!! and it is Black to move.
```

Now four endgame studies with mistakes.

**BK.28.** G. Amiryan  
**Schakend Nederland 1979**

```

d2a3 0032.13 Draw?


```

**BK.29.** J. Hasek  
**La Stratégie 1928**

```

b5f4 0031.12 White wins?

(BK.29.) 1.Se5 Ke3 1...Ke4 2.c8Q e1Q 3.Qc6+ speeds up the solution. 2.c8Q e1Q 3.Qh3+ Ke4 4.Qh7+ Ke3 5.Qh6+ Ke4 6.Qc6+ Ke3 7.Qf3+ Kd4 8.Sc6 mate.

But after 1...Kxe5!! 2.c8Q Be3! Black holds.
```

**BK.30.** I. Melnichenko  
**3rd hon. mention Belokon MT 1989**

```

f7c6 0031.12 White wins?

(BK.30.) 1.Kg6 Be6 2.Se2 Kd6 3.Sf4 Bg8 4.Kg7 Ke5 5.Sg6+ Ke6 6.Se7 Bf7 7.Sxd5 1-0. But 6...d4! could hold this endgame (EG#7961).

(BK.31.) 1.Sc3 e6 1...a3 2.d5 transposes to the main solution. 2.a6 with two parallel lines:

2...Kf4 3.d5 exd5 4.Se2+ Ke5 5.Sd4, or:


But in the second line (2...Kg4) Black has an easy draw after 4...Kf4! with the idea 5.a7?? dxe4! and Black would even win!
BK.31. V. Tyavlovsky
1st hon. mention Szachy 1960

d2f3 0031.22 White wins?

(to be continued)
Last June I spent a highly enjoyable week in my favourite European city of Prague. The match between grandmasters David Navara and Sergey Movsesian was held in the Michna Palace and I was invited by the tireless organizer Pavel Matocha to present a selection of my endgame studies and even to compose an original study especially for the event.

A highlight in my stay was a pleasant meeting with the Czech composers Jaroslav Pospišil, Emil Vlasák, Jaroslav Polášek and Michal Dragoun. I also met Jozef Marsalek, a veteran member of the Olympic team who is also represented with a study in HHdb1V and promotes our art in his books. The Czech (and Slovak) art of the endgame study has had a long and glorious tradition and among the earlier books I have especially enjoyed since my younger years were the monographies of grandmasters Richard Réti, Dr. Jindrich Fritz and Vladimir Pachman.

Still under the strong impression of this visit I would like to introduce here some highlights from the remarkable award in the recent biennial tourney of the superb monthly Československý šach (2009-2010).

It’s a delicious cocktail of fashionable topics displayed in a human and players-friendly manner. This time I let the instructive comments of judge Stanislav Nosek (translated by Emil Vlasák) speak for the moves.

1.Rg8+/i Kd7 2.dxe7 Bg6/ii To keep winning chances black needs to block the b5-pawn with the king. 3.e8Q+ Bxe8 4.Rg7+!/iii A key move slacking up the bK.. 4...Kc8/iv 5.Rg1 Bh5 6.Kd4 (Kc4) d1Q 7.Rxd1 Bxd1 8.Kxd3 Kb7 Black has reached the planned goal with a small delay. 9.Kd4/v A fantastic saving move. 9...Kb6 10.Kc4! zz. The wind slowly hauls. 10...Bc2! 11.Kc3! Preparing another zugzwang. 11...Bd1/vi This forced move leads to a repetition. 12.Kc4! (Kb4? Bb3;) Ka5 13.Kc5 Be2 14.b6 Bf3 White is finally trapped? 15.b7/vii No, the pawn’s sac crowns the precise defence. 15...Bxb7 16.Kc4! The bishop doesn’t control d1, time to transfer the king to the stalemate corner. 16...Bd5+! A last try (Bc8; b4+). 17.Kxd5 Kb4 18.Kc6! And Black’s win has definitely become only a illusion. 18..Kb3 19.Kb5 draw. The study is dedicated to Marco Campioli. A memorable study for zugzwang lovers, but also for all chess-players..

A.1. J. Polášek (Czech Republic, Praha) & M. Hlinka (Slovakia, Košice)
1st Prize Československý šach 2009-2010

Prizewinners explained

YOCHANAN AFEK

saving move. 9...Kb6 10.Kc4! zz. The wind slowly hauls. 10...Bc2! 11.Kc3! Preparing another zugzwang. 11...Bd1/vi This forced move leads to a repetition. 12.Kc4! (Kb4? Bb3;) Ka5 13.Kc5 Be2 14.b6 Bf3 White is finally trapped? 15.b7/vii No, the pawn’s sac crowns the precise defence. 15...Bxb7 16.Kc4! The bishop doesn’t control d1, time to transfer the king to the stalemate corner. 16...Bd5+! A last try (Bc8; b4+). 17.Kxd5 Kb4 18.Kc6! And Black’s win has definitely become only a illusion. 18..Kb3 19.Kb5 draw. The study is dedicated to Marco Campioli. A memorable study for zugzwang lovers, but also for all chess-players..

i) 1.Rg1? exd6+ 2.Kd4 Bg4 wins.


iv) Ke6 5.Rg1 Bh5 6.b6 Bf3 7.b7 Bxb7 8.Rd1 draws.


A.2. L’uboš Kekely (Slovakia, Snežnica), Ladislav Salai (Slovakia, Martin), Matej Vyparina (Slovakia, Žilina) & Ján Hlas (Slovakia, Žilina) 3rd prize Československý šach 2009-2010

1.b6/i g3/ii 2.Bh3 c5!/iii The bB needs some space immediately. 3.Kb5!/iv A tempo battle begins 3…Bb7!/v 4.Kxc5/vi Be8! The battle is moved to another diagonal (Be4; Kd4). 5.Kc6!/vii Bb7+ 6.Kd6!/viii Controlling the central squares e6 and e5 and in this way limiting the bishop’s movement. 6…Bc6!/ix 7.Kc5! Tempo! 7…Bb7 8.Kd4 Be8 9.Kc3! wins. The composers found a maximum form in a simple same-colour bishop ending. A nice study for o.t.b. players!

i) 1.g3? exb5+ 2.Kc5 Kxa7 draws.


vii) 5.Bxc8? stalemate, after 5.Kd6? Bxh3 6.gxh3 g2 7.Kc7 g1Q 8.b7+ Ka7 9.b8Q+ Ka6 the critical square b6 is guarded.


A.3. Emil Vlasák (Czech Republic, Ústí nad Labem) 4th/5th prize Československý šach 2009-2010

1.b6 b2 2.Rb4! (Rd2 Kb3;) 2…Sd5! Introduction to strong stalemate counter play. 3.Rxb2+/ii Kxb2/iili 4.b7 Sc7+! Closing the c-file with a tempo. (a2; Rc8). 5.Kc7!/iv a2 6.Ra8? Sxa8 7.b8Q+! Sb6 8.Qe5+ Kb3 9.Qe3+ Kb2 10.Qd4+ Kb3! The threat is Sc4-a3-c2. 11.Kd6! Sc4+/v 12.Kc5! In this way White creates a mating net. 12…Sa3 Too late. After 5.Kf7? the wK would be on d5 and Black would keep the position. 13.Qb4+ Kc2 14.Qxa3 wins. White’s win seems to be optically questionable in the setting. The king is moving in a real-time and although the chessboard is not curved like space, he still reaches in time. Einstein would have liked this study, too.


iii) axb2 4.Ra8+ Kb3 5.b7 Sc7+ 6.Kd7 Sxa8 7.b8Q+ wins.

iv) 5.Kd7 (Kf7)? a2 6.Ra8 Sxa8 7.b8Q+ Sb6 draws.

Trio ... trio!

BY VLADIMIR KUZMICH (1)

In a 3 man study the play on the chess stage is being performed by the following actors: two kings and a pawn. Other 3 man combinations do not make a study. Up to the present day there are not so many three unit ideas as compared for example to quartets.

K.1. A. Mandler
*Tidskrift for Schack* 1969


In the book *Neobychnye shakhmaty* by E. Gik (2002), the following trio by V. Kuzmichev was published:

(K.2.) 1.b4? Kf4! 2.b5 Ke5! 3.b6 Kd6! 4.b7 Kc7! 5.b8Q Kb8! – The excelsior of the white pawn in the try is unsuccessful. We can ask ourselves, what can White hope for as we can see with the naked eye that the bK is closer to the white pawn and will get to it first?

1.Kg5! Kf3 2.Kf5! Ke3 (b4? Ke4;) 3.Ke5! Kd3 (b4? Kd4;) 4.Kd5! (b4? Kc4;) – White has shown maximum patience, did not push the pawn ahead and is now rewarded as it turns out that the bK can attack only from beneath as the attack from above is blocked by

K.2. V. Kuzmichev
*Neobychnye shakhmaty* 2002

h6g3 0000.10 2/1 Win

the wK. 4...Kc2 and now 5.b4! – “try to catch us”. White wins. Here we see in all its beauty the unique capability of the pawn to jump over the square of the second row.

I also want to underline that the studies K.1. and K.2. have a common geometrical pattern which gives a certain artistic value to the study, namely the synchronic systematic manoeuvre of the kings in one direction, “the race of the kings” as I call it in my book.

Here we can see a combination of several record “races of the kings”:

K.3. V. Kuzmichev

h4h7 0000.10 2/1 BTM, Win

I. diagram II. Pieces one rank down.

(1) Translation by Maria Kuzmicheva.


Another interesting moment is that the Black can take the opposition and play 1...Kh6, but White has an objection 2.b4! and it turns out that the bK does not manage to reach the pawn on its way to promotion. Win.

II. Why do I focus on another twin position? Here is my answer: in this particular position there appears another variant to the solution with an excelsior of the white pawn. Up until now not a single pawn excelsior was presented without duals. It is obvious that in win studies the pawn sooner or later is promoted to Queen, but the point is to make this happen with no duals. 1...Kh5 2.b4! Kg4 3.b5! Kf5 4.b6! Ke6 5.b7! Kd7 6.b8Q wins (HH: bit 6.b8R is a dual of course). The rest is the same, but in this position the record of the moves on the way to the win is missing.

To finish with, here is another motive for retro – a trio with underpromotion, of course a rook promotion. There are two studies showing this theme completely and it’ll be hard to make a third one.

**K.4. J. Beasley**

*EG 1989*

```

```

1.f8Q? stalemate. 1.f8R! wins.

**K.5. E. Pogosyants**

*Sovetskaya Moldaviya 1970*

```

```

b4a6 0000.10 2/1 Win

1.b8Q? stalemate. 1.b8R! wins.
Reviews

BY JOHN ROYCROFT


There are precious few mentions of studies in this bi-lingual book, whose principal value and interest will be for researchers, with its coverage and commented presentation of a confusingly prolific period of flourishing of chess, including publications, especially in Serbia and Croatia, in the then Yugoslav Republic.

Statistics of the main sections:

– Books: 57
– Periodicals: 3 (listed in significant detail on nine pages)
– Bulletins, Programmes and Games Collections: 146.

The three periodicals were:

– Jugoslavenski Šahovski Glasnik (1953-1967, determining the compass of the volume itself)
– Bilten Odbora za Problemski Šah pri Šss (i.e. the Serbian Chess Association) 1959-1962

An example of user-friendly comment, cited from the index: Croatian always uses the Latin alphabet, while Serbians use both the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets, although the official alphabet is Cyrillic. When books are printed in Croatia the names are always printed in the original form (Euwe, Fine etc.), while in Serbia, even when printing using the Latin alphabet, the corresponding phonetic form is always printed (Eve, Fajn etc.).

A third, and presumably final, part, is to be expected from the admirably industrious Belgrade professor.


Centre-Stage and Behind the Scenes, by Yuri AVERBAKH, 2011.


The first we shall term X, the second Y. Both have been competently translated into English. Neither title is explicitly about studies, but each has some relevance for readers of EG.

It must have been in 1947 that the blind player R.W. Bonham visited Malvern College to play just a few of us – three, I think – simultaneously. He knew the Ruy Lopez inside out, and before long – the board was still crowded – I was faced with loss of a piece. Racking my brains to make it difficult for my unsighted opponent I opted for a line that placed my bishops on opposite sides of the board but both on the fifth rank. White could skewer them with an outside move of his queen to the rook’s file. Surely he wouldn’t ‘see’ that? But he did. Invisibility is relative.

X is built on an original idea, with many unfamiliar examples, lots of psychological hypotheses, observations and theories (example: ‘residual image’), and a spectrum of eye-opening tactical motifs. It is very readable, with diagrams exactly where and when one needs them. Seeing Yochanan Afek as one of the authors, it is no surprise to meet the word ‘beauty’ more than once. The two studies – and even a 4-mover – provide garnish. There are exercises, but every one is starred and captioned with a hint. The whole could not be more friendly. Jarring notes are struck by ‘forget’ where ‘overlook’ is meant, and by fre-
quent mention in the text of other books and sources, presumably to avoid compiling a bibliography.

Y is unique. There is not a single diagram. The IGM author is a veteran survivor in a position, as a lifelong insider, to lift the lid on the Soviet chess past. Which he proceeds to do. Did he join the Communist Party? He did, but left it late, which does him credit, though not as much as the late GM Bronstein, who never joined. If, like me, you have ever wanted to know what the ‘Sports Committee’ did, and what its powers were, this is the book for you – that body’s name occurs dozens of times. Studies and composition do get the odd mention, but always en passant. My long-cherished hope that the mystery of Somov-Nasimovich would be cleared up is, sadly, not satisfied: the top-rank study composer, co-editor for several years of the composition section of 64 up to WW II, still has neither photo nor obituary anywhere in native Russian chess literature. He died in 1942, but as for the details, there is a deafening silence.


The content expands Kasparian’s 555 Miniature Studies published (in Russian) in 1975 – in an edition size of 20,000. The ‘888’ manuscript came to light when the GM’s son Sergei was sorting his father’s papers. In due course Sergei found a publisher, BeoSing in Belgrade (Serbia), who are responsible for the production (presumably including the translation), though copyright is also ‘by Sergey Kasparian’. After the 888 diagrams, all very clear, and on excellent quality paper, we find ‘Chapter 4’, with 889-907 not being miniatures but studies by Kasparian junior.

That is all the good news. Sadly, the translation and the proof-correcting, not excluding the spelling of proper names, are, frankly, disgraceful. Examples: ‘Prited by’, ‘Not once it was proved’ (meaning: many times), Born (for Bron), ‘Nikolai Grigoriev Dmitrievich’, ‘Genrikh Nadareishvili’. Proofreader: Petar Katanic Vujic (who clearly was ignorant of the subject matter). There is no excuse, though we should give credit to the publisher for being (the only one?) ready to take the risk. Your reviewer would have been honoured to have performed all three tasks (translation, editing and proof-reading) without charge. He would have done this in memory of the great man, whose Complete Studies he translated and edited in happy collaboration with the GM himself in the single volume published by Hanon Russell in 1997, given here as ‘1977’.

Paul Valois, who selflessly devotes much of his time to trawling old Russian newspaper chess columns, has traced this ‘unknown’ GMK miniature, which, as far as we know, has not been reproduced elsewhere. If GMK had a reason for not including it in any of his collections or anthologies, we do not know what that reason was. If he deemed it suspect for unsoundness, this has been ruled out (but only in 2011) by Marc Bourzutschky, who (at my request) generously generated the relevant 7-man database to test it – and it passed the test. The likely answer is that the position was just mislaid, which could have happened in any number of ways.

G.M. Kasparian
Trud 12iv1959


(HH: but what about 3.Bc8 with a prosaic win, e.g. 3...Kd2 4.Ra6 Rc2+ 5.Kd5).

Studies, articles, poems by the St Petersburg Katsnelson brothers, either individually or in collaboration over 35 years. The well-produced book (the third Katsnelson brother, Anatoly, assisted) builds on LIK’s somewhat shorter 2000 volume, which has a similar title but includes no photographs.


This is a second edition of the book with the same title (indeed, with the same yellow cover and design) published in 2003, though that had 224 pages. Nevertheless, the 188 study diagrams – all of them miniatures, with no more than seven diagrammed chessmen – slightly exceed the earlier 179, an expansion remarkably achieved without crowding the page.

The content is confined to Romanian composers (20 in number), the arrangement being alphabetical. A photograph or friendly caricature heads every section. The production quality and presentation are excellent. GM Nestorescu has added a short preface.

The thematic index follows that of the first edition. It is, very possibly, still original, with twelve headings, each with one or more subheadings. A study may be indexed more than once.

The twelve headings:
1. General characteristics of the position (9 sub-headings – ‘domination’ points to 59 studies)
2. Mate (6)
3. Stalemate (7)
4. Positional draw (6)
5. Promotion (2)
6. Battery play (2)
7. Sacrifice (6)
8. Pinning (2)
9. Logical combinations (5)
10. Zugzwang (2 – the ‘reciprocal’ list points to 23)
11. Themes involving the pieces of one side only (7)
12. Themes involving the pieces of both sides (9).

The hierarchical indexing invites the ‘student reader’ (aren’t we all students?) to familiarise himself with a theme and at the same time to acquire a feel for how it is treated by composers of differing styles and preferences.
On the occasion of the 90th birthday (6viii2011) of Wouter J.G. Mees, the Dutch Chess Problem Society (Nederlandse Bond van Schaakprobleemvrienden – NBvS) and ARVES jointly organized a chess composition tourney. Wouter edited an endgame study column in Probleemblad for more than 25 years and was one of the founders of ARVES (and is an honorary member). He stimulated cooperation between both societies and always wanted to close the ‘gap’ between chess problems and endgame studies.

Therefore, this tourney’s theme is a logical ult. The ult stipulation was invented by Moravec and Mandler, and translates as ‘White to win in n moves’. The following example comes from John Beasley’s British Endgame Study News Vol. 6 No. 2, June 2001.

A.W. Daniel

British Chess Magazine 1931

This was originally published as an endgame study, but proved to be unsound when checked against the EGTBs. With the ult stipulation however, it is perfectly sound: 1.Sc8!

Kb8 2.Sb6 and now: 2...Sd2 3.Bg5! and White mates (e.g. 3...Se4 4.Bf4+ Sd6 5.Bxd6 mate) or captures the knight ultimately at move 5. Or 2...Sc3 3.Bf6!, or 2...Sa3 3.Be7!

A logical ult requires a thematic try. For this tourney we request that the thematic try is a white move that does win, but not within the required number of moves. Of course, a good thematic try has an unique refutation by Black. The example given is not a logical ult, as it has no thematic try.

Please send your original compositions (a maximum of 3 per composer) to the tourney director Henk le Grand (Heimanslaan 5, NL-6705 AD Wageningen, the Netherlands; h.le.grand@xs4all.nl) before 1vi2012.

Judges: Wouter Mees & Harold van der Heijden.

Book prizes (problems, endgame studies). The award will be published in Probleemblad.

PLEASE REPRINT!
ChessBase 25 Composing Tourney

To celebrate the 25th anniversary of ChessBase, the world’s leading chess software company, we are announcing a special composing tourney for endgame studies (win or draw). There are no restrictions on the type of study. ChessBase have generously offered some of their products as prizes. First prize: A copy of the famous Fritz program signed by over-the-board world champions. Special prizes will be awarded to the best composing débutants.

The tourney judge is GM Dr. John Nunn (Great Britain), former world champion for solving. The tourney director is Luc Palmans (Belgium), chairman of ARVES.

Entries (not more than three per composer) should be sent to the tourney director by e-mail: palmans.luc@skynet.be not later than 31xii2011. Luc Palmans will only accept entries by Email. Please attach pgn files. The judge’s award will be published on the ChessBase news page by the end of March 2012.

PLEASE REPRINT!

Milu Milescu 100 MT

EG announces a special composing tourney for human studies to commemorate the centenary of Milu Milescu (11xi1911-6xi1981), a Romanian originated Israeli promoter of the art of the endgame study and International judge for chess composition. In Romania he was for many years the editor-in-chief of the Revista Româna de Sah and later he ran in leading magazines (such as Europe Échecs, Deutsche Schachzeitung and the Israeli monthly Shahmat) popular and highly instructive columns regarding the linkage between chess composition and the realm of over the board chess. In 1962 he published the book Sigmund Herland: Problèmes Choisis and with Dr. Hans-Hilmar Staudte he wrote the bestseller Das 1x1 des Endspiels.

The judge is Amatzia Avni. Book prizes, honourable mentions and commendations will be awarded. No set theme.

Original human studies (not more than three per composer) should be sent (preferably by e-mail) on diagrams with full solutions and postal address before 31iii2012 to the tourney director:

René Olthof, Achter ’t Schaapshoofd 7, 5211 MC ’s- Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands, raja@newinchess.com.

PLEASE REPRINT!
The third international Tata Steel Chess and Studies Day will be held on Saturday, January 28th, 2012 in De Moriaan in Wijk aan Zee (Netherlands) as part of Tata Steel chess tournament and in collaboration with ARVES. Chief Arbiter: Luc Palmans

Here is the time-table:
10.00 – 10.30: Registration
10.45: Official opening
11.00 – 14.00: International Open Solving Competition of studies with a prize fund of 750 Euros and book prizes. Special prizes will be awarded to the best newcomers and youth solvers.
14.00 – 17.00: Watching live the penultimate round of the world’s most famous chess tournaments with GM commentary.
17.30: Prize giving and presentation of the solutions.

Entry fee: 15 Euros; juniors (u-20) 10 Euros; GMs and IMs – free.

Winners of 2009 edition: 1.IM Twan Burg
2.GM John Nunn 3.GM Eddy van Beers

Winners of 2011 edition: 1.GM John Nunn
2. GM Eddy van Beers 3. WGM Alina L’ami

For further details and registration (in advance as the number of participants is limited!) Please write to the organizer Yochanan Afek (afek26@gmail.com) before January 25th 2012. Join an enjoyable chess and chess composition weekend with the special atmosphere of the great Wijk aan Zee festival and help us to create a successful event again!

Teodoru

Former President Dr. George Teodoru (front, left) and current President Valeriu Petrovici (front, right) of the Rumanian Committee for Chess Composition, on the occasion of their 75th birthday, were honoured for their life time achievement in chess composition during a meeting of the Rumanian Chess Federation. During the meeting Teodoru also received an e-mail with congratulations from his friend grandmaster Emilian Dobrescu, wishing him good health and a long and happy life.
Study of the Year 2010

During the WFCC meeting in Jesi, Italy, the endgame study subcommittee members almost unanimously selected the following study from 2010 as the best one for promoting endgame studies to a general chess public.

1.g6! hxg6 2.bxa3 g5 3.a4 g4 4.a5 g3 5.a6 g2 6.a7 g1Q 7.a8Q Qg8+ 8.Kb7! Qxa8+ 9.Kxa8 Kc6 10.Ka7!

(10.a4? Kb6 11.a5+ Ka6 12.Kb8 h5 13.Kc7 h4 14.Kc6 h3 15.b5+ Kxa5 16.b6 h2 17.b7 h1Q+) 10...Kb5


The thematic try of this study is: 1.bxa3? hxg5 2.a4 g4 3.a5 g3 4.a6 g2 5.a7 g1Q 6.a8Q Qg8+ 7.Kb7 Qxa8+ 8.Kxa8 Kc6 9.Ka7 Kb5 10.a4+ Kxa4 11.Kb6 Kxb4 12.Kc6 Kc4 13.Kd6 Kd4 14.Ke6 Ke4 15.Kf6 Kf4 and now we see the big difference with the solution. Since the black pawn is at h7, 16.Kg6 is not possible, therefore 16.Kg7 h5 and wins.
In the endgame study section 48 composers from 21 countries participated with 48 studies (no co-authorship allowed). Judge Sergey N. Tkachenko (Ukraine) remarked that he found it difficult to judge the tourney as there was no study stood out, although there were quite a few studies of excellent quality.

Translation from Russian to English by HH.

No 17851 Sergiy Didukh (Ukraine). 1.Sg5+/i fxg5 2.Ra7/ii Bf3+ 3.e4/iii Bxe4+ 4.Ke6/iv Bxb7 (Sg8; b8Q+) 5.Rxb7+ Sf7 6.Rxf7+, and:
   – Kh6 7.Rf1 c2 (Kh5; Be5) 8.Rh1/v c1Q 9.Bgl+ Kg7 10.Bd4+/vi Kf8 11.Rh8 first model mate, or
   ii) The first battery. The attempt to control the 1st file fails: 2.Rf1? Bf3+ 3.e4 c2 4.b8Q c1Q 5.Qa7+ Kg8 draws, or here 3.Rxf3 b1Q 4.b8Q Qd1+ 5.Ke4 Qc2+ with equality.
   v) Second battery!
   vi) Compare with the thematic try: no pawn on e3 now.
   vii) 7.Be5? b1Q 8.Ke7 Qf5
   “Of course model mates are not unusual. But the foresight idea leading to the model mates is impressively sparkling as there are no analytical weeds”.

   i) The open position of the wK demands action. But the flank attack is wrong: 1.Bh4+? Kg1 2.Qa7+ Kh1 3.Sg3+ Kg2 4.Qb7+ Qd5. Victory requires blood!
   iii) Bad is 2.Qg3+? Ke2 3.Qf3+ Ke1 4.Qg3+ Kd1 and White has to draw: 5.Se3+ Kxd2
6.Qf2+ Kd3 7.Qc2+ Kxe3 8.Qe2+ Kx e2 and White is stalemate.

i) Kxf1 4.Qg1+ Ke2 5.Sxd4+

ii) Kf3 8.Qc1+ Ke4 and White is stalemated.


ix) Qf2 8.Qc1 mate, or Qf4 8.Qe2 mate.

“The position after 8.Sa5! suggests that amazing finds in the ploughed classical 4001 ending are still possible”

No 17853 E. Eilazyan
3rd prize (bronze medal)

No 17853 Eduard Eilazyan (Ukraine).


vi) The salt of White’s strategy! In contrast to the thematic try White had to take control of square a6!


x) But not Re1+? 15.Kd5 Rd1+ 16.Kc5 Rh1 17. Se7 Rg1 18.g8Q+.

“Study with the theme the author likes so much: change of play. Of course this work is much richer than the first two studies, but without bright study points. And the abundance of thematic tries (although delicious!)
makes you feel tired at the end of the solution”.

No 17854 Y. Bazlov
4th prize

f5h4 0066.40 5/5 Draw

No 17854 Yuri Bazlov (Russia). 1.h6/i Se2/ii 2.d7/iii Ba6 3.h7/iv Bd3+/v 4.Ke5 Bxh7 5.c7/v Sxc7 6.d8Q Bxd8 7.e7, and:
– Bxe7 model mirror mate, or:
– Se6 8.e8Q S2f4 (S2d4; Qh8) 9.Qe7+ Bxe7 and 2nd model mate.


viii) 5.c7 Bb7 6.d8Q Sg6 mate.


“In the fight against the formidable black fauna, White’s sacrificial play begs Caissa twice for a stalemate rescue. Again, as in previous studies, for the ease of perception of the author’s intentions, an excess of ‘underwater currents’ is avoided. The analysis of this study took me quite some time – the ending of queen and pawn (or pawns) against a quartet of light pieces is unconventional. I even had to contact some renowned practical players – GM Mihail Golubev and IM Maxim Notkin. Together we were convinced of the correctness of the author’s intention”.

No 17855 I. Akobia
1st honourable mention

h1S 7.Rb2+ Kh3 8.Rh6+ Kg4 9.Rg6+ wins, or:

i) A two phase study in which White has to find a way to control his opponents passed pawns. Bad is the immediate execution 1.Rxb4? c3 2.Rc4 h2 3.Kc7 Kg3 4.Rh8 Rc1 5.f5 h1Q 6.Rxh1 Rxh1 7.Rxc3+ Kh4 with a clear draw. More important than material is the cooperation of the wRs.


iii) Ke3 4.Rh4 Kg8+ 5.Ka7 Rh7 6.Rxh4+ Kg3 7.Rg3+ Kh3 8.Rxh3 Ke4 draws. First the bK must be forced of the f-file.

iv) h2 5.Rb2+ Kh3 6.Rh7+ wins.

v) 5.Rb2+? Kh1 6.Rf2 f3 7.Rxf3 h2 8.Rb2 Kg8+

vi) Now the second phase of the study begins: the fight against the last black pawn. 6.Rf8? is too close: h1S 7.Rb2+ Kh3 8.Rh5+ Kg4 and the bK has reached out to the wR. 6.Rf8? is too distant: Kh1, and 7.Rh8 Kg8+ 8.Rxg8 stalemate, or here 7.Rh7 Kg7 8.Rh8 Kg1 (Rg8?; Rxh2+) 9.Rh6 Kg6 10.Rh5 Kg5 11.Rh4 Kg4 12.Rxg4 stalemate.


“A subtle rook ending in the best tradition of the Georgian study. I am especially pleased that the wins in the second phase depends on the intermediate check 3.Rf4+ of the first phase”.


i) Black has sufficient material to win, e.g. 1.Ka7? Bf4 2.d3+ Sd2 3.Rc6 b5.


vi) Qxe4 (Bxe4) 6.Qxe4 Bxe4 (Qxe4) stalemate.


“Yes, similar stalemate motifs have already been shown more concisely, but the sacrificial white fairy is charming”.

No 17858 Valery Vlasenko (Russia).


vii) But not 6.Sxd3? g2 7.Rxh2 g1Q 8.Rf2 Qg3 9.Re2 f4 10.Rf2 Qe3+ 11.Kc2 f3 and after bK plays to g3 or f4, it is easy to destroy the fortress.

“This study reminds me of a grandmaster game in which the most interesting and intriguing moments lie behind the scenes; in the analyses and thoughts of the players”.

No 17857 G. Amann
3rd honourable mention
a8b4 4164.13 5/8 Draw

No 17858 V. Vlasenko
4th honourable mention
d2a8 3101.07 3/9 Win


ii) A beautiful move anticipating on future events. If 6.Kg6? a1Q 7.a8S+ Rxa8 8.Sd4+Ka5 9.Sb3+ Ka4 10.Sxa5 Ra6 pins the wQ.

iii) 7.Kf4? a1Q 8.a8S+ Qxa8 draws.

iv) Rxa8 9.Sd4+ Ka5 10.Sb3+ Ka4 11.Sxa1 and now the pin on the 6th line is not there (see line ii).

v) Beautiful domination. If Black takes the wS, it is mate on a5. And Sd2 11.Sc6+ Ka6 12.Qa5 is also mate.

vi) b6 14.Sc6+ Kb7 15.Qc7+ Ka6 16.Sb8+ Ka5 17.Qc3+ Ka4 18.Qa1+ wins the bQ.

vii) Bad is 14.Qc7? Sc4 15.Sc6+ Ka6 and a5 is covered by the bS.

“This study doesn’t have much thematic tries, but has many bright moves in the main line. Unfortunately, the second phase of the study after 10.Qc7!! is significantly inferior to the previous brightness. Do not confuse this composer with the famous Russian politician. This work is from a relatively unknown Ukrainian composer, who’s main study discoveries are yet to come”.


iv) A draw? No! It turns out that while not eating the pawn on the 2nd move, White has prepared a cold shower for the newborn queen.

“The fact that one has to see 12 moves ahead to see the difference between the thematic try and solution, is of course applauded by the judge. But the machinegun play knocking out all the pieces, distresses”.

No 17861 Mirko Miljanic (Serbia). 1.Kh3 Qc8+/i 2.g4+ (Qg4? Qh8++;) Kg1 3.Qxe7 (Qg5? Qc7;) g5 4.Qa7+ (Qxg5? Qc7;) Kh1 5.Sh5 Qc3+ 6.Qe3/ii Qxe3+/iii 7.Sg3+ Sxg3/ iv 8.hxg3 draws/v.
**No 17861** M. Miljanic  
2nd commendation

```
gf2 4004.22 5/5 Draw
```

ii) 6.Sg3+? Sxg3 7.hxg3 Qh8+.  
iii) Sxe3 7.Qg3+ Kg1 8.Qe2+ Kf2 9.Qc3. e.g. Kf3 10.Sb1.  
iv) Kg1 stalemate.  
v) Despite numerous possible moves, and an extra bQ, Black is unable to win.  
“...the stalemate fortress is known (A. Sochnev, 2nd/4th prize Krikheli MT; EG#9453) but this is the ideal setting”.

**No 17862** A. Pallier  
3rd commendation

```f7g5 0331.31 5/4 Draw```

i) Equality is easily achieved after: Kf5 2.c6 a3 3.Sd8 Rxd8 4.c7, or here: Be5 3.Sf8 a3 4.Kg8 a2 5.c7 a1Q 6.c8Q+.  
ii) In contrast the central 3.Sc5? a3 4.h8Q+ Rxe8 loses. 3.h8Q+? Rxe8 4.Sd4 a3.  
iv) a2 6.c7 Rb7 7.c8Q draws.  
“An elegant 3.Sf8!! White maintained his trump card: the connected passed pawns. The finish is less impressive”.

**No 17863** D. Gurgenidze  
4th commendation

```
g8a6 4310.32 6/5 Win
```

i) g1Q 3.c8Q+ Kb6 4.Bg2.  
ii) 6.Qxc5? stalemate.  
“...the modest 8.c8R! makes the winning point in the duel. Very pleasant study by the Georgian grandmaster”.

```
i) 2.Qxe8? e1Q+ 3.Qxe1 stalemate.  
“...an emotional short study without a claim for originality”.
```

**No 17865** Vasily Kozirev (Russia). 1.g8Q+ Sd5 2.Rd6/i h1Q/i 3.Rxd5 Rxd5+ 4.Qxd5+ Kb2 5.Qd2+ Kb1 6.Qxc3 Qg2 7.Be5 Qa2+
FIDE Olympic ty 2010

No 17864 V. Neishtadt
5th commendation

![Diagram](image)

- h1Q 20.Qd3+ Kc1 21.Ba3+ Qb2+ 22.Bxb2 mate, or:


No 17865 V. Kozirev
special prize

![Diagram](image)

8.Ka4 4101.33 7/5 Win

- h1Q 20.Qd3+ Kc1 21.Ba3+ Qb2+ 22.Bxb2 mate, or:


“This demonic study brought the judge a lot of hassle. Somehow I could not believe that out of the large number of possible continuations this was the only way for White to win. However, even after rigorous computer analysis, no defect was found in this study. … But what should solver do? I do not envy the brave souls who risked to swim in this work’s ocean. There are just too many possibilities for White attacks and Black defences. You’ll drown! … Tell me how to award this work. … A special prize”.

No 17866 Martin Minski (Germany). I: diagram II: remove bBh5, add bBh7. I: 1.a5, and:
- Ke3 2.a6 (Kg3? Kd4;) Be8 3.Sf3 Kxf3 (Kxf2; Se5) 4.Sd3 Ke4/iii 5.Sb4 wins.

II: 1.a5 (Sf3+? Ke3,), and:
- Bg8 2.Se4+ Ke3/iv 3.Se2 Kxe4 (Bg5; Sc3+) 4.a6 Ke5/v 5.Sc3 Kd4 6.a7 wins, or:
No 17866 M. Minski
special honourable mention

h2d2 0032.10 4/2 Win


ii) Bd5 4.Sfd2, or Kxf3 4.Sg5+.

iii) Bg6 (Bc6, Bf7) 5.Se5+.


vi) 2.a6? (Sg4+? Kd4;) Kxf2 3.Sh3+ Ke3 4.Sg5 Bg8 5.a7 Bd5.

vii) 4.Se2+? Ke5 5.a7 Bd5.


“A nice miniature bulking with forks. However, for a solver without the help of EGIBs it is difficult to understand the different (thematic) tries”.
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