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# 9th International Internet Tournament (UAPA) <br> MT Eduardo M. Iriarte 

Jaroslav Polášek and Emil Vlasák, Czech Republic, international judges FIDE

Final Award (2020, March)

## Section A

Win studies with thematic Domination White (B or N) vs Black Rook. The initial position may present additional pieces.

15 studies from 9 authors from 6 countries entered the section A.
Thanks to Andrzej Jasik, Ivan Bondar, János Mikitovics, L'uboš Kekely, Mikhail Khramtsevich, Oleg Pervakov, Pavel Arestov, Valery Kalashnikov, Vladislav Tarasiuk.

The Tarasiuk study A10 (Kf4/Ka4) has side solution 1.Rc1 Kb3 2.Ke3 Kc3! 3.Bxd6 Kb2
4.Kd2 Rd7! 5.Rxc2+ Kb1 6.Rc1+ Kb2 positional draw? White wins 7.Rc6! a1Q 8.Rb6+ Ka2
9.Ra6+ Kb2 10.Rxa1 Rxd6+ 11.Ke3 Kxa1 12.Kf4 Rxf6 13.e4. Even easier is 6.Rxa2 Kxa2
7.Ke3 with the same win. Because the core of the study is sound, we allowed a correction.

The theme was not very happily chosen. What exactly is Domination?
The most authoritative source is surely Kasparyan's Domination in 2,545 Endgame Studies (Moscow 1980 or later edition). Kasparyan says: The term domination was introduced into endgame literature by the outstanding French composer Henri Rinck. Its essence is that White, controlling specific squares, attacks and captures a Black piece, after which Black suffers other material losses and is defeated. However, I believe the term domination should be viewed on a broader plane... In the present anthology domination is understood as the capture of pieces by various patterns: geometric, pinning, tying up, discovered attack, shutting out, repulsion of mating threats, zugzwang, etc.

Kasparyan is probably a bit pragmatic because he mainly needed to easily sort studies into his books. But several participants may be used this publication as a domination reference.

Another important source is Словарь шахматной композиции (The Dictionary of Chess Compostion), Зелепукин, Киев 1982. The author repeats the Kasparyan's definition about controlling squares and he also admits using domination not only for direct winning material, but for other goals, for example zugzwang.

Another problem is the required material. White minor piece ( B or N ) is too weak to trapping Black rook. So it needs help from king and pawns and exactly it cannot be a pure $B / N$ versus $R$ domination.

No wonder there were doubts during the tournament whether some of the published studies are thematic. But the rules cannot be changed in the middle of the competition because the participants would not have the same conditions.

After studying listed sources and some discuss we made following decision:
The hard-core dominations with classical trapping are mentioned normally and several nice studies with weaker domination motives got special honours.

In the Arestov study (Ка8/Ка4) the domination seems to be very weak. We liked the content, so we moved the study to section B1.


## Oleg Pervakov, RUS

Prize
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins
1.Ne8+! After 1.Nh5+? Kg6! 2.d7 Rc1+ 3.Kb7 Rb1+4.Kc6 Rc1+5.Kb6 Rb1+6.Kc5 Rc1+ 7.Kb4 Rd1 Black has not problem. 1...Kf7 2.d7 Ra8+ 3.Kb7!

Thematic try $3 . K c 7$ ? Rxe8 $4 . B e 6+$ Kf8 and White has not a good move. And $4 . B g 4$ !? Rh8 5.Bh5+ Rxh5 6.d8Q Rh6 is known theoretical draw.
3...Rxe8 Interesting is 3...Rd8 4.Kc6 - the simplest - 4...e5 5.Nd6 Ke7 6.Kc7.
4.Be6+! Kf8 5.Kc7 Black is in the mutual zugzwang here. 5...Ra8 6.Bd5! Re8 7.Bc6 wins.

mutual zuzwang

7.Bc6! domination

Undoubtedly the best study in the section A with miniature form, interesting play, $\mathrm{wtm} / \mathrm{btm}$ mutual zugzwang and pure hard-core domination as the final.


# Oleg Pervakov, RUS 

special Prize<br>UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins
1.d7 Rh8 1...h2 2.Bb6+! Kb7 3.d8Q. 2.Nc6+! Bad is both 2.Bf6? Rg8 3.Be5 Kb7 (for example 4.Nd5 Rd8 5.Nf6 a5 6.Kxf3 a4 7.Kg3 Kc6! with 8...Rxd7) and 2..Bc7? Kb7. 2...Kb7! 2...Ka8 3.Bf6! Rg8 4.Be5 with a simple win. 3.Na5+ Ka7 The best defence for Black, after 3....Ka8 4.Bc7 Rf8 White wins for example with 5.Nc6 Kb7 6.Bd6! Kxc6 7.Bxf8 Kxd7 8.Kxf3 Kc6 9.c4! 4.Bc7 h2 5.Bxh2 Rxh2+ 6.Kxf3 6.Ke3? Rh8! 7.Nc6+ Kb6 8.d8Q+ Rxd8 9.Nxd8 Kc5=. 6...Rh3+! 6...Rh8 7.Nc6+ Kb6 8.d8Q+ Rxd8 9.Nxd8 Kc5 10.Ke3 Kc4 11.Kd2 is a simple technical win. 7.Kf4!! Rxc3! 8.Ke4! Mutual zugzwang. But not $8 . N c 6+$ ? Rxc6 9.d8Q Kb7 with known theoretical draw or 8.d8Q? Rf3+! stalemate/perpetual. 8...Rc1 9.Nb3! Again 9.d8Q? Re1+. 9...Rd1 10.Nd4 wins.

Thematic try 7..Ke4? Rxc3! 8.Kd4 Rc1! draw, or 7.Ke2? Rxc3 8.Kd2 Rc7(c5)! 9.d8Q Rc2+!

mutual zugzwang

after 9.Nb3!

The study with a nice zugzwang and stalemate play, maybe more interesting than the author's first Prize. But the thematic domination (diagram) is only weaker type and the main theme is rather pawn promotion.


## Pavel Arestov, RUS

honourable mention
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins
1.h8Q Rfd7+ 2.Ke8 Re7+ 3.Nxe7 3.Kf8 loses time: 3...Rf7+ 4.Kg8? Rg7+ 5.Qxg7? Rxg7+ 6.Kxg7 g2. 3...Ra8+ 4.Kf7 Rxh8 5.Nxd5+ Bad is 5.fxg3 d4, for example 6.Nd5+ Kb3 7.Nf4 Rxh5 8.f6 Rg5 9.Ke6 d3 10.Nxd3 Rxg3. 5...Kc5 The line 5...Kc4 6.fxg3 Rxh5 7.g4 Rg5 8.Kf6 Rg8 9.Ke6 Rxg4 finished with a fork 10.Ne3+. 6.fxg3 Rxh5! The best Black chance, $6 . . . K x d 57 . g 4$ is a technical win. 7.Nf4! Nice move! 7..g4? Rg5 8.Ne3 Kd4! 9.Kf6 Rg8 10.g5 Kxe3 or 7.Ke6? Kd4 8.Nf4 Rh8! 9.f6 Ke4 draw. 7...Rxf5+ 8.Kg6 wins.

8.Kg6! domination


Berger 1890

Another classic-style-domination in a good fashion. The prepared f2/g3 duo reduces impression a little.

A little archaeology: Berger was very close to find this interesting position already in 1890, but he did not.


# Vladislav Tarasiuk, UKR 

correction
special honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins
1.Ra1 Too slow is 1.Rc1? Rb7 2.f7 Rb1. 1...Kb3! 2.Be7!

Preliminary is 2.Kd2? Rf8! 3.Be7 Rc8! 4.Rc1 Ra8! 5.Ra1 Rc8 6.Rc1 Ra8 with interesting positional draw. 2...Kb2 3.Kd2 Kxa1 4.Kc1! Of course not 4.Kxc2? Rh7, for example 5.Bd6 Rc7+. 4...Rh7 5.f7! Not 5.Bxd6? Rh1+6.Kxc2 Rc1+! 7.Kxc1 stalemate. 5...Rxf7
6.Bg5! Starting an interesting B vs R duel, the first destination is d2. Again 6.f6? Rh7 7.Bxd6 Rh1+ 8.Kxc2 Rc1+! 6...Rxf5 7.Bd2! Thematic try 7.Be3? Rd5! 8.Bh6 Rd1+ 9.Kxc2 Rg 1 ! 10.Bd2 Rg3 11.Bc1 Rc3+(b3)! 12.Kxc3 Kb1 13.Bb2 a1Q 14.Bxa1 Kxa1 15.e4 Kb1. 7...Rc5 8.Bh6! 8.e4? Rc4 9.Bh6 d5! 8...Rc7! 8...Re5 9.Bg7. 9.Bg5! 9.Be3? Rc4. 9...Rf7 10.Be3! Rf1+ 11.Kxc2 Rd1! 12.Bg5! Try: 12.Bh6? Rg1! 13.Bd2 Rg3! or 12.Bc1? Rxc1+! $13 . K x c 1$ d5 14.e3 d4 15.exd4 stalemate. 12...Rf1 13.Bd2! wins.

12. Bg 5 !

The final winning B vs $R$ duel was treated many times. Tarasiuk version with interesting introductory play is long and original enough and we even allowed a correction. But the domination is of very weak nature, the main theme in duel and mate.


# Ivan Bondar, BLR <br> Michail Khramtsevich, BLR 

$1^{\text {st }}$ commendation<br>UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins

Bad is 1.Nxc1 Qe4. White starts the attack finishing with the win of Black queen. 1.Ra6+! 1...Kc5 1...Kc7 2.Ra7+. 2.b4+ Kd4 3.Nf3+ Ke4 4.Re6+! Qxe6 5.Ng5+ Kf5 6.Nxe6 Ra1 6...Rf1 7.Nd4+. 7.Nd4+ Ke4! Keeping double threat to beat knights. 8.Nc3+ Kxd4 9.a5! The domination with zugzwang. 9...Rf1(h1) 10.Ne2+! 10.a6? Ra1! 11.a7 Ra6!=. 10...Ke4 11.Ng3+ Kxf4 12.Nxf1 wins.

9. a5!
domination with zugzwang


Jaroslav Polášek, scheme win

The golden rule of the study composition says: if you have mutual zugzwang, look for a try with wtm/btm play. It was possible here - Jaroslav's scheme has the solution: 1.b4+ 1.Rxa1 Rh1+. 1...Kd4! 2.Rxa1! Rh1+ 3.Ke2! Rxa1 4.Kd2! wins.


## L'uboš Kekely, SVK

$2^{\text {nd }}$ commendation UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins
1.Nc3 1.d6 Rxa5+ 2.Kc6 Rd5 =. 1...Rxa5+ 2.Kc4 After 2.Kb4? Rxd5 3.Nxd5 exd5 4.Kc5 Kb2 5.Kxd5 a5 6.Kc5 a4 one tempo is missing in the pawn ending. And 2. $2 . K b 6$ Ra3 3.d6 stuck to $3 . . . R b 3+!$ 2...exd5+ The pawn ending $2 \ldots . . R x d 53 . N x d 5$ exd5+ 4.Kxd5 Kb2 after 5.Kc4! a5 is winning: $6 . d 5$ ! (6.Kb5!? Kb3!=) 6...a4 7.d6 a3 8.d7 a2 9.d8Q for example 9...a1Q 10.Qd2+ Kb1 11.Kb3. 3.Kb3 Nice domination with zugzwang. 3...Rb5+ 4.Nxb5 axb5 5.Kb4 Kb2 6.Kxb5 Kc3 7.Kc5 wins.

3.Kb3!
domination with zugzwang
Classic domination in a good design linked with several fine pawn endings.


# Andrzej Jasik, POL 

special commendation UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. A

White wins
1.Kg6! Premature is 1.Nb3? Re4 2.Nc5. Black holds opening the f-file 2...f3! 3.gxf3 Rxe5+ 4.Kg6 Re3 5.f4 Rg3+6.Kf5 d4 7.Nxd7 Kg8 8.Ke6 Re3+ 9.Ne5 Ra3 10.h5 Ra8 11.Kf5 Kh7!=. 1...f3! Interesting is also 1...Kg8 2.Nb3 Rc4 3.h5! Kf8 4.Nd2 Rc2 5.e6! dxe6 6.Nf3 Rxg2+ 7.Ng5 f3 8.h6 f2 9.h7 Rh2 10.Nxe6+ Ke8 11.f7+ or 1...:Ra4 2.Nc2 Kg8 3.h5 Rc4 4.Ne1! targeting g5 again. 2.gxf3 Rxh4 2...Rd3 3.f7 Rxf3 4.h5 Rg3+ 5.Kf6 Rf3+ 6.Ke7 Kg7 7.h6+ Kxh6 8.f8Q+ Rxf8 9.Kxf8 Kg5 10.Ke7 Kf5 11.Kd6. 3.Nb3 Directing to c5. 3...Rc4! 4.e6! Not directly 4.f7? Rc6+5.Kf5 Kg7. 4...dxe6 5.f7 Rf4 After 5...Rc8.for example.6.f4 e5 7.fxe5 Rc6+ 8.e6! Rxe6+ 9.Kf5. 6.Nd4! Zugzwang. 6...e5 7.Nf5 Rxf5 8.Kxf5 Kg7 9.Ke6! Kf8 10.Kxd5 wins.

6. Nd4! zugzwang

The study with interesting play. Unfortunately the author failed to emphasize the mutual zugzwang using a try. Domination is of weak nature, the main theme seems to be pawn promotion.

## Section B1

Free theme, win.

31 studies from 23 authors from 14 countries entered the section $B 1$.
Thanks to Alexander Avedisián, Alexander Zhukov, Amatzia Avni, Andrzej Jasik, Arpad Rusz, Daniel Keith, Daniele Gatti, David Blundell, Fabio Magini, János Mikitovics, Lubos Kekely, Luis Miguel González, Marc Gelly, Marcel Dore, Mario García, Martin Minsky, Michal Hlinka, Mikhail Gromov, Oleg Pervakov, Pavel Arestov, Peter S. Krug, Valery Kalashnikov, Vladislav Tarasiuk.

The Arestov study (Ka8/Ka4) was moved here from the section A. More see in study comments.


## Andrzej Jasik, POL

$1^{\text {st }}-2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize ex aequo UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.f7 f2+ 2.Ke2 f1Q+! 2...Rf3 3.f8Q+ Rxf8 4.Ra8+. 3.Kxf1 Rf3+ 4.Kg1! Looking far ahead.
4...Rxf7 5.Ne8! Such an unusual move would be easily overlooked by players.

Surprisingly, matting threats appear. 5...Kc8 5...Kxe8 6.Ra8 mate. 6.Rc7+! What a move that delicacy! White performs a logical maneuver of his rook because of the immediate 6.e6? dxe6 7.Nd6+ fails because 7...Kb8! 6...Kd8 6 ...Kb8 $7 . \mathrm{Rxd} 7$ wins technically. 7.Rb7! Kc8 7...d6 8.e6. 8.e6! The final point. 8...dxe6 8...Rf2 9.Rxd7! Re2 10.Rc7+ Kd8 11.Rc6. 9.Nd6+! exd6 10.Rxf7 wins.

Thematic try: 4.Kg2? Rxf7 5.Ne8 Kc8 6.Rc7+ Kd8 7.Rb7 Kc8 8.e6 would fail because of 8...Rf2+!

5. Ne8!

8. e6!

A perfect study, fully understandable without a computer.


# Arpad Rusz, ROM Pavel Arestov, RUS 

$1^{\text {st }}-2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize ex aequo UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.d4! The first systematic movement starts - the "elevator" rises. After 1.Kxa5? Kxd3 2.Kb4/b5/b6 Rh4/h5/h6+ and 3...Rg4/g5/g6! Black holds easily. Similar motives continue to work. 1...Kd3 2.d5 Kd4 Black could otherwise transfer his rook to g-column after 2...Rh4+ 3.Kxa5 Rg4, but he does not win the important pawn: 4.Kb6! Kd4 5.d6 Kd5 6.Kc7 Ke6 7.Re8+. 3.d6 Again 3.Kxa5? $\mathrm{Kxd5} 4 . \mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Kd} 4$ ! 5.Kb4 Kd5 6.Kb5 Kd4 is a draw. 3...Kd5 4.Kxa5 Kxd6 5.Kb6! Now the White king is hidden from horizontal checks.
5...Kd5 6.Kc7 d6 The second systematic movement starts - the "elevator" falls. 7.Kb6! After 7.Kd7? Ke5 8.Re8+ Kf6 the White pawn is pinned. 7...Kd4 The Black king has to avoid vertical checks. 8.Kc6 But not $8 . K b 5$ ? Rh5+ 9.Kc6 Rg5 10.Kxd6 Rg6+ 11.Ke7 Ke5 12.Kf7 Rf6+ draw. 8...d5 9.Kb5! Kd3 10.Kc5 d4 11.Kb4! Kd2 12.Kc4 d3 13.Kb3! Kd1
14.Kc3! Bad is $14 . K b 2$ ? d2! with mutual zugzwang. But not $14 . .: R h 2+$ ? $15 . \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{~d} 2$ 16.Rd8 Rg2 17.Rxd2+! 14...d2 15.Kb2! Mutual zugzwang, Black to move! 15...Rh5 15...Ke2 16.Re8+. 16.Rb8! The last accurate move, $16 . R d 8$ ? Rb5. White wins.

We hope to meet this excellent study in future textbooks about chess endgames. In the same tournament Arpad Rusz published a miniature simplified version of this study. It could be useful for simpler solving contests. Here is it.


Arpad Rusz, UAPA9
win
1.g7 Rh7 2.Rg8 Kxd5 3.Kb6 Kd4 4.Kc6 d5 5.Kb5 Kd3 6.Kc5 d4 7.Kb4 Kd2 8.Kc4 d3 9.Kb3 Kd1 10.Kc3 d2 11.Kb2 Rh6 12.Rb8.


# Andrzej Jasik, POL <br> $3^{\text {rd }}$ Prize <br> UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1 

White wins
1.e7 $1 . \mathrm{Kxg} 4$ is not sufficient to win: $1 . . \mathrm{Nf} 8$ 2.e7 Kf7 3.Be4 Rb2 4.Bd5+ Ke8 5.exf8Q+ Kxf8 $6 . \mathrm{Kf4} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 7.1 . . . \mathrm{Bh} 5$ !! It is not easy to find this excellent counter-play, many players would resign either immediately or after $1 \ldots K f 7$ 2.Bg6+. 2.Kxh5 f5! The point, bad is $2 \ldots R h 2+$ 3.Kg4 f5+ 4.Kg3. 3.Nxf5+ Rxf5+ 3...Kff7 4.Nh6+. 4.Bxf5 Nf6+ The game went into endgame that doesn't look dangerous for Black. For example $5 . K g 5 \mathrm{Kf7}$ ! and White has no a good move: $6 . . B g 4 . \mathrm{Ne} 4+, 6 . B d 3$ Ke6! 7.Kg6 Ne8 8.Bc4+ Ke5! or finally 6.Kh6 Ne8 ( $6 . . . \mathrm{Ng} 8+$ is also enough to hold) $7 . \mathrm{Bg} 6+\mathrm{Ke} 68 . \mathrm{Bxe} 8 \mathrm{Kxd6}$. But...5.Kh4!! with the idea 5...Kf7 6.Kg5! zugzwang and time to resign: 6...Ne8 7.Bg6+ or 6...Ke8 7.Bg6 mate. 5...Ne8! The best change. 6.Kg5 Nxd6 7.Bg6! Ne4+ 8.Kf5 Nf6 9.Bh5! d6 10.Ke6 d5 11.Ke5 d4 12.Kxd4 Kh6 13.Ke5 wins.

5.Kh4!!

9.Bh5!

Another excellent ending with miniature material.


# Martin Minski, DEU <br> Amatzia Avni, ISR 

honourable mention
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1
White wins

After 1.f6+ Kd7 2.Rb2 Kc8! 3.Rh2 Nb5 4.Rh8+ Kd7 5.a8Q Bxa8 6.Rxa8 Nd6 Black achieved a typical positional draw, even better is 6 ...c6. White therefore tries to take advantage of the somewhat uncertain position of Black minor pieces. 1.Rb2! Bc6! After 1...Bh1 2.f6+ Kd7 3.Rb8 there is not the saving manoeuvre Ne4-d6. 2.f6+ 2.Rc2? f6+. 2...Kd7 3.Rd2+! White continues attacking minor pieces because of 3.Rb8? Ne4 4.a8Q Bxa8 5.Rxa8 Nd6 we have already seen. 3...Kc8 4.Rc2 Nb5! The best chance. 5.Rxc6 Nxa7 Black is again close to known positional draw, for example $6 . R \mathrm{Rc} 1$ Kd7 7.Rd1+ Kc6 8.Rd8 Nb5 9.Rf8 Nd6. Therefore, extreme means are required. 6.Ra6! Nb5 Or 6...Kb77 7.Re6!! Nc8 8.Re7 Nd6 9.Kd5. 7.Re6!! This nice point does not allow Black to consolidate.

## 7...Nd6 8.Re7 Kd8 9.Kd5 wins.

It should be added: the immediate 6.Re6? Kd8 7.Re7? failed on 7...Nc6+.

6. Ra6 Nb5 7.Re6!!

A remarkable way to refute positional draw!


# Michail Gromov, RUS Oleg Pervakov, RUS 

honourable mention
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Qe2 Threatening Ne4+, for example 1...Qxh5 2.Ne4+ dxe4 3.Qf2+ Kh3 4.Qh2 mate. 1...Nc5+ 2.Kd6 Qxh5 2...f5 3.Kxc5 Qc4+ 4.Qxc4 dxc4 5.f4 Bh4 6.Kxc4 Kg2 7.Nd3 Kxg1 8.Kd5 is winning for White. 3.Ng4 3.Kxc5 Qxf3 4.Bh2+ Kg2. 3...Ne4+ 3...Nb7+4.Kc7 Qf7+ 5.Kb6 Qe6+6.Ka7. 4.fxe4 dxe4 How to continue the attack? Thematic try 5.Qe1+? Kxg4 6.Qd1+ Kf5! 7.Qd5+ Kg4 8.Qd1+ (8.Qxe4+ Kg3) 8...Kf5 9.Qxh5 gives only stalemate. And after $5 . B h 2+$ Kh4 6.Qe1+ Kxg4 7.Qd1+ Kf5 8.Qd5+ Kg4 9.Qxe4+ Kh3 there is not Qh1+. 5.Bf2+! Kh3 6.Qf1+ Kxg4 7.Qd1+ Kf5 8.Qd5+! Kg6 9.Qg8+ Kf5 10.Qh7+ Kg4 10...Qg6 11.Qd7 mate. 11.Qxe4+ Kh3 12.Qh1+! Kg4 13.Qd1+ Kf5 14.Qxh5 and stalemate is avoided -e4 is free for Black king.

5. ??

A modern study with a middle-game contour. White has to choose from three promising attacking ways.


## Peter Krug, AUT

honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Qe6+! Necessary preparation because of 1.Qxe7? Rxb3+! 2.Kxb3 Qg3+ 3.Kc2 Qf2+! 4.Bd2 bxa6 5.h6 Qf5+. 1...Kh8 2.Qxe7 Rxb3+! The best defence, bad is 2 .::Nxh5 3.a7! Qd8 4.Qe5+, for example 4...Kg8 5.g4 b5 6.gxh5 Rd2+ 7.Kc3. 3.Kxb3 bxa6+ 4.Ka2 4.Ka3? Qg3+. 4...Nxh5 4...Qg8+5.Ka1 Ng4 6.Bc1. 5.Ka1! A nice moment! Premature is 5.g4? Qg8+ 6.Ka1 Ng7. 5...Qg8 Targeted against g4. 5...a5 6.g4 Qa8 7.Qe5+! Kg8 8.Qe6+ Kh8 9.gxh5 Qh1+ 10.Kb2 Qg2+ 11. Kc3 Qg3+ 12.Kd4 Qh4+ 13.Kd3 Qg3+ 14.Be3. 6.Qe5+ Ng7 7.Qf6 Zugzwang. 7...a5 8.Kb2! 8.Qe7 Ne6 9.Qf6+ Ng7 loses time. 8.g3?? a4 9.g4 a3 10.g5 a2 and White has no good move. 8...Qb8+ 9.Ka2 Qg8+ 10.Ka1! Using King triangulation White changed the move order. 10...a4 11.g3! a3 12.g4 a2 13.g5. Black is finally outtemped.

8. Kb2! Qb8+ 9.Ka2! Qg8+
10.Ka1!

Another middle-game study. The final tempo-play in not completely new, but the whole design is very pleasant and economical.


# Vladislav Tarasiuk, UKR Martin Minski, DEU 

special honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins

Bad is 1.Nxb7? Qxe7+ 2.Nc5+ Kc6 3.Nd4+ Kd5 4.Rd8+ Rd6, therefore White simply wins the queen. 1.Ne5+ Kxe7 2.Ndc6+ Qxc6! 3.Nxc6+ Kd6 4.Re8!! After 4.Rd8+? Kxc6 White is in zugzwang: 5.Ra1 Rb8 6.Rc1+ Kb7 or 5.Re8 Kd5 6.Rad8+ Rd6! Bad is also 4.Rf8? Rxc6! 4...Kxc6 4..:Rxc6 5.Rad8 model mate with self-block on c6. 5.Red8! Black has not a good move.

zugzwang

Very interesting mechanism and good correction of older Tarasiuk study.


## Pavel Arestov, RUS

special honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.c7 Rc4! 1.:.Nd7 2.Rxd7 a1Q 3.c8Q Qh1+ 4.Rb7 or $1 \ldots$... 1 1Q 2.c8Q and Black has no check. 2.Rd4 Rxd4 3.Bxa2 Nd7 4.Ka7 Nb6! The only chance. 5.Kxb6 Yes, we are looking here something like a weak domination. But Black had to help it through sac, it lasts very short and the main themes are other. 5...Rd6+ 6.Kc5! Rd7 7.c8R! 7. c80? Rc7+! with stalemate; 7.Bb3+? Kxb3 8.c8Q a2=. 7...Ra7 8.Kb6 Domination. 8...Rh7 9.Rc4 mate.

7.c8R!

The well-known arsenal - stalemate, unerpromotion, mate - in very good economic treatment.


## Andrzej Jasik, POL

commendation
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Bb8 Be5!? The only good possibility, 1...Rxa5 2.c7. 2.Bxe5 Rxa5 3.Bb8! 3.c7? Ra8.
3...Ra6 4.c7 Re6+! 4...Rc6 5.Ke4 shortens the solution. 5.Kd3! 5.Kf4? Rf6+ 6.Ke5 Rf8.
5...Rc6 5...Rd6+? 6.Ke4. 6.Ke4 e6 6...Kg2 7.Kd5 Rd6+ 8.Kxc5. 7.Kf3! A nice zugzwang. 7...e5 Or 7...:Kh2 8.c8Q check. 8.Ke4 Kg4 9.Kd5 wins.


Final zugzwang

Pretty little puzzle with an unexpected finish.


# Pavel Arestov, RUS <br> Alexander Zhukov, RUS 

commendation
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Rd8+ Premature is $1 . . K g 5$ ? $\mathrm{Qxf6}+!$ 1...Kxf7 2.R8d7+ Kg6! The point appears after 2...Kf8 3.Kg5! - Black has not Qxf6 here, for example 3...Qa3 4.Rd8+ Kf7 5.R5d7+ Ke6 6.Re7+. 3.f7 Qf1!? A little co-operation from Black. Tougher for player or solver should be surely the technical line 3 ... Qff6t 4.Kg3 Qc3+5.Kg2 Qc2+ 6.Kf3 Qc3+ (6...Qb1 7.f8N+!) 7.Rd3 Qf6+ 8.Kg2 Qb2+ 9.Rd2 Qg7 10.R2d4! 4.f8N+! Of course with a tempo. 4.f8Q Qh3+ with stalemate or perpetual after 4.f8R Qh1+. 4...Qxf8 4....Kf6 5.Nh7+ Kg6 6.R5d6+. 5.Kg4! $5 . R 7 d 6+$ ? Kg7 6.Rd7+ Kf6! or $6 . K g 5$ Qe7+. 5...Qb4+ 6.Rd4 with 7.Rd6 mate.

4. $\mathbf{f 8 N}+$

An interesting miniature contains mate, stalemate, perpetual and underpromotion.


# Vladislav Tarasiuk, UKR 

commendation
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Bf7+ Ka3 2.Qxa4+ Kxa4 3.Kb2 Rxf7 33...:Kb5 4.Bc4+! Kb6 5.Rxg2. 4.Rg5! Threatening Ra5 mate. 4...e5 5.Rxe5 Ra7 6.b5+ Ka5 7.b6+ Kxb6 8.Rh6+ Kc7 9.Re7+ Kd8 10.Rxa7 g1Q 11.Rh8+ wins.

Logical tries:
1.Qxa4+? Kxa4 2.Kb2 Kb5! 3.Rg5+ Kb6! 4.Bxf3 g1Q.
3.Ka2? Rxf7 4.Rg5 e5! 5.Rxe5 Ra7 6.b5+ Ka5 7.b6+ Kxb6+ with check.
4.Rh5? e5! 5.Rxe5 Ra7 6.b5+ Ka5 7.b6+ Kxb6 8.Rg6+ Kc7 9.Re7+ Kd8 10.Rxa7 g1Q.

4. Rg5 or 4.Rh5?

Interesting play with triple selection of the right move.


# Luis Miguel González, ESP 

commendation
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Qg1! After 1.Og2? 0-0! 2.Nh5 g6! (but not 2...Ne6? 3.Nf6+ as the main line) 3.Nf6+ Kg7 there is not 4.Qe3 as in the main line and Black has no problems: 4.Qf2. Ne4! 5.Nxe4 Qc7! 6.Qd4 f6 or 4.Qg5 Qd8! 5.Qh4 h6! And the computer line 1.Rxc3? 0-0! 2.Ned3 Qd8 3.Rxc5 a2! 4.Qa1 Qh4+ 5.Nh3 Ra8 6.Rg5 f6 7.Rg2 Qc4 8.Nhf4 Ra6 does not seem to be dangerous for Black. 1...0-0! Visibly the only good move: 1 ....Ne6 2.Nxe6! Qxe6 3.Qxg7 Rf8 4.Rxc3! f6 5.Rc5! a2 6.Rb5 or 1...:q6 2.Nxf7 Kxf7 3.Nd5+. 2.Nh5! Ne6! 2...g6 3.Nf6+ Kg7 4.Qe3! 5.Kh3 Qb7 (5...Qe7 6.Qxc3 Na4 7.Qd4!) 6.Neg4! Kh8 7.Rf1 Qb5 8.Kg2! Qc6+ 9.Kg1. 3.Nf6+ Kh8 4.Qg6!! The main point. 4...Ng5! 4...fxg6 5.Nxg6+ hxg6 6.Rh3 mate or 4...gxf6 5.Qxf6+ Ng7 6.Rg3. 5.Qxg5 Qd8! 5...Qe6 6.Nh5 g6 7.Nxf7+. 6.Qh5! 6.Nxh7? Kxh7! 7.Rh3+ Kg8 8.Rh8+ (8.Qh5 Qd2+ 9.Kg3 Qh6) 8...Kxh8 9.Nxf7+ Rxf7 10.Qxd8+ Kh7=. 6...gxf6 7.Nxf7+ Rxf7 8.Qxf7 c2! 8....Qd2+ 9.Kh3! Qh6+ 10.Kg2 Qg5+ 11.Rg3 Qd2+ 12.Kh3! Qh6+ 13.Kg4 Qg5+ 14.Kf3 Qf5+ 15.Ke2 Qc2+ 16.Ke3 Qd2+ 17.Ke4 Qc2+ 18.Kd4+Qd2+ 19.Rd3 Qf2+ 20.Kxc3. A very unpleasant side line for solvers - that is, if they are found at all. 9.Rd3! 9.Rg3? Qd2+ 10.Kh3 Qh6+. 9...Qb8+ 10.Rg3! 10.Kh3? c1Q! 11.Qxf6+ Kg8 12.Qe6+ Kh8! 10...Qxg3+ 11.Kxg3 c1Q 12.Qf8 mate.

4. Qg6!!

Exercises in computer analysis.


# Michal Hlinka, SVK Ĺuboš Kekely, SVK 

commendation
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

BTM, White wins
1...Bb3+ 2.Rxb3 Qc4+ 3.Kh8! The main point. After 3.Kh7? Qxb3 4.Rg7+ Kxh4! White has no good move: $5 . \mathrm{Ng} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 36$. Nf2 $2+\mathrm{Kh} 27 . \mathrm{Ne} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 8+$ with stalemate. Computer indicates a draw in the line 3.Rf7? Qxb3 4.Nf3 Qe6 (or 4...Qb8+/Qb5). 3...Qxb3 4.Rg7+!
A) 4...Kxh4 4:.:Kf4 5.Nf6 Qb8+ 6.Rg8 Qd6 7.Nh5+ Ke3 8.Ng2+, 4...Kf5 5.Nd6+ Ke6 6.Rg6+ Kd7 7.Ne4. 5.Kh7! Mutual zugzwang. 5...Qa3 5....Kh3 6.Nf2+ Kh4 (6...Kh2 7.Rg2 mate) 7.Ng2+ Kh5 8.Nf4+ Kh4 9.Rg4 mate. 6.Ng2+ Kh3 7.Nf2+ Kh2 8.Ne3! Black has not stalemate here. 8...Qa6 8....Qa8 9.Nf1 mate, 8...Qxe3 9.Ng4+. 9.Rg2 model mate.
B) 4...Kh5 5.Ng3+ Kxh4 6.Ng2+ Kh3 7.Nf4+ Kh2 8.Rh7+ Kg1 (8...Kxg3 9.Rh3+) 9.Rh1+ Kf2 10.Ne4+ Ke3 11.Rh3+ wins.


Mutual zugzwang
Too much ammunition for one zugzwang. The second heterogeneous line is not a great benefit, but rather distracts from the subject.


# Alexander Avedisián, URY 

commendation
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins

The study is based on paradoxical key 1.Bd2!! To win the bishop White King has to return, while in other lines the King would stop pawns: 1.Bh4? Rg8! 2.Bf2 (2.d5 Kc4 3.d6 Kd5 4.d7 Rf8! 5.Bg3 Kc6!=) 2...Rg2! 3.Be1 Rg8 4.d5 Rd8 5.Ke6 Re8+ 6.Kf7 Rd8!=, or 1.d5? Rf1+! e.g. 2.Kg5 (2.Kg6 Ke4 3.d6 Ke5 4.d7 Rxf6+) 2...Ke4 3.d6 Ke5 4.d7 Rg1+ 5.Kh6 Rg8 6.f7 Ra8=. 1...Kxd2 Black has no time for $1 \ldots$....Kxd4 $2 . f 7$ and Bf4. And $1 . . . \mathrm{Rg} 8$ loses the possibility of rear checks: 2.d5 Kd4 3.d6 Kd5 4.Bb4! 2.d5! The rest are usual logical moves. 2...Rf1+ 3.Ke6! 3.Kq6? Kc3=, 3.Kg5 Kd3/e3 4.d6 Ke4!=. 3...Re1+ 4.Kf7! 4.Kd7? Kc3. 4...Kc3 5.d6 Rd1 5...Kb4 6.d7 Rd1 7.Ke7 Re1+ 8.Kd6 Rd1+ 9.Kc7 Rc1+ 10.Kb7. 6.Ke7! 6.Ke6? Кc4! 7.d7 Kc5! 8.f7 Kc6!=. 6...Re1+ 7.Kd8! 7.Kd7? Kc4 8.f7 Rf1!=. 7...Rf1 8.d7! Rxf6 9.Ke7 wins.

4.Kf7!


## David Blundell, GBR

special commendation UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B1

White wins
1.Kh6 Kf6 2.b4 g5 3.Kh5 Kf5 4.b5 g4 5.Kh4 Kf4 6.b6 g3 7.b7! Time to leave the established rhythm. 7...g2 8.b8Q g1Q 9.Qf8+ Ke3 10.Qc5+ wins.
The rhythmic movement of pawns gives a pleasant impression. Of course, the theme is not new.


Selezniev 1912
1.Kc4 a5 2.d4 Ke(f)4 3.d5 Ke5 4.Kc5 a4 5.d6 Ke6 6.Kc6 a3 7.d7 a2 8.d8Q a1Q 9.Qe8+ Kf6 10.Qh8+ Ke6 11.Qxa1 wins.

## Section B2

Free theme, draw.

26 studies from 23 authors from 14 countries entered the section B2.
Thanks to Alexander Zhukov, Amatzia Avni, Anatoly Skripnik, Andrzej Jasik, Arpad Rusz, B. Buyannemekh, Daniele Gatti, David Gurgenidze, Evgenev Kopylov, János Mikitovics, Luboš Kekely, Marc Gelly, Marcel Dore, Mario S. García, Martin Minski, Michal Hlinka, Nikolay Griva, Oleg Pervakov, Pavel Arestov, Peter S. Krug, Piotr Murdzia, Valery Kalashnikov, Vladislav Tarasiuk.

The Kalashnikov study B2 08 ( $\mathrm{Kf} 1 / \mathrm{Kd} 1$ ) is unsound.
1.Rgd4+ Kc2 2.Rac4+ Kb3 3.Rb4+ Ka3 4.Ra4+ Qxa4 5.Rxa4+ Kxa4 6.g7 Ba6+ 7.Ke1! Bc4
8.Nd7 and here 8...Bg3+!! 9.Kd2 Kb5 10.Nf6 Bf4+ 11.Ke1 Be5 12.g8Q Bxg8 13.Nxg8 Nf5 Black wins.

The Hlinka and Kekely study B2 01 (Kf8/Kh5) is unsound.
We have refuted the background positional draw. The quickest is 10...Bf6! 11.Kd5 Ra8! 12.Rb4 12.Rb7 Ra1 13.c6 (13.Rb8 b1Q) 13...Rd1+ 14.Kc5 Ke6 15.Rxb2 Bxb2 12...Ra4! 13.Rb8 13.Rb3 Ra3 14.Rb8 Rd3+. 13...Rd4+ 14.Kc6 Rd1! 15.Kd7 else queening 15...Rh1! 16.Rb3 16.c6 Rh7+ 17.Ke8 Кe6, 16.Kc6 b1Q. 16...Rh3 17.Rb8 Rh7+ 18.Kc6 Ke6! 19.Re8+ Re7! 20.Rb8 Ra7! 21.Re8+ Be7! Nice maneuver 22.Rb8 Ra6+ wins.

In both cases the cook is in the kernel and a correction would be rather reconstruction, so it was not required.

The Gatti study B2 03 (Kh8/Kh6) is almost identical with J. Lazar, Magyar Sakkvilág\#507, 1940, EG 64785, mirrored.


# Valery Kalashnikov, RUS 

$1^{\text {st }}$ Prize UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Rf7+! Other ways to win the Queen do not work: 1.Rh7?! Qxh7 2.Rf3+Ke7! or 1.Rh3?! Qxh3 2.Rf7+! Kg8! 1...Kxf7 2.Rh3! Qg7! 2...Qxh3? 3.Nxg5+, 2...Qf8? 3.Rf3+. 3.Rh7! Qxh7 4.Nxg5+ Kg7 5.Nxh7 Kxh7 White position stays critical because of bad King. 6.a4!! Try 6.95 ? loses after 6...a4!, for example 7.Kb1? Kg7 8.Kc1 Kf7 9.Kd2 Ke6 10.Kc3 Kf5 11.Kb4 Kxg5 12.Kxb5 Kh4 13.Kxc4 g5 14.Kd3 g4 15.Ke2 Kh3! or 7..b4? a3! 8. Kb1 Kg7 9.Kc1 Kf7 10.Kd2 Ke6 11.Ke3 Kd5! 12.c3 Ke5 or 7.bb3? c3! 6...b4 7.g5 Kg7 8. Ka2 Kf7 9.c3 b3+ Or $9 \ldots . . .6 \times c 3$ 10.b4!=. 10.Ka3 Ke6 stalemate with self-imprisonment.


Very interesting pawn ending with natural pleasant introduction.


## Arpad Rusz, ROM

$2^{\text {nd }}$ Prize
UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Rd2+ 1.Rxf4? Ke5+. 1...Ke5 1...Kc5 2.Rxc4+! Kxc4 3.Rxd6 but not 2.Rxd6? Rh1+ 3.Kd2 Rxc1 4.Rf6 Rf1! 5.Ke2 Rh1 6.Rxf4 Kb4. 2.Rxd6 After 2.Rxc4? Rh1+ 3.Kc2 Ra6 4.Rd8 Black finally wins but DTZ49 is a little disturbing. 2...Rh1+! 2...Kxd6 3.Rxc4=. 3.Kd2 Rxc1 4.Rc6 Kd5! 4...f3!? 5.Kxc1 f2 6.Rc5+ Ke4 7.Rxc4+ Kf3 8.Rc3+ Kg2 9.Rc2=. 5.Rf6 Rf1 6.Ke2! Ke5! 6....c3!? 7.Kxf1 c2 8.Rf5+ Kd4 9.Rxf4+ Kc3 10.Rf3+ Kb2 11.Rf2= (echo). 7.Rc6 Rc1 8.Kd2! Kd5! 9.Rf6 positional draw.

6.Ke2! Ke5! 7.Rc6 Rc1 8.Kd2

Excellent discovery in rook ending - whatever we call it positional draw, perpetual attack or echo. A pity of a long proof line after 2. Rxc4 that slightly reduces the impression.


# Pavel Arestov, RUS Alexander Zhukov, RUS 

$3^{\text {rd }}$ Prize<br>UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2<br>draw

1.Qh1! Guarding b7 is only way to stop Black's attack. 1.e8Q? Na6+ 2.Ka8 Nc7+ 3.Kb7 Qb6+ 4.Kc8 Nxe8-+ or 1.Qh3? Na6+ 2.Ka8 Nc7+ 3.Kb7 Qb6+ 4.Kc8 Qc5!-+. 1...Qg3+! 1...Na6+ does not work here because of 2.Ka8 Nc7+ 3.Kb8! Qb6+4.Qb7! 2.Nf4! After 2.Ka8? Qxa3! Black wins, for example 3.Qc6 Kb4+4.Kb8 Qg3+5.Ka7 Nd6 6.e8Q Nxe8 7.Qxe8 Qc7+ 8.Ka8 Qb7 mate or 5.Kc8 Nd6+ 6.Qxd6 Qxd6 7.e8Q Ka5. 2...Qxf4+ In difficult lines like 2.:.Nd6!? White seems finally to hold: 3.Qc6 Na6+ 4.Ka7 Qe3+5.Ka8 Qxa3 6.Ne6! Ne8 7.Qd7 (7.Qxe8? Nc7+ 8.Nxc7 Kb6+) 7...Qf3+ 8.Ka7 Qe3+ 9.Nd4 Nac7 10.Kb7 Qc3 11.Nc6+ Ka4 12.Kb6 Ka3 13.Qd4 b4 (13...Qxd4+ 14.Nxd4 b4 15.Nc2+) 14.Qxb4+ Qxb4+ 15.Nxb4 =. 3.Ka8 Kb6! 3...Na6 4.Qb7! Nc7+5.Ka7 Qe3+ 6.Kb8 Qxe7 7.Qxc7+ Qxc7+ 8.Kxc7. 4.Qc6+!! 4.e8Q? Qa4+ 5.Kb8 Qa7+ 6.Kc8 Qc7 mate. 4...Kxc6 5.e8Q+ Nd7 5...:Kd5 6.Nxb5=. 6.Qc8+! 6.Nxb5? Nfe5! 7.Nc3 Qh2! 8.Qe6+ Kc5 9.Qd5+ Kb4 10.Na2+ Ka3 11. Qa5+ Kb2 12.Nb4 Qh8+! 13.Kb7 Qb8+ 14.Ka6 Qa8+ 15.Kb5 Qb7+ 16.Ka4 Nb6+ 17.Kb5 Nbc4+. 6...Kd6! 6...Kb6 7.Qb7+ Kc5 8.Qxb5+ = 7.Nxb5+ Ke7 8.Qe8+!! 8. Qc7? Qe4+ 9.Qb7 Qe5 10.Na7 Nd8. 8...Kxe8 9.Nc7+! Ke7/f8 9....Qxc7 stalemate. 10.Nd5/e6+ draw.

8. Qe8+!!

The final is very nice, but to digest the whole play you need quick hardware and strong engine with offline EGTBs support.


# Vladislav Tarasiuk, UKR 

$1^{\text {st }}$ honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Rb6! Bad is 1.Bxd3? Bxc6, for example 2.Kxh4 Bb5 3.Bb1 Kb7 4.Kg4 Bf1. 1...h3! $1 . . \mathrm{d} 2$ ?
2.Be2 and White even wins. 2.f6!! Strong resources are needed, after 2.gxh3? Bxf3+ 3.Kh4 d2 Black wins easily. 2...gxf6 White has no problem in the line 2...h2? 3.f7 h1Q+ 4.Kg6. 3.gxh3 Bxf3+ 4.Kh4! Creating stalemate house. 4...d2 5.Be2! Bxe2 Bad is now $6 . R x b 2$ ? f f 3 7.Rxd2 f2-+, but White has a better move. 6.Rb8+! Ka7! 6...Kxb8 stalemate. 7.Rb7+! Again 7.Rxb2? f3! 8.Rxd2 f2. 7...Ka6! With Black King on $6^{\text {th }}$ rank White finally can run the main plan. 8.Rxb2 f3! 8 .:.d1Q 9.Rb6+! Ka5! 10.Rb5+! Ka4 11.Rb4+! Ka3 12.Rb3+! positional draw. But not 11.Ra5+? Kb3 12.Ra3+ Kc4 13.Rc3+ Kd5 14.Rd3+ Ke4 15.Rxd1 f3 or $15 . R d 4+$ Kf3 16.Rxf4+ Ke3. 9.Rxd2 f2 10.Rd6+! The point. 10...Kb5 11.Rxf6 f1Q 12.Rxf1 Bxf1 13.Kh5 draw.

6.Rb8+ Ka7 7.Rb7+ Ka6
8.Rxb2

A nice final combination with stalemate motives.


# David Gurgenidze, GEO Martin Minski, DEU 

$2^{\text {nd }}$ honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.g3+! 1.gxh6? cxd1N+!; 1.Nf2? c1Q+ 2.Qxc1 Qxg5+ 3.Kxe2 Qxc1. 1...Kxg5 1...Kxg4. 2.Nf2+=. 2.Nf2 2.Qxe5+? Kxg4+. 2...h1Q! 3.Nxh1 Kxg4+ 3....c1Q+4.Qxc1 Kxg4+ 5.Nf4 exf4+ $6 . K x e 2$ ! leads to the main line. 4.Nf4! exf4+5.Kxe2 c1N+! Nice winning chance, after 5 ...c1Q White has also 6.Nf2+ =. 6.Qxc1 6.Kf2? Qh2+. 6...f3+ 7.Kf2! Qh2+ 8.Ke3 Qh6+ 9.Kf2 Qxc1 stalemate or positional draw.

btm cannot win
Very interesting final. All pieces moved to their positions. Surely it was technically difficult job - the startup position is unnatural and a little confused.


## Andrzej Jasik, POL

$3^{\text {rd }}$ honourable mention UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2 draw
1.Kb6! 1.Kb7? Kb5 2.a7 Rh3 3.a8Q Rh7+ 4.Kb8 Rh8+5.Kb7 Rxh8. 1...Rg3 1...Rh3 2.a7 Rh8 3.Bh2 Ra8 4.Bb8 transposes to the main. 2.a7 Rg8 3.Bh2 Ra8 4.Bb8! 4.Kb7? Rxa7+ 5.Kxa7 Kb5. 4...c5! It lures the king, slow is 4...Kb3 5.Kb7 Rxa7+ 6.Bxa7! e5 7.Kxc6 f4 8.exf4 exf4 9.Kd5. 5. Kxc5 Nb3+ 6.Kc6!! Nice move, after 6.Kb6? Na5 White is in zugzwang: 7.Bc7 Nc4+ 8.Kb7 Rxa7+ 9.Kxa7 Nxe3 or 7. or 7.Kc5 Nb7+! 8.Kc6 Nd8+ 9.Kd7 e5 10.Bxe5 Rxa7+ 11.Kxd8 Kb3. 6...Na5+ 7.Kb6 Black is in zugzwang here! 7...Kb4 8.b3! 8.Bd6+? Kb3 9.Bb8 Ka4. 8...e5 9.Bxe5 Rxa7 10.Bd6+! But not 10.Kxa7? Nc6+. 10...Kxb3 11.Kxa7 draw.

6.Kc6 or 6.Kb6?

8.b3 Black to move

Pleasant "computerless" classical study with wtm/btm zugzwang.


## Amatzia Avni, ISR

$1^{\text {st }}$ commendation UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Rh8! 1.g8Q+? Kxg8 2.Nxf6+ Kf8-+ and after a few checks White loses. 1...Qh1+ 2.Kg4 f5+ 3.Kxf5! Logical try: 3.Kg5? Qc1+ 4.Kxf5 Qc5+5.Kg4 Qd4+ 6.Kf3 (6.Kh3 Qd7+ 7.Kh4 Qe7+ 8.Kg4 Qe4+ 9.Kh3 Qg6 10.Rf8+ Ke7 11.g8Q Qxh5+) 6...Qxg7 7.Nxg7 e1Q 8.Rh3 (8.Nf5 Qc3+) 8...Kxg7! (remarkably, 8...Qf2+? 9.Kg4 spoils the win) 9.Rxg3+Kf6. White is just short of achieving a fortress, but it fails: 10.Kg4 Qe4+ 11.Kh3 Qh7+ 12.Kg4 Qf5+ 13.Kh4 Qf4+ 14.Kh3 Qh6+ 15.Kg4 Ke5 and Black wins. 3...Qxh5+ 4.Rxh5 e1Q 5.Rg5! In this way White succeeds to place his pieces in favourable positions, $5.980+$ ? Kxg8 6.Rg5+ Kh7-+ will lose in the long run. 5...Kg8 6.Kg4! Qd2 7.Kh3! Completes the switchback Kh3-g4-f5-g4-h3. Bad is 7.Kh4? Qxg2 8.Rxg3 Qh2+ 9.Kg4 Kxg7. 7...Qxg5 stalemate.

7. Kh3!


Jaroslav Polášek btm

Another interesting final with stalemate and fortress. The "logical"try $3 . \mathrm{Kg5}$ ? is connected with the thematic main line only weakly through similar positional draws.

Jaroslav illustrates possibilities to extend the introduction for free. Diagram 1...a1Q! Guarding f6. 2.g7 Kf7 3.Rh8 Qh1+ Avni position.


# Evgenev Kopylov, RUS Oleg Pervakov, RUS 

$2^{\text {nd }}$ commendation UAPA 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Rf3+! Other endgames are hopelessly: 1.Kxg3? Bxh5 2.Nxh5 Rxh5 or 1.Kg5? Bd3! 2.Rg1 Kf2. 1...Ke4! 1...Ke2? 2.Rxg3 Bxh5+ 3.Nxh5 Rg6+ allows 4.Kf4! =. 2.Rxg3 Not 2.Rf4+? Ke5 3.Kxg3 Bxh5 4.Rh4 Rg6+ 5.Kf2 Rxg7 6.Rxh5+ Kd6 with easy win. 2...Bxh5+! Sacrifices a piece because of 2...Bf7 3.Kg5 Rh8 4.Rb3 =. 3.Nxh5 Rg6+ 4.Kh4!! Looking far ahead. 4...Rxg3 5.Nxg3+! Thematic try 5.Kxg3? b4 6.Nf6+ (6.Nf4 b3 7.Ne2 Kd3! 8.Nc1+ Kc2) 6...Kd3! 7.Nd7 b3 8.Nc5+ Kc2 9.Na4 b2 10.Nxb2 Kxb2 11.Kf4 Kc3 12.Ke5 Kc4 13.Kxe6 Kc5! 14.Kd7 Kb6. Unfortunately wins also 7...Kc4 8.Nb6+ Kb5 9.Nd7 Kxc6.
5...Kf3! 6.Nf1! Ke2 7.Ng3+
A) 7...Kd3 An impressive White Knight solo follows now: 8.Nh1!! b4 9.Nf2+ Kc2 10.Ne4! 10.Ng4? Kd2! 11.Ne5 Kc3! 10...b3 10...e5 11.Nd6! Kd3 12.Nb5! e4 13.Nxc7 =. 11.Nd6! e5! 11...b2 12.Nc4 b1Q 13.Na3+ =. 12.Nc4! 12.Kg3? Kd3! 13.Nb5 b2 14.Na3 Ke2! 15.Nb1 e4 16.Kf4 e3. 12...e4 13.Kg3! 13.Kg4? Kc3 14.Na3 b2-+. 13...Kc3 14.Na3 e3 14...b2 15.Kf2! Kb3 16.Nb1 Kc2 17.Na3+ =. 15. Kf3 Kd2 15..: Kd3 16.Kg3(2) e2 17.Kf2 b2 18.Ke1 =. 16.Nc4+ Kd3 17.Nb2+ Kc3 18.Nd1+! 18.Na4+? Kd2. 18...Kd2 19.Nxe3 b2 20.Nc4+.

Now it is clear after 4.Kh3? Rxg3+ 5.Nxg3+ Kd3! 6.Nh1!? b4 7.Nf2+ Kc2 8.Ne4 b3! 9.Nd6 b2 10.Nc4 b1Q 11.Na3+ Kc1 12.Nxb1 Kxb1 White should be too late 13.Kg4 Kc2 14.Kf4 Kd3 15.Ke5 Kc4 16.Kxe6 Kc5! 17.Kd7 Kb6.
B) 7...Ke3 8.Nf1+ Kd3 9.Kg3! b4 10.Kf2 b3 11.Ke1 b2 12.Nd2 Kc2 13.Ke2 b1Q 14.Nxb1 Kxb1 15.Kd3! Kb2 16.Kc4! 16.Kd4? Kb3 17.Ke5 Kc4 18.Kxe6 Kc5 19.Kd7 Kb6. 16...Ka3 17.Kb5 e5 18.Ka6 e4 19.Kb7 e3 20.Kxc7= and stalemate with king on a8.

8. Nh1!!

According to the authors, this is a synthesis of two corner moves, but unfortunately we cannot consider the line B with Ka8 to be full-featured.

We also have doubts if the introduction with massive annihilation was worth easy try 4.Kh3. Being Czech composers we should prefer something like this:


Polášek and Vlasák draw
1.bxc6! Try 1.Nxa3+? Kff3! 2.bxc6 bxc6! 1...b5 1...bxc6 2.Kxg3!=. 2.Nxg3+ Kd3 3.Nh1! etc.


# Peter S. Krug, AUT 

$3^{\text {rd }}$ commendation UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Kf1 1.Kf2? h1Q 2.f7+ Qxf7 3.Nxe5 gives Black an extra option 3...Qh2+. 1...hxg1Q+ Here is $1 . . . h 1 Q$ bad because of 2.f7+ Qxf7 3.Nxe5 Qe8 4.Qd5+. 2.Kxg1 Bd4+ 3.Qxd4 3.Kg2? Qh3 mate or 3.Kf1? Qh3+ 4.Ke2 Qxf3+ with a quick mate 5.Kd2 Qc3+6.Ke2 Qe3+ 7.Kf1 Qf2. 3...Nxf3+ 4.Kf2 Nxd4 5.Rxg7+ Kh8 6.Rh7+ Kxh7 7.Nf8+ Kh8! A good chance to win. After 7.:.:Kg8 8.Nxe6 b3 9.f7+! Kxf7 10.Ng5+ and 11.Ne4 White has an easy draw.
8.Nxe6 b3! 9.Nxd4 b2 10.f7! Not 10.b6? b1Q 11.f7 Qa2+. 10...Kg7 11.b6 b1Q 12.b7

Positional draw (12...Kxf7 13.Nc6 Qxb7 14.Nd8+; 12...Qxb7 13.Ne6+ Kxf7 14.Nd8+).

btm positional draw

We like the final positional draw include the introductory move 7...Kh8! In addition, it can also confuse many powerful chess engines.

But for us, as composers of the older school, the difficult introduction with a lot of annihilated material, that is unrelated to the final, is hard to accept. Therefore, as an illustration, we tried to develop our own version of this study, focusing more in depth than spectacular effects.


## Jaroslav Polášek, CZE Emil Vlasák, CZE after Krug

dedicated to all UAPA participants original
draw

Bad is 1.Kf4+?! Bg7 2.Rxg7+ Rxg7 3.Rxg7+ Kh8 4.Rh7+ Kxh7 5.Nf8+ Kh8! 5.:.Kh6? 6.Nxe6 b3 7.Ke5 = Nf3+ 8.Kd6 Kg6 9.Ke7 Ne5? 10.Nf4+. 6.Nxe6 b3 7.Nxd4 7.Ke5 Nf3+ 8.Kd6 Kg8 9.Ke7 Ne5. 7...b2 8.f7 Kg7 9.b6 b1Q 10.b7 Qb6! Black wins, for example 11.Ke5 Qc7+! or 11.Kf5 Qd6! - there is not Nf5+ fork - or finally 11.Kq3 Qd6+ 12.Kh3 Kf8!

Correct is 1.Kf2+! Bg7 2.Rxg7+ Rxg7 3.Rxg7+ Kh8 4.Rh7+ Kxh7 5.Nf8+ Kh8! 5.:.Kg8. 6.Nxe6 b3 7.f7+ Kxf7 8.Ng5+ Ke7 9.Ne4. 6.Nxe6 b3 7.Nxd4 7. Ke3? b2 8.Kxd4 Kg8! (8...b1Q?! 9.f7 =). 7...b2 8.f7 Kg7 9.b6 b1Q 10.b7 Qb6! 10...Kxf7 11.Nc6, $10 \ldots \mathrm{Oxb7}$ 11.Ne6+ Kxf7 12.Nd8+ Kf6 13.Nxb7. 11.Ke2! Compare to the try. Bad is $11 . K e 1$ ? Qb2! 12.Kf1 Qh2 13.Ke1 Qe5+ 14.Kf1 Qf4+ 15.Ke2 Qe4+ 16.Kf1 Qe5 17.Kg2 Qd5+ 18.Kh3 Qd7+ 19.Kg3 Qd6+ 20.Kh3 Kf8 21.Nc6 Qd7+. 11...Kf8 11...Kxf7 12.Nc6. 12.Kd3! Kg7
13.Ke2! Positional draw.

11. ?? -+

11.Ke2! 11.Ke1?


## Michal Hlinka, SVK

 B. Buyannemekh, MNG Mario García, ARG$4^{\text {th }}$ commendation UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2

draw
1.Re1+! Of course not 1.Rxe4? Qf7+ and 2...Qxf8. 1...Kc2! 1...Kb2? gives a tempo 2.Bg7+, for example 2...Be5 3.Bxe5+ Qxe5 4.Re2+ Kxa3 5.Re3+ Kb2 6.Bc6 Qe6+ 7.Kc5. 2.Ba4+! Too slow is $2 . B b 4$ ? Qf3 3.Kd4 Bh6 4.Re2+ Kb3 5.Bc4+ Ka4 6.Bd6 (the pawn e4 is always taboo 6.Rxe4 Bg7+ 7.Ke5 Qf5+) 6...Bc1 7.Be5 e3 8.Rh2 (8.Bd3 Qg4+) 8...Qg4+ 9.Kd5 Qd7+ 10.Ke4 Qb7 or 3.Kd5 Bb8 4.Be2 Qf5+ 5.Kc4 Qe6+ 6.Kb5 Qd5+ 7.Ka4 Bg3 8.Bd1+ Kb2 9.Re2+ Kc1 10.Bc2 Qc6+ 11.Kb3 Qe6+ 12.Ka4 Qa6+. Bad is also 2.Bc5? Qf7+ 3.Kd4 Qf6+ 4.Kd5 Qe5+ 5.Kc6 Qe6+ 6.Kb7 Qd5+ 7.Bc6 Qxc5. 2...Kb2 3.Bg7+! Slow moves are bad again: 3.Bb4? ? Qf3! 4.Rd1 Bg5 5.Rd5 Qe2+. 3...Be5 4.Bxe5+ Qxe5 5.Re2+ Kxa3 5...Kc1 6.Bb5! Kd1 7.Kb4! positional draw. Compare to 1...Kb2 Black seems to win a decisive tempo. $6 . \mathrm{Bc} 2$ ? e3 7.Kd3 (7.Bd3 Qf4+! 8.Kd5 Kb4 9.Rc2 Kb3 10.Re2 Kc3) 7...Kb4! 8.Rxe3 Qc3+ 9.Ke2 Qxc2+. Or he does not? 6.Re3+! Kxa4 7.Ra3+ Kxa3 ideal stalemate.

6. Re3+!

A stalemate idea helps White to hold a difficult position.


# Nikolay Griva, UKR Alexander Zhukov, RUS 

special commendation

UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2
draw
1.Kg4! 1.Kg5? a4! 2.Kf5 b5! 1...a4 2.Bh4 a3 3.Kf5! 3.Kf3? Ke5! 4.Be1 Kd4! or 3.Kf4? Kd4! 4.Bf6+ Kd3! 3...Kc4! 4.Be7! 4.Bf6? b5 5.Ke4 b4 6.Be7 Kc3 or 4.Ke4? b5 5.Be7 b4. 4...a2 5.Bf6 Kd3 5.:.:Kb3 $6 . . \mathrm{Ke} 4$ Kc2 7.Kd5! 6.Ke6! b5 7.Kd5 b4 8.Kc5 b3 9.Kb4 Kc2 10.Ka3 draw.

4.Be7! a2 5.Bf6


Horning 2009

Small pleasant endgame with ultimate treatment.
Of course, this motive was used many times.
For example Horning, Magyar Sakkvilág 2009:
1.Bb4 a2 2.Bc3 b6 3.Ba1 h2 4.Kg2 Ke4 5.Kxh2 Kd3 6.Kg3 Kxc4 7.Kf4 Kd3 8.Ke5 b5 9.Kd5 b4 10.Kc5 b3 11.Kb4 Kc2 12.Ka3.


# Anatoly Skripnik, RUS Pavel Arestov, RUS 

special commendation<br>UAPA $9^{\text {th }}$ Iriate MT sec. B2<br>draw

1.e8Q g2 2.Nxe4 Qh6+ 2.:. $91 Q$ for example 3.Qa4+ Ke2 4.Qc2+ =. 3.Ka5! g1Q 4.Nc3+! 4.Qa4+? Ke2 5.Nc3+ Kf1! 6.Qd1+ Kg2. 4...Kd2 5.Qd7+ Kc2! 5...Ke1 6.Qd1+ Kf2 7.Qc2+ Kf3 8.Qe4+ Kf2 9.Qc2+ Ke3 10.Qe2+ Kd4 11.Qe4+ Kxc3 12.Qc6+ Qxc6 stalemate or 10...Kf4 11.Qd2+ Qe3 12.Nd5+. 6.Qa4+ Kd2 7.Qd7+ Kxc3 8.Qc6+ Qxc6 stalemate.

7.Qc6+!


Proskurowski 1959
3.Qb4+

A pleasant miniature. In our opinion the twin position is no benefit.

There are record QxQQ studies with several stalemates.
For example Proskurowski 1959:
3.Qb4+
3...Kf2 4.Qc5+ Qxc5,
3...Ke2 4.Qe4+ Qxe4,
3...Kd1 4.Qg4+ Kd2 5.Qf4+ Kd3 6.Qd6+ Qxd6,
3...Kf1 4.Qf4+ Kg1 5.Qe3+ Kh2 6.Qf4+ Kg1 7.Qe3+ Kf1 8.Qf4+ Ke2 9.Qe4+ Qxe4.

