

When EG95 reported CESC members' guesses as to the number of $W$ moves in the longest wins for W in the GBR 5 -man pawnless endgames 3200, 1600 and 0014, I little thought that the electronic pronunciamentos were just round the corner. Yet they were, merged in with the results of scores of other data bases generated by a genius programmer new to the arena and with access to a parallel processor of prodigious power - the fabled Connection Machine in its CM2 manifestation with 32 thousand processors fed by a VAX front end ordinary computer. For several years the jest of the computer world has been that parallel processing is a solution in search of problems. Well, to generate 805 -man pawnless endgame data bases in a total of 227 minutes of machine time is an order of magnitude faster than any precursor, and is clearly the right task for this engine. We can only hope that more chess work is done on the CM2 before other applications are identified! The programmer was Lewis Stiller of Boston, Massachusetts and the results are in an article in the June 1989 issue of the ICCA Journal.

Well, Stiller's results, which can be accepted as accurate because many of them independently confirm Ken Thompson's earlier pioneering work, are:

320016 moves
160020 moves
001477 moves

It is, of course, the last result that is hard to swallow. An innocuous bishop-ahead pawnless drawn ending undergoes instant metamorphosis into something incomprehensible.

EG99 will give the position and all 77 moves, with whatever sensible commentary we can concoct in the meantime.

To keep the pot boiling here are other interesting results taken from Stiller's article. They relate to $G B R$ classes 1330, 1303 and 0002.01. Every equioptimal move is included, between parentheses.

1.Kd1 Rg4 2.Qc5 Bb4 3.Qe3 + Rg3 4.Qe6 + Kh2 5.Qe2 + Kh3 6.Qf1 + Kh2 7.Qf2 + Kh3 8.Qf5 +Kh 4 9.Qf4 + Rg4 10.Qh6 + Kg3 11.Qe3 + Kh2 12.Ke2 Bc3 13.Qh6 +Kg 314. Qd6 + Rf4 15.Qd3 + Kg2 16.Qe3 Rf6 17.Qe4+ Kg3 18.Qd3 $+\quad \mathrm{Kg} 2$


19.Qd5 + Kh3 20.Qb3 Kg2 21.Qg8 + Kh2 22.Qc4 Bal 23.Qh4 $+(\mathrm{Qb} 4 \mathrm{Qa} 4)$ $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \quad$ 24.Qg4 +Kh 2 25.Ke3 Rf1 26.Qh5 + (Qc4 Qe2 + ) Kg2 27.Qg6 + Kh2 28.Qg4 Bc3 29.Ke2 Rg1 30.Qh5 + Kg 3 (Kg2) 31.Qg6+ Kh2 32.Qd6 + Kh3 (Kg2 Kh1) 33.Qc5 Kh2 34.Qc7+ Rg3 35.Kf2 Bd4+ 36.Kf1 Ba1 (Be3) 37.Qa7 $\quad(\mathrm{Qc} 2+) \quad \mathrm{Rg} 7 \quad(\mathrm{Bg} 7 \quad \mathrm{Bh} 8)$ 38.Qa2 + Kh1 39.Qf2 (Qd5+) Be5 40.Qh4 + (Qf3 + ) Bh2 41.Qe4 + Rg2 42. Qxg 2 mate.


1. Ka3 Kg3 2.Qb3 + Kh4 3.Qc4 +Kg 3 4.Qd3 + Kh4 5.Qe4 + Kh3 6.Qe6 + Kg3 7.Qe3 + Kh4 8.Qel + Kg4 9.Ka4 Kf3 10.Qf1 + Rf2 11.Qd3 + Kg4 $12 . \mathrm{Qd} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 5$ (Kf3) $13 . \mathrm{Qg} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 4$ 14.Qd4 + (Kb5) Kf3 15.Kb5 (Ka5) Re2 16.Kb6 Kg2 17.Qf4 (Qf6) Rf2 $18 . \mathrm{Qg} 4+(\mathrm{Qe} 4+) \mathrm{Kf1} 19 . \mathrm{Qd} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 20.Qd3 Kh2 21.Qg6 (Kc7 Kc5) Rg2 22. Qe4 Rf2 23.Kc5 Kg1 24.Qd3 Rg2 (Kh2 $\mathrm{Kg} 2)$ 25.Qd4 $+(\mathrm{Qb} 1+\mathrm{Kd} 6) \mathrm{Rf} 2$ 26.Kd5 (Kd6) Kg2 27.Ke5 Rf3 (Kf3) $28 . \mathrm{Qg} 4+(\mathrm{Qd} 2+) \mathrm{Kf} 229 . \mathrm{Qh} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 30.Qg5 + Kf1 31.Ke4 Rf2 32.Qb5 + Kg 1 33.Qc5 (Qc4) Kg2 34.Qc4 Rb2 35.Kf5 Kh2 (Kh3 Kg3) 36.Qd4 (Qe4 Qf4 + Qh4 + Qd5 Qe6 Qc5 Qc7+ $\mathrm{Kg} 5) \mathrm{Rg} 2$ 37.Qe5 + Kh3 (Kg1 Kh1) 38.Kf4 Kh2 39.Kf3 $+\mathrm{Kg} 140 . \mathrm{Qd} 4+$ (Qa1 + Qe4 Qe3 +) Kh1 (Kh2) 41.Qf4 (Qh8 +) Rh2 (Rc2 Kg1) 42.Qc4 (Kg3 $\mathrm{Kg} 4) \quad \mathrm{Rh} 3+43 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \quad(\mathrm{Kf} 2) \quad \mathrm{Ra} 3$ 44.Qd5 $+\quad(\mathrm{Qc} 6+) \quad \mathrm{Kh} 2 \quad$ (Kg1) 45.Qd6+ Kg2 (Kg1 Kh1 Rg3 +) 46.Qxa3.

1.S4c3 + Kal 2.Sd1 Kbl 3.aSc3 + Kcl 4. Kc4 Kc2 5.Se3 + Kb2 6.cSd1 + Ka3 7.Kc5 (Kb5) Kb3 8.Kb5 Ka3 9.Sc4+ Kb3 10.cSb2 Ka3 11.Kc4 Ka2 12.Kb4 Kb1 13.Ka3 Kc2 14.Ka2 Kc1 15.Kb3 Kb1 16.Sd3 Kal 17.Sb4 Kb1 18.Sc3 + and mate next move.

1.Sb4 + Kb6 2.Sd3 Kc7 3.Sb5 + Kc6 4.Sa3 Kb6 5.Kb8 (Sc4+ Sc2) Kc6 6.Sc4 (Sc2) Kb5 7.cSe5 Kb6 8.Kc8 Ka6 (Ka5 Kb5) 9.Kc7 (Kd7) Kb5 10.Kd6 Ka4 11.Kc5 Kb3 12.Kb5 Kc3 13.Ka4 Kc2 14.Kb4 Kd1 15.Kb3 Kd2 16.Kb2 Kd1 17.Sc4 Ke2 18.Kc2 Kf3 19.Kd2 (Kd1) Kg3 (Ke4) 20.Ke2 (cSe5) Kg2 21.cSe5 Kg3 22.Kf1 Kh4 23.Kg2 (Kf2) Kg5 24.Kf3 Kf5 25.Sc4 Kf6 26.Kf4 Ke6 27.Ke4 Kf6 28.Kd5 Ke7 29.Ke5 Kf7 30.Kd6 Kf6 31.Sd2 Kf5 32.Ke7 Kg6 33.Ke6 Kg7 (Kg5) 34.Se4 Kg6 35.Ke5 Kg 7 36.Kd6 Kh7 (Kh6) 37.Sd2 (Sf2) Kg7 38.Ke6 Kf8 39.Se4 (Sc4) Ke8 40.Sf6 + (Sd6 + ) Kf8 (Kd8) 41.Sh5 Ke8 42.Sg7 + Kd8 43.Kd6 Kc8 44.Se6

Kb8 (Kb7) 45.Kc5 Ka7 46.Kc6 Ka6 47.eSc5 + (Sg5) Ka5 48.Sb3 + (Se4) Ka4 49.Sd2 Ka5 50.Kc5 Ka6 51.Sc4 Kb7 52.Kd6 Kc8 53.Sa5 Kd8 54.Sb7 + Ke8 55.Ke6 Kf8 56.Sd6 Kg7 57.Kf5 Kh6 58.Kf6 Kh5 59.Sf7 (Se4) Kg4 60.Sg5 Kh4 61.Kf5 Kg3 62.Ke4 Kg4 63.Sf7 Kh5 (Kg3) 64.Kf5 Kh4 65.fSe5 Kh5 66.Sg4 Kh4 67.Sf6 Kh3 68.Ke5 Kg3 69.Ke4 Kh3 70.Kf3 Kh4 71.Kf4 Kh3 72.Se8 (Se4 Sh5) Kh4 73.Sg7 Kh3 74.Sf5 Kg2 (Kh2) 75.Kg4 Kh2 (Kf1 $\mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Kh} 1)$ 76.Sd6 (Sg3) Kg2 (Kg1 Kh1) 77.Sc4 (Se4) Kh2 (Kg1) 78.Sd2 Kg2 79.Kh4 Kh2 (Kg1) 80.Sf4 (Se1) Kg1 81.Kg3 Kh1 82.Sf3 (Se2 Sh3) d3 83.Sh3 d2 84.Sf2 mate.

The above solution may be compared with the 87 moves (to mate) of Pierre Bridier (L'Échiquier de Paris, 15.xii.1962) starting from: h8d8 $0002.01 \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{c} 5 . \mathrm{d} 43 / 2+$. This is No. 1882 in Cherron III (1982) where the exposition and analysis extend across 6 pages.

## * ${ }^{*}$

Finally (until next time) here are 30 unsequenced positions from the 001477 move solution. Readers are invited (no prizes, and please don't write in) to put the diagrams in their proper order before EG99 arrives. The diagrams bristle with clues - and false trails!
To add to the interest there are no indications as to which side has the move, except that in 22 out of the 30 it is WTM.
P.S. Don't forget to renew your subscription!

## IN MEMORY OF A COLLEAGUE

## by IM Velimir I. Kalandadze

The Georgian school of problemists suffered a heavy loss when in ix. 88 during an All-Union congress of chess composers in the town of Sukhumi GM Iosif (Joseph) Krikheli died, very suddenly.
It was at the age of 16 that Krikheli entered the arena in which he performed his creative feats with almost fanatical devotion right to the last minutes of his life.
Krikheli's creative versatility was as remarkable as its high standard, witness his achievements in orthodox, heterodox and fairy chess. His brilliant talent worked with practically every genre of chess composition, including the chess study. Since it was with problems of the so-called logical style that he won his greatest successes, it is not surprising that the influence of this latter style can be sensed in the best of his studies.
As a study composer Krikheli worked with the classic themes. His personal preferences concentrated on stalemate, positional draw, and themes from problemdom. He always endeavoured to find that one elusive, light and economical setting to express his chess thought: in his best output one can feel the harmony of form with content.
A great propagandist for chess composition, Krikheli was the author of dozens of interesting articles, in which his own professionally high standard sheds light on many aspects of the art. Despite the fact that Krikheli was not Georgian by birth his productions exude the characteristic features of the Georgian national school. He won great admiration and respect from Georgian composers. His life and work is a bright page in the 26 centuries of history of friendship and coexistence between the Georgian and Jewish peoples. Krikheli was not just a talented composer. As a connoisseur and major cri-
tic he time and again displayed a subtle sense of humour. Pouring out with an energy that was bound up with his fabulous temperament, his work's quality and prolificness can be seen and felt in an output running to around 1500 compositions in a variety of styles and genres.

Returning to the study and the theme that so appealed to him, in K1 we see effective and delightful play with a climactic stalemate.

K1
Iosif Krikheli


The solution: 1.Sg5 Sf6 + 2.Ke7 Sh7 3.Sxh7 Rd7+ 4.Ke8 Rxh7 5.Se6 Sd5 6.Sg5 Kg2 7.Sxh3 Sc7 + 8.Kd8 Se6 + 9.Ke8 Sxf8 10.Sf4 + Kf3 11.Se6 Sxe6 stalemate.


In K2 we offer a study that in our view is one of the finest in Krikheli's legacy. It shows the synthesis of a pair of stalemate positions.
1.Se4 de 2.Bb7 Bf3 3.f6 c2 4.f7 Bxh8 5.Bxe4 Bxe 4 6.f8Q Bd $4+7 . \mathrm{Kb8} \mathrm{Be5}+$ (clQ; Qf3 +) 8.Ka7 Bd4+ (clQ; $Q h 6+) 9 . K b 8$, positional draw.


Not long ago Krikheli paid a tribute to the enthusiasm of Georgian study composers for R -endings by publishing a number of such studies. K3 is one of them.
1.Kg5 Re7 2.Kf6 Re6 + 3.Kf5 Re7 4.Rg5 Re6 5.Rg8 + Kb7 6.Rg7 Re7 7.Kf6 Re6 + 8.Kxf7 Rxe5 9.Kf6 + wins.
Iosif Krikheli has left us all too soon, but he has bequeathed a brilliant creative legacy bestowing great aesthetic enjoyment upon lovers of chess composition, and upon their composer universal recognition and immortality.
Tbilisi
Iiv89
$\dagger$ Evgeny Ivanovich UMNOV (b2.ii. 13 d22.vii.89). Composer, solver (he sat on the other side of the board from Loshinsky as they jointly solved at Pi ran in 1958), author, and, it must be said, something of a cagey party-line 'survivor' through Stalinist times, the problemist Umnov exhibited remarkable energy for chess composition. At the time of his death he had been working with Kralin for several years on the definitive collection of Troitzky's studies.

## KESTUTIS STALIORAITIS <br> (1909-1979)

by Raimondas Senkus (with minor additions by AJR)

The remarkable analyst Kestutis Stalioraitis (Stalioraitis means carpenter's son in Lithuanian) was born in Suwalki in north-east Poland into a Lithuanian farming family whose language was Lithuanian and religion Roman Catholic. His school days from 1919 to 1927 were spent in Marijampolé, and then in 1927 he studied Russian and German language at Kaunas University, but he did not graduate and thereafter had no constant employment, apart from teaching for one year (1928) in a Jewish school.

Kestutis Stalioraitis married in 1934. A daughter later died, but the son is today an academician living in Vilnius, the capital, where he works in the Institute of Electricity. Mrs. Stalioraitis still teaches in a school of music.

In 1944 Stalioraitis voluntarily emigrated to Germany ahead of the advancing Soviet forces. He worked as a translator in the industrial town of Essen's drama theatre and continued in assorted employment until 1955 when he fell ill, spending six months in hospital in France in the following year. While in Germany he played chess, and in 1950 won the championship of Essen. Later he returned to the east, at first to East Germany, and then in 1959 to Lithuania, in fact to Marijampolé (called Kapsukas between 1955 and 1989), where he was employed as a factory economist. He suffered from asthma and was retired in 1970, passing away nine years later.

Kestutis Stalioraitis was very fond of both chess and mathematics. While in West Germany he became acquainted with the chess endgame and chess studies. He sent his studies to the USSR.

The present writer never met him but knows that he was a gifted and strong player who was four times Marijampolé champion.

He always analysed chess positions alone because such activity has never been popular in our town. Indeed in those times he was the only inhabitant with this interest - and today the only one is myself! His widow has kept the analyses he made, and I have gone through a thick blue exercise book that he filled. He never gave talks or lectures on chess though he was Marijampolé's principal organiser of chess events such as matches. His $Q+P$ endgame analyses were published in the Latvian journal Sahs, there being no counterpart in Lithuania. The most important of these analyses have been incorporated by IGM Yuri Averbakh into his series of authoritative endgame textbooks. The standard of analysis is extraordinarily high (often more accurate and deeper than that of Grandmasters), as is demonstrated by a move-by-move comparison with the data bases created by Ken Thompson during AJR's four weeks' visit to New Jersey during xi.85: the variations attributed to Kestutis Stalioraitis in the appropriate Averbakh volume coincided time and again with the obher dictator of the data base's optimality.

Lithuanian books on chess are few and far between, so I cannot say what books Kestutis Stalioraitis had read, and in any case no chess bool was found in his house when he died.

He excelled himself when participating in FIDE's first World Chess Compositions Tourney (1972-75). The late Harold Lommer (Great Britain) set the studies theme 'one or more $W$ pieces move far from bK' and had the, in retrospect, unenviable task of judging the entries. When first place was awarded to G. Steckbauer of East Germa-


Kestutis Stalioraitis together with his son
ny, the Soviet Union alleged incompetent judging. Stalioraitis kept quiet but shut himself off for a week. He was analysing. As reported in EG (No. 2820 in EG47) he was able to show that Steckbauer's study, intended to be a win, was incorrect, because the Bl defence could be improved on the 8th move of the main line to secure a draw. The consequence was, or should have been, the study's elimination - but it seems that the analysis came on the scene too late.

He was also responsible for analysing a complex opening variation of the Giuoco Piano (1.e4 e5 2.Sf3 Sc6 3.Bc4 Bc5 4.c3 Sf6 5.d4 ed 6.cd Bb4+ 7.Sc3 Sxe4). A certain chess veteran of our town came up with this method of play for Bl but he was unable to analyse it properly, so he approached Vladas Mikénas from Vilnius for assistance. But
even the famous master could do no better. Over a period of two weeks Kestutis Stalioraitis analysed the line to produce the definitive verdict - a win for W. I have seen the manuscript of this analysis but I have never seen a book on the Giuoco Piano opening, so I do not know if this line has ever been published anywhere, and nor does our local chess veteran. Even if the analysis is not original, it was performed without assistance or prior knowlegde.

Kestutis Stalioraitis was frank, friendly, honest, well educated and intelligent. At the time of his death the old cemetery in the town centre was closed. Deceased were interred in a new burial ground outside the city. But the local chessplayers asked permission for the body to be buried in the old cemetery. This was done. Many still remember him, and indeed every year Marijempolé holds a memorial tourney for the K. Stalyoraitis Cup, and anyone may compete.

## Marijampolé <br> 26.v. 89

## BOURNEMOUTH

1. Were you at Bournemouth in August for the XXXII FIDE PCCC meeting? No? Shame on you, for missing talking to 150 composition enthusiasts from over 20 countries. Now you'll never: hear Mike Bent's talk 'It's my pleasure!'' on swings (pendulum theme studies) and roundabouts (piece-chasing); wonder at the USSR, competing in the World Solving for the first time, taking team and individual honours, the latter going to 27 -year old Georgy Aleksandrovich EVSEEV from Moscow; participate in the open solving and quick composing tourneys; contribute to the BCPS bookstall takings of nearly $£ 2000$; learn how the FIDE Judge title was awarded (for studies) to

Paul Joitsa (Romania) and Jan van Reek (Holland), the FIDE GM title to Emilian Dobrescu (Romania), and the FIDE IM title to Yochanan Afek (Israel) and Vazha Neidze (USSR); and, if you are British, teach our visitors from abroad how to pronounce Bournemouth! But you can plan to experience similar excitements at Alicante in 1990, and at Tbilisi (yes, Tbilisi) in 1991.
2. A new composer title, FIDE Master, will be awarded for 12 Album points (8 studies).
3. The Sub-Committee for Studies, inaugurated in 1988 at Budapest, will: work to produce guidelines for judges and tourney organisers in all those tricky situations that arise - please send details of your own oddball experiences to AJR (who may not reply, but who will log everything); select and publicise STUDIES OF THE YEAR two wins and two draws, each year; and have official space in EG to carry information on the sub-committee's activities.
4. The FIDE ALBUM 1986-88 Tourney is to be officially announced before the end of 1989. To enter, send your best studies published in this 3 -year period to the Section Director for Studies, Jan Rusinek (see back page of EG). You must send clear diagrams and full solutions in 5 copies (ie, one for each of the three judges, one for the section director and one for the Album director). Closing date: 1.viii.90.
5. Paul Valois, who filled in cracks in the organisation well ahead of their appearing, once more prodded me to set a studies theme for a quick composing tourney. It was T.R. Dawson Centenary Year, so I pandered to the fairy chess flavour by asking for twin studies with the most outlandish, bizarre, or amusing twinning mechanism, where
the solution play would be secondary to the drollery of the discriminant. There were three daring entries. The prize went to: wwKh5 bKh7 wPf7. Win. 1. f8R. Not original, you say, and where's the twin?
Well, don't change the position, don't change the stipulation, and keep the promotion to rook. Any ideas yet? Add the two words: Losing Chess. In this variant capture is compulsory (including capture of the kings), and the winner is the side that gets rid of all his force (first). Solution 1. Kh6 Kxh6 2. $f 8 R$. This is the only promotion that stops bK placing himself en prise next move, and wR's self-immolation is thereafter no problem. The composer: John Beasley. I challenge anyone to forget this position!

## BOURNEMOUTH SNIPPETS

1. EG91.6664-6669, the 1984 Saloniki Olympiad tourney award. The award, announced at the end of the otb Olympiad, was eventually published in booklet form in 1988, with other material included. Virgil Nestorescu, one of the judges, reports (in French) that the theme was badly understood, but he fails to explain why. We enquired (anything and everything was possible at Bournemouth) and learned that the intended theme was non-specific, namely 'strategy of a white rook'. The idea arose from the Aspos Pyrgos, a mediaeval White Tower, now a restaurant, which is a famous landmark feature of Saloniki. In fact the building was originally a fortress, which accounts for those knowledgable entries, especially soviet ones, showing the fortress theme. Alas, this was deemed unthematic by the (Greek) judges.
2. Did you know? KOMMUNIST (-MM-) is Armenian, and KOMUNIST (-M-) is not.
3. Did you know? Van (capital $V$ ) is Belgian and van (small $v$ ) is Dutch.
4. The Dutch studies organisation is called $A R V E S$, the abbreviation of Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor Eind-spel-Studie. There is some funding from the Rueb Foundation. Its maga-
zine, in Dutch, has as yet no name.
5. The Sukhumi event where Krikheli died at the chessboard playing lightning chess was for soviet study composers working on international theme compositions: WCCT and the USSR vs. Rest-of-the-World.


No.7487: O.Pervakov (Moscow). Judge: Andrzej Lewandowski (Torun, Poland). 1.d8S+ Kf6 2.Ra6+ Kg5 3.Sf7+/i Kh4 (Sxf7;Re6) 4.Ra4+ d4 5.Rxd4+ Sg4 6.Rxg4+ fg 7.b8B/ii h1Q+ 8.Kxh1, with two variations:
$\mathrm{e} 1 \mathrm{Q}+9 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 4+/ \mathrm{iii} 10 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{~g} 3+$ 11.Bxg3+ Kg4 12.f3+ Kxf3 13.Sg5+ Ke3 14.Bf2+/iv Kd3 15.Sxe4 Kxe4 16.a4 Kd5 17.a5 Kc6 18.a6 Kc7 19.Ba7 Kc6 20.a4 wins, or
Kh3 9.Sg5 + Kh4 10.Bg3+ Kxg5 11.f4+/v gf 12.a4 Kf5 13.a5 Ke4 14.a6 Ke3 15.Kg1 Kd2 16.a7 e1Q+ 17.Bxe1 Kxe1 18.a8Q f2+ 19.Kh2 f1Q 20. Qh1 wins.
i) $3 . \mathrm{Se} 6+$ ? $\mathrm{Kh} 44 . \mathrm{Ra} 4+\mathrm{Sg} 4$ drawn.
ii) 7.b8Q? h1Q+ $8 . K x h 1 \mathrm{elQ}+$ 9. Kg2 Qe4+ 10.Kh2 Qf4+. iii) g3 10.Bxg3+Kg4 11.f3+.
iv) 14.Sxe4? Kxe4 15.a4 Kd5.
v) 11.f3? h4 12.Bf2 Kf4 13.fg Kxg4 14.a4 Kf3 15.Bxh4 Ke4 drawn.
"...The initial play is dynamic with sacrifices and underpromotions leading to two interesting variations with many subtleties. The pieces are very active. A remarkable achievement by the still young composer."


No.7488: N.Micu (Romania). 1.Sc3 Be8/i 2.Bb7 Rb6 3.Bc8/ii

Rc6 4.Bf5+ Kxf5 5.Se4 Bd7 6.Sc5 Be8 7.Se4 Bd7 8.Sc5 Rc7 9.Kd6 Rc6+ 10.Kd5 Be8 11.Se4, positional draw.
i) $\mathrm{Bf} 12 . \mathrm{Bb} 7 \mathrm{Bg} 2+3 . \mathrm{Se} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 6$ 4.Ba8 Rb8 5.Bc6 Rc8 6.Kd6.
ii) 3.Ba8? Rb8 4.Bc6 Bxc6 5.Kxc6 Rc8+.
"An excellent miniature. The attractive moves 4.Bf5+ and 5.Se4 lead to an interesting position where Bl , with great material freedom to manoeuvre in his favour is nevertheless helpless against the threats by wS."


No.7489: Jan van Reek (Margraten, Netherlands). $1 . c 7 \mathrm{~h} 32 . \mathrm{gh}$ g3 3.Bb7 g2 4.Bxg2 Rc8/i 5.Bc6/ii Rxc7 6.g6 Kg3/iii 7.Kd5 Kh4 8.Kd6 Rg7 9.Be8 Rb7 10.Kc6 Rb6+ 11.Kc7 Re6 12.Bf7 Rf6 13.Kc8 Rf5 14.g7 Rc5+ 15.Kd7 wins.
i) $\mathrm{Kxg} 25 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Kxh} 36 . \mathrm{Kc} 6$.
ii) 5.g6? Kxg2 6.Kd5 Rxc7 7.h4 Kh3 8.h5 Rg7 9.Ke6 Kg4 10.Kf6 Rb7 11.h6 Rb6+ 12.Kf7 Rb7+ 13. Kf 8 Kg 5 .
iii) Rc 8 7.Kd4 Rg 8 8.Be4 Kg 3 9.Ke5 Re8+ 10.Kf5 Rf8+ 11.Ke6 Re8+ 12.Kf7 Rxe4 $13 . \mathrm{g} 7$ draws.
"...the solution is analytically difficult, with precise, if somewhat monotonous, play."


No.7490: Pauli Perkonoja (Finland). 1.Se5, with 3 variations: f2+ 2.Kf1 Rf5 3.Sc3+ Kb4 4.Sd5+ (Sa2+? Ka3;) Kb5 (Kc5;Sf4) 5.Sc7+ Kb6 6.Sa8+ Kb7 7.Rh7+ Kxa8 8.Sc6 Rf7 9.Rh8+ Kb7 $10 . S d 8+$ wins, or Rf5 2.Sc3+ Kb4 3.Sa2+/i Ka3 4.Sc4+ Kb3 5.Se3 f2+6.Kf1 Rf3/ii 7.Sc1+ Kb2 8.Ke2 Rxe3+ 9.Kxe3 wins, or
Re7 2.Sc3+ Kc5 3.Rh5 Kd4 4.Se2+fe $5 . \mathrm{Sc} 6+$ wins.
i) $3 . \mathrm{Sd} 5+$ ? Kc5 4.Sf4 Rxe5+.
ii) $\operatorname{Re} 57 . \mathrm{Sc} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 28 . \mathrm{Sd} 3+$.
"This miniature with three pointed variations shows faultless construction."

No.7491: P.Arestov (USSR). 1.f7/i Re7/ii 2.Sg6+ Sxg6 3.Bxg6 Bxb6 4.Kb4/iii Bc7 5.Kc4 Bd6 6.Sg4+ Kxe6 7.f8S mate.
i) 1.e7? Bxb6 2.efQ Rxf8 3.Sg6+ Kxf6 4.Sxf8 Bc5+.
ii) Rxe6 2.Sxe6 Kxe6 3.b7 Bc7 4.Ka4 Kd7 5.Kb5.
iii) 4.f8Q? Bc5+ 5.Kb3 Rb7+ drawn.
"The mate by promoted wS with two active self-blocks is unexpected, but the introduction is rather brutal."


No.7492: Jan Marwitz (Netherlands). 1.Sa4+ Ka1 2.Rxh2/i Ra6+ 3.Kb4 (Kb5? Bxe7;) Rxh4+/ii 4.Rxh4 Bxe7+ 5.Sc5 Rb6+ (Bxh4;Sxa6) 6.Ka5 Bxc5 7.Ra4+ Kb2 8.Rb4+ Rxb4 stalemate.
i) 2.Sxb6? Rh5+3.K-h1Q.
ii) Bxe7+ 4.Kb3 Rxh4 5.Ra2+ Kb1 6.Sc3 Kc1 7.Rc2 mate.
"Sharp play after the attractive 5.Sc5! leads to stalemate or loss of bPb7."


No.7493: M.Halski (Poland). 1.a7 Kb7 2.a6+/i Kxa7 3.Rd7+ Ka8 4.Rd8+/ii Ka7 5.Rd7+ Kb8 6.Rxe7 $\mathrm{Rb} 3+7 . \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 4+8 . \mathrm{Ka} 3$ (Kxb4? Bf8;) Rg4 9.Rb7+/iii Kc8 10.Rb8+ Kxb8 11.a7+ Kb7 12.a8Q+ Kxa8, draw.
i) 2.Rd7+? Ka 8 3.Rxe7 $\mathrm{Rb} 3+$ 4.Ka4 Rb4 5.Kxb4 Bf8, or 3.Rd8+ Kxa7 4.Rd7+ Ka8 5.Rd8+ Kb7. ii) 4.Rxe7? Rb3+ 5.K- Bf6 6.Re8+ Rb8.
iii) 9.Re8+? Kc7 10.Rxg8 Bb2+. "Precise manoeuvres lead to stalemate. It is a pity that $w B B$ are so passive."


No.7494: Y.Kolesnikov (USSR). 1.Sb3+/i Kb2 2.d6 Sc4 3.d7 Se5 4.d8S Kxb3 5.Se6 Sc6+ 6.Ka8 f3
7.Sg5 f2 8.Se4 f1S 9.Sc5 Sxc5 stalemate.
i) 1.d6? Sc5 2.Sb3+Sxb3 3.d7 Sd4 wins.
"The construction is wonderful, but the originality of this miniature is low."


No.7495: Norman Macleod (Scotland). 1.Rd2+ Kc3 2.Se2+ Sxe2 3.Bxe2 Ra1+/i 4.Bd1/ii Re4+ 5. $\mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Rxe} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kxe} 2$ drawn.
i) If Rb1+, not 4.Bd1? Re5+5.Re2 Rxe2+ 6.Kxe2 Ral, zugzwang, but 4.Rd1 Rxdl+ 5.Bxd1 (Kxdl?) Ral 6.Ke2 drawn.
ii) 4.Rd1? Rxd1 5.Bxd1 Rbl 6.Ke2 Ra1 and $W$ is in zugzwang.
"The idea of using a known position of mutual zugzwang to show the problemist's dual avoidance theme in a study is interesting."

No.7496: D.Gurgenidze (URRS). 1.Sg3 Rxd6 2.Sh5+ Kh8 3.Rh1/i Rxf7/ii 4.Sf6+ Kg7 5.Rh7+ Kf8 6.Rh8+ Ke7 7.Re8 mate. i) 3.Sf6? Rd5+ 4.Kg6 (Sxd5? Kg 7 ;) $\mathrm{Rg} 5+5 . \mathrm{Kxg} 5 \mathrm{Rxf} 7$, and the d6 square is unoccupied.
ii) Rg8+ 4.Kf5 Rd5+ 5.Ke6. Rd5+ 4.Kg6 Rg5+ 5.Kxg5 Rxf7 6.Kg6 Rh7 7.Ral.
"An attractive mate with two selfblocks is achieved via unaesthetic capturing of passive pieces."


No.7497: B.Gusev (USSR). 1.Ra7+ Ke8 2.Ra6 Bd4 3.Rd6 Bh8 4.Rh6 Bg7 5.Rg6 Bd4 6.Rd6 Bxc5 7.Rd5 Bb4 8.Rb5 (Rxf5? Rc5+;) Rc4+ 9.Ke3/i f4+/ii 10.Kd3 Rc3+ $11 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Rb} 3+12 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 3+$ 13.Kd2 Rc4+ 14.Kd3 Rc3+ 15.Kd2 draw.
i) 9.Kd3? Rf4 10.Ke3 Bd6 11.Rd5 Re4+ 12.Kf3 Be5.
ii) $\mathrm{Bc} 5+10 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 4+11 . \mathrm{Kc} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 5$
12.Kc4 Re5 13.Rxc5 Rxc5 14.Kxc5 Kf7 15.Kd4.
iii) 11.Kd4? Rb3 12.Kc4 Rb1 13.Rxb4 Rxb1 14.Kxb4 f3.
"The play in this well constructed miniature is not obvious."


No.7498: V.Miltner (Czechoslovakia). 1.Rb8 Rxg8 (Kxg8 Kg6) 2.Rb7+ Ke8 3.Bg7 c2 4.Ke6 Kd8 5.Rb8+ Kc7 6.Be5+ Kc6 7.Rxg8 wins.
"This is a nice miniature where the interest lies in the choice of the first move."


No.7499: Gerd Rinder (West Germany). 1.Se3+/i Ke2 2.Rxb3 Rc1 3.Sc2 Rxc2 4.Kxc2, with 4 draws (one stalemate, the rest wK moves) depending on Bl's choice of pro-
motion piece, the only sensible alternative being the standard wrongcorner draw after Bxb3+. Unfortunately (AJR) the $S$-promotion-with-check involves a serious dual: wKb 2 draws as well as the intended $w \mathrm{Kc} 3$.
i) 1.Sa1? Sc1 2.Rh3 Bc6. 1.Rxb3? Rxc2+.
"A skilful presentation of replies to 4 different promotions."


No.7500: V.Tarasyuk (Kharkov region). Jury: Velimir Kalandadze and Otar Alkhanishvili. Around 100 entries were received. In view of the high overall quality 5 special prizes were awarded for elaborations of known ideas. The award was headed provisional (in capitals) but made no specific mention of confirmation time: it seems to have been 'assumed' - we have been informed (ii89) of one elimination. 1.Rg8/i Kd6/ii 2.Rg7 Rb7+ 3.Kc4 bRc7+ 4.Kb5 Rb7+ 5.Ka6 Rxg7 6.Rd8+ Kc7 7.Rc8+ Kxc8 8.a8Q+ Rb8 9.Qc6+ Rc7 10.Qe8 mate.
i) 1.Re8+? Kd6. 2.Re6+ Kxe6 3.Re8+Kf7 4.a8Q Rb7+, perpetual check.
ii) Rb7+ 2.Kc4 dRc7+ 3.Kd4 Rb4+ 4.Ke3 Rb3+ 5.Kf4 Rb4+ 6.Kg3 $\mathrm{Rc} 3+7 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 2+8 . \mathrm{Rg} 2$.
"The systematic movement in the try, the effective sacrifice of a pair of rooks for a surprise checkmate in the main line leave an indelible impression. All of this is in the crystal transparence of a miniature."


No.7501: David Gurgenidze (Chailuri, Georgia). 1.Re8+ Kf2 2.Re2+/i Kxe2 3.Re8+ Kd1 4.a8Q $\mathrm{b} 1 \mathrm{Q}+5 . \mathrm{Kxb} 1 \mathrm{Rb} 7+6 . \mathrm{Ka} 2$ (Qxb7? Rb4+;) Rc2+ 7.Ka3 Rc3+ 8.Ka4 cRc7 9.Rd8+ Kc2 10.Rc8 wins. i) $2 . \mathrm{Rf} 8+? \mathrm{Kg} 23 . \mathrm{Rf} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 3$.
"An attractive product. The Bl counterplay for stalemate demands witty manoeuvring by wK and wR."

No.7502: A.Sochniev (Leningrad). 1.Qf6/i Kb1 2.b3 Sd4 3.Qxd4 Qa7+ 4.Qxa7 h1Q 5.Qc7/ii Qa8+ 6.Ba7 Qg2 7.Bf2 Qa8+ 8.Ba7 Qh8
9.Bd4 Qxd4 10.Qg7 Qxg7 stalemate.
i) 1.b3? Sc3 2.Qf6 Qh3 3.Bd4 h1Q 4.Bc3+ Kb1 wins.
ii) 5.Qc5? Qa8+6.Qa7 Qc8 7.Bc5 Qh8 8.Bd4 Qh2 9.Bf2 Qe5 10.Qd4 Qe2 wins.
"A study on the grand scale. It needs brilliant manouevring by wQ and $w B$ to deflect (or funnel) the furious rage of bQ."


No. 7503
4th Prize, '"October-70" Matous


No.7503: M.Matous (Czechoslovakia). 1.c7/i Bd5 2.Bc6 Bxc6 3.c8Q Be4 4.Qc4 c2 5.Qxc2 Bxc2 6.f7 Ke2 7.f8R/ii Kf1 8.Rf3 Be4 stalemate.
i) 1.f7? Bxf7 2.c7 Bd5 3.Bc6 Bxc6 4.c8Q Be4 5.Qf5 Sf4 6.Qe5 c2 wins.
ii) 7.f8Q? Kf1 8.Qf3 Be4 wins. "The introduction is lightweight. In the finale a good impression is created once again by the pinning of a rook that has arrived by underpromotion."


No.7504: A.Davranyan (Donets Region). 1.Ke7 Bc8 2.Kd8 Be6 3.a3 Kb6 4.Be7/i Bc4 5.Kc8, with: Ba6+ 6.Kb8 Bb5 7.Bd8+ Kc5 8.Kc7 Bc4 9.Be7+ Kd4 10.Kd6 Bd3 11.Bf6+ Ke3 12.Ke5 Be2 13.Bg5+ Kf2 14.Bf4 Bf3 15.Bxf3 Kxf3 16.Bh2, winning, or Be6+ 6.Kb8 Bd7 7.Bd8+ Kc5 8.Kc7 Be6 9.Be7+ Kd4 10.Kd6 Bf5 11.Bf+6 Ke3 12.Ke5 Bg4 13. $\mathrm{Bg} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 2$ 14.Bf4 wins.
i) 4.Be5? Kc5 5.Bxh2 Bd5 6.Bxd5 Kxd5 and it's a draw if old analyses by Rauser are known.
"The composer has realised an original systematic movement in a pair of echo variations with the participation of four chessmen."


No.7505: V.Manaev (Khabarovsk Province). 1.b7 Rb8 2.Re8 Ba4 3.Rf8 Bb5 4.Ke7+ Ke5 5.Rd8 Ba4 6.Rg8 Rxg8 7.c7 Rg7+ 8.Kf8 Rxc7 9.b8Q Kd6 10.Qb4+ wins.


No.7506: Gamlet Amiryan (Erevan). 1.Rh1 Sd3 2.Rd1 b1Q 3.Rxb1 Sc1 4.Rb4, with: Se2 5.Rb1 Sc1 6.Rb4 d1Q 7.Rd4+ Qxd4 8.e8Q+ Kxe8 stalemate, or Sb3 5.Re4 Ke8 6.Kxb3 d1Q 7.Kc3, drawn.

No.7507: V.Vinnichuk (Polonka, Volynsk Region). 1.Sc2 a1Q 2.Sxal f2 3.Qh5+ Kg2 4.Qg4+ Kh2 5.Qf4+ Kg2 6.Sc2 Re1
7.Qg4+ Kh2 8.Qh4+ Kg1 9.Qg3+ Kh1 10.Sxe1 f1Q+ $11 . S 53$ wins.


No.7508: Yu.Solovyov (Ivanov Region). 1.Rf1+Kg4 2. Rg8+Kh3 3.Rh1+ Qxh1 4.Rh8+ Kg2 5.Rxh1 Kxh1 6.f8Q, with:
bSc5+ 7.Kc8 clQ 8.Qf3+ Kh2 9.Qh5 $+\mathrm{Kg} 2+10 . \mathrm{Qg} 5+$, Qxg5 stalemate, or
aSc5+ 7.Kc8 c1Q 8.Qf3+ Kg1 9.Qg4+ Kf2 10.Qf4+ Qxf4 stalemate.

No.7509: P.Mulezhko (Khmelnitsky region). 1.Sd7+ Kc6 2.Se5+ Kd6 3.Sc4+ Kd5 4.Se3+ Kd4 5.Sf5+ Ke4 6.Sg3+ Kf4 7.Se2+ wins.


No.7510: the late Eduard Asaba (Moscow). 1.Rb1 Qg1 2.Bf3+Kh2 3.Rf1 g2 4.Qe5+ Kh1 5.Qf5 Kh2 6.Qf4+ Kh1 7.Qxh4 Qxf1 8.Qxh3+ Kg 1 9.Bb7 and 10.Qxg2 mate.


No.7511: V.Sereda (Tbilisi). 1.c5
d5 2.Sd4 Bd8 3.Sb5 Kf4 4.Sd6 Bf6 5.Sxb7 Kf5 6.c6 Be5 7.h7 Ke6 8.Sd8+ Ke7 9.Sf7 Bal 10.Kc2 Ke8 11.Kb1 Bc3(d4) 12.c7 Kd7 13.Sd6 wins.
[A study by Akobiya (Kh1/h6) was eliminated at this place in the award.]


No.7512: G.Mzhavanadze (Mayakovsky). 1.Sh2 Kb2 2.Kd2 f4 3.Bf2(h4) Kb1 4.Bd4 f3 5.Kd1 f2 6.Be5 a2 7.Ba1 f1Q 8.Sxf1 h2 9.Sd2+ Kxal 10.Kc2 h1Q 11.Sb3 mate.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No. } 7513 \\
& \text { 5th Commendation, "October-70", }
\end{aligned}
$$



No.7513: Ernest Pogosyants (Moscow). 1.Se6 Kd7 2.Sd4 Kd6 3.Kb2 Kc5 4.Kc3 b6 5.Kd3 Kb4 6.Ke4

Kc4 7.Ke5 Kc5 8.Ke6+ Kxd4 9.Kd6 Kc4 10.Kc6 wins.


No.7514: Gia A. Nadareishvili (Tbilisi). 1.d7 Rd2/i 2.d8Q Rxd8 3.cdB Kd2 4.Bh4 Kc3 5.b5 Kc4 6.b6 Kb5 7.b7 e1Q 8.Bxe1+ Ka6 9.b8R wins.
i) Kd1 2.d8Q+ Rd2 3.Qh4 e1Q 4.Qxe1+ Kxe1 5.c8Q Rd1 6.Qc2 wins.
"An economical setting of the popular theme of systematic pawn promotion."
DVH mildly enquires: What sort of promotion would be unsystematic?


No.7515: Vazha Neidze (Tbilisi).
1.Rd8+/i Ke1 2.Rc1+ Ke2 3.Rc2+ Kf1 4.Rxf2+ Kxf2/ii 5.g7 Bf7 6.g8Q Bxg8 7.Rd2+ Ke1/iii 8.Rd1+Kxd1 stalemate.
i) 1.g7? $\mathrm{Qxb} 8+2 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \quad \mathrm{Rf} 8$. 1.Rb2+? Ke1 2.Re1+ Bd1 3.Rxf2+ Kxf2.
ii) Qxf2 5.g7 Bf7 6.g8Q Bxg8 7.Rf8 Qxf8 stalemate.
iii) ???Bf7 8.Rxf7 Qxf7 stalemate, again!
"Three pure stalemates in the fabric of a solution incorporating both synthesis in both parallel and serial dimensions."
DVH: Goodness me!


No.7516: A.Maximovskikh (Zagainovo, Kurgan Region). 1.h6/i gh 2.Rd4+, with: Kh5 3.Kf5 b2 4.g3 b1Q 5.Rh4+ gh $6 . g 4$ mate, or g4 3.Kf5 h5 4.Rxd5 b2 5.Kf4 b1Q 6.Rh3+ gh 7.g3 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rd} 4+$ ? Kxh5 $2 . \mathrm{Rxd} 3 \mathrm{~b} 2$, and 3.Kf5 is met by b1Q+.
"Chameleon echo pawn mates, incorporating echo sacrifice by wR."

No.7517: Revaz Tavariani (Tbilisi). $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{~h} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kf} 1 \mathrm{~h} 23 . \mathrm{Sxg} 4$

Kxg4 4.Rg6+/i Kh5 5.Rg2 h1Q 6.Rh2 Qxh2 stalemate. i) 4.Rh6? Sh3 5.Rg6+Kf5.
"An attractive 'echo chamber' study."
DVH: Could I buy an 'echo chamber' study? [AJR: a joke, I think.]


No.7518: A.Sochniev (Leningrad). $1 . \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 1+2 . \mathrm{Ka} 7 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Ra1+} \mathrm{3.Ba5}$ Rxa5+ 4.Kb7 Rb5+ 5.Kc7 Rc5+ 6.Kd7 Rd5+ 7.Ke7 Re5+ 8.Kf7 $\mathrm{Sg} 49 . \mathrm{Sg} 3$ mate.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Kc} 7$ ? $\mathrm{Rc} 1+3 . \mathrm{Kd7} \mathrm{Rd1}+4 . \mathrm{Ke} 7$ Rxe1+ 5.Kf7 Sg4 draws.
"A beautiful study in the logical style."


No.7519: David Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). Judge: Paul Lamford, whose analytical skills, supplemented by the anticipations service of Brian Stephenson, eliminated just about $50 \%$ of the 48 qualifying entries. More than that, the award supplied reference information to allow the anticipations to be retrieved. The high failure rate deserves comment: it does not (necessarily!) imply that THE PROBLEMIST publishes a higher proportion of unsound originals than other magazines, but rather we suspect many studies thought to be sound drop through the loose net of other publications. [We intend to propose through the newly formed FIDE Standing Sub-Committee for Studies that to qualify for a FIDE Certificate (no such thing yet exists) a tourney MUST, among other things, have ALL its entries tested (a) for soundness by a recognised method, and (b) for anticipations by a recognised method. Such requirements are more important than that the tourney judge should possess the title of FIDE judge for studies. If the conditions are met,
and if the award identifies (directly or indirectly) all the unsoundnesses and anticipations, perhaps the award need not have a confirmation time. The present award meets all the foregoing requirements, but might yet fail a Fide certificate test for other reasons, such as timely publication (by maybe two years) and diagram misprints (one in the award and one among the originals)! Stringent provisions such as these (there are many more to be devised) could be applied to any tourney, formal or informal, international or not, and should in the long term bring about an improvement in tourneys for studies. We intend to suggest that a FIDE certificate be awarded only after the final award has appeared, but a tourney announcement should declare the intention on the part of the organisers to seek such a certificate. AJR] Another laudable feature of the award, tending to maintain a high quality, is the proportion (1 to 6) of honoured studies to valid (as distinct from dis-honoured!) studies. 1.f7 Rg4+ 2.Ka5 Rg5 + 3.Ka6 Sc7+ 4.bc Rg8 5.fgB Bxc7 6.Sd4 Kb8 (B-;Sc6) 7.Sc6+ Kc8 8.Be6 mate.
"This study shone like the Koh-inoor in a bag of coal. A stalemate defence, underpromotion, and ideal mate all in one study guaranteed First Prize for this masterpiece. Most of the other contenders were lapped before the end."

No.7520: A.Maksimovskikh and
V.Shupletsov (Kurgan region, USSR). 1.Ka4 Re7 2.Bd5 Rc7 3.Rb5 Rd7/i 4.Bc4 Rc7 5.Bd5 Rf7 6.Rb4 Rc7 7.Rb5 Rd7 8.Bc4 Rd4 9.cd c1Q 10.Ra5+/ii Kb6 11.Rb5+ Kc7 12.Rc5+ Kd6 13.Rd5+ Ke7 14.Re5+ Kf6 15.Rf5+ Kg6 16.Rg5+ Kh6 17.Rh5+, and it's a draw.
i) c1Q 4.Ra5+ Kb6 5.Rb5+ Ka6 6.Ra5+.
ii) 10.Rc5+? Qxc4 11.Rxc4 d2. "This features a surprising perpetual check and a good fight, but the suspicious P's on $94 / \mathrm{h} 4$ are a minor drawback."


No.7521: Charles Michael Bent (England). 1.Se5 Ba6 (Sd7;Sxd7)
2.Bg5 Kf8/i 3.Sd6 Kg8 4.Bd8 Kg7 5.Kf2 h6 6.Kel h5 7.Kf2 h4 8.Bxh4 K- 9.Bd8 Kg7 10.Ke1 K11. Bc 7 wins.
i) $\operatorname{Sd7} 7 . \operatorname{Sxd} 7 \mathrm{Kxd} 74 . \mathrm{Sc} 5+$.
"Another excellent study by the evergreen CMB. I liked the tempogaining manoeuvres to prevent bK reaching f6."


No.7522: the late Iosef Krikheli (Georgian SSR). Either: 1...Ka2 2.Rh2 f4 3.Rf2 Kal 4.Kh2 (Rf1+? b1R;) blQ 5.Rf1 Qxf1 stalemate, or:
1...Ka1 2.Kg2, but not 2.Rg5? b1Q+ 3.Rg1 f4 4.Rxb1+ Kxb1 5.Ka2 Kc2 6.Kh3 Kd3, and 7.Kg4 Ke 3 , or $7 . \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 2$, and Bl wins.
"An interesting fight to reach a drawn 0000.11 position."

No.7523: Jan Rusinek (Warsaw). Judge: Andrzej Lewandowski, to celebrate whose 50th birthday the formal international tourney was organised. The award included a complete list of competitors. 1. $\mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{i} \quad$ Bxd8 $\quad 2 . \mathrm{h} 7 / \mathrm{ii} \quad \mathrm{Sd} 7+$ (Bg5;h8Q) 3.Kf7/iii Se5+ 4.Ke6

Re7+ 5.Kd5/iv Bc4+ 6.Kd4 Sf3+/v 7.Sxf3/vi Rxg7 8.Bc6+/vii Kb4/viii 9.h8Q Bf6+ 10.Se5 Rg4+ 11.Be4 Bxh8 stalemate.
i) 1.g8Q? Sd7+ 2.Kg7 Sf6+ 3.Qf7 Rxf7+4.Kxf7 Bc4.
1.h7? Sd7+ 2.Kf7 Se5+ 3.Ke6 Re7+ 4.Kf5 Bh3 +5 .Ke4 $\mathrm{Sg} 6+$ and Rxg7.
ii) $2 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? Sd7+ $3 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Sf} 6+$.
iii) 3.Ke8? Sf6+ 4.Kxd8 Rxa8+ and Sxh7.
iv) 5.Kd6? Bc4 6.g8Q Sf7+ 7.Qxf7 Rxf7 8.h8Q Bc7 mate.
v) Rg 7 7.h8Q $\mathrm{Sf} 3+8 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Sg} 5+$ 9.Kf4 drawn.
vi) 7.Kc3? Rxg7 8.h8Q Bf6+ 9.Kc2 Sxel+, and 10.Kcl Sd3+, or $10 . \mathrm{Kbl} \mathrm{Bd} 3+$.
vii) 8.h8Q? Bf6+ 9.Se5 Rg4+. 8.Se5? Bf6 9.Bc6+ Kb6 10.Kxc4 Bxe5 11.h8Q Rg4+.
viii) Kxc6 9.Se5+ and 10.h8Q.

DVH: "Great fun!"


No.7524: V.N.Kondratev (USSR). 1.Kb8/i Rh8 2.Rxh8 b2 3.Rg8+ Kh5 4.Rh8 +Kg 4 5.Rg8+ Kh3 6.Rh8+ Kg2 7.Rg8+ Kh1 8.Rh8+ Kg1 9.Bb6+/ii Kg2 10.Rg8+ Kh3
11.Rh8+ Kg4 12.Rg8+ Kh5 13.Rh8+ Kg6 14.Rg8+ Kf7 15.Rg7+ Ke6 (Kg7;Bd4+) 16.Rg6+ Kd5 (Kf5;Rf6+) 17.Rg5+ Kc4 18.Rg4+ (Rc5+? Kb4;) Kb5 19.Rg5+ Kxb6 20.Rg7 Bg2 $21 . \mathrm{e} 4$ Bxe4 22.Rxb7 Bxb7 stalemate.
i) 1.Kd8? Rh8 2.Bc3 Rxe8+ 3.Kxe8 Bxe2 4.Kd7 Kf5 5.Kc7 Ba6 6.Kb6 Ke4 7.Kc5 Kd3 8.Kb4 Kc2 wins.
ii) $9 . \mathrm{Rg} 8+$ ? Bg 2 10.Bb6+ Kf1 11.Rf8+ Ke1 12.Ba5+ Kd1 13.Rd8+ Kc1 14.Rc8+ Bc6 15.Rg8 Ba 4 wins.


No. 7525 Em. Dobrescu 3rd Prize, Lewandowski Jubilee,


No.7525: Em.Dobrescu (Romania). 1.g7/i Qh1+/ii 2.Kg3 Qe1+ 3.Kh2

Qh1(g1)+ 4.KxQ alQ+/iii 5.Kh2, with:
Qxg7 6.Rc5+ (Rb5+? Qg5;) Kh4/iv 7.Rb4+ Qg4 8.g3 mate, or Qe5+ 6.Kh3 Qg7/v 7.Rc5+ Qg5 $8 . \mathrm{g}^{4}$ mate, but not $8 . \mathrm{Rxg} 5+$ ? Kxg 5 9.Rbl Kf4 10.g4 Ke3 11.g5 Ke2 $12 . \mathrm{g6}$ a2 draws.
i) 1.Rc5+? Kh6 2.g7 Kh7 3.g8Q+ Kg8 4.Rc8+ Kf7 5.Rb7+ Qe7. ii) Qe3+2.g3. a1Q 2.g4+. iii) d1Q+5.Kh2 Qd5 6.g4+ Kh4 7.Rh6+ Kg5 8.Rh5+ Kf6 9.Rxd5 wins. iv) Qg5 7.Rxg5+ Kxg5 8.Rb1 Kf4 9.Kg1 Ke3 10.Kf1 Kd3 11.Ra1 Kc2 12.Ke2 wins.
v) $\mathrm{Qf5}+7 . \mathrm{g} 4+\mathrm{Qxg} 4+8 . \mathrm{Rxg} 4 \mathrm{P}=\mathrm{Q}$ 9.Rh4+.


No.7526: D.Gurgenidze (USSR). 1.Rd8+ Ke7 2.R8d7+ Ke6 3.R7d6+ Ke5 4.R6d5+ Ke4 5.R5d4+ Kxe3 6.R2d3+ Kf2 7.Rf4+ Ke1 8.Kg1 Ra2 9.Re4+/i Re2 10.Rf4 Qa7+ 11.fRd4 Ra2 12.Re3+ Re2 13.eRd3 Qa1 (Re8;Rd1+) 14.Rf4 Ra2 15.Re4+ Re2 16.Rf4, positional draw.
i) 9.Rf1+? Ke2 10.Ra1 Rxal+ 11.Kh2 Kxd3 wins.


No.7527: Julien Vandiest (Belgium). 1.Bf1+ Kd6 2.Qc7+ Ke6 3.Bh3+ Kf6 4.Qf4+ Ke7 5.Qe5+ Kf8 6.Qf6+ Kg8 7.Be6+ Kh7 8.Bf5 + Kg8 9.Qg6+ Kf8 10.Be4 Qh3+ 11.Kd8 Qe3 12.Qf6+ Kg8 13.Qxh4 Kf7 14.Kd7 Qb3 15.Qh7+ Kf8 16.Qh6+ Kg8 17.Bh7+ Kf7 18.Bg6+ Kg8 19.Qh7+ Kf8 20.Qh8+ Qg8 21.Qf6 and mate next move.


No.7528: Yu.Akobiya and N.Pandzhakidze (USSR). 1.d8Q/i Sxd8/ii 2.Rh6+ Kg8 3.Bxa3 Sxa3 4.Rxb6 Rxa7 5.Rb8 Rd7 6.Rb3 Ra7 7.Rb8 Rd7 8.Rb3 Sc2 9.Rb2

Rc7 10.Rb8 Rd7 11.Rb2 Sa1 12.Rb1 Ra7 13.Rb8 Rd7 14.Rb1 Sc2 15.Rb2 Sa3 16.Rb3 drawn.
i) 1.Bxa3? Sxa3 2.d8Q Sxd8 3.Rxb6 Rxa7+. 1.Rxb6? a2 2.Ra6 Rxa7 drawn. 1.Re8? Sf8.
ii) Rxd8 2.Bxa3 Sxa3 3.Rxb6 drawn.


No.7529: Oscar Carlsson and Luis Parenti (Argentina). 1.e5 Kc2 2.Qf6 Rxf6 3.ef Sd6 4.Kc7 Se8+ 5.Kc6 Bc4 6.b5 Sxf6 7.b6 Bd5+ 8.Kc7 Se8+ 9.Kd7 Sf6+ 10.Kc7 draws.


No.7530: Alexander Hildebrand (Uppsala, Sweden). 1.Ra2/i Kel/ii 2.Ra1+/iii d1Q 3.Rxd1+ Kxd1
4.Sxe3+/iv Sxe3 5.Bh5+ Ke1 6.Bf3 Kf2/v 7.Bh1 Kg1 8.Bc6 Sg2 9.a5 h1Q 10.a6, drawn.
i) 1.Sxe3? Sxe3 2.Ra2 Ke1 3.Ra1+ d1Q 4.Rxd1+ Sxd1 5.Bd5 Sc3 6.Bc6 Sxa4+ 7.Kb5 Sb2, B1 wins. ii) e2 2.Sc3+ Ke1 3.Bd5 d1Q 4.Re2+ Qxe2 5.Sxe2 Kxe2 6.a5 Se3 7.Bh1, drawn.
iii) 2.Sxe3? Sxe3 3.Ra1+ d1Q 4.Rxdl+Sxdl and Bl wins.
iv) $4 . \mathrm{Sc} 3+$ ? $\mathrm{Kc} 25 . \mathrm{Bd} 5 \mathrm{Kxc} 3$ wins. v) Kf1 7.a5 $\mathrm{Sg} 28 . \mathrm{a} 6 \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{Q} 9 . \mathrm{a} 7$ Qh6+ 10.Bc6 drawn.


No.7531: David Gurgenidze (USSR). 1.Rg2 (Kb6+? Kb1;) Rd2 2.Kb6+/i Kb2 3.Rf8 f1S 4.gRf2/ii Rxf2 5.Rxf2+ Sd2/iii 6.Rxd2+Kc3 7.Rd5 b4 8.Rc5+ Kd2 9.Rb5 Kc3 10.Ka5 b3 11.Ka4 b2 12.Ka3 wins. i) 2.Rf8? f1S 3.gRf2 Rxf2 4.Rxf2+ Ka3 5.Rxf1 b4 draws.
ii) 4.Rxd2+? Sxd2. 4.fRf2? Kc2 5.Kxb5 Rxf2 6.Rxf2+Sd2.
iii) Kc3 6.Rxf1 b4 7.Kb5 b3 8.Ka4 b2 9.Ka3 Kc2 10.Rf2+ wins.

No.7532: Velimir Kalandadze (Tbilisi, Georgian SSR). 1...Bb8+
2.Kf6/i Ra6+ 3.Kg5 Ra5+ 4.Kg4 Rh5 5.Rxh5 gh+ 6.Kg3 h1B (h1Q stalemate; $7 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Bxb} 78 . \mathrm{Kg} 1$ $\mathrm{Ba} 7+$ (Bxf4 stalemate;) $9 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 8$ 10.Rf8 Bg4 11.Kg3 Bc5 12.Rf4 Bd6 13.Kh4 Bxf4 stalemate.


No.7533: P.A.Maly (USSR). 1.Kd3/i Kd5 2.h5 gh 3.gh Ke6 4.Kc4 e4 5.Kxb4 Kf5 6.Kc3 Kg5 7.a4 Kxh5 8.a5 Kg4 9.a6 e3 10.a7 e2 11.Kd2 wins.
i) 1.h5? gh 2.gh Ke6 3.h6 Kf6 4.h7 Kg 7 5.Kxe5 Kxh7 6.Kd4 Kg7 7.Kc4 Kf7 8.Kxb4 Ke8 9.Kb5 Kd8 10.Kb6 Kc8 drawn

No.7534: A.Frolovsky (Tula region). Judge: K. Sumbatyan (Mos-
cow), of whom we have heard all too little in recent years, contributes a lively commentary. Narodnoye obrazovaniye means, more or less, Popular Education, but publication titles almost invariably mislead when translated either way between English and Russian. Computer Weekly, for example, was described in a soviet chess magazine as a mathematical journal, when it is nothing of the kind, being concerned chiefly with new products, trends, commercial computing, company news, political aspects, and advertising. And another thing: in Russian an adjective in titles and topographical proper names has the capital letter while the accompanying noun does not, whereas English gives capital letters over-generously (even to the days of the week and the months of the year). Kishinov is the capital of the Moldavian SSR. 1.Sf2+ Kc2 2.Qe2+ Kc3 3.Qf3+ d3 4.Qc6+ Kd2 5.Se4+ Kd1 6.Sc3+ Kel 7.Qh1+ Kd2 8.Sb1+ Kc2 9.Qc6+ Kd1 10.Qf3+ Kc 2 11.Sa3+ Kc3 12.Qf6+ Kb4 13.Qd4+ Ka5 14.Qa7+ Kb4 15.Qb8+ Kc3 16.Qe5+ Kb4 17.Qb5+ Kc3 18.Qc5+ Kd2 19.Sb1+ Kd1 20.Qxh5+ Kc2 21.Sa3+ Kc3 22.Qe5+ Kd2 23.Qf4+ Kd1 24.Qf3+ Kd2 25.Sb1+ Kc2 26.Qc6+ Kd1 27.Qh1 + Kc2 28.Sa3+ Kd2 29.Qxh6+ Kd1 30.Qh1+ Kd2 31.Qh2+ Kc3 32.Qe5+ Kd2 33.Sb1+ Kd1 34.Qh5+ Kc2 35.Qc5+ Kd1 36.Sc3+ Ke1 37.Qg1+ Kd2 38.Se4+ Kc2 39.Qc5+ Kd1 40.Qh5+ Kc2
 55.Qh1+ and 56.Qxcl, and W wins, if he's got any breath left for crossing the line.
"The adornment of the tourney. It is not a question of the solution's practically dual-free length (56 moves) but rather that it stands apart from otherwise similar compositions where a motif is repeated. In the course of winning bQ, the $w Q$ and wS weave one after another quite different designs, the flow never halts, and finally leads to the desired conclusion. It is rare to see the whole board cleared at the composer's behest."


No.7535: M.Bordenyuk (Moldavian Republic). There was no other prize. 1.Kg7 Bh5 2.cd Kxd7 3.Rh3 Be8 4.Kf8 Kd8 5.Ra3 Sc8 6.Rd3 Bd7 7.Se6 mate.
"The struggle is subtle, full of nu-
ances, leading to a brilliant checkmate with a pair of active selfblocks and pin of a Bl piece. The position is an interesting one: there is no feeling that Bl stands badly, and it is indeed the case that at every turn $W$ has but a single way forward."


No.7536: D.Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). 1.Sd2 e1Q+ 2.Kxd3 Qg3+ 3.Kc2 Qg6+ 4.Kc1 Qxc6+ 5.aSc4 Qa4 6.Sa5 Ka2 7.aSc4 c6 8.Sb6 Qb4 9.bSc4 Qa4 10.Sb6, positional draw.
"An unconstrained realisation of a chain of five positional draws which W achieves in contention
with bQ: first there is a perpetual check, then a cunning prison for bK. Had there not been a small, but nevertheless unwelcome dual on move 6 , and also because of the unsubtle introduction, the placing would have been higher."


No.7537: P.Arestov (Rostov region). 1.Sc4+ Ka4 2.Rb7 b1S+ 3.Kxd3 Rh3+ 4.Kc2 Sa3+ 5.Sxa3 Kxa3 6.Ra7 mate.
"A fast and furious mêlée leads to a pair of similar mating pictures. Perhaps too laconic."


No.7538: the late E.Asaba (Moscow). 1.Rb4 Se6 2.Rf7+ Ke8 3.bRb7 Rc6 4.Rh7 Rd6+5.Ke2 Sf8
6.Rh8 Rd8 7.Ra7 Rb8 8.Rg8 Rb2+ 9.Kf3 Rb3+ 10.Kg4 f5+ 11.Kxf5 $\mathrm{Rb} 5+$ 12.Ke4 Rb4+ 13.Kd5 Rb5+ 14.Kc6 Rb8 15.Rc7 Rd8 16.Kb7 wins.
"W's systematic stranglehold on B1 does not impress, but it is the workaholic wK running from one side of the board to the other that exacts the final dues."


No.7539: O.Pervakov (Moscow). 1.Ke5 Kc4 2.Kf6 Kd5 3.Ke7 Kc6 4.Kf7 Kd5 5.Kf6 d6 6.Kg7 Ke6 7.Kxh7 Kf7 8.c4 wins.
"A brilliant P -miniature that is soluble without fatigue."

1.Ra7+ Kb4 2.Re7 Qa8 3.Ra7 Qe8 4.Re7 Qh5 5.Rh7 Qd1 6.Rd7 Ka4 7.Ra7+ Kb4 8.Rd7 Qa4 9.Ra7 Qe8 10.Re7 Qa8 11.Ra7 Qe8 12.Re7 Qa4 13.Ra7 Qd1 14.Rd7 Qh5 15.Rh7 Qe8 16.Re7, positional draw.
"Essentially this is just a skeleton. But it is still highly entertaining and instructive."


No.7541: G.Gorbunov (Saratov region). 1.Sd4 Kxh5 2.Kg3 h2 3.Kxh2 Bd3 4.Sf5 Kg4 5.Sg3 Bc4 6.Kh1 Kxg3 stalemate.
"An unpretentious study with a simple finale, and yet the moves and motivations of both sides are somehow out of the ordinary."


No.7542: A.Frolovsky. 1.Kg8 Se1 2.Rc3 Sg2 3.Kf7 Se1 4.Kf6 Sg2 5.Kf5 Sel 6.Kf4 Sg2+ 7.Ke4 Se1 8.Ke3 Sg2+ 9.Kf2 Sf4 10.Rc4, and the win is not complex.
"In contrast to the prizewinner by the same composer the kernel of this study is a single move. One must not hurry over finding the solution in a position where one might suppose that all roads lead to Rome. It is easy to overlook the pair of echo stalemates and the pair of positional draws. Only by avoiding all submerged perils can one find the counterintuitive one true solution."

The award in the newspaper source includes no annotations, whether to this or any other study.


No.7543: Per Olin (Espoo). This celebratory tourney judged by Jan Rusinek of Poland was between the town of Espoo and the 'Rest of Finland'. With a population of 162,000 Espoo lies 10 km west of Helsinki. 1.a6 ba 2.Be4 Bxe4
3.Ra1+ Kf2 4.Kxd4 b2 5.Rb1 Bxb1 6.Kxc3 and 7.Kxb2, draw. "After wR sacrifice ( $5 . \mathrm{Rb} 1$ ) a very special position arises in which wK draws on his own against bB and 3 bPP."


No.7544: Erkki Puhakka (Espoo). 1.Bh2? Rh1. 1.Sd1 (for Sc3+) f4 2.Bh2 Rh1 3.Rd3 Rxh2 4.Sf2+ Ke5 5.Sg4+ Kf5 (Ke4;Rf6+) 6.Sxh2 g1Q 7.Rd5+ Ke4 8.Re5+ Kxe5 9.Sf3+ Ke4 10.Sxg1 wins. "Interesting play incorporating inter alia checkmate threats."


No.7545: Harri Hurme (Espoo).
I: 1.Kb7/i Kxd5 2.Rd1+ Kc5 3.Rc1+ Kd4 4.Rd1+ Ke5 5.Kc6 Rc3+ 6.Kd7 d5 7.Rb1 Ra3 8.b7

Ra7 9.Kc6 Rxb7 10.Rxb7 d4 11.Re7+ Kf4 12.Kd5 d3 13.Re4+ Kf3 14.Kd4 d2 15.Rxe3+, drawn. i) 1.b7? Kxd5 2.Rd1+ Kc6 3.Rc1+ Kd7 4.Rc3 Rxc3 5.b8Q Ra3+ and Bl wins.
II: 1.c7/ii Kxe5 2.Re1+ Kd6 3.Rd1+ Ke7 4.Rd3 draws.
ii) 1.Kc7? Kxe5 2.Re1+ Kf5 3.Kd6 $\mathrm{Rd} 3+4 . \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{e} 5$ 5.Rc1 Ra3 6.c7 Ra8, "and now W's promotion loses an important tempo."
"Twins with play that is both tough and deep, but analysis predominates over artistry."


No.7546: Bruno Breider (Espoo). 1.h6 Kf7 2.h7 Kg6 3.f7, with Be7 4.Bf6 Ba3+ $5 . \mathrm{Bb} 2$, or $\mathrm{Bg} 5+$ 4.Kxc2 Bh6 5.Bg7+, winning.
"A manoeuvre resembling a Plachutta interference, but with K and B."

No.7547: Pekka Massinen (Helsinki). 1.Ra1 Ka7 2.Kb5+ Kb7 3.Kc5+ Kc7 4.Rxa8 e2 5.Ra7+ Kc8 6.Rf4 Kb8 7.fRa4 wins. "Precision play by White creates a mating net."


No.7548: Osmo Kaila (Helsinki). 1.Be5 Kxe5/i 2.h7 Kd4 3.h8Q+ Kxd3 4.Qh3+ Kc2/ii 5.Qg2+ Kb3 6.Qd5+ Ka3 7.Qe5 wins.
i) Sd6 $2 . \mathrm{h} 7$ (or Bal) Sf7 3.Bal.
ii) Kd4 5.Qd7+ Kc5 6.Qe7+ Kd4 7.Qb4+Ke3 8.Qb2+ wins. "A Q-ending with forcing moves."


No.7549: Per Olin. 1.Sg5 Kf2 2.Sf7 Kg3 3.Sxh6 Kh4 4.Sxg8 Kxh5 5.Se7 Kh6 6.Kb2 Kg7 7.Kc3 Kf6 8.Kd4 Kxe7 9.Ke5 wins.
"A study with practical value."


No.7550: Kauko Väsänen (Helsinki). 1.Kc5 h1Q 2.b8S+ Ka7 3.Sc6+ Qxc6+ 4.Kxc6 a3 5.Ra5+ Kb8 6.Rxa3 b1Q 7.Rb3+ Qxb3 8.cb wins.
"Sharp. But brutal."


No.7551: Veikko Nevanlinna (Jyväskylä).
I: 1.Ra8+ Kxa8 2.c8Q+ Ka7 3.Qa6+ Kb8 4.Qb6+ Ka8 5.Bd5 wins.
II: 1.Ra8+ Kxa8 2.Bd5+ Ka7 3.c8S+ wins.


No.7552: Pekka Massinen. 1.a6 c5 2.ab+ Bxb7 3.Bc8 Bg2 4.b7+ Bxb7 $5 . \mathrm{Bxb7}+\mathrm{Ka} 76 . \mathrm{b} 5$ and $7 . \mathrm{b} 6$ mate. "Simple."


No.7553: Veikko Nevanlinna. 1.Ke7 Kel 2.Bb5 Se 2 3.Bxe2 Kxe2 4.f5 f1Q $5 . f 6$ and 6.f7, drawn.
"The finale is known from Proskurowski (Szachy, 1983)."

No.7554: V.S.Kovalenko. Judge: G.A.Umnov. 57 studies by 46 authors. 1.Sb6 (Be1? Sxd3;) Kb5 2.Bd2/i Kxb6/ii 3.Be3+ Ka6 4.Bxf2/iii Be5+ 5.Ka8 Sd5 6.Bg1/iv Bg3 7.Bd4, with: Sc7+ 8.Kb8 Sb5+ 9.Ka8 Sxd4 stalemate, or Bh 2 8.Bf2 $\mathrm{Be} 59 . \mathrm{Bg} 1 \mathrm{Bg} 3$
10.Bd4, positional draw (or stalemate!).
i) 2.Be1? Sxd 3 3.Bh4 $\mathrm{Sc} 6+4 . \mathrm{Kc7}$ Be5+ 5.Kb7 Sa5+ 6.Ka7 Bd4 7.Bd8 Sc4 wins.
ii) Sc6+ 3.Kb7 Sa5+ 4.Bxa5 draw.
iii) W's material is sufficient to draw, but meanwhile a mating net has been drawn.
iv) 6.d4? Sb6 mate. 6.Ba7? Sc7+ 7.Kb8 Sb5+ and Sxa7. 6.Bc5? Sc7+ 8.Kb8 Se6+ wins.


No.7555: the late S.Belokon and A.Alekseyev. The first named is presumably the Kharkov composer who died several years ago. 1.h6 gh 2.Rg8+ Kh4 3.Bxd7/i Sf4 4.Rg4+ Kh5 5.Rxf4 Bg5 6.Be8
mate.
i) 3.Bf5? Sf4 4.Rg4+ Kh5 5.Rxf4 Bg 5 drawn.


No.7556: D.Gurgenidze. 1.g7 g1Q/i 2.g8Q+ Ke7 3.Qg7+ Ke6 4.Bxe2/ii Qb1+ 5.Kc8/iii Qc2+ 6.Kd8 Qxe4 7.Bg4+/iv Kd6 8.Qc7+ Kd5 9.Bf3 Qxf3 10.Qb7+ wins.
i) e1Q 2.g8Q+ Ke7 3.Qg7+ Kd6 4.Qc7+ Ke6 5.Bg4+ Kf6 6.Qd6+ Kg7 7.Qe7+ Kh6 8.Qf8+.
ii) 4.Qg6+? Ke 7 5.Bxe2 $\mathrm{Qb} 1+$ 6.Kc7 Qc2+ 7.Qc6 Qxe2.
iii) 5.Kc7? Qxe4 6.Bg4+ Kd5.
iv) 7.Bc4+? Kf5 8.Bd3 Qxd3+.


No.7557: V.S.Kovalenko. 1.a7 Rc6+ 2.Kb7 Rc7+ 3.Kb6/i Rc8
4.Kb7 Ra8 5.Kxa8/ii Kd4 6.Rb3 Be4+ 7.Rb7 Kd5 8.Rc7 Bxc7 9.Kb7 Kd6+ 10.Kc8 Bb6 11.Kb8, and again perpetual check or stalemate.
i) 3.Ka8? Be4 4.Re3 Rxa7+ 5.Kxa7 Bc5+ wins.
ii) 5.Rb3? Be4 6.Kxa8 Kc5+ 7.Rb7 Kc6 wins.


No.7558: V.Kozhakin. Yes, wK is in check, which most critics find distasteful, presumably because it too obviously restricts W's options, but it would be worse with Bl in check, BTM. 1.Ke5 Bxg7+ 2.Qxg7 f1Q 3.Ra4+ (Qg4+? Bc4;) Kxc5 4.Qc7+/i Rc6 5.Qxa5+ Qb5 6.Rc4+,. and we assume that Bl prefers to be mated with a pawn than with a queen, Bxc4 7.b4, a pin mate with three active self-blocks, and every man involved.
i) 4.Qa7+? Rb6 5.Rxa5+ Kc6.

No.7559: M.Zinar. 1.g6 b1B/i 2.g7 Bh7 3.Ka8 Bg8 4.a7 Bf7 5.g8Q Bxg8 6.a6 Bh7 7.a5 Be4+ 8.fe h5 9.e5 h4 10.e6 h3 11.e7 h2 12.e8S+ Kc8 13.Sd6 + , drawn by perpetual check. When is a P-ending not a P -
ending? How many different endings have we got in the single solution line, and in what sequence?! Interesting.
i) b1Q 2.g7 Qh7 3.g8Q Qxg8 stalemate.


No.7560: the late E.Asaba and E.Leun. 1.d5+ Kd7 2.gf Sxf7 3.e6+ Ke8 4.ef+ Kxf7 5.d6 Rxc5/i 6.d7 Rc4+ 7.Kd3 Rc6/ii 10.d8S+ and 11.Sxc6 wins.
i) $\operatorname{Rg} 8$ 6. $\operatorname{Rc} 7 \operatorname{Re} 87 . \mathrm{Kxf4}$ wins.
ii) A player would choose to head for a Q vs. $\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{P}$ endgame rather than fall for a simple S-promotion fork! But the source supplies no analysis of alternatives. The original 2nd commendation study (d4f7
by Elonov, Ionov, Kraev and Peretyatko) had been published already, and was therefore eliminated.


No.7561: N.Pandzhakidze and Yu.Akopiya. 1.fSe3 Qxh1 2.Sxg4 f1Q 3.Qe3+ Kxg4 4.Qe4+ Kh3 5.Qh4+ Kxg2 6.Qg3 mate.


No.7562: D.Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). Judge: V.Kozirev (Morzovsk). 1.Ra4+ Kh5 2.b8Q Qg1+ 3.Kxb2 Rb7+ 4.Qxb7 Qg7+ 5.Kc1 Qxb7 6.Ra5+ Kg4 7.Rc4+ Kf3 8.Ra3+ Ke2 9.Rc2+ Ke1 10.Re3+ (Rd3? Qf3;) Kf1 11.Rd3 wins.

No.7563: I.Bondar (Gantsevichi) and S.Osintsev (Sverdlovsk). 1.d7

Bb5+ 2.Be2 Rxe2 3.Kf4 Rd2 4.Rh2 Bxd7 5.Rg2+ Bg4 6.Kg3 Sh1+ 7.Kh2 Sf2 8.Kg3 Se4+ 9.Kh4 Rxg2 stalemate.


No.7564: V.Kondratev (Ivanovsk region). 1.e7 g2 2.Bd5+ Kc7 3.e8Q g1Q 4.Qc6+ Kd8 5.Qd6+ Kc8 6.Bc4 Qb1+ 7.Bd3 Qb7+ 8.Kg6 $\mathrm{Qg} 2+$ 9.Kf6 Kb7 10.Ba6+ Ka8 11.Bc4 Qf2+ 12.Ke6 Qe3+ 13.Kd7 Bb6 14.Bd5+ Ka7 15.Qc6 Ka6 16.Qa4+ Ba5 17.Qc4+ Ka7 18.Qc6 Qh3+ 19.Ke8 Qe3+ 20.Be4 wins.

No.7565: I.Galushko (Volgograd). 1.Bc2 Sh8 2.Bd1 Sg6 3.Kc2 Kf2 4.Kd3 Kg3 5.Ke4. This curious little piece has definite value for theo-
ry, but it's very much a study. The try shows a stalemate defence, the win is by a tempo gain: 1.Bd1? Kf2 2.Kd2 Kg3 3.Ke3 Kh4 4.Bc2 Sh8 5.Kf4 Kh5 6.Kf5 Kh6 7.Kf6 Sg6 8.Bxg6 stalemate.


No.7566: V.Vlasenko (Kharkov region). 1.b7 Qf1+ 2.Kh2 Qf2+ 3.Kh1 g3 4.b8S+ Ka5 5.Sc6+ Ka4 6.Rb4+ Ka3 7.Rb3+ Ka2 8.Sb4+ Kal 9.Ra3+ Kbl 10.Rb3+ Ka1 11.Ra3+, drawn.

No.7567: M.Zinar (Odessa region). 1.h4 c1S 2.h3 Sxa2 3.Kxa2 Kg6 4.Kb1 Kf5 5.Kc2 Kf4 6.Kd3 Ke5 7.Ke2(c2) Ke4 8.Kd2 d3 9.Kc3 Ke 3 stalemate. In the diagram wK
is stalemated adjacent to the left of $\mathrm{Rc} 2+9 . \mathrm{Rf} 2 \mathrm{~h} 3+10 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 3+$ the P-column, and at the finish he pillows his head on the other side.


No.7568: V.S.Kovalenko (Pacific Maritime province). 1.Bb3+ Kxe5 2.Bg3+ Kd4 3.Sb5+ Kc5 4.Bxb8 Bxb8 5.Ka5 Sc7 6.Ba4 Kxc6 7.Sa7+ Kb7 8.Bc6+ Kxa7 9.Sc3 Sc7 10.Sb5 mate. Obviously destined to be a favourite with the public.

No.7569: A.Maksimovskikh and V.Shupletsov (Kurgan region). 1.b7 Rh4+ 2.Kg3 Rg4+ 3.Kxg4 Rxb4+ 4.Bc4+ Rxc4+ 5.Rf4 h5+ $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rc} 3+7 . \mathrm{Rf} 3 \mathrm{~h} 4+8 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$
11.Rf3 wins.


No.7570: G.A.Umnov (Podolsk). 1.Kg4 h1Q 2.Sf4+ Kg1 3.Sh3+ Qxh3+ 4.Kxh3 a2 5.Rg3 Kh1 6.Ra3 ba 7.a7 a1Q 8.a8Q Kg1 $9 . \mathrm{Qg} 2$ mate.

No.7571: Yu.Akobiya (Tbilisi). 1.Sb4+ Kb3 2.Sxa2 Ba5+ 3.Kf2 Kxa2 4.e7 Rxe7 5.Bxd5 Bxd5 6.Ra6 Re2+ 7.Kf1 Re1+ 8.Kf2 Re2+ 9.Kf1, drawn.


No.7572: A. and V. Solovyov (Gorky). 1.Rxh6 Kg4 2.Kg2 Bd2 3.Rh7 Bel 4.h5 Kxg5 5.h6 Bc3 6.Rc7 Bb2 7.Rb7 Bf6 8.Rb6 Bd4/i 9. $\mathrm{Rb4} 4 \mathrm{Bf} 610 . \mathrm{h} 7$ wins.
i) 8...Bc3 9.? 8...Ba1 9.? Annotation help, please, anybody!?


No.7573: N.Danilyuk (Kherson region). 1.Sb4+ Ke3 2.Kc5 Ke2 3.Rb2 Ke3 4.Rxb3+ Ke2 5.Rb2 Ke3 6.Sd5+ Kd3 7.Rb4 d1Q 8.Rxd4+ wins.


No.7574: A.Shnaider (Kotovo). 1.g4 Bd7 2.f4 Ba4 3.Re2 b5 4.Re4 de $5 . \mathrm{de} \mathrm{Kc} 46 . \mathrm{f} 5$ wins.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { No. } 7575 & \begin{array}{r}
\text { V. Kalyagin and } \\
\text { A. Selivanov }
\end{array} \\
\text { Commended, Birnov } \\
\text { Memorial, }
\end{array}
$$



No.7575: V.Kalyagin and A.Selivanov (both Sverdlovsk). $1 . \mathrm{Sg} 5 \mathrm{c} 3$ 2.h7 c2 3.h8Q Kb1 4.Qh7 Kb2 $5 . \mathrm{Qg} 7+\mathrm{Kb1} 6 . \mathrm{Qg} 6 \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ 7.Qf6+ Kb1 8.Qf5 Kb2 9.Qe5+ Kb1 10.Qe4 Kb2 11.Qxb4+ Ka2 12.Se4 $\mathrm{clQ}+13 . \mathrm{Sc} 3+\mathrm{Kal}$ 14.Kc8(b8) wins.
P. Vasiliev

Commended, Birnov, Memorial,


No.7576: P.Vasiliev. 1.Sc2 Bc3 2.Sa3 Kc6 3.Kc2 Bd4 4.Sb5 Kxb5 5.Kd3 Kxc5 6.Ke4 wins.

No. 7577 A. Chebotarev
Specially Commended, Birnov
Memorial, 1987


No.7577: A.Chebotarev (Volgograd). 1.Ke7 Kh4 2.Kd7 Kh5 3.Kc7 Kh4 4.Kb7 Rh7+ 5.Kc6 Rh6+ 6.Kd5 Rh5+ 7.Kd4 Rh6 8.Ke4 Kh5 9.Kf5 Kh4 10.a7 Rh7 11.Kg6 wins. The commendation was for re-work of a known idea.

No.7578: Michal Hlinka (Kosice). Judge: Bohuslav Sivak (Zvolen). 1.Bc4+ Kd2 2.Kg4 e2 (Rxf1;Rxf1) 3.Bxe2 Kxe2 4.Rg1 Bxg1/i 5.Kg3, with: Rxh2 6.Rg6 Kf1/ii 7.Rg4, positional draw, for R- 8.Rf4+. Bd4 6.Kxg2 Rg1+ 7.Kh3 Bxf6 stalemate.
i) Rxg1 5. Kg3 Be3 6.Re6 and Ra6.
ii) Threatening bRh6; winning, for $7 . \operatorname{Rg} 5(\mathrm{~g} 7, \mathrm{~g} 8) \mathrm{Rh} 5(\mathrm{~h} 7, \mathrm{~h} 8)$, and if 7.Rf6+? Bf2 8.Rxf2+ Kg1 9.Ra2 Kh1.


No.7579: M.Hlinka. 1.e7 Bf3+ 2.d5/i Bxd5+ 3.Kb6 Sd7+ 4.Sxd7 Bd4+ 5.Ka5/ii Re4 6.Rh4 Rxe7 7.Sb6+ Kc3 8.Sxd5+ wins.
i) 2.Kb6? Sd7+, and 3.Sxd7 Bxd4+ 4.Ka5 Re4 5.Rh4 Rxe7 6.Sb6+ Kc 3 drawn, while if 3.Ka6? $\mathrm{Sb} 8+$ 4.Kb6 Sd7+ 5.Ka5 Bc7+ 6.Ka4 Sf6 7.Rxf6 Rxf6 8.b5 Bc6 9.bc Rf1 and Bl wins.
ii) 5.Ka6? Re4 6.Rh4 Re6+ (Rxe7? Sb6+) 7.Ka5 Be4. 5.Kc7? Re4 6.Kd8 f5.


No.7580: M.Bednar (Kurima). 1.Sg6 Sg5/i 2.f3 (for Sf4/f8) Se6 3.g5 Sd4/ii 4.Sf4 Sb5/iii 5.Sd5 Sc3+ (cd;cb mate) 6.Sxc3 bc $7 . \mathrm{g} 6 / \mathrm{iv}$ c2 $8 . \mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{clQ} 9 . \mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ and $10 . \mathrm{Qa} 8$ mate.
i) Sd4 2.Sf4 Sb5 3.Sd5 Sc3+ 4.Sxc3 bc 5.Kxa3 Kxa5 6.f4. f5 2.Se5 Sf8 3.Sd3 Sd7 4.gf wins.
ii) Sxg5 4.Sf8 wins. f5 $4 . \mathrm{Se} 5 \mathrm{Sf} 8$ 5.Sd3 Se6 6.14 wins. fg $4 . S e 5$ (for Sd7) Sf8 5.Sf7 Sd7(Se6) 6.Sd6 (for Se8) Sf6 7.Sb5 Sd5 8.Sc7+ Sxc7 9.bc wins.
iii) $\mathrm{Se} 25 . \mathrm{Sxe} 2 \mathrm{f5} 6 . \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{f} 47 . \mathrm{Sd} 4$ wins. fg 5.Sd3 Se6 6.Se5 (for Sd7) Sf8 8.Sf7 Sd7(Se6) 9.Sd6.
iv) 7.gf? c2 8.f7 c1Q 9.f8Q Qxc4+ 10.bc stalemate.


No.7581: Lubos Kekely (Zilina). 1.e5/i b2 2.Be4 de 3.e6, with: b1Q 4.e7 Qa2 5.e8Q+ Qg8 6.Qe5+ and 7.Qg7 mate.
Kg8 4.e7 Kf7 5.Kd7 b1Q(Kf6) 6.e8Q+ Kf6(b1Q) 7.Qe6 mate.
i) 1.ed? cd. 1.Bd1? de. Both are draws.

No. 7582 J. Valuska (14.xi.86)
1 Hon. Mention, Pravda-Tirnavia, 1985-86


No.7582: Jan Valuska (Zvolen). 1.Kc3 Sa6 2.Kc4 Ke5 3.Kb5 Kd6 4.b7/i Bxb7 5.a8S draws, but not 5.a8Q? Sc7+.
i) 4.Kxa6? Kc6 5.b7 Bxb7 mate.


No.7583: Stefan Todek (Banska Bystrica). 1.Bb2 Kf7 2.Ba3 Sa6/i 3.Kd7 Sb8+ 4.Kc7 Sa6+ 5.Kb7 wins.
i) Ke8 3.Kc7 Sd7 4.Bd6, and Sf8 5.Bxf8 Kxf8 6.Kd7 wins, or Sf6 5.gf Kf7 6.Be7 g5 7.Kd6 g4 8.Ke5 wins.


No.7584: L.Kekely. 1.Sd4 Kxd4 2.b7, with c1Q 3.b8Q Qb2+4.Kc6 Qxb8 stalemate, or c1R 3.Kb6, but not, here, 3.Ka6? Bc8 and Bl wins.


No.7585: Peter Gvozdjak (Bratislava). $1 . \mathrm{Sf} 4+\mathrm{Kd} 2 / \mathrm{i} 2 . \mathrm{Qe} 2+\mathrm{Kc} 1 / \mathrm{ii}$ 3.Sd3+ Kbl 4.Qd1+ Scl/iii 5.Qxc1+ Ka2 6.Qc2+ Bb2 (Qb2+;Sb4 mate) 7.Sb4+ Ka1 8.Qd1+ Bc1 9.Qxc1 mate.
i) $\mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{2} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 1 \quad(\mathrm{Kg} 3 ; \mathrm{Sh} 5$ mate) 3.Sxh3+ Kh1 4.Qf1+ Qg1+ 5.Sf2 mate.
ii) Kc3 3.Sd5+ Kd4 4.Qe4 mate.
iii) $\mathrm{Ka} 25 . \mathrm{Sb} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 26 . \mathrm{Qc} 2$ mate.


No.7586: L.Kekely. 1.Re2+/i Kxc1 2.Rxc2+/ii Rxc2 (Kxc2;Sd4+) 3.Sd4 Rc3 (Rc5(d2);Sb3+) 4.Se2+ Kd2 5.Sxc3 Kxc3 6.d4 (K? Kd4;) Kc4 7.d5 draw, but not 7.K? Kd5 and Bl wins.
i) 1.Kd7? Rc3. 1.Rf1? Rxe6.
ii) 2.Kd7? Kb1. 2.Rxf2? Rxe6. 2.Sd4? Rd6+.


No.7587: S.Todek. 1.g5 Sxg5 2.Kb1, with:
a5 3.g3 a4 4.g4 a3 5.Ka1 drawn, or a6 3.g4 a5 4.Ka1 a4 5.Kb1 a3 6.Kal drawn.

No.7588: L.Bucina (Zvolen).
1.Bh2 e1Q+ (ef;Sxf3) 2.Kxe1 Kxh2 3.Sxf3+ Kh1 4.Sg3 mate.


No.7589: Nicolae Micu (Bucharest). Judge: Jan van Reek (Netherlands, the Schakend Nederland columnist). This provisional award was open for 4 months. 1.Sf4+/i Kh6 2.e7 Rb2 3.Se6/ii Se 5 4.Kc3/iii Rb8 5.Sd8 Rc8+ 6.Kb3 $\mathrm{Rb} 8+7 . \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 8+8 . \mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rb} 8+/ \mathrm{iv}$ 9.Ka6 Sc4 10.Ka7 wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{e} 7$ ? $\mathrm{Rd} 2+2 . \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 2+/ \mathrm{v} 3 . \mathrm{Sc} 3$ $\mathrm{Se} 3+4 . \mathrm{Kb} 5(\mathrm{~b} 4) \mathrm{Rb} 2+$ and Rb 8 . If 4.Kb3(d3) Rxc3+.
ii) 3.e8Q? Rb4+ 4.Kc3 Rxf4 5.h5 Se5 6.Qh8+ Kg5 7.h6 Rh4 8.Qg7+ Sg6.
iii) 3.e8Q? Rb8 5.Qa4 Rb4+.
iv) Sc4 9.Kxc4 Ra4+ 10.Kd5 Ra5+ 11.Kc6 Re5 12.Sf7+ wins.
v) $\mathrm{Se} 5+$ ? 3.Kb3/vi Rxd5 4.e8Q+ Sg6 5.Qf7 Rd3+6.Kc2 Kh6 7.h5, a variation indicated by the young Czech composer Jan Lerch in refutation of Micu's envisaged refutation of $3 . S e 5+$ ? as in note (vi).
vi) 3.Kc3? Rd3+ 4.Kc2 Rxd5 5.e8Q+ Sg6 6.Kc3 Kh6 7.Kc4 Rh5.


No.7590: Oscar J.Carlsson and the late José Mugnos (Buenos Aires, Argentina). 1. $\mathrm{Bc} 3+\mathrm{Kb} 5$ 2. Bd5 b2 3.Ba2 f5 4.Kf6 f4/i 5.Ke5 f3/ii 6.Be1 Ka4 7.Bf2/iii Kb4 8.Kd4 b1Q 9.Bxb1 Kb3 10.Kd3 Kb2/iv $11 . \mathrm{Bc} 2$ c5 $12 . \mathrm{Bxc} 5 \mathrm{f} 213 . \mathrm{Bd} 4 / \mathrm{v}$ Ka 2 14.Bxf2 Kb2 15.Kd2 wins.
i) $\mathrm{Ka} 45 . \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{~b} 1 \mathrm{Q} 6 . \mathrm{Bxb} 1 \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ 7.Kd4 c5+ 8.Kd3 f4 9.Kd2 f3 10.Bd3.
ii) Ka4 6.Kxf4 b1Q 7.Bxb1 Kb3 8.Ba1 a2 9.Be4 c5 10.Bd5+ c4 11.Ke3 Kb4 12.Kd4.
iii) 7.Kd4? f2 8.Bxf2 b1Q 11.Bxb3 Kxb3.
iv) $\mathrm{a} 211 . \mathrm{Bc} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ 12. $\mathrm{Bd} 4+\mathrm{Kc} 1$ 13.Ba1 f2 14.Kc3 f1Q 15.Bb2 mate. v) 13.Bxf2? a2 14.Bd4+Kc1 15.Be5 a1Q 16.Bxa1 stalemate.


No.7591: Beat Neuenschwander (Ittigen, Switzerland). 1.g7 f5 2.d6/i cd 3.b6 Bxb6/ii 4.c5/iii Bxc5 5.e3 Bxe3 6.g8S+Kg6 7.Se7+Kf6 8.Sd5 Ke6 9.Sxe3 h4 10.a5 g3 11.a6 g2 12.a7/iv g1Q 13.a8Q Qxe3/v 14.Qe8 wins.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Kg} 8$ ? Bf6 $3 . \mathrm{d} 6 \mathrm{~cd} 4 . \mathrm{b} 6 \mathrm{~g} 35 . \mathrm{b} 7$ g2 6.Kxf7 Bxg7 7.b8Q g1Q 8.Qxd6+ Kh7 9.c5 Bd4 with at least a draw, for instance, 10.c6 Bc5 11.Qe6 Qg8+ 12.Kf6 Qg7+ 13.Kxf5 $\mathrm{Qg} 4+$, with perpetual check.
ii) g3 4.b7 g2 5.b8Q g1Q 6.Qxd6+ Qg6 7.g8S mate.
iii) 4.g8S+? Kg6 5.Se7+ Kf6 $6 . S d 5+K g 67 . S x b 6 \mathrm{~g} 3$.
iv) $12 . S x g 2$ ? h3 $13 . \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{hg} 14 . \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ g1Q.
v) On other moves $W$ wins if he's got the technique.

No.7592: Andrzej Lewandowski (Torun, Poland). 1.Se6+ Kb6/i 2.f7 Bxa6 3.Sd6 Be5 4.f8Q Bb7 5.Kb8 Rg8 6.Sd8 Rxf8 stalemate
i) $\mathrm{Kd} 72 . \mathrm{f} 7 \mathrm{Bg} 73 . \mathrm{Sxg} 7 \mathrm{Rf} 44 . \mathrm{Sd} 8$ Kxd8 5.f8Q.
ii) 3.bSc5? Bxc5 4.Sxc5 Rf4 5.Sd7+ Kc7 6.f8Q Bb7.


No.7593: Michal Hlinka (Kosice, Czechoslovakia). 1.Rd3+ Kc8 2.b7+/i Kxb7 3.Sc5+ Bxc5 4.Kb2 Ra6 5.Ka1 Ra4 6.Rb3+ Kc6 7.Rb2 Bd4 stalemate.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Rc} 3+$ ? $\mathrm{Kb} 73 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Re} 2+4 . \mathrm{Ka} 1$ Bg 7 5.Sc5 Kc6 6.Se4(a4) Kd5(b5)+ 7.b7 Kxe4 -xa4 8.b8Q $\mathrm{Bxc} 3+9 . \mathrm{Qb} 2 \mathrm{Bxb} 2+$ wins.

No.7594: Henk Enserink (Amsterdam). 1.Ke7 f5/i 2.Kf6 e4/ii 3.fe/iii g4/iv 4.Bd5+ Kc5 5.b4+/v Kd4 $6 . \mathrm{e} 5 \mathrm{Kxd5} 7 . \mathrm{e} 6 \mathrm{~g} 38 . \mathrm{e} 7 \mathrm{~g} 29 . \mathrm{e} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ g1Q 10.Qe6+ Kd4 11.Qb6+ and 12.Qxg1 wins.
i) $\mathrm{g} 42 . \mathrm{fg} \mathrm{f} 53 . \mathrm{Kf} 6 \mathrm{e} 44 . \mathrm{gf} \mathrm{gf}$ 5.Kxf5 e3 6.Bc4 Kc5 7.Ke4.
ii) Kd6 3.Bc8 e4 4.Kxg5 ef 5.b4

Kd5 6.Ba6 Ke4 7.Bf1 and 8.b5. iii) 3.Kxg5? ef 4.Kf4 f2 5.Bc4 Kc5 6.Kf3 Kb4 7.Kxf2 g5 8.Ke2 g4 9.Kd2 g3.
iv) fe $4 . \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{e} 35 . \mathrm{Bc} 4 \mathrm{Kc} 56 . \mathrm{Kxe4}$.
v) 5.e5? Kxd5 6.e6 g3 7.e7 g2 8.e8Q g1Q 9.Qe6+ Kc5.


No.7595: Michal Hlinka and Jan Sevcik (Czechoslovakia). 1.Bb7 e4 2.Rb8/i h1Q 3.Bg7+ Ka2 4.Bd5+ Ka3 5.Bb2+ Ka4 6.Bc6+ Bb5/ii 7.Rxb5 Qe1/iii 8.Bd7 Qg3+ 9.Kh6 d5 10.Be5 Qe3+ 11.Kh7 Qg5/iv 12.Bd6 Qd8/v 13.Rb7+ Ka5 14.Bc7+ wins.
i) 2.Bg7+? Kb1 3.Rb8 Kcl 4.Rc8+ Kd 2 . DVH: $2 . \mathrm{Rb} 8$ is a fine move.
ii) Ka 5 7.Bc3+ Ka6 8.Bb7+ Kb6 9. $\mathrm{Bxe} 4+\mathrm{Kc} 7$ 10.Rb7.
iii) Qh3 8.Rb8+Ka5 9.Bf6.
iv) Ka3 12.Bd6 Ka2 13.Be6.
v) Qf5+ 13.Bxf5 Kxb5 14.Kg6 Kc4 15.Kxh5 e3 16.Bg4 Kd3 17.Kxh4 e2 18.Bb4 Ke3 19.Kg3 d4 20.Bh5 d3 21.Bg6 d2 22.Bc5 mate.


No.7596: Virgil Nestorescu (Bucharest), corrected by Henk Enserink (Netherlands). 1.Sf2/i Sg 5 2.Bg6/ii Ke3 3.Sg4+ Kf4 4.Sf6 Ke5 5.Sd7+ Kd6 6.Sb8 Kc5/iii 7.Ka3 Kd4 8.Sc6 Kc5 9.Sa5 Kd4 $10 . \mathrm{Sb} 3 \mathrm{Ke} 3$ 11.Sc5 Kd4 12.Kb4 wins.
i) 1.Sg3? Sg5 2.Bg6 Ke3 3.Sf1 Kf4 4.Sd2 Ke3 5.Sc4 Kd4 6.Sd6 Ke5. ii) 2.Bf5? Ke3 3.Sg4 Kf4 4.Sf6 Sxe4 5.Bxe4 Ke5.
iii) Ke5 7.Sc6+ Kd6 8.Sb4 Ke5 9.Sd3+ Kd4 $10 . e 5$ wins. In Nestorescu's original setting (with wKa1) 6 ...Kc5 was a refutation.

No.7597: Emilian Dobrescu (Bucharest). 1.Sd7 Sa6+ 2.Kb7 Sc5+/i 3.Sxc5 Qf7+ 4.Kb8 Kc6 5.Ka8/ii

Qa2 6.Sa6 Bf4/iii 7.Qf1 Qg8 8.Qh3 Qa2 9.Se7+ Kd6 10.Sf5+ Kc6 11.Qf1 Kb6 12.Qg1+ Kb5 13.Qc5+ wins.
i) Qh6 3.Qf1 Ka5 4.Qa1 Kb5 5.Sa7.
ii) 5.Sa7? Kxc5 6.Qxh2 Qb3+ 7.Kc8 Qg8+ 8.Kd7 Qf7+.
iii) Qxa6+ 7.Sa7+ Kc7 8.Qc1+ Kd7 9.Qd2+ Kc7 10.Qc2+ Kb6 11.Qc6+ Ka5 12.Qc5+ Ka4 13.Qc2+ and 14.Qxh2.

No. 7597 Em. Dobrescu (vi.88)


No.7598: Henk Enserink (Amsterdam). 1.Be5/i Kf3/ii 2.Sf7 Ke2 3.Sd8 Kd2 4.Se6/iii Kc2 5.Sd4+ Kc3/iv 6.Sxc6 Kc2 7.Sd4+/v Kc3 8.Sb5+ Kd3 9.Ba1/vi c5 10.Kd6 c4 11.Kc5 c3 12.Sxc3 Kc2 13.Sa4 b2 14.Bxb2 (Sxb2? Kb1;) Kb3 15.Kb5 wins.
i) 1.Ba3? Kf5 2.Sf7 Ke4 3.Bb2 Kd3 4.Se5 Kc2 5.Sc4 Kd3 6.Sa3 c5.
ii) Kf5 2.Sf7 Ke4 3.Bg7 c5 4.Sd8 c4 5.Sc6 Kd3 6.Sa5.
iii) 4.Sxc6? Kc1 5.Sb4 Kd2 6.Ke6 c 5 and bKc .
iv) $\mathrm{Kb} 26 . \mathrm{Sb} 5 \mathrm{Kc} 17 . \mathrm{Sa} 3 \mathrm{~b} 28 . \mathrm{Sf} 4$.
v) $7 . \mathrm{Sb} 4+$ ? Kd2 $8 . \mathrm{Ke6} \mathrm{c} 59 . \mathrm{Sd5} \mathrm{c} 4$ 10.Ba1 c3 11.Bxc3+ Kc2.
vi) 9.Ke6? c5 10.Kd5 c4 11.Kc5 c3 12.Bxc3 Kc2 13.Kb4 b2 14.Sd4+ Kc1 15.Sb3+Kc2.


No.7599: Jan H.Marwitz (Dalfsen, Netherlands). $1 . \mathrm{Sd} 5 / \mathrm{i}$ fg $2 . \mathrm{Se} 3+$ Ke1 3.Sxg2+ Kxf2 4.Sf4 Rc4/ii 5.Bxg4 Kxg3 6.Sxe2+ Kh4 7.Kf6 wins, for if Rxg4 8.Rh8 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{gf} \mathrm{Rxb6}+2 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{gf} 3 . \mathrm{Rd} 8+$ Ke1 4.Bxf3 Kxf2.
ii) Rb6 5.Kg5 Rb5+ $6 . \mathrm{Kh} 4$ wins.

No.7600: Zoilo R. Caputto (Argentina). 1.Rxh3+/i Qxh3 2.Rg4 Qxg4 3.Sf6 +Kg 5 4.Sxg4 Kxg4 5.c6 f3 $6 . c 7 \mathrm{f} 27 . \mathrm{c} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Kg} 38 . \mathrm{Qc} 4$, with one of theory's wins.
i) 1.Rg7? Qa2+ 2.Ra3 Qc2+ 3.Kxa5 Kh4 4.Rh7 h5 and Bl has the better chances.


No.7601: A.P.Manyakhin (Lipetsk, USSR). Judge: the late Iosef Krikheli, who selected 12 from the 62 originals published in the period, 17 of which having been eliminated by solvers. 1.Be6+Kf8 2.Qe3/i Ke8 3.Qe5 Qb4 4.Qh8+ Qf8/ii 5.Bf7+ Ke7 6.Qf6+ Kd7 7.Be6+ Ke8 8.Bd7+ Kxd7 9.Qxf8 wins.
i) 2.Qc5+? Qe7 3.Qf5+ Ke8 4.Qe5 Qd6, drawn.
ii) Ke7 5.Qf6+ Ke8 (Kd6;Qf8+) 6.Qf7+ Kd8 7.Qd7 mate.
"This malyutka shows fine play with a surprising quiet move by wQ that avoids a stalemate trap. The backwards effect of play by wB and the mating positions in the variations underline the beauty and
harmony of the whole. A superb piece of work!"


No.7602: A.Sochniev (Leningrad). 1.Se6+ Kh6/i 2.d7 Be5 3.d8B (d8Q? Bf6+;), Bb1 (or Bd3)/ii 4.Bh5 Bg3+ 5.Kg4 Bf5+ 6.Kxf5 Kxh5 7. Bg 5 and $8 . \mathrm{Sg} 7$ mate.
i) Kf7 2.d7, and Be5 3.d8Q Bf6+ 4.Sg5+, or Bc 7 3.Sxc7 Ke7 4.Bg4 winning.
ii) $\mathrm{Be} 84 . \mathrm{Bc} 2$. Or $\mathrm{Bb} 74 . \mathrm{Bg} 5+$ $\mathrm{Kg} 65 . \mathrm{Bc} 2$ mate. Or Bf5 4.Bg5+ Kg 6 5.Bh5 mate.
"Lively and witty play by both sides is accompanied by a startling change in the situation - counterplay for stalemate, underpromotion, the generation of mating threats and countersacrifices. A combination that impresses."


No.7603: A.P.Maksimovskikh (Zagainovo, USSR). 1.Sf3+/i Kf2/ii 2.Se1 Kxe1/iii 3.Sc5 a1Q 4.Sd3+ Ke2 5.Sc1 Kf3 6.h5 Kg4 7.h6 Kh5 8.h7 Kg6 9.h8R wins, not 9.h8Q? Qxcl+. wR plays to dl, whereupon Sb 3 and Ra 1 finishes it. i) $1 . S c 5$ ? a1Q $2 . S d 3+K f 13 . S c 1 \mathrm{fg}$ 4.h5 g4 5.h6 g3 6.h7 g2 7.h8Q g1Q drawn, or, in this, 4.fg f4 5.h5 f3 6.h6 f2 7.h7 Kg1 8.h8Q f1Q, and again drawn.
ii) Ke 2 2.Sd4+ and 3.Sb3. Kf1 2.Sd2+.
iii) a1Q 3.Sd3+ and 4.Sc1. We may note that 2.Sc5? a1Q 3.Sd3+ Kxf3 4.Sc1 Kg 4 would not have sufficed.
"Somewhat artificial, but an interesting synthesis of known positions with blockade of bQ and an underpromotion. The new wR captures bQ in an effective manner. At the conclusion, though, most of the pawns are surplus to requirements."


No.7604: A.P.Maksimovskikh and V.Shupletsov. 1.Se4 Bxe4/i 2.Be6 f3 3.Bxf7 (Bc4? Bg6;) Bd3 4.Bg8 f2 $5 . f 7 \mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ 6.f8Q Qxf8 stalemate.
i) Kxh3 2.Sg5+ Kg3 3.Sxf3 Kxf3 4. Kg 7 Kg 4 5.Kxf7 f3 6.Ke7 f2 7.f7 drawn.
"Beautiful play by wB leads to a pin stalemate."


No.7605: A.P.Manyakhin. 1.Kel/i $\mathrm{Qe} 3+$ 2.Kdl $\mathrm{Qd} 3+3 . \mathrm{Kcl} \mathrm{Qbl}+$ 4.Kd2 Qb2+/ii 5.Kd1 Qb1+ $6 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Qb} 2+7 . \mathrm{Kd1}$, and Bd 5 8.Qc3+ Qxc3 stalemate, or Kg 2 8.Ke1 Bf3 9.Qc2+ Qxc2 stalemate. i) 1.Qc1? Qd3+2.Kg1 Qd4+3.Kh2 Qh8+ 4.Kg1 Qg7+ 5.Kf1 Qg2+ 6.Ke1 Qe2 mate. So wK seeks safety in the opposite direction.
ii) Qa2+5.Kc3 Qc2+6.Kd4 Qxc7 is a stalemate surprise.
iii) 6.Qc1? Qb3+ 7.Ke1 Bc2 wins.


No.7606: G.M.Kasparyan (Erevan, USSR). 1.Bf5+/i Kb8 2.Rh8+ Ka7 3.Rh7+ Kxa6/ii 4.Bc8+ Kb5 5.Rh5+ Kc6 6.Rc5, 'an epaulettes model mate'.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rh} 8+? \mathrm{Kc} 72 . \mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 8$.
ii) $\mathrm{Kb} 84 . \mathrm{a} 7+\mathrm{Ka} 85 . \mathrm{Be} 4+\mathrm{dRc} 6$ 6.Rh6 wins.


No.7607: Hans J.Beyer (Grosshansdorf, West Germany). This is a tempo duel. 1.Kd2/i a4 2.b4 (Bc3? ab ;) Ra3 3.Bc3 Ke6 4.b5 (zugzwang) Ra2 (Ke7;Bb4+) 5.Kc1 $\mathrm{Ra} 36 . \mathrm{Kb} 2$ and W wins.
i) 1.Bd4? Ke6 (Ra1? g7) 2.Kd2 a4 3.b4 Ra3 4.Bc3 a6 5.Kd3 Ra2 6.Bd4 Ra3+ 7.Bc3 Ra2 and W makes no progress because bR alternately attacks wP and wB.


No.7608: B.D.Gusev (Moscow). 1.Bf3/i Kh2 2.Rh5+/ii Kg3 3.Bxg2 Kxg2 4.c4/iii Kf3/iv $5 . \mathrm{Sg} 6 / v$ Rc5/vi 6.Sxe5+ (Rxe5? Rxc4;) Ke4 7.Rh4+ Kxe5 (Ke3;Kd7) $8 . \mathrm{Ke} 7$ and Bl is well and truly in zugzwang.
i) 1.Sxc6? g1Q 2.Bf3+ Kh 2 3.Rh5+ Kg3 4.Rg5+ Kxf3 5.Rxg1 Rc5 is a draw.
ii) 2.Bxg2? Kxg2 3.Rf6 e4 4.Sf5 Kf2 $5 . \mathrm{Sd} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 3$ draw.
iii) 4.Sg6? Kf3. 4.Sxc6? Rc5 5.Rg5+ Kf2 6.Rf5+Kg2.
iv) Rc5 5.Sf5 Kf3 6.Sd6.
v) 5.Sxc6? Rc5 6.Sxe5+ Ke4. 5.Sc8? Ra8. 5.Sf5? Kg4.
vi) Ke4 6.Ke7 Rc5 7.Kd6 Rxc4 8.Rh4+ Kd3 9.Sxe5+.


No.7609: V.Gerasimov (Kaluga, USSR). 1.Re7+/i Kxh8/ii 2.Rb7 hg/iii 3.Bf6+ Rxf6+/iv 4.Kxf6 g1Q $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 6$ and W wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Sg} 6$ ? $\mathrm{Kxg} 6 \quad 2 . \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 3.Rxg3 hg 4.Bf6 Rf1 5.Kf7 g1S draw.
ii) Kh6 2.Rf7, and h2 3.Rxf4 h1Q 4.Rh4+, or hg 3.Rxf4 g1Q 5.Sf7+. Kg8 2.Sg6 h2/v 3.Sxf4 h1Q 4.Re8+ Kh7 5.Bf6 Qe1+ 6.Kf7 wins.
iii) Re4+ 3.Kf7 Kh7 4.Bf6 Kh6 5.Rb8 Kh5 6.gh. h2 3.Bf6+ Kg8 4.Rg7+ Kf8 5.Rh7 Re4+ 6.Be5 Rg4 7.Rh8+ Rg8 8.Rh4 Rg5 9.Bf6 Rg6 10.Rc4 Kg8 11.Rc8+ Kh7 12.Rh8 mate.
iv) Kg 8 4. $\mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 85 . \mathrm{Rxg} 3 \mathrm{Re} 4+$ 6.Be5 Re2 7.Rg4 Re3 8.Rxg2 Re1 9.Rh2 Rg1 10.Ra2 Rg6+ 11.Bf6 Kg 8 12.Ra8+.
v) hg 3.Bb6 Rf1 4.Bd4+.


No.7610: Yuri M.Belyakin (Sverdlovsk) and Alexey G.Kopnin (Chelyabinsk). 1.Sb4+ Kxc5 (Ke5/e6;Sxa2) 2.Sxa2 Kb6 (Sxa2;Bf2+) 3.Bd3/i Bxd3 4.Bf2+ Ka5/ii 5.Be1 (Sxc3?Bxf2;) Kb6 $6 . \mathrm{Bf} 2+\mathrm{Ka} 5$ 7.Be1, with repetition of moves, the alternative being Kb5 8.Bxc3 (Sxc3+? Kc6;) Bb1 (Bc4;Sb4) 9.Kb7/iii Be3 10.Sb4 Bc5 11.Sc6 drawn, but not 11.Sd5? Kc 4 12.Kc6 Bc 2 and Bl wins ( $\mathrm{Ba} 4+$ ).
i) 3.Sxc3? Bf5 mate. 3.Kd7? Sxa2 4.Bc4 Se5+ and Sxc4.
ii) $\mathrm{Ka6} / \mathrm{c} 65 . \mathrm{Sb} 4+\mathrm{Kb5} 6 . \mathrm{Sxd} 3$ wins. Kb5 5.Sxc3+ and 6.Bxa7.
iii) 9.Sc1? Kc6 for mate. 9.Sb4? Bc5 10.Sd5 Kc4.


No.7611: Dzhemal Makhatadze (Zestafoni, Georgian SSR). 1.a7 Rh1 2.Bf8 d6 (Kxf8;a8Q+) 3.Bxd6 Rh8 4.Bb8 Rh1 5.Be 5 wins.


No.7612: Gia A.Nadareishvili (Tbilisi, Georgian SSR). 1.f6 Kh8 2.f7 Kh7 3.f8R Kxh6 4.Rf5 Kg7 5.Ra5 Kh6 6.Rb5 Kh7 7.Rb6 Kg7 8.h6+ Kh7 9.Ra6 Kg8 10.Ra5 Kh7 11.Rh5 Kg6 12.h7 (Rh4? Kh7;) Kxh5 13.h8Q and now W wins by squeezing bK to the bottom rank, finishing by 33.Qb4 Ka1 34.Qd2 Kb1 35.Qh6 Kc2 36.Qxh3 gh $37 . g 4$ and wins. Not bad from such an unpromising starting position!


No.7613: M.Matous (Czechoslovakia). Judge: Yochanan Afek (Israel). There were only 11 studies to be evaluated, "some of which were of a particularly high standard. I thank Mr Hillel Aloni and the solvers in Shahmat and the Jerusalem Post for checking correctness and originality." 1.a7/i Rxf2 2.Bg1 Rh2+ 3.Bxh2 Be4 4.a8Q(B)/ii Bxa8 5.g8R f2+/iii 6.Rg2 Kd1 7.Bg1 Kel 8.Bxf2+ Kf1 9.Bg3 Bxg3 stalemate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Bg} 1$ ? Bc5 $2 . \mathrm{Rf} 1 \mathrm{f} 2$ wins.
ii) $4 . \mathrm{Kg} 1$ ? $\mathrm{Bc} 5+5 . \mathrm{Kf1} \mathrm{Bd} 3+$. 4.g8Q? $\mathrm{f} 2+5 . \mathrm{Qg} 2 \mathrm{Kd1} 6 . \mathrm{Qxe} 4$ f1Q+ 7.Bg1 Qh3+. 4.Bxd6? f2+ 5.Kh2 f1Q 6.g8Q Qh1+ and Qg1+. iii) Bd5 6.Rc8+ Kd2 7.Kg1 draws. Bc6 6.Bg1 f2+ 7.Rg2 draws.
"Mutual sacrificial play, underpromotion and self-pins after 7. Bg 1 generate a ravishing stalemate spectacle. The way W neutralises the powerful battery of $\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{P}$ is most impressive."

No.7614: Virgil Nestorescu (Romania). 1.Sd2+/i Bxd2/ii 2.g6 e4 3.g7 e3 4.Sg6/iii e2 5.Sh4+ Kf2
6.g8Q e1Q 7.Qg2+/iv Ke3 8.Qh3+ Ke2 (Ke4;Qf5+) 9.Qf3 mate.
i) 1.g6? e4 2.Sf7 e3 3.Sg5+ Kf4 4.Sh2 e2 5.hSf3 Kg3 6.Kh6 Kg4 drawn. 1.Sg6? Kf2 2.Sh2 Bd2 3.Sg4+ Ke2 4.Se7 Bxg5 5.Kxg5 e4 6.Sf5 e3 drawn. 1.Sh2+? Kg3 2.Sg4 e4 3.Sf7 Kf4 4.fSe5 e3 5.g6 e2 6.g7 e1Q 7.Sd3+ Kg3 8.Sxe1 Bxg7 draws.
ii) Kf4 2.Se4 Bb4 3.g6 Bf8 4.Sc5 Kf5 5.Sf7 Bg7 6.Sd6+. Ke3 2.Se4 Bb4 3.g6 Bf8 4.Sc5 Bg7 5.Sf7 Kf3 6.Sg5+ Kg3 7.gSe6 Bh8 8.Kg5 Kf3 9.Kf5 Ke3 10.Sd7 wins. iii) 4.g8Q? e2 5.Sg6 e1Q 6.Sh4+ Ke2 7.Qg4+ Kd3.
iv) 7.Qf7+? Bf4 8.Qxf4+ Ke2.
"An excellent key introduces a fi-nely-timed battle (4.Sg6!) culminating in a mate with two self-blocks. A miniature pearl in the classical style."


No.7615: Ofer Comay (Israel). 1.Sb4/i c2 2.Sxc2/ii Sg4 3.Kxg4/iii Bxe4 4.Se1 Bxh1/iv 5.Sg2 Bxg2 stalemate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Sf} 2$ ? $\mathrm{c} 22 . \mathrm{Sd} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 53 . \mathrm{Sc} 5 \mathrm{Sg} 4$ wins.
ii) 2.Sd3? c1Q 3.Sxc1 Bxc1 4.Sf2

Kf5 5.g4+ Sxg4 Bxe4+ wins. iii) 3.Sd4? Se5+ 4.Ke2 Bxe4 5.Sf2 Bd5, whereafter Bl wins by exchanging Ss.
iv) Be3 5.Kh3 Bxh1 6.Sg2 Bg1 7.g4 Kf6 8.Kg3 Ke5 9.Kh3 Kd4 10.Kg3 Ke4 11.Sh4 Ke3 12.Sg2+ Ke2 13.g5 Kf1 14.Sf4 Bd4 15.g6 drawn.
"This may be the first artistic application of a theoretical discovery in which the composer has a share (the GBR class 0023 win - see EG75). [AJR: True, it may. But we can neither substantiate nor adequately test this claim of priority unless the award gives the date of publication more precisely than '1985'.] The enjoyable and refreshing execution will compensate the 'victims' of this revolution - or we may at least hope so."


No.7616: Yehuda Hoch. 1.Bb6+ Kb8 2.Ba7+/i Kxa8 3.Sd7 Bf2 4.e3 Bxe3 5.d4 Bxd4 6.Bxd4 Sf8 7.f4 (or Sb6+ first) Qxf4 8.Sb6+ Kb8 9.Be5+ Qxe5 10.Sd7+ Sxd7 stalemate.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Sd} 7+$ ? $\mathrm{Kc} 83 . \mathrm{Sc} 5 \mathrm{Qe} 74 . \mathrm{Bb} 7+$ Kb8 5.Ba7+ Kc7.
"An elating and lively stalemate combination."


No.7617: I.Krikheli (USSR). 1.Rc4/i e3 2.Rd4+/ii Kc2 3.Rxf4 e2 4.Re4 Kd2 5.Rxe2+ Kxe2 6.Kg4/iii Ke1 7.Kf3 Kf1 8.Kg3 drawn.
i) 1.Re5? e3 2.Kg4 e2 3.Kxf4 Bh2+.
ii) 2.Rxf4? e2 3.Re4 e1Q+ 4.Rxe1+ Kxe1, with a zugzwang (reciprocal, mutual) for if: 5.Kh3 Kf 2 , or $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Kf} 1$, or $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Ke} 2$ 6.Kh4 Kf3.
iii) Once again a zugzwang, but now BTM.
This and the next are "two fairly simple demonstrations of the (mu-
tual) zugzwang element, which somewhat freshens the well-worn matrices."


No.7618: Y.Sadger. 1.Kg1/i cb 2.cb ab 3.Kg2 b3 4.Rxh3+ gh+ $5 . \mathrm{Kf} 3 \mathrm{~g} 4+6 . \mathrm{Kf} 4 \mathrm{~g} 37 . \mathrm{hg}$ mate.
i) 1.bc? Rxh2+ 2.Rg2 Kh3 3.c6 Rxg2+ 4.Ke1 Rf2 5.Kxf2 Kh2. 1.Kg2? cb (ab? c4) 2.cb ab 3.b3 Rxh2+4.Kxh2 stalemate.


No.7619: Y.Hoch. 1.Kb4 h2 2.Se3+ Kg1 3.Rg8+ Kf2 4.Sg4+ Ke 2 5.Re8+ Kd2 6.Ra8 h1Q 7.Rxa2+ Kd3 8.Sf2+. 1.Kb5(b6)? would have allowed the escape 7...Kc3.
"A miniature contribution to the long line of $\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{S}$ struggles against advanced Ps."


No.7620: G.Costeff. Judge: Amatzia Avni. Brian Stephenson was consulted for anticipations, not without effect. 1.Be3 (Bc5? Rxe2;) Rxe3/i 2.fe d2 3.Bf5+ Bd3 (Kc3;Rb1) 4.Bxd3+ Kc3 5.Ra1 d1Q 6.Rb1 Qd2 7.Rb3 mate.
i) d2 2.Bf5+ Kc3 3.Rb1 Bc4 4.Bd3 Bxd3 5.Rb3+ Kc2 6.Rb2+ wins. "A Bl stalemate combination meets with an astonishing W reply. The last three moves feature such composition motifs as loss of move, capture avoidance and self-block. Rich content in a light setting constitutes a beauty!"


No.7621: Noam Elkies (U.S.A.). 1.a6 a2 2.ab Bf4 3.Sg5 Bb8/i
4.Sh7+/ii Ke8 5.Bc6+ Kd8 6.Sg5 Kc7 7.b5 Kd6 8.Se4+ Kc7 9.Sg5 a1Q $10 . S f 7$ with a positional draw, for if $\mathrm{Qxc} 3+11 . \mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Qb} 4+$ 12.Ke6 Qh4 13.Kf5 Qe7 14.Kg6 Qe6+ 15.Kg7 Qf5 16.Kf8 Qf6 17.Ke8 Qe6+ 18.Kf8 Qxc6 19.bc Kxc6 20.Ke7, drawn.
i) a1Q 4.Se6+ Kg8 5.Sxf4 Qxc3+ 6.Kf5 Qc7 7.Bd5+ and Se6. ii) $4 . \mathrm{Se} 6+$ ? Kg 8 5.Bd5 a1Q $6 . \mathrm{Sg} 5+$ Kh8.
"W cannot halt bPa3, but succeeds in improving the position of his pieces so that suddenly Bl , despite enormous material advantage, finds his pieces paralysed. Positional draw!"


No.7622: N.Elkies. 1.b8Q Rxb3+ 2.Qxb3 c1S+ 3.Kc2 Sxb3 4.Re8+/i Kf2 5.Rf8+ Kg2/ii 6.Rxf1 Sd4+ 7.Kd3 Sf3 8.Ke3(e2) Sxh2 9.Rh1 Kxh1 10.Kf2 wins.
i) 4.Kxb3? Rf2 5.h4 Rxh2 6.h5 Kf2 7.h6 Kg2 8.h7 Kh1 9.Kc4 Rh6 10.Kd5 Kh2, drawn.
"The final position was shown schematically by Pogosyants (1976) but the introduction is excellent here, so the study has an intrinsic value."


No.7623: Yehuda Hoch. 1.Rg2 Ra6+ 2.Kb3/i Rb6+ 3.Ka4 Ra6+ 4.Kb5 Qxb2+ 5.Rxb2 Ra5+ 6.Kc4/ii Rxe5 7.Rh1+ Re1 8.Rxa2 Rxh1 9.Kd3 Ke1 10.Ke3 Kf1 11. Kf3 Kg1 12.Kxg3 wins.
i) 2.Kb4? $\mathrm{Qxb} 2+3 . \mathrm{Rxb} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 6+$ 4.Kc3 g2 5.Rxa2 Rc6+.
ii) 6.Kc6? Rxe5 7.Rh1+ Re1 8.Rxa2 Rxh1 drawn.
"As the composer himself points out, there is an anticipation by Ka kovin (1951) from move 9. As in the 1 HM study here too there is good new work in the introductory play: the study exists in its own right."


No.7624: Y.Hoch. 1.Ra8+ Kb7
2.cRb8+ Kxc7 3.Rc8+ Kb7 4.Rc1 Kxa8 5.Rh1/i b2 6.Rb1 Ka7 7.Kg7 Ka6 8.Kf6 Ka5 9.Ke5 h1Q $10 . \mathrm{Rxh} 1 \mathrm{~Kb} 411 . \mathrm{Kd} 4$ wins. i) 5.Kg7? Kb7 6.Kf6 b2 7.Rb1 Kc6 drawn. 5.Rb1? Ka7 6.Kg7 Ka6 7.Kg7 Ka6 7.Kf6 h1Q 8.Rxh1 Kb5 9.Ke5 Kc4 drawn.
"The diagram does not seem to offer anything of special interest, but pleasant surprises await the solver: firstly, W abandons his cP that was seemingly groomed for stardom; secondly, $5 . \mathrm{Rb} 1$ is a nice try; and thirdly, W loses a tempo to win in a position where time is ostensibly of the essence."


No.7625: Y.Hoch. 1.a7 b4+ 2.Kb3/i Rg3+ 3.d3 Rxd3+4.Kxb4 Rd8 5.Kb5, with:
Sf3 6.Kxb6 Sd4 7.Kb7 Rd7+ 8.Kb6 Rd6+ 9.Kb7, draw, or Sg6(g3) 6.Kxb6, and either, Se5 7.Kb7 Rd7+ 8.Ka6 Rd6+ 9.Kb7 draw, or Se 7 7.Kc7 Ke8 8.Kb7 Rd7+ 9.Ka6 Rd6+ (Sd5?? a8Q+) 10.Kb7, drawn again.
i) 2.Kxb4? $\mathrm{Rxg} 4+3 . \mathrm{Kb5} \mathrm{Rg} 8$ 4.Kxb6 Sf5 wins.
"Accurate play by wK against assorted 'correction' attempts by bS."


No.7626: Em.Dobrescu. The 31 studies published in the Romanian monthly suffered 14 eliminations in the course of the work of G.A.Nadareishvili (USSR), the judge. We may suppose (but wish that we knew a way to demonstrate) that the high proportion of eliminations reflects the high quality of solving and judging rather than a deterioration in the quality of composing and pre-publication testing. 1.b7/i Rh8 2.b8Q+ Rxb8 $3 . \mathrm{Bg} 8$ e4 4.h8Q/i Be5+ 5.Kb1 Ka5+ 6.Kc2 Rc8+ 7.Kb3 Rc3+ 8.Ka2 Rc2+9.Ka3/iii Rh2 10.Bh7 $\mathrm{Rh} 3+11 . \mathrm{Ka} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 2+12 . \mathrm{Kb} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 2+$ 13. $\mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Rb} 814 . \mathrm{Bg} 8$ wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Bg} 8$ ? Rc1+ $2 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Rh} 14 . \mathrm{b} 7 \mathrm{e} 4$. ii) 4.Kb1? Ka4+5.Kc1 Bf4+6.Kc2 $\mathrm{Rb} 2+7 . \mathrm{Kxb} 2 \mathrm{Be} 5+$ and g 6 .
iii) 9.Kb1? Rh2 10.Bh7 $\mathrm{Rb} 2+$ 11.Kc1 Rb8 12.Bg8 Rc8+ with repetition.

No.7627: G.M.Kasparyan (Erevan, USSR). 1.Re7+/i, and if Kb6 2.Bd4+ Kc6 3.Be4+ wins, so: Ka6 2.Bc8+/ii Kb6 3.Bd4+ Kc6
4.Bb7+ Kd6 5.Bc5 mate, or Ka8 2.Be4+ Kb8 3.Re8+/iii Kc7 4.Kb5, with Kd6 5.Be5+ Kd7 6.Bc6 mate, or Kd7 5.Bc6+ Kd6 6.Be5 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Bd} 4+? \mathrm{~Kb} 8(\mathrm{~Kb} 7 ? \mathrm{Re} 7+)$ 2.Re8+Kc7 drawn.
ii) 2.Bd4? Rb2+ 3.Bxb2 Rxf5 4.Bd4 Rb5+ 5.Ka4 Ra5+ 6.Kb4 Rb5+ 7.Kxc4 Rb4+ 8.Kxb4 stalemate.
iii) 3.Kb5? Rf8 4.Bg7 Rf2 drawn.


No.7628: N.Micu (Bucuresti/Bucharest, Romania). 1.d5/i Rd4 2.Rf5+/ii $\quad \mathrm{Kg} 4 \quad 3 . \mathrm{d} 7 \quad \mathrm{Bxd5}$ 4.Rg5+/iii $\quad \mathrm{Kf4}$ 5.Rxg3 $\quad \mathrm{Kxg} 3$ 6.d8Q, with:

Bc4+ 7.Ke1 Rxd8 stalemate, or

Rd1+ 7.Ke2 Bf3 + 8.Ke3 Rxd8 stalemate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rf} 8 ? \mathrm{~g} 2+2 . \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 53 . \mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ 4.Rf5+ Kg6 5.Rf6+ Kg7 wins.
ii) 2.d7? Rxd5 3.Rf8 Rd1+ 4.Ke2 Rxd7 5.Rxa8 Rf7.
iii) 4.d8Q? Rd1+ 5.Ke2 Bf3+ 6.Rxf3 Rxd8 7.Rf7 Kh3 8.Rh7+ Kg 2 .


No.7629: V.Nestorescu. 1.Bb8/i Bf5+ 2.Kd8 Rd7+ 3.Ke8 Rxb7 4.a8Q Be4 5.Bc7 Bc6+ 6.Kf8/ii Rxc7 7.Qa6/iii Kc2 8.Qe2+ wins. i) $1 . \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ ? Bf5+2.Kb8 Rh8+ drawn. 1.Be5? Be4 2.Sc5 Kc4 3.Sxe4 Rxa7 drawn. 1.Bc7? Bf5+ 2.Kb8 Rh8+ 3.Bd8 Be4 4.Sc5+ Kc4 5.Sxc4 Rxd8 drawn.
ii) $6 . \mathrm{Kd} 8$ ? Rxc7 7.Qa6 Rd7+ 8.Kc8 Ba4 drawn
iii) 7.Qa5? $\mathrm{Rc} 8+8 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Ba} 4$ 9.Qb6+ Ka3 10.Qe3+ Bb3 11.Qa7+ Kb2 drawn.

No.7630: G.G.Amiryan (Erevan, USSR). 1.Sc4+ Ke4 2.h7 Ba7 3.Sd6+ Kd5 4.Sf5 Bb8 5.Se3+ Ke4 6.Sc4 Ba7 7.Sd6+ Kd5 8.Sf5 draw.


No.7631: Jan van Reek (Margraten, Netherlands). 1.Kg1 f4 2.Rxb3 f3 3.Rb2/i b3 4.Rd2 b2 5.Rxb2 Bf7 6.Rb8 Be8 7.Rb6 Bc6 8.Rb2 Bb5 9.Ra2 Ba6 10.Ra5 Bb5 11.Ra8 Be8 12.Ra6 Bc6 13.Ra2 Bb7 14.Rb2 Bc6 15.c4 Bb5 16.c5 Bc6 17.Rd2 Bd5 18.c6 Bxc6 19.Rd6 wins.
i) 3.cb? f2+ 4.Kxf2 Kxh2 $5 . \mathrm{Rb} 1$ Bb5 6.Rg1 Bc6, draw.

No.7632: the late E.A.Asaba of Moscow. 1.Qf4+ Ka8 2.Qa4+ Qa6 3.Qxa6+ ba 4.gh Rb8 5.eSg8/i $\mathrm{Rb} 1+$ 6.Ka2 Bd5+ 7.Ka3 Rb3+ 8.Ka4 Bd3 9.h8Q Bc2 10.Ka5 Rb5+ 11.Kxa6 Bd3 12.Sf5 Rb1+ 13.Ka5 Rb5+ 14.Ka4 wins.
i) $5 . \mathrm{hSg} 8$ ? $\mathrm{Rb} 1+6 . \mathrm{Ka} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 5+$ 7.Sxd5 Rh1 drawn.


No.7633: M.Matous (Prague). 1.a7 Rb7 2.Ka6 Kc7 3.a8S Kb8 4.dc $\mathrm{Ra} 7+5 . \mathrm{Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rxa} 26 . \mathrm{c} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 8$ stalemate.


No.7634: I.Khvalchev and N.Mironenko (USSR). 1.a4+ Ka5 2.Bd8

Rb6+ 3.Kc8 Bxa8 4.Kxd7 Ka6 5.c8R (c8Q? Rb7+;) Bc6+/i 6.Ke7 Rb7+ 7.Kf8 Bd5 8.Rc5 Rd7 9.Ke8 Be6 10.Rc6+ wins.
i) Rb 3 6. $\mathrm{Rxa8} \mathrm{Kb7} 7 . \mathrm{Be} 7 \mathrm{Kxa8}$ $8 . \mathrm{Bc} 5$ wins.


No.7635: P.Joitsa (Romania). 1.f7 Bc4+ 2.d5 Bxd5+ 3.Kd6/i Bxf7 4.c7+ Kc8 5.Be2 Bd5 6.Ba6+ Bb7 7.Bc4 Re3 8.Bb5 Bc6 9.Ba6+ Bb7 10.Bb5 Sf6 11.Bd7+ Sxd7 stalemate.
i) 3.Kxd5? Sf6+ 4.Ke6/ii Sh7 5.Bc2 Sf8+ 6.Kd6 Rf3 7.c7+ Kc8 8. Ke7 Sd7 9.Ba4 Re3+ 10.Kd6 Sf8 for Se6, winning.
ii) $4 . \mathrm{Kc} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 75 . \mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 3+6 . \mathrm{Bc} 4$ Se4+ 7.Kd4 Rc1 8.Bd5 Sd6+ wins. 4.Kd6 Rd3+ 5.Ke6 Sh7 6.Bc2 Sf8+ 7.Kf6 Rd6+ 8.Kg7 Ke7 9.Be4 Se6+ wins.

No.7636: O.Pervakov (Moscow). Ranok is a Ukrainian literary monthly that runs occasional composing tourneys. Judge: M.Zinar. We have not seen this award, and even now only the three prizewinners are accessible. 1.h7 Rel+ 2.Se4+/i Rxe4+ 3.Kd8 Sd6 4.Bxd6 Re8+ (c1Q;h8Q) 5.Kxe8 c1Q
6.Be7+ Kg6 7.h8Q Qc8+ 8.Rd8 Qc6+ 9.Rd7 (Kf8? Qe8+;) Qa8+ 10.Bd8 Qe4+ 11.Re7 Qa4+ 12.Kf8 Qf4+ 13.Qf6+ Qxf6+ 14.Kg8/ii Qd6 15.Rg7+ Kh6 16.Bg5 mate. i) 2.Kd8? Sxd6 3.Bxd6 Rh1, and wP is held. So $2 . \mathrm{Se} 4+$ ! is to decoy bR from the bottom rank.
ii) Since this position of (mutual) zugzwang does not occur in a try, its mutuality cannot count among the study's major artistic merits. But it has enough other merits.


No.7637: G.A.Umnov (Moscow region). 1.Ke7 $\mathrm{Rg} 62 . \mathrm{Be} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 3.Rf7+ Kg8 4.Bd4 Re6+ 5.Kxe6 Bc4+ 6.Ke7 Bxf7 7.Sg4 h5 8.Sh6+ Kh7 9.Sxf7 Kg6 10.Ke6 a2 11.Bf6 h4 12.Sd6 h3 13.Se4 h2 14.Sf2 wins.

Magazines, bulletins and newspapers (with the studies' editor's name between parentheses) that reliably hold annual (or biennial) international informal tourneys for the composition of original endgame studies are listed below. Always send in diagram form, in duplicate. In the addresses a comma generally indicates the end of a line.

そESKOSLOVENSKY SACH (Michal Hlinka) Muskátová 38, 04011 Kosice, Czechoslovakia.
CHESS LIFE (Pal Benko) 'Benko's Bafflers', United States Chess Federation, 186 Route 9W, New Windsor, NY 12550, U.S.A.
DIAGRAMMES (Guy Bacqué) 65240 Arreau, France
EUROPA-ROCHADE (Manfred Rittirsch) Weisenauer Strasse 27, 6090 Rüsselsheim, BRD/West Germany GAZETA CZESTOCHOWSKA (Mariusz Limbach) srytka pocztowa 349, 42-407 Czestochowa 7, Poland. L'ITALIA SCACCHISTICA (Enrico Paoli) Viale Piave 25, 42100 Reggio Emilia, Italy.
PROBLEMIST (Adam Sobey) 15 Kingswood Firs, Grayshott, Hindhead, Surrey, GU26 6EU, England. PROBLEMISTA (Eugeniusz Iwanow) Kilinskiego $57 \mathrm{n} .53,42-200$ Czestochowa, Poland.
REVISTA ROMANA DE SAH (Iosif Grosu) str. Batistei 11, sect. 2, Bucuresti / Bucharest, Romania
SACHOVÁ SKLADBA (J. Brada) Na strži 61, 14000 Praha/Prague, Czechoslovakia.
SAKKÉLET (Attila Korányi) 'Tanulmányrovat', P.O.Box 52, H-1363 Budapest, Magyarország/Hungary. SCHACH (Manfred Zucker) Postfach 29, Karl-Marx-Stadt, 9061 DDR/East Germany.
SCHACH-ECHO (Hemmo Axt) Ferdinand-Miller-Platz 12a, D-8000 Munich 2, BRD/West Germany.
SCHAKEND NEDERLAND (Jan van Reek) Eijkerstraat 44, 6269 BN Margraten, Netherlands.
SCHWALBE (Michael Pfannkuche) Schweringsheide 6, D-4400 Münster, BRD/West Germany.
SCHWEIZERISCHE SCHACHZEITUNG (Beat Neuenschwander) Sieberweg 2, CH-3063 Ittigen, Switzerland
SHAHMAT (Hillel Aloni, for 'ring' tourney) 6/5 Rishon-le-Zion street, 42-274 Netanya, Israel.
SHAKHMATNA MISAL (Petko A. Petkov) ul. Rakitin 2, Sofia, Bulgaria.
SHAKHMATY/SAHS (Vazha Neidze) bulvar Padom'yu 16, et. III, Riga, Latvian SSR, U.S.S.R.
SHAKHMATY v SSSR (Anatoly Kuznetsov) abonementny yaschik 10, 121019 Moscow G-19, U.S.S.R.
SUOMEN SHAKKI (Kauko Virtanen) Välimäenkuja 3 D 20, SF-33430 Vuorentausta, Suomi / Finland.
SZACHY (Jan Rusinek) ul. Wspolna 61, 00-687 Warsaw, Poland.
VECHERNY LENINGRAD (?) nad.r. Fontanki 59, 191023 Leningrad, U.S.S.R.
64-SHAKHMATNOYE OBOZRENIYE (Ya.G. Vladimirov) ul. Arkhipova 8, Moscow K-62, 101913 GSP, U.S.S.R.
There are other informal international tourneys of uncertain periodicity (for instance, the Yugoslav Solidarity series). Chervony Girnik is soviet All-Union.
Formal tourneys are considered 'one-off'. Would composers please note that EG itself does not require originals (unless a tourney is announced).

The Chess Endgame Study Circle

1. Annual (January-December) 4 issues) subscription: $£ 8 .--$ or $\$ 15 .--$. (Airmail: $£ 3$ or $\$ 5$ supplement.) 1989: EG95-98
2. National Giro Account: 511525907 (Chess Endgame Consultants \& Publishers).
3. Bank: National Westminster ( 21 Lombard Street, London EC3P 3AR -- A.J. Roycroft Chess Account).
4. All analytical comments to: 'EG Analytical Notes', David Friedgood, 47 Grove House, Waverley Grove, London N3 3PU, England.
5. Composers may have their unpublished studies confidentially tested for originality by the HARMAN INDEX: Brian Stephenson, 9 Roydfield Drive, Waterthorpe, Sheffield, S19 6ND, England.
6. All other correspondence to: A.J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, London, NW9 6PL, England.
7. Unless clearly pre-empted by the context (such as a tourney judge's comments between inverted commas), all statements and reviews are by AJR.

* C ${ }^{*}$ denotes a computer-related article or diagram.

BTM - Black to Move
WTM - White to Move
otb - over-the-board
ICCA - International Computer Chess Association
PCCC - Permanent Commission of the FIDE for Chess Composition
GBR code (after Guy/Blandford/Roycroft) concisely denotes chessboard force in at most six digits. Examples: two white knights and one black pawn codes into $\mathbf{0 0 0 2 . 0 1}$; wQ bQ wR codes as $\mathbf{4 1 0 0}$; wBB vs. bS codes as 0023; the full complement of $\mathbf{3 2}$ chessmen codes as $\mathbf{4 8 8 8 . 8 8}$. The key to encoding is to compute the sum ' 1 -for-W-and-3-for-B1' for each piece-type in QRBS sequence, with wPP and bPP uncoded following the 'decimal point'; the key for decoding is to divide each QRBS digit by 3 , when the quotient and remainder are in each of the 4 cases the numbers of $\mathbf{B l}$ and $\mathbf{W}$ pieces respectively.

Next meeting of The Chess Endgame Study Circle (in London) on Friday 6th January, 1990. Phone John Roycroft on 01-2059876.

