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A view last minute messages:

1) The Mongolian jubilee tourney S.Denzen-60 (for the reported announcement, see EG94, p456) was, it now appears, for problems only, and not for studies.

2) Alain Pallier and Harold van der Heijden supplied the reasons for the eliminations of the Van Tets (EG 112 #9309) and the Carvajal (EG 112 #9355). The Van Tets won a 2nd Prize in Chess Life 1991. For the Carvajal compare the position after the first move with Kalandadze, 3HM '64' 1968: e5 0380.21 g8a2c1c6d8a6d4/c4 5/5+. Obviously the judges decided that adding one move to an existing studie is just not enough for a 2nd Prize.

3) In this issue you’ll find the Tavariani 70 award with the remark that we did not receive the initial position of the 1st/2nd Prize by Gurendzide. The shown position is David Blundell’s reconstruction. We just received the initial position after all. To get the good position move the white Rook from f7 to h5 and the black Rook from h4 to c4.
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THE 6-MAN PAWNLESS ENDGAME ROOK
AND BISHOP AGAINST TWO KNIGHTS
WITH THE 223-MOVE WIN
commented by John Roycroft

Introduction
"... there are ... grey areas in endgame theory,
where the general case is itself unclear. One such
example is Q and nP against Q. Another ... is
2B's against S ... where the books give only one
known drawing position (for example, black Sb7,
black Kc7), and even this is not a solid fortress." [Note: this was written 16 years before the computer
discovery that two bishops 'always' win against a
knight.] "... one would like to see ... a clarification
of the grey areas. On the other hand it is unrealis-
tic to expect all grey areas to be tidied up. Why,
in the whole range of possible distributions of
force, should there not be one or more where
roughly half the positions are wins and half
draws, so that the area is permanently 'grey'? ...
case in point ... the ending two S's against R and
B ... Chéron (Vol.1, second edition 1960, p.298)
and Fine (p.521) give this material as drawn,
under the general class of 2 minor pieces against
R and minor piece, but Fine adds 'there are quite
a few exceptions, especially with R and B against
2S's'. Neither Chéron nor Fine give any examples
of R and B against 2S's ...' [The Averbakh
volumes exclude endings with two pieces on one
side. The composer Henri Rinck published 5
studies with this material, none with solutions
longer than 7 moves, and with the supporting
analyses assuming a draw in the general case.] "... It is possible to discuss the subject without
diagrams, and this is all we intend to do. We have
no proof, just observations. Assume W has R and
B. W's weapons are mate, win of S, reduction to
a winning case of R against S (by no means rare).
Both R and B are pieces that can pin. Both can
also tempo, while this is difficult with S's, so that
zugzwang is a useful tactic also. How should Bl
defend? Clearly all his pieces should be kept
together. Suppose he tries a hedgehog position
with S's supporting each other and bK in be-
ween. But then wB can attack one S, and if either
S can be pinned by wR then W wins, for wK can
obviously approach the more exposed S. (One S
will always be more exposed than the other in
such situations.) If the exposed BS can also be
attacked by wB then it can probably be attacked
by all 3 W pieces, and Bl has only 2 defenders,
so that BxS wins automatically. ... there will be
drawing chances only if the exposed S cannot be
attacked by wB. To prevent wK approaching it is
clear that bS's should be on opposite colours even
if they do not defend one another (b3 and c3, for
instance), but as in such cases it requires 2 moves
for one S to defend the other in an emergency,
even though wK cannot approach it is clear that
the Bl position is difficult. If bS's are on the
same colour, wK can approach; if on different
colours, one S is certain to be vulnerable to pins
and tempo-maneouevres. There really only remains
a 'running fight' defence, with fluid play by all
the participants, but here also the R and B
working from a distance are well suited, while the
S's, apart from their powerful forking ability,
must rely on continuous checking to keep wK
away. Such play is ... very complex to analyse. ...
Has the ending R and B against 2S's without P's
ever occurred in master play?" (Abbreviated from
the editorial of issue 8 of EG, dated April 1967.)

The Stiller/Elkies discovery of June 1991

In June 1991 computer programmer and resear-
cher Lewis Stiller, with advice from
mathematician and studies specialist Noam Elkies,
used the Connection Machine in the U.S.A. to
wrench open an unsuspected treasure vault com-
parable to the discovery of the Tomb of
Tutankhamun. Impact on practical play will be
imperceptible, unless it results in the burying of
the '50-move rule' and all its relatives in the
Tomb which will then be sealed for ever. The
value lies rather in the demonstration of how far
humans are from mastering chess: nothing in
chess literature, history or experience prepares us
for what we see here - unless it is earlier com-
puter results. We use a 'polyphoto' approach,
with the 75 moments chosen by the commentator.
To reduce space, 'equi-optimal' moves are
omitted.

DIWTM a7b3 d2b1 116 d2b3e66 3/3b
W, in check, has to avoid the exchange of wB for
Bs, as this would lead to a drawn R vs. S 4-man
ending. This defensive resource occurs throughout
the length of the solution, though towards the half-way stage we begin to encounter cases where the swap favours W. If 1.Kb6? Sd4, for Sc4+.

D2 a1d3 0116 h2b3b4c4 BTM
The K-march down the board's edge pursued (or accompanied) by a pair of opposing S's is seen in endgame studies by the Georgian FIDE Grandmaster composer Gia Nadareishvili.
7... Sc4-e5 8.Ka1-a2 Sc5-c4+ 9.Kb2-c1 Ka3-e3 10.Bb3-d1 Sb4-d3+ 11.Kc1-b1 Sc4-d3+ 12.Kb1-a1 Sc2-b3+ 13.Ka1-a2 Sb3-c5 14.Ka2-a3 Sd3-b4

D3 a3c3 0116 h2d2d3c3 WTM
W has saved his B from being exchanged, but with b5b4-d3-b4 as an oscillating manoeuvre and bK on a dark square secure from wB checks, W's only weapons seem to be the R and a squeeze (ie to give B1 the move so that his stranglehold on wK has to slacken).

15.Rh2-h3+ Sb4-d3

D4 a3c3 0116 h2d1c5d3 WTM
It looks as if W has nothing up his sleeve. If b5d3 is not pinned it can move to and fro, and if it is pinned bK can oscillate between c3 and d2.
16.Bd1-g4 Ke3-d4 17.Bg4-f5 Sd3-f2 18.Rh3-h6 Sf2-d3 19.Ka3-a2 Kd4-e5 20.Bf5-g6 Ke5-d4

D5 a2d4 0116 h6g6c5d3 WTM
When two S’s protect one another they set up a defensive ring of steel - but like magician entertainers' interlocking and separating 'Chinese rings' there has to be a gap or two. If the attacker times it right (before another ring is formed) the grip can be locally loosened. This happens time and again in the lengthy 5-man endgame Q vs. SS. The comparison of R and B with Q in the battle against two S’s is most interesting, seeing that the move of the Q combines those of R and B.
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21. Ka2-b1  Kd4-c3  22. Bg6-h7  Kc3-d2  23. Rh6-h2+  
Kd2-c3  24. Bh7-g8

D6 blitz 0116 b2g8c5d3 BTM

wK and wB from opposite sides of the board combine to show that the soft spot in the Bl cordon is the square c2. If W can play Rc2+, and Rc4+, then wKc2, and the blockade is breached. Remarkably, bSS cannot prevent this by checks, nor can they any longer gain tempi by attacking either W piece! The W preparation for this has already taken up 24 moves. Playing optimally, Bl does not wait for the demonstration, but sets up his next line of defence.

24... Kc3-d4  25. Kb1-c2  Sd3-b4+  26. Kc2-d1  Sc5-e4

D7 d1d4 0116 h2g8b4e4 WTM

The characteristics of this position are now very different - and obscure. Bl solidly occupies the centre. It is not clear why 27. Kc2, is not best, except on the general grounds that the other W pieces should improve their positions: their present positioning was good for the now accomplished breach of the blockade, but are not so good for whatever the next phase demands - and that phase must include the safe 'advance' by wK to displace bK from the centre of the board.

27. Bg8-e6  Kd4-e3  28. Be6-f5  Sb4-d5

D8 d1e3 0116 b2f5d5e4 WTM

W's reorganisation is not clear because Bl's defensive plan is not clear either! (Whenever there are, as here, 'equi-optimal moves' at successive turns to play we suspect a regrouping to be in progress).

29. Kd1-c1  Se4-d6  30. Bf5-d7

D9 c1e3 0116 h2d7d5d6 BTM

Bl has maximum mobility and central occupancy with a b5 on each colour which allows (in principle) the option to check at any time - or at any rate wK will be severely restricted in his options.

30... Ke3-d4  31. Kc1-b2  Sd5-e3  32. Rh2-b4+  
Kd4-d5  33. Bd7-a4
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The target has to be c4. Imagine bSc4 with wBb3 and wKc3, when Bxc4 will surely win. Bl of course avoids this. One use of wB that we should look out for is the control of squares from which bSS could deliver nuisance checks as wK advances.

33... Sd6-f5 34.Rh4-h8 Sf5-d6 35.Rh8-h5+ Kd5-d4 36.Ba4-c6 Sd6-c4+ 37.Kb2-b3 Sc4-d2+ 38.Kb3-b4

We can begin to talk about W exerting pressure. wK does so now, while wB and wR pressurise the d5 and e4 squares. Bl should avoid these so he is forced to occupy others: he 'suffers' from having to move one of his three men at each turn!

38... Sd2-e4

W can nearly always safely (ie not endangering the piece moved) lose a move because R and B are both line-pieces whose effectiveness is generally restricted when close to the scene of action. Only the (arbitrary) board-size limits the distance of their effectiveness. It is interesting that if we replace wR and wB (in this position) by the 'stronger' wQ (i.e. the ending now becomes 5-man) we have a general draw (not in the endgame books, which largely ignore the endgame Q vs SS, but I have verified this against the Thompson data base). The explanation why the 'weaker' force wins is that given the right situation a S can be attacked once more than it can be defended, so that BxS is a very powerful threat - there is no equivalent threat using a Q. (Of course the Q transports her power much faster than two pieces can, but this counts for less if targets are few.)

39.Bc6-a8 Se3-c2+ 40.Kb4-b5 Sc2-e3 41.Kb5-c6

Maybe wB moved to a8 to get out of wK's way! Anyway wRh5 does establish a barrier (supported by wB controlling d5) and this allows wK to outflank via the 'top' of the board. Control of d5 is currently the key factor.

41... Se4-f6 42.Rh5-h4+ Kd4-e5 43.Kc6-e5 Sf6-d7+ 44.Kc5-b5 Sd7-f6

Bl defends doggedly. We see that if Se3-f5 Bl has indeed a good fortress set-up (as after move 38) but one rank closer to a board edge. However, bK 'in front of' bSS to block wK approaching is a strong defence in any region of the board. W's next is probably to focus on e4, since Bl has now 'overprotected' d5.
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45. Ba8-h1 Se3-f5 46. Rh4-a4

W has just played extreme-length moves with his line pieces. We can see that wR supported by wB creates a barrier (e4 is solidly in W's hands) and wK shields wB from attack. But W must make progress, presumably by advancing wK. It's BTM here, of course...

46... Sf5-d6+ 47. Kb5-c5 Se4-g3 49. Bh1-g2 Sd6-e4

Bl has reconquered e4! But wK is a little farther forward and not for the moment checkable - so there is time for a W regrouping - if we can think of one that holds on to the ground gained (namely, wK's slightly improved position). wB is restricted rather than active but we can say that wB cannot be cornered and captured (or exchanged). That is why bK joining in a chase wB would result only in bK being decoyed away from the (desirable) board centre.

50. Ra4-a8 Ke5-d4 51. Ra8-d8+ Kd4-c5 52. Rd8-d5+ Ke5-f4 53. Rd5-a5

Well, W found a forcing continuation (Ra4-a8-d8-d5-a5!) that has driven bK back a little - and e4 looks a likely target for all the W men. Short episodes, illustrated by the play from D16 to D17, can characterise at least some of the play in this ending. They lighten the darkness when we can identify a clear target (in chessplayer terms), even if we may not understand why, for instance, Ra5+ was not chosen from D16.

53... Se4-c3 54. Ke6-c5 Sg3-f5 55. Bg2-c6

W now shields both pieces from S-harassment - for the moment.
55... Sf5-e3 56.Kc5-d4

D19 d4f4 0116 a5c63a3 BTM

For the first time wK takes on an active role - the initiative is in W's hands and bK is no longer centralised - and therefore has less choice, less freedom. W invites checks, and shows that they can actually serve W's purpose. We should be able to learn from such manoeuvres.

56... Sc3-e2+ 57.Kd4-d3 Se2-c1+ 58.Kd3-c3 Sc1-e2+ 59.Kc3-b4

D20 b4f5 0116 a5c6f5 BTM

Did we speak too soon? Not really - bK is still excluded from the four central squares. But again the question recurs - how is W to build on his achievements? It is in the nature of seamless optimal play that we cannot expect to base future plans on past move history. All has to be new - and therefore exciting!

59... Se3-f5 60.Bc6-a8 Se2-g3 61.Kb4-c3 Sg3-e4+

D21 d3f4 0116 a5c6f5g5 BTM

So the 'outflanking' on c6 was a feint! The real outflanking is via d3! In the last few moves we see W's control of the centre and in particular e4 consolidated.

63... Sg5-f7 64.Ra5-a4+ Kf4-e5 65.Ra4-a7

D22 d3e5 0116 a7c6f5f7 BTM

A small indication that W (still) has the initiative is that bK has been forced (though how we still do not know) to a square where bSf7 (under attack) would like to play.

65... Sf5-d6 66.Ra7-a8 Ke5-f4 67.Ra8-a4+ Kf4-e5 68.Bc6-d7

D23 d3e5 0116 a4d7f7f7 BTM
bSd6 has no good-looking move at all (and Ra5+ is a potential threat), despite being on a good square - again a small indicator of progress. Kd5?? Ra5+ wins immediately.

68... Sd6-b7

A delicious position! See D25, capturing the moment of first catching sight of the contents of the Inner Chamber of Tutankhamun's Tomb! 69.Ra4-e4+ Ke5-d6 70.Re4-d4+

The computer has 'composed' a position of symmetry to delight us. This pleasure does little, however, to enlighten.

70... Kd6-e5 71.Bd7-c6 Sb7-d6

The Bl pieces occupy the squares they did on move 68. But W's grip on d5 and e4 is now about to be put to good effect. See our D22 note.

72.Bc6-g2 Sd6-f5 73.Rd4-e4+ Ke5-d6 74.Re4-a4 Kd6-e5 75.Bg2-b3

Here we expect S7d6 to set up a barrier against W's further advance, but we do not see this move played. We continue to use the word 'advance' even though the direction of advance changes with time. The target (bK or bSS) is shifting sand.

75... Sf5-g3 76.Ra4-g4 Kg3-f5 77.Rg4-e4+ Ke5-f6 78.Re4-e1

Bl is driven back even further. But W will not find it easy to advance, wB does not look so well placed against a Bl fortress constructed in the f6-g6 zone - which any necessarily slow advance of wK will surely allow. All we can say about the manoeuvre by wR (moves 76-82) is that it is remarkable.
78... Sf7-d6

D29 d3f6 0116 e1h3d6f5 WTM
W's next manoeuvre exhibits extreme deliberate calm - an anthropomorphic expression which can have no relevance to computer play per se, but has to be a starting-point for our eventual comprehension of events.

79.Re1-e2 Kf6-g7 80.Re2-e5 Kg7-f6 81.Re5-d5 Kf6-e6 82.Rd5-c5 Ke6-f6

D30 d3f6 0116 c3h3d6f5 WTM
In hindsight we can say that wR is now optimally placed, preventing bK from re-occupying the centre and exerting wB-aided pressure on f5. So it is time for wK to stir his stumps again - he last made a move 20 moves ago! The threat to occupy f4 with wK forces Bl into checking activity.

83.Kd3-e2 Sf5-d4+ 84.Re2-e5 Sd4-e6 85.Re5-d5 Sd6-c4+ 86.Ke3-f2 Se6-g7

D31 f2f6 0116 d5h3e4g7 WTM
Positions now begin to lurk more frequently in which W wins by BxS,KxB: with a winning R vs S ending to follow (even though this has a maximum depth of over 20 often very difficult moves despite being 'only' a 4-man endgame). This complicates our tentative explanations.

87.Kf2-e2 Sg7-e6 88.Rd5-f5+ Kf6-e7 89.Ke2-d3 Sc4-b2+ 90.Kd3-c3 Sb2-a4+ 91.Kc3-b4 Sa4-c5 92.Kb4-c4 Sc5-d7

D32 c4e7 0116 f5h3d6e5 WTM
Bl's pieces are re-coordinated. Now Ke5? Sf6+;Ke5,Sd7+; is strong. wR is not well placed for a wK advance - too vulnerable to bSS.

93.Rf5-a5 Sd7-c6+ 94.Ke4-c3 Sd6-c5

D33 c3e7 0116 a5h3b6c5 WTM
One of those positions that S’s revel in! Rx5?? Sa4+.
95.\texttt{Kc3-b4 Sc5-d3+ 96.Kb4-b5 Sb6-d5} 

\textbf{D34} \texttt{b5\text{e7} 0116 a5\text{h3}d3d5 WTM} 

Now the pieces of both sides look placed at random. But wB's restraining influence, especially on bK, in controlling d7, e6, f5 (and even g4) is remarkable, given that a lone B is by definition colourblind and 'porous'.


\textbf{D35} \texttt{c6f6 0116 a6ble3f4 WTM} 

Guess W's next! My earlier comments will hardly help you. There is an undoubted clue in the fact that the otherwise desirable move Kd6 is a gross blunder (Sc4+).

100.Ra5-a6 

\textbf{D36} \texttt{e6f6 0116 a6b1e3d4 BTM} 

If we search for pointers to progress achieved we can notice that Bl has very few decent moves. Sc4?? Kc5+ is typical. If Ke5,Ra4 looks surprisingly good.

100... Sf4-e2 101.Kc6-d7+ Kf6-e5 102.Ra6-e6+ 

\textbf{D37} \texttt{d7e5 0116 e6b1e2c3 BTM} 

Bl's re-occupation of the centre is shown to be illusory. But he will set up another centre of operations in the f3 zone of the board, as wK will be remote for some time to come.

102... Ke5-f4 103.Re6-e4+ Kf4-f3 104.Re4-e8 

\textbf{D38} \texttt{d7f3 0116 e8b1e2c3 BTM} 

Offhand one would think that Bl has enough time to set up a good defensive position before the pressure mounts again - there are equioptimals among the next few moves. It may be relevant that wB can (via e4) control f3 and g2 to make Bl's putative fortress less secure.
104... Se2-g3 105.Kd7-e6 Se3-f1 106.Bb1-e2 Kf3-f4

D39 e6f4 0116 e8c2fg3 WTM
It is not a good omen for Bl that bSS form no barrier to wK advancing. On the other hand everything looks cosy in the f3-g2 zone. It is hard to see Bl falling victim to zugzwang, for instance. The bS on a light square (f1), despite being in principle vulnerable, will also be hard for W to attack with all three pieces, while there is no mileage from attacking the other bS with only two pieces.

107.Re8-f8+ Kf4-e3 108.Rf8-d8 Sf1-h2
109.Rd8-a8 Sg3-f1 110.Ra8-a3+ Ke3-f4
111.Bc2-d1 Sf1-d2 112.Ke6-d5 Sh2-f1
113.Kd5-d4

D40 d4f4 0116 a3d12f1 BTM
Now another general threat to Bl looms. bSS could be isolated from bK by wK attacking both: neither could move without allowing the other to be taken, one would inevitably be vulnerable to BxS, and bK could be driven back by wR and wB combining - with wK poised to assist in a mating attack at the right moment. Bl is beginning to feel the pinch. (Yes, we have said that before! And always Bl has demonstrated that he has resources!)

113... Sf1-g3 114.Ra3-a4 Sd2-e4 115.Kd4-d5 Kf4-e3 116.Kd5-e5 Ke3-d2

D41 e5d2 0116 a4d14g3 WTM
Only one move is ‘best’ here, and it may come as a surprise. Consider that wB operates best from a distance provided its targets are relatively static.

117.Bd1-h5

D42 e5d2 0116 a4h5e4 BTM
Yes! If Sxh5;Kxe4 and W wins fairly easily. For example, Sg3+;Kf3,Sf5;Kf4,Se3;Rd4+ and Kxe3.

117... Se4-c5 118.Ra4-a2+ Kd2-e3 119.Bh5-g6 Sc5-d7+

D43 e5c3 0116 a2g6d7g3 WTM
The checks are awkward - but when they stop W will have an initiative ‘on the rebound’.
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120.Ke6-d6  Sd7-f6  121.Ra2-a3+  Ke3-f4
122.Ra3-a4+

Now fSe4++;Bxe4,Sxe4++;Kd5 wins.

122... Kf4-g5  123.Bg6-d3  Sf6-g4

This is another halt where W is clearly well placed and Bl is restricted - but how do we go ahead? What (minor) adjustment is possible and necessary to hop to the next stepping-stone, especially when the whereabouts of the next stepping-stone are shrouded in dense fog? The good news is that we know (since we are in database land) that the stepping-stone exists.

124.Bd3-a6  Sg3-f5+  125.Kd6-e6  Sf5-g7+  126.Ke6-f7  Sg7-f5  127.Ba6-e2

It is difficult to see why Bl's gSh6+, is uniquely optimal. Perhaps W's pressure on g4 is forcing that S away.

127... Sg4-h6+  128.Kf7-e6  Sf5-g3  129.Bc2-d1  Sg3-f5

127... Kf4-g5  128.Kf7-e6  Sf5-g3  129.Bc2-d1  Sg3-f5

The Bl position is on the one hand self-contained and solid looking but on the other hand Bl does not want to move any piece. It is not surprising that W's next move is a 'waiter'.

130.Ra4-b4  Sf5-e3  131.Bd1-f3  Sg3-f5  132.Bf3-g2  Sf5-g7+  133.Ke6-d5

It looks as if (either) Sf5 is met by Rb5.

133... Sg7-h5  134.Rb4-b5  Kg5-f4  135.Kd5-e6  Sf5-g3  136.Rb5-b4
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A general observation on W's timing of checks (especially later in the solution) is that a bS often blocks a flight. The solution may be well advanced, but moves are no easier to divine. Should bK play to e3 or to g5?

136... Kf4-g5 137.Bg2-h3 Sg3-e2 138.Ke6-e5 Se2-g3

D50 e5g5 0116 b4b3g3h6 WTM

The old, old question: all well and good, but what next?

139.Rb4-a4 Sg3-e2 140.Bh3-e6 Se2-g3

D51 e5g5 0116 b4b3g3h6 WTM

Very interesting: bSh6 has no safe move and bSe2 is at a loose end. One is entitled to retort 'So what?', if there is still nothing decisive. Very surprisingly W allows bSh6 to 'escape'. This is counter-intuitive. Presumably Rf4 is answered by Sh5.

141.Be6-d7 Sh6-f7+ 142.Ke5-d4 Sf7-d6
143.Bd7-h3 Sd6-f5+ 144.Kd4-e5 Sf5-h6

D52 e5g5 0116 a4b3g3h6 WTM

W has indulged in an obscure tempo manoeuvre (Bl's position has scarcely changed over the last eight moves) and now plays Ra5, preventing a bS from occupying f5, for BxS,Sxf5;Ke4(e6) would win at once.

145.Ra4-a5 Kg5-h4

D53 e5h4 0116 a4b3g3h6 WTM

W's next (which is unique) defies satisfactory explanation. It makes Bl a gift of the g4 square. However, wB has spent a long time on the h3-c8 diagonal!

146.Bh3-g2 Kb4-g5 147.Bg2-a8 Sh6-g4+
148.Ke3-e6+ Kg5-f4 149.Ra5-a3

D54 e6f4 0116 a3g2g4 BTM
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The position looks very tactical, with Rf3+ or Ra4+ in the air, bK tied to both bSg3 and bSg4, and wK closely involved. But a concrete refutation of Se3 is not easy to see.

149... Sg4-h2 150.Ba8-b7 Sg3-e2 151.Ra3-a4+ Kf4-e3 152.Ra4-e4+ Ke3-f2

154... Se2-d4 155.Kd6-c5 Ke5-f3+; is awkward. W's unique move 153 poses yet another minor mystery.

153.Kc6-d6 Sh2-f3 154.Re4-e8

D55 e6f2 0116 e4f2 e3f2 WTM
wK now seems to have an approach path - but Ke5,Sf3+; is awkward. W's unique move 153 poses yet another minor mystery.

D56 d6f2 0116 e8b7e3f3 BTM
This supports the other S on f3 and covers a number of light squares while avoiding obstructing his own K. eSg1 would allow wK more latitude to approach. If bSf3 moves then again wK can approach and an open f-file is to W's advantage.

D57 e4f2 0116 e8c3e4 WTM
Bl again looks to have organised a defence that is a barrier against wK's approach - but this time bK does not stand between the knights and wK, ie the barrier is less robust, consisting of S's only - for the instant one moves a hole is created that cannot be covered by bK.

159.Be2-a4 Sf4-g6 160.Kc4-d5 Sf3-g5 161.Kd5-d4

D58 d4f2 0116 e8d5f6 BTM
Bl's position suddenly looks not so bad again: wK cannot approach any closer, wB is doing nothing, and wR can hardly improve on the square he already occupies.
161... Sg6-f4 162.Ba4-c6 Sg5-f3+ 163.Kd4-e4 SF4-e6

D59 e4f2 0116 e8d6f3 WTM
Bl has just played another 'clever' move - but a simple retort puts Bl under pressure again. (It's a relief to find a ready explanation, for once. Only later do we see wB playing to the vacated e8 square?)

164.Re8-e7 Se6-c5+ 165.Ke4-d5 Sc5-b3

D60 d5f2 0116 e7c6d2f3 WTM
It makes sense now to transfer wB to h5, to pressurise f3 while wK can support from e4 and wR from f7 especially if the other bS is relatively ineffectual. But it is still a surprise to see the move Be8. In the BB vs. S 5-man endgame in a lengthy and crucial phase a B (even both B's) must transfer from one side of the board to the other (or be ready to do so) - and since B's do not move like R's (or, if you like, since the board is square and not diamond-shaped) they have to play via the board's edge. This is mysterious until one sees the aim. It is a tame-looking means to a forceful end, a single move as part of a manoeuvre.

166.Be6-e8 Sb3-d2 167.Be8-h5 Kf2-g3

D61 d5g3 0116 e7h5d2f3 WTM
We now see a wR manoeuvre reminiscent of the episode D29-D30. wK cannot approach at once - but Bl can be squeezed to loosen his grip.

168.Re7-e3 Kg3-f2 169.Re3-d3 Kf2-e2 170.Rd3-c3 Ke2-f2

D62 d5f2 0116 c3h5d2f3 WTM
Now Bg4 is not a waste of time: Kg3? Bxh5,Sxf3,Kd4.
171.Bh5-g4 Kf2-g2 172.Rc3-d3 Kg2-f2

D63 d5f2 0116 d3g4d2f3 WTM
But W can still do nothing unless wK can exert pressure more directly. It is remarkable that he can do this via e6, abandoning the possibility of our last note.
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For the last ten moves wR has been jockeying on the third rank, and we cannot fully explain this. But suddenly there is a skirmish at close quarters.

Speaking for the defender it begins to look as if Bl (as in other pawnless endings) can use the edges of the board as his ally - W cannot (as he has done before) 'get round the back'! Note the Bl threat of Sh2 (to exchange wB).

W can certainly transform his position faster than Bl - but we are left with the question what sort of transformation? After Ra7! we guess that wR is going to operate unharassed from a distance, hence allowing wK and wB their chances to move. Maybe there would be no general win on a 7-by-7 board.
186. Rh7-c7+ Ke3-f2 187. Bg6-d3 Sc2-e1 188. Bd3-a6

D68 g4f2 0116 e7b6c1d2 BTM
It is astonishing how the checking venom of bSS has been drawn though the process has been agonisingly slow. Bl is now short of moves - and his K is even in danger of being checkmated.

188... Sd2-b3 189. Kg4-f4 Sb3-c5 190. Ba6-b5 Sc1-d3+

D69 f4f2 0116 e7b6c5d3 WTM
Of course bSS have managed to organise some defence by gaining time attacking wB (though not wR) and wK. But they cannot prolong this tactic and now form an island: bK is cut off from them by the action of wR. However, the straits are narrow, and one move would unite bK with his cavalry.


D70 f5f2 0116 d6h5b4c5 BTM
An eagle-swoop (Be2-b5) has exposed bK: the e2 and e3 squares are both open to wR. But cannot e3 at least be covered? No! Sc2;Re2+, or Sd5;Re2+, Kg3;Re5! Bl is now clearly in trouble, especially his K.

194... Kf2-g3 195. Re8-e2+ Kg3-f2 196. Re3-c2+ Kf2-g3 197. Re2-d2

D71 f5g3 0116 d6h5b4c5 BTM
If Kh4;Rd4+, Kxh5;Rxb4 wins. So bSS are on their own and liable to demolition by the united W trio. Their only defence is to gain time with checks, latent forks, and counter-attacks. Warning - S's are rather good at this!

197... Sb4-c6 198. Rd2-d6 Sc6-b4 199. Kf5-e5 Sb4-d3+ 200. Ke5-d4 Sd3-f4

D72 d4g3 0116 d6h5c5f4 WTM
Now Bl can draw if for instance Kxc5, Sxh6. So wB has to move, and d1 or g6 (to cover d3 - Sd3? Bxd3) look the favourites. But it's Bf7...
The Bl pieces are re-united, after hair-raising adventures - but Bl is in check.

W is close to the win now. Kg4;Bd1+ is strong. W's pieces are well placed, wR and wB work from a safe distance, bK is almost on the brink.

The foregoing was written and compiled in June 1991. Looking back in June 1993 a few further observations may be made. Most commentators have assumed that the play is equivalent to the statement that R+B vs. S+S is a general win. Playing through the solution certainly seems to endorse this view, seeing that W always manages to out-tempo Bl, that Bl seems to take up every conceivable defensive configuration but still comes to grief, that W seems to be able to force the Bl men to get in each other's way... But, logically, this is insufficient for drawing the
conclusion. The computer has given us something we never dreamed of and the books never suggested - and still we cannot resist imposing our puny opinions, despite the fact that we have no other samples of optimal play in this ending! What we have is the longest win, no more and no less. Let us consider our experience with other computer-supplied 'longest wins'. With BB vs. S the computer showed us (longest win: 66 moves) that the Kling & Horwitz defensive position could be permanently broken, and extensive experience using the know-all database failed to unearth anything stronger than that position. This justified us in stating firmly that BB always win vs. S. With R+B vs. R it was different. The longest win in 59 moves was just that: it gave the longest win but did not alter theory which calls the general case a draw. With B+S vs. S the lesson was the same (the draw of theory confirmed by the computer), but the existence of a 77-move win informed us of the unsuspected and extraordinarily long-drawn-out winning manoeuvres possible when the defending king cannot escape from a corner area. So, what does the computer tell us about R+B vs. SS? The answer is unequivocal: we do not know yet! No one has been able (the facility is simply not physically available) to spend time investigating this endgame with the help of the computer. So we should reserve judgement, not dispense it as if we were the computers!

TAVARIANI-70

This 1992 tourney, national rather than international, celebrated the 70th birthday of the senior Georgian composer Revaz ('Rezo') Tavariani. The award was published xi92 in the sports newspaper "Lelo" (Tbilisi). Judge R.Tavariani (Tbilisi)

No 9583 D.Gurgenidze (Tbilisi)
=1/2 Prize Tavariani-70

4/4 Win

No 9583 D.Gurgenidze

Our computer diskette source omitted to supply the initial position! The diagram is David Blundell's reconstruction, working purely from the solution and five support variations. (In problem this type of puzzle is sometimes called a 'synthetic'.) He wonders if he can claim to have created a composition. We hope shortly to confirm Gurgenidze's setting for comparison.


i) 1.Qa8+? Ra4 2.Sxe2 Rxc8+ draw,
ii) Rb4 Rxb4+ Kxb4 4.Sxe2 wins,
iii) Ka3 8.Sa2+ Ka4 9.Rb4+ Ka5 10.Ra3 mate,
v) Ka5 11.Rb5 mate.

No 9584 V.Kalandadze (Tbilisi)
=1/2 Prize Tavariani-70

4/4 Win

No 9584 V.Kalandadze

4/4 Win

No 9585 I.Akobia (Tbilisi)
=3/4 Prize Tavariani-70

Win

No 9585 I.Akobia
4/4 Draw
   i) 1.Re7? Kh5 2.Rxa7 Qd5+ 3.Kb8 Qd8+ 4.Rc8 Qc8 mate.
   ii) Qa5 2.Rh1+ Kg7 3.Rg4+ Kh6 4.Rh5+ stalemate.

No 9586 M.Gogberashvili (Tbilisi) 3/4 Prize Tavariani-70

4/4 Win
   v) Ka3 8.Sc5 mate, or Kc3(4) 8.Sc5 mate.

No 9587 J.Makhatadze (Zestafoni) 5th Prize Tavariani-70

5/4 Win
   i) Qg8 2.Rxg8 Kh7 3.Bf7 e6 4.g6+ Kh6 5.Kg3 draw.
   ii) e1S 6.Rb3 b5 7.Ra3 draw.

No 9588 V.Neidze (Tbilisi) 1st Special Prize Tavariani-70

3/7 Win
No 9588 V.Neidze 1.Re5+ Kd7 2.Rd5+ Kc7 3.Re7+ Kb8 4.Rxb7+ Kb6 5.Qc5+ Kb7 6.Qc7+ with:
   i) Kb8 6.Qc8+ Qb8 7.Sc7 mate, or
   ii) 6.Sc7+ Ka7 7.Qa8 mate.

No 9589 V.Neidze (Tbilisi) 2nd Special Prize Tavariani-70

37 Draw
No 9589 V.Neidze 1.c7+ Kb7 2.c8Q Kc6 3.Qc5+ Kb7 4.Qc7+ with:
   i) 5.Ka8 5.Qc8+ Qb8 6.Sc7 mate, or
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No 9590 G. Nadareishvili, E. Kvezereli (Tbilisi)
Hon. Mention Tavariani-70

5/5

No 9590 G. Nadareishvili, E. Kvezereli
1. Bf5
cRxc1 6. Kd6 Rxe2 7. g8Q+ Bxg8 8. Rd7+
with:
Kc8 9. Rc7+ Rxh5 stalemate, or
i) Rh2 2. Rh8+ Ke7 3. Ra6 Kh6 4. g8Q Bxg8

No 9591 M. Mgebrishvili (Tbilisi)
Commendation Tavariani-70

10/6 Draw

No 9591 M. Mgebrishvili
1. Kb6 Ra8 2. Kb7 Rd8

No 9592 R. Takidze (Tbilisi)
Commendation Tavariani-70

14/4 Win

No 9592 R. Takidze
1. a5 h4 2. a6 h3 3. a7 Bd5
4. Kxd5 h2 5. Bd3 Kxf3 6. a8Q Kg2 7. Kb4+ Kg1
8. Qa1+ Kg2 9. Qb2+ Kg1 10. Qb1+ Kg2 11. Qxb6+
Kh1 12. Qe4+ Kg1 13. Qe1+ Kg2 14. Qe2+ Kg1
15. Ke3 h1Q 16. Qf2 mate.
i) David Blundell points out that solution uniques
ends here.
No 9594 E.Dvizov (Zlobin) and L.Tamkov (Gomel)
1st Prize Afanasiev-80

6/5 Win


No 9595 M.Bantish (Vitebsk)
2nd Prize Afanasiev-80

4/4 Draw

No 9595 M.Bantish 1.Se4+ i) Kb6 2.ef Se6 3.Bc8 Rh6 4.Sf6, with:
Sc7+ 5.Kb8 Rx6f 6.Qe8 Sa6+ 7.Ka8 Rxf8, stalemate with pinned bishop, or
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No 9598 I.Bondar
2nd Hon.Mention Afanasiev-80

7/8 Win

No 9598 I.Bondar 1.Rf6 a1Q+ 2.Kb8 b1Q+ 3.Kc8

No 9599 V.Sychev (Minsk)
3rd Hon.Mention Afanasiev-80

4/7 Win

No 9599 V.Sychev 1.fSd6 f2 2.Sf5+ Ke4 3.bSd6+
Kf3 4.Sh4+ Kg3 5.dSf5+ Kh2 6.Sf3+ Kh1 7.fSh4
and 8.Bg2 mate.

No 9600 L.Tamkov
=1st/2nd Commendation Afanasiev-80

No 9600 L.Tamkov 1.Bf8+ Kxf8 2.Ke6+ Rf2
3.fRx f2+ Kg7 4.Rg2+ Kh6 5.Rh2+ Kg5 6.bRd2+

No 9601 M.Plotnikov
=1st/2nd Commendation Afanasiev-80

No 9601 M.Plotnikov 1.Rd5+ Kc3 2.Rd3+ Kh2

No 9602 G.Novikov (Minsk)
3rd Commendation Afanasiev-80

No 9602 G.Novikov 1.Be4+ Qxe4 2.Qg1+ Ka2
3.Qh2(7)+ Ka3 4.Qh3+ Ka4 5.Qa1(2)+ Kh5
6.Qa5+ Kc6 7.Qxc6+ Kd5 8.Qb7+ c6 9.Qxc7
mate.

Zvyazda 1990

The 1990 tourney of the magazine Zvyazda (Minsk) was judged by V.Sichev.

Special remarks: the newspaper cutting was supplied, but only that part relating to studies - it was clearly a multi-genre award. What suggests that it was not an informal tourney is the 'Place' system rather than normal prizes. But the next award (a year later), has the same form.

Just 3 studies were in the provisional award.
4. Rd1 draw. Or if Rc2 2. Kg6 Rc1 3. Kg6 Ke8

2. Rc7 Ke8.

iv) For Rc2 3. Kg6 Rc1 4. Kg6, see (ii).


"Are innovations still possible in R-endings? Here we have multum in parvo:
mutual mating threats in the lines l. Rc3? Kf7, and l. Rd7? c3? ... 4. Kf6!
A light and impressive execution of the problem theme (3. Rc7!) enhanced by the traps set by Bl
(6...Rb6!?; 8...Rbl!?); accuracy in critical
variations (3...Ke8 4. Kg6 Kd8 5. Rc3!). All this in a 5-man (ultra-)miniature. Undoubtedly a rare pearl, whose place among the classics is assured!"

At AJR’s request the main line of the solution has been checked by IGM John Nunn against the
appropriate Ken Thompson 5-man database on CD-ROM and found to be correct.

No 9610 J.H. Marwitz
2nd Prize Hillel Aloni 50

No 9611 A. Zinchuk (Ukraine)
Hon. Mention Hillel Aloni 50


viii) e2 10. Rf8+ Ke3. 11. Re8+ wins.


x) f2 7. Rf1 Kf3. 8. Kh3 wins.

xi) Ke3 8. Kd1 f2. 9. Rg2 wins.


"A hard-fought battle between pieces and pawns, with impressive critical moves (4. Kh5!, 7. Bd3!) which lead to a series of beautiful self-block mates. The one regret is the banal introductory play, which has no bearing on the main content, and seems to be capable of improvement. There are also numerous variations that lack monovolence."

No 9612 G. Kasparyan (Armenia)
1st Commendation Hillel Aloni 50

No 9613 A. Sochniev and L. Katsnelson (Russia)
2nd Commendation Hillel Aloni 50


"A double 'staircase' has been shown before (eg Bondarenko and Al.Kuznetsov, 1st Prize, Olympic ty 1964), usually with a mechanical element. On the other hand there is an inherent charm about an obsessive chase bestriding the board towards the unknown, especially in a win study rather than in a luke-warm positional draw. Here there is some interest in the differentiation in the bBB's play on the e1-a5 and f1-a6 diagonals, prescribed by wK's travels g3-b3 and h3-c8. Note also the function of wSS in decoying bR from the vital a-file. We hope that the hazardous supporting analysis will prove reliable."


ii) Ka5 2.Ra7+ Kb6? d8Q+.


"An impressive 'martyrology' where all W men are sacrificed in order to arrive at a piquant stalemate. A Q is promoted too, ostensibly to administer perpetual check, but eventually serving as bait to catch Bl in a frustrating 'try-and-get-out-of-this' BTM stalemate. Unfortunately an abridged version (by the same author) appeared in TFS in 1981, even if for some reason it was not honoured. Otherwise the improved version would have been ranked higher."

%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%

Israel 'Ring' Tourney 1990
This tourney was judged by Yehuda Hoch (Israel).
16 studies published, apparently pruned from an unknown total, and submitted by Hillel Aloni, the tourney director who has for many years contributed greatly to the advancement of study competition in Israel. As usual, he invested a lot in organizing the tourney and in a meticulous check of the entries

The provisional award was published in VARIANTIM No.17, December 1993, which includes IRT 1991 award in non-study genres.
No explanation offered for delay in award, nor are we told if more than the two quoted outlets (VARIANTIM and SHAHMAT) were trawled.

No 9616 Hillel Aloni (Israel)
1st Prize Israel 'Ring' 1990
3/3 Win


v) Kc8 4.Sc7+ Kc7 5.Kb4 wins.


"I enjoyed this study very much. It bristles with stratagems and combinations, and runs like a Swiss clock. Since the battery aimed at bK does not yield a win, W very carefully diverts the attention of the battery to bS - and wins. The side variations are no less interesting than the main line. A perfect specimen of this kind of study."
No 9617 Juri Randviir (Estonia)
2nd Prize Israel 'Ring' 1990

5/4 Win

No 9617 J.Randviir I.h5, with:
Sxg7 2.h6 Sf5 3.h7 Se7+ 4.Kb6 Sg6 5.Kxa6 e5/i
e3 11.b7 e2 12.h8Q e1Q 13.Qb4+ Ke2 14.Qxe1+ Kxe1
15.Kd4 Kf2 16.Ke4 Kg3 17.Kf5 wins, or
Sh6 6.b4/v Kbl/vi 7.b5/vii ab 8.b4 Ke1 (Ka2; see
Sg5 13.Kc5 wins, Bl being short of one tempo.


ii) Ka3 8.b4 Kd4 9.b5 Ka5 10.Kc5 e4 11.b6 Ka6

Si8 draw.

Sg8 8.h6 a3 9.Kf7 Se7+ 10.Kf7 a2 11.Kxe7 a1Q
12.g8Q+ wins.


Or Ka2 7.Kd4 Sf5+ 8.Ke5 Sxg7 9.h6 e3 10.hg
e2 11.g8Q+ wins.


viii) 3.Ke5 Sxg7 4.h6 e3 draws.

"A lovely study, which has no less depth, accuracy and creativity than the 1st Prize winner,
and even a much longer solution." The judge
points out that though W uses 'particular creativity' (6.b4! and 7.h5!) in simultaneously
restraining the pair of bPs, the study's construction
is less polished than its rival.

No 9618 Gady Costeff (Israel)
3rd Prize Israel 'Ring' 1990

9/5 Win

No 9618 G.Costeff 1.Rf1 Qa6+/i 2.d3 a1Q 3.Sf3+
Qxf1+ 4.Kxf1, with:
Qa1+ 5.Sa1 Qg7 6.a8Q Sc6/i 7.St4 Qg1+
h1Q 12.Qb8+ Kh1 12.Kf2 wins, or
Qxd3+ 5.Ke1/ii Qxh5 6.Kf2 Qf7/vi 7.a8Q
Qg7 8.Sb4+ Sb7 9.Qa6 Qg1+ 10.Kf3 Qd1+
Kxb2 15.e4 wins.

i) hq2 2.Sxg1+ Kxg1 3.g8Q+ Kf2 4.Kf2 wins.
Or Sc6 2.Kf2. Or Qg4+ 2.Sf1+ Kg2 3.Sf4+ Kg3
4.a8Q wins.

ii) Qgl+ 7.Ke2 Qg4+ 8.Kd2 Kg1 9.Qa1 h1Q
10.St5+ Kg2 11.St4+ wins.

iii) 5.St2? Qxd5 (reci-zug), if now 6.e4 Qc5+,
or if 6.b4 Qa2+.


Or Sc6(Sb7) 7.a8R(a8Q? Qd2+?) Qd1 8.g8Q wins.
The judge confesses that the copious "thunder and
lightning" is not his cup of tea, but he was
impressed, pointing to the original reci-zug and an
under-promotion.

The judge confesses that the copious "thunder and
lightning" is not his cup of tea, but he was
impressed, pointing to the original reci-zug and an
under-promotion.
A.Kopnin, V.Kirillov and A.Selivanov (Russia)

1st Hon.Mention Israel 'Ring' 1990

4/5 Win


"Bl's promotion attempt is foiled by a surprising W mating trap. The study is not flawless (bB is captured without playing, and some squares in the mating position are already guarded), but altogether enjoyable. There is evocation (Platov) of other mate-traps vs. aP promotion attempts, but I do not know of a direct anticipation."

Hillel Aloni (Israel)

2nd Hon.Mention Israel 'Ring' 1990

6/5 Win


"W forces a draw in a paradoxical way - by offering his only two pieces, to rebuild the diagram but with a small change, and then underpromotion."

Ofer Comay (Israel)

3rd Hon.Mention Israel 'Ring' 1990

4/4 Draw


"W forces a draw in a paradoxical way - by offering his only two pieces, to rebuild the diagram but with a small change, and then underpromotion."

A.Rabinovich (Israel)

1st Commendation Israel 'Ring' 1990

Win


The judge points out that conventional material gain is not on, but W engineers a domination of bR that deserved a prize had there not been an anticipation (by Hoch and Y.Aloni).
"The play is entirely forced, and the self-blocks pre-arranged, but the S-wanderings across the board are nevertheless impressive and amusing."

No 9623 H. Aloni
after T. M. Czerniak and W. Proskurowski (USA)
2nd Commendation Israel 'Ring' 1990

No 9624 Alexander Krochek (Israel)
3rd Commendation Israel 'Ring' 1990

No 9623 H. Aloni
1.b7/i Rg5/iii 2.Kc8 Rxg7 3.b8Q
7.Kd8 Kd6 8.a5/vi with:
Kg2 13.Kg5 Kxh3 14.Khx5 Kxh2 15.Kxh4 wins, or
wins, or
Kb3 16.h4 Kxb2 17.h5 Ke1 18.h6 b3 19.h7 b2
20.h8Q b1Q 21.Qc3+ Kd1 22.Qd4+ Ke2 23.Qf2+wins.
i) 1.gSQ? Rd8+ 2.Qxd8 stalemate. Or 1.g8R?
Kxh6 2.Rg6+ Ka5 3.Kc7 Rd7+wins. Or 1.Kc8?
Rc5+ 2.Kd8 Rg5 3.b7 Rxg7 4.b8Q Rd7+ 5.Kc8
Rd8+ 6.Kb7 Rd7+ 7.Kc6 (Kc7? Rc7+?) Rd6+
ii) Rd8+ 2.Kc7 Rg8+ 3.b8Q Rxg7+ 4.Kc6 Rg6+
5.Qd6 wins.
10.Kc4 Kc6 draw.
Kg2 draw.
"Just as a good P-ending ought to be - accuracy, accuracy, and again accuracy. BI’s stalemate threats constitute a bonus."

No 9624 A. Krochek I...Qd5+ 2.b3 Qa5+ 3.Kb2
Qe5+ 4.Ka2/i Qb2+ 5.Rb2 (Ka1? Ka3:) Qxg1
(Qxb3+;Rb2) 9.Rc3+ Kc3 stalemate.
The composer immigrated from the former Soviet Union. "Amusing and likeable. W cannot hold on to wRR, but manages to save himself by stalemate."

A.F. Kuryatnikov JT

This international tourney was published in the magazine 'Saratovskie vesti' and sponsored by insurance company AVE, managing director Yulia Yurievna Taller. Judges were A. Kuryatnikov and A. Khait. 83 entries from 42 composers received. The final award was published in Saratovskie vesti, 13vii94.

No 9625 V. Kovalenko (Maritime region)
1stPr A.F. Kuryatnikov JT

No 9625 V. Kovalenko 1.Bd1+ c2 2.Bxc2+ Ka3
3.Ra6 Qxa6 4.Sxa6, with:
a1Q 5.Bd6+ Ka2 6.Sb4+ Ka3 7.Sxd5+ Ka2
8.Sb4+ Ka3 9.Sd3+ Ka2 10.Be5 and bQ is lost, or
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No 9626

D.Gurgenidze (Georgia)
2ndPr A.F.Kuryakinov JT

5/4 Win

No 9626 D.Gurgenidze 1.g7+ Ke7 2.Sf5+ Kf6 3.Bxb3 Qa8+ 4.Kh7 Qh1+ 5.Sh6 Qb1+ 6.Kh8 Qg6 7.g5+ Qxg5 8.g8=Q mate.

No 9627

L.Katsnelson (St Petersburg)
3rdPr A.F.Kuryakinov JT

3/6 Win


No 9628

N.Bondar (Belarus), V.Nefedov (Russia) and R.Usmanov (Russia)
4thPr A.F.Kuryakinov JT

4/5 Win


No 9629

E.Markov (Saratov)
5thPr A.F.Kuryakinov JT

5/4 Draw

No 9629 E.Markov 1.Sc6 Sd5 2.Sxd5 Rg4+ 3.Kd7 Qxg4+ 4.e6 Qxe6 5.Qxc+ Kg7 6.Qg8+ Kxf8 7.e7+ Kg8 8.e8=Q+ Kh7 9.Qg7+ Kh8 10.Qg7+ Rxg7 stalemate.
No 9630  K.Presnyakov (Ufa)
1HM A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

4/4 Draw

No 9630  K.Presnyakov 1.Ra7 h1Q 2.Ra8+ Rf8 3.Ra7, with:
Qxf4 4.Rg7+ Kh8 5.Sf7+ Rxf7 6.Rg8+ Kxg8 stalemate, or
Rb8 4.Rg7+ Kf8 5.Se6+ Ke8 6.Sc7+ Kd8 7.Se6+ drawn

No 9631  L.Mitrofanov (St Petersburg) and
V.Samilo (Ukraine)
2HM A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

5/3 Win

Ra6 10.Sc3+ wins.

No 9632  V.Ivanov (Moscow)
3HM A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

10/7 Win

No 9632  V.Ivanov 1.g5+ Kh7 2.Sd7 Rc8 3.Ra4

No 9633  A.Grin (Moscow)
=Comm A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

3/5 Draw

No 9633  A.Grin 1.Rc7+ Kd4 2.Rb5 d2 3.Ka3
d1Q 4.Rxd5+ Kxd5 5.Rd7+ Kc4 6.Rxd1 c2

No 9633  A.Bezgodkov (Ukraine)
=Comm A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

528

No 9635 A.Malyshev (Yaroslavl region) =Comm A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

h1d2 0450.00 d8g8b3d6h4 4/5+


No 9636 D.Pikhurov (Stavropol) =Comm A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

3/5 Win


No 9637 S.Borodavin (Ukraine) =Comm. A.F.Kuryatnikov JT

Win

No 9637 S.Borodavin l.Kh5, with:

Qb7 2.Qa5+ Qa7 3.Qa5+ Qa7 4.Qc5+ Ka7 5.Qa5+ Ka7 6.Qf8+ Ka7 7.Qf8+ Ka7 8.Qf8 mate, or


SAKKÉLET 1993

Judge was László Zoltán. The provisional award was published in SAKKÉLET 7-8/94. Confirmation period to 31xii94.

No 9638 S.Shaigarovsky (Bulgaria) (iv-v.93) 1st Prize Sakk&et 1993

3/3 Win

No 9639 A. and S. Manyakhin (Russia) (iv-v.93)  
2nd Pr Sakkélet 1993

No 9639 A. and S. Manyakhin l. Bb4 Qg3+ 2. Ka4  
Kc1 3. Qc4+ Kd1 4. Qf1+ Ke2 5. Qe2+ Kb1  
nor 9. Bxc3 stalemate?

No 9640 Imre Szeles (Güdöllő, Hungary)  
(iv-v.93) Hon. Men. Sakkélet 1993

No 9640 I. Szeles l. Bc4 Qxc4 2. Sf6+ Kh8/i  
3. Qa8+ Qg8 (Bg8; Qhl+) 4. Sxg8 Bxg8 5. Kg5 (for  
Bg7 9. Bxg7+ and mate.

i) Kf7 3. Qe8+ wins. Or Bxf6 3. Qe8+ Kg7 4. Bh6+  
Kh6 5. Qf8+ Bg7 6. Qf4+ mates.


No 9641 Péter Gyarmati (Zalaegerszeg, Hungary)  
(viii-ix.93) Commendation Sakkélet 1993

No 9641 P. Gyarmati l. h6 Sb6 2. Ba5+ Sb5 3. h7  
Bd8+ (Sf8; hBQ) 4. Bxh8 Sf8 5. Bf6 Sxh7 6. Bg7  
wins.

i) And neither 2. Bd2? Sd7 3. h7 Bd8+ 4. Bg5 Sf8  
5. hBQ Sg6+, nor 2. Bg3? Bd8+ 3. Kg4 Sd7 4. Kf5  
Bf6 5. Be5 Sxe5 6. Kxf6 Sg4+, drawing in either  
case.

No 9642 Iuri Akobia (Tbilisi, Georgia) (viii-ix.93)  
Commendation Sakkélet 1993

No 9642 I. Akobia l. Sf1 Sxf1 2. Sxb2 a2 3. Bb8 b2  
and Qb1 8. Rb5+, or Qc1(Qe1) 8. Sd3+, drawing.

Even if we start with wRg3 (wRh3? clearly loses  
to 2.. b2), there is still the line 2.. b2 3. Sd1+ Kd3,  
or, here, 3. Se4+ Kd3, and Bl still promotes.

Schakend Nederland 1993  
Judge was Jan van Reek, the provisional award  
was published in Schakend Nederland 4/94.
No 9643 Oleg Pervakov (Moscow) 1st Prize Schakend Nederland 1993

1/8 Win

No 9643 O. Pervakov 1. Bc8 Rxg5+ 2. Kf4 Bg8/i
Bxc3 14. Rd8+ Bd2 15. Bc2+ (g8Q? Re3+) Ke1
16. g8Q Re3+ 17. Kg2 Re2+ 18. Kh1 wins.

i) Re5+ 3. Kg3 h4+ 4. Kh2 Bg8 5. Rh8 Rf2+ 6. Kg1
Rc2 7. Bxh6 wins.

12. Kh3 Ke2 13. Bg6+ Kxe2 14. Rd8+ Bd6 15. g8Q
Re3+, perpetual check.

iii) Ka5 7. Bd2+ Ka4 8. Ra8 (Bc4), and either Bxg7


No 9644 Emilian Dobrescu (Bucharest) 2nd Prize Schakend Nederland 1993

2/4 BTM Draw

No 9644 E. Dobrescu 1...Bc4+ 2. Ka1 Bb5 3. Re5/i
Bd7 4. Re7 Bc6 5. Re6 Bb5 6. Re5 Bb4 7. Re3
(Re47 Kbb5) Kd2 8. Re4 Bb5 9. Re5 Bc6 10. Re6
Bd7 11. Re7 drawing by repetition.

Or 1...Bb5 2. Re5 Bc4+ 3. Ka3/i Bf7 4. Re7 Bb5
Kf3 10. Kg5 g3 11. Kgx5 g2 12. Re1 draw.


No 9645 Ignace Vandecasteele (Belgium) 3rd Prize Schakend Nederland 1993

4/4 Win

No 9645 I. Vandecasteele 1. Ba4+ Kd6 2. Sg3,
with:

Bd5+ 3. Kkb6 Se6 4. Sf5 mate, or
Se6 3. Sf5+ Kd5 4. Bc6 mate, or
f6 3. Bxf6, and another bifurcation:
Se6 4. Se4+ Kd5 5. Be6 mate, or
Bd5+ 4. Kf6 Se6 5. Sf5 mate, or (not mate this

i) 3. Ka1+ Bf7 4. Re7 Bb5 5. Re5 Sf6 6. Kg5 g6
wins.

No 9646 Genrikh Kasparyan (Erevan) 4th Prize Schakend Nederland 1993

5/4 Win

No 9646 G. Kasparyan 1. e8Q Qxe8 2. Bd7 Qe7+
3. Ke4 Be2+ 4. Kh3, with:

Bd1+ 5. Kca2 Qxg7 6. c8Q+ Ka7 7. Qc7+ wins, or
Bc4+ 5. Kxc4 Qb4+ 6. Kxb5 and Qg5+ 7. Ka6 or
Qh5+ 7. Kb6 wins.
No 9647 Vitaly Kovalenko (Russia)
Hon.Mention Schakend Nederland 1993

No 9648 Julien Vandiest (Belgium)
Special Hon.Mention Schakend Nederland 1993

No 9649 A.Hadari and H.Aloni (Israel)
1st Special Mention Schakend Nederland 1993

No 9650 G.Kasparyan
2nd Special Mention Schakend Nederland 1993
Leonid (Fedorovich) TOPKO JT
This tourney, usually known as TOPKO-55 of the magazine Mistetski shakhi and Chervony girnik was judged by L.TOPKO, assisted by V.Pidlivaiolo.
The provisional award was published in the Ukrainian newspaper Chervony girnik 21vii94 and signed by L.TOPKO and V.Pidlivaiolo.
20 entries received from Ukraine, Russia and Belarus. Remarks: to have a judge (Pidlivaiolo) figure in the award he is judging has a strong post-soviet flavour!

No 9651 A.Bezgodkov and V.Samilo (Kharkov)
1stPr Topko-55

No 9651 A.Bezgodkov and V.Samilo

No 9652 V.Kovalenko (Maritime Province)
2ndPr Topko-55

No 9652 V.Kovalenko

No 9653 M.Gorbman and V.Pidlyvaylo =1-4HM Topko-55

No 9653 V.Kondratev (Gavrilov posad)
3rdPr Topko-55

No 9653 V.Kondratev

V.Syzonenko

V.Gorbunov

M.Rezvov and V.Chernous

534
No 9659 M.Rezvov and V.Chernous
1.Re1+ Kxe5/i 2.h3Q Rf2+ 3.Ka3 Rf3g 4.Qa1+ Kd2 5.Qb2+ Ke3(Kel) 6.Qe5+ Kf3 7.Qe4 mate.
i) Kd3 2.Rc3+ Kxc3 3.h8Q Ra5+ 4.Kb1 Rb5+ 5.Kc1 Rg5 6.Qe4 wins.

No 9660 S.Abramenko and V.Kolpakov

No 9661 V.Prigunov
i) Rb8 2.Bc8. Or Rd8 2.Bg5.


Though hastily, even carelessly, produced (in No.2, p17 betrays omissions of wKh5 and bKd6 - on separate diagrams), these 32-page brochures, so far all in Russian, are very welcome. The core content is original articles, each with some theme or other, and plentifully illustrated with diagrams. When an IGM-titled composer takes the trouble to select a handful of studies and to comment on them it behoves us to listen - we expect to learn something. (There is no good reason to heed the views of an IGM or any other specialist talking outside his specialisation; magazine space taken up by the text of rambling interviews with 'personalities' panders to the psychological phenomenon known as the 'halo' effect. Marlon Brando - his real name! - writes in his recent autobiography that crass interviewers have asked him questions about quantum physics and the sex life of fruit flies - and he has answered those questions!) There is a strong focus on Georgian composers and tourneys, with post-1975 Georgian awards (but the leading studies only) as space-fillers, so it is not clear if contributions from other authors are invited. We hope that this series will continue, and that the cover diagram will now and then be changed!


This is a well-constructed, highly educative, up-to-date and fact-full anthology of 363 compositions (106 are studies) by nearly one hundred Leningrad/St Petersburg composers in all orthodox-piece genres. The edition size - one thousand. If jargon harks back to soviet times, the excuse may be that most of the facts cover the same period. We learn that the city had its first individual composing championship in 1966 - for work published since 1950 - and has had an annual individual solving championship since 1976. An appendix catalogues the successes of 'local' composers in the wider competitive arena of 'All-Russian', 'All-Union', newspaper, armed forces, inner-town matches, and international contests. Diagrams are somewhat dark. There is a composer index - from which A.I.Kotov and Kubbel are omitted, and in which Fokin has most entries. A fascinating 'bridge' between old and new times is a competition (closing date 31xii95) loosely based on snooker's 'Shot of the Championship' on British television to find the best three compositions in the book: lucky winners will be awarded an honorary title and will receive prizes - but not an air-fare-and-all-expenses-paid 535
visit to the Venice of the North!
(To produce such a relatively handsome book at all in the economic chaos that prevails in Russia bears witness, we opine, to the residual influence and staying-power of the 'old guard': Pókkin and Razumenko both figure prominently in the armed forces honours list, and what is the Muscovite survivor Vladimirov doing there if not for the sway of his FIDE IGM composer title, well earned though it is?)


Having emigrated to Sweden in 1969 from his native Poland to avoid the effects of politically inspired anti-semitism, the author is now a mathematics academic in California. This book of a mere 50 pages (in fact 37 pages - 38 studies - followed by appended matter) is the briefly discursive autobiography of a polyglot study-composer. It is tinged with sadness.

Ungarische Schachproblem Anthologie, Budapest, 1983. This a German version of Új Magyar Szakképfeldvány Antológia which appeared in 1979. Although the core 516 positions are identical, other differences are significant. While the 44 mugshots in the 1979 volume are omitted, there are now 200 instead of 100 diagrams in the 100 preliminary pages, which are strong on history - as it should be from the pen of Attila Benedek.

Biographies have been updated. Some half-dozen studies are added to, and a couple dropped from, the earlier volume.

Sachové Studie by František Dedrle
František Dedrle - Král a dáma proti králí, věži a pěticí - Národní osvození 1937-38 (Brno, 1994, 26 pages each, salmon-coloured card cover, stapled, in Czech. Compiled by V.Kos and J.Kalendovský.)

Published studies by Dedrle are brought together by two fellow townsmen (Dedrle died in Brno in 1957) in the first of these booklets, and his published analyses of GBR class 1300.01 (Q vs. R+P) in the second. The list of references that ends the first omits Rinck, whose '1414' contains critiques of several of Dedrle's analyses.


There has not been a heavier book on endgame studies for over 40 years! The enviably well-read and articulate author tells us on p2 that his latest work is 'based on the results of a systematic enquiry into the elaboration of problem themes in chess endgame studies up to the year 1930', and on p25 describes the task he set himself in these words: 'to retrieve from the vast amount of chess endgame studies the specimens that are the realization of some preconceived objective'. The 'preconceived objective' is the author's study 'Type C' (for Concept - under 'A to F' he lists five other classification possibilities), and if the reader surmises from this that there is more to come from the Grondijs pen, the reader will be right: this is 'Volume A'. Among the studies dating after the cut-off date 1930 are welcome Grondijs originals.

What qualities are required of human being X if he is to succeed in unravelling the original concept in human being Y's creative act, when X has never known Y, when X has never been in contact with Y, and when Y may have been long laid to rest in a far-off country? There are over 200 Y's listed in Never Ending. Grondijs' erudition is not in dispute (he seems to acknowledge Salkind's pioneering role as regards problem themes in studies), but failure can be glorious - remember Gallipoli. To take a trivial example, on p12 we read that in writing Test Tube Chess (TTC) I tried to describe 'all possible aspects of the world of endgame studies'. Harrie did not consult me over this: it would be truer to say that each of the 12 chapters of TTC was directed at a person with a significantly distinct type of interest - so that, in total, the content would be sufficient to introduce the subject. A fair test is to ask which chapter of TTC covers Harrie's motivation. The answer is clearly Chapter 9: Connoisseur or Critic. In the reviewer's limited personal experience, 'concept-first' composition is a non-starter: true, the sudden thought 'since this is possible, why not that?' is common enough, as is 'my goodness, what a move!', but the rest is hard slog taking advantage of whatever goodies turn up along the way - the more protracted the way the greater the probability of the mediocre composer coming across some worthwhile enhancement or even enhancements. Such experience lends Harrie's exploration an exotic, even irrelevant, flavour.

This is not to say that there cannot be enjoyment in the exotic. Although the author has written and published Never Ending for his own pleasure (it seems not to be part of the STES series) the book may well appeal to anyone who enjoys reading about endgame studies. Especially if the style of writing resembles, if only at times, a tropical rainstorm: each word a plump raindrop, each
paragraph holding an idea, and each idea a flash of lightning - with paragraphs tending towards shortness. The late Leopold Mitrofanov told me more than once how much he enjoyed swimming in stormy weather. To be fair to the author he has reined in some of the ebullience he exhibited in *Works of Simkhovich*, but enough is left to leave authorship in no doubt!

Are there other categories of reader? The chapters include intriguing diagrammatic illustrations in unexpected places, they abound with problem jargon (some of it, such as 'antimetocritical', must be new) that may deter, and they are not short on indefatigable thematic content analysis to challenge the toughest digestive tract - it frequently defeated this reviewer. Perhaps the book will be welcomed by study enthusiasts with a curiosity about problems, but against that is the fact that the book is not for beginners. There may well be a class of general reader attracted by having so much work done for him - Harrie Grondijs has sifted the world's studies for problem themes, and here presents them to us in hundreds, in a more or less organised fashion, and discursively.

A grand bonus is the incorporation, in English translation, of eight essays taken from the writings of Salkind (no fewer than 39 of his compositions here), Levman, Lamare and Herbstman. There are also illuminating excerpts from Kockelkorn, Koldijk, Kubbel and others. (One hopes no copyright has been infringed.)

Type is beautifully distinct. Diagrams are mostly clear. Jargon aside, language is in generally excellent English - at least '8 out of 10'. Three faults might have been remedied: the over 800 diagrams are not only unnumbered but the author retains diagram references that relate solely to his personal collection; the use of the GBR code (not always correctly applied) is consistent - except for the folly of omitting a GBR-sequenced retrieval directory; sources where known to the author are always supplied, but over-reliance on the van der Heijden database leads to the occasional contamination such as "Blathy" and "J.Reiners" for Blathy and J.Rayner. However, the author has to be congratulated on finding such a creative use for that rich database, and the final verdict on *Never Ending* must be deferred awhile.

AJR

---

FIDE JUDGE TITLE-HOLDERS (studies)

The year given is the year of the award by the FIDE PCCC.

Y.Afek (1988, Israel)
H.Aloni (1978, Israel)
Yu.Averbakh (1956, Russia)
M.Botvinnik (1956, Russia)
D.Bronstein (1961, Russia)
A.Gulyaev/Grin (1956, Russia)
D.Gurgenidze (1994, Georgia)
A.Hildebrand (1956, Sweden)
P.Joita (1989, Romania)
V.Kalandadze (1993, Georgia)
G.Kasparyan (1956, Armenia)
A.Kazantsev (1956, Russia)
A.Koranyi (1984, Hungary)
W.Korn (1964, U.S.A.)
V.Kos (1991, Czech Republic)
An.Kuznetsov (1965, Russia)
L.Lindner (1956, Hungary)
A.Maksimovskikh (1987, Russia)
W.J.G.Meess (1959, Holland)
V.Neidze (1980, Georgia)
V.Nestorescu (1958, Romania)
P.Perkosova (1972, Finland)
A.J.Roycroft (1959, U.K.)
J.Rusinek (1983, Poland)
V.Smyslov (1957, Russia)
J.Sulc (1960, Czech Republic)
W.Unzicker (1958, Germany)
J.van Reek (1989, Holland)
R.Voia (1958, Romania).

The above lists current (ie surviving) holders of the FIDE title of International Judge for Chess Compositions, where the competence includes studies. The title is awarded for life. It should be noted that the title does not ipso facto distinguish the genres of competence. This is intentional, to simplify the subsequent addition of a genre. To determine the studies competence one needs further data, most readily accessible in PROBLEM CHESS LISTS. This is a unique, and uniquely useful, assembly of facts regarding the FIDE PCCC and its activities. The names, not only of titleholders, but of every composer represented in the set of FIDE Albums, together with his current total of points, is in the 38-page booklet (1993 update). The compiler is Hannu Harkola (Ampujantie 18, 00700 Helsinki, Finland) who can supply the booklet for a small charge (say £5, postage included). Hannu has attended 23 PCCC meetings and in 1994 at Belfort was elected a PCCC Vice-President. A few composers

---

**REGULATIONS**

1.p391 col.1 for 'R.W.B.Clarke' read 'M.R.B.Clarke'
2.p393 col.1 for '05a3b8d1a2a5' read '05b8c3d1a2a5'
are shown as having earned '0' (ie, 'null points'), the reason for this being that editors (not judges) have occasionally included in an 'annexe' compositions that were not submitted for the relevant selection tourney.

Kalandadze (Bratislava, 1993) and Gurgenidze (Belfort, 1994) are the sole additions to the names in the 1993 PROBLEM CHESS LISTS, while it should be noted that: I.Grosu (1978, Romania) died in 1990; and A.Werle (1956, Sweden) died in 1994. There has been no change in recent years in the Album points requirements for FIDE composition titles:

Grandmaster 70 points
International Master 25 points
FIDE Master 12 points

The Russian Far East
The most active chess composition publicist in the Russian Far East is the columnist of Magadan Pravda, Vladimir Vladimirovich Kozhakin. He produces an irregularly appearing sheet named Kudesnik, with diagrams, news and awards. The latest, dated 10x94, gives the award (by An.Kuznetsov, Moscow) in the 4th Open Studies Championship of the Far East. The years covered were 1990-1994. It was an individual event, for published studies. 18 composers participated with 84 studies. Both V.Kovalenko and A.Skripnik totalled 28 points, but First Place (and presumably the title) went to the former. One point behind, on equal 3rd-4th Places, were N.Ryabinin and S.Tkachenko.

The principle content of another issue of Kudesnik bearing the same month and year is the provisional Dolgov-70 JT award, judged by the celebrant. Naturally, this award is being prepared for EG's pages. The same issue announces the 5th Open Championship of the Far East, covering the years 1992-1993, to participate in which five published studies (or 2-ers or 3-ers) should be sent (complete with source and full solution, in 2 copies) by 30.11.95 to:
Magadan Pravda - CHESS ul. Prolitarskaya 11
MAGADAN 685000
RUSSIA - Far East

It is not stated off there are prizes.
The same address will accept (closing date: 1005) originals (same 3 genres) for the newspaper's Third International Tourney (again, 2 copies).

Further, Mr Kozhakin has a range of over a dozen offerings (subscription to Kudesnik, compilations, awards, caricatures) for sale for US dollars payable, for example, via the Clearing House Interbank Payment System. For full details write direct to:

V.V.Kozhakin
Post Office ab. yaschik O/28
MAGADAN 685000
RUSSIA - Far East

== International Tournament announcement (informal) ==

Original studies to celebrate the 90th birthday (on 25vi94) of Luis PARENTI, who is still composing studies, are requested for publication in Ajedrez de Estilo. Together with the late Jose Mugnos, from about 1940 Parenti pioneered the development of studies in Argentina. Closing date 31ii95. Maximum 2 entries per composer. Four prizes in US$ (or equivalent in books) will be awarded. Judges: O.J.Carlsson, A.Foguelman and Z.R.Caputo. Address:

Ing.Oscar J.Carlsson,
Av.Santa Fé 3069 4to. "B",
1425 BUENOS AIRES
Argentina

Entries will be 'thoroughly selected'. Any composition unsolicited after a year automatically reverts to the composer (this does not imply that such compositions will be physically returned). Send to:

Virgil Nestorescu ["GAMBIT"]
Bd. Al. Obregia 24, ap. 6,
75579 BUCURESTI 82
ROMANIA

== EG Subscription ==

EG is produced by the Dutch Association for Endgame Study ('Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor SchaakEindspelstudie') ARVES. Subscription to EG is not tied to membership of ARVES. The annual subscription of EG is NLG 35 (Dutch guilders), free of bank charges, or alternatively NLG 55.

Bank account: Postbank 54095, in the name of ARVES, Laren (NH), The Netherlands.

Payment by Eurocheque is preferable, but please fill in your number and mention EG! The intention is to produce 4 issues per year. If organizational problems make the production of 4 issues in one year impossible, the subscription fees are considered as payment for 4 issues.