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the first prize winner of the Hastings Centenary Tourney was also successful in the Moravskoslezský šach tourney of 1995-6. The diagrams and solutions of this tourney can be found starting from page 181.
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CALLING ALL COMPOSERS!

Reader, your magazine, already unique in the history of the endgame study, is about to take the leap into full maturity. We hope the 'move' will meet with an approbatory '!!', even if also with the annotation 'and about time too'. Since the year 1965, originals in fair numbers have appeared in our, no, your pages, and there have been six jubilee and one memorial tourneys (though none since 1984). But EG has never yet initiated a section for originals. Those originals which EG has been pleased and proud to publish have mostly been the gifts of prolific composer friends of the magazine such as Mike Bent, the late Ernest Pogosyants, and Julien Vandiest. Well, starting with EG/27 next January, EG will have a regular section for originals, with its own, independent editor. The search for the right incumbent was protracted. More than one front-rank established player grandmaster was approached, but for one reason or another negotiations failed to bear fruit. Then, in the latter half of 1996 the picture was transformed - overnight. The problem, if that is what it was, solved itself - at least in the mind of your principal editor. A young Israeli-American professor of mathematics of Harvard University, on his first appearance at a FIDE PCCC congress, took the World Individual Solving Championship title, against opposition from the world’s established top solvers. [Evseev and Nunn were absent.] This spectacular achievement in Tel-Aviv was to his own and everyone else’s astonishment. Noam is naturally already a familiar name. Both his originality as a composer and his vital contributions to Lewis Stiller’s mind-bending pioneer computer investigations into pawnless 6-man endings have already found recognition in EG’s pages. We are delighted and proud that Noam Elkies has, after careful consideration, accepted our invitation to become EG’s first studies editor. The post is, like all the others, unpaid, and no payment will be made for studies published. But a complimentary copy of the relevant issue (the one printing the diagram of the composer’s submission) will be sent by the ARVES treasurer.

EG has always welcomed fresh faces, fresh ideas, and extensions to its proclaimed cosmopolitanism. English in origin, EG now has the indispensable rock-solid support of the Dutch ARVES connection, the high quality German expertise running Spotlight, and the enthusiastic French editorship of a correspondence and opinions section. Now EG’s breadth is widened once more. ... The fact that EG was already one year old when Noam Elkies was born is an incidental fact that nevertheless emphasises both EG’s established status among cognoscenti, and the ever renaissance life of the endgame study itself. The new appointment is paralleled by an even more remarkable appointment elsewhere: Andrei Selivanov - composer, elected representative to the Russian parliament (where he is deputy chairman of the committee for women, family and youth affairs), and chess magazine editor - was recently elected President of the Russian Chess Federation. And Andrei Selivanov is one year younger than Noam Elkies. With FSU ('former Soviet Union') composers continuing to ooze talent and creativity but finding themselves relatively starved of outlets, we trust that the response from the 'East' to the news of EG’s latest appointee will be genuinely significant to the advantage of all - and we hope that the two sparkling ‘leaders’ will find opportunities for mutual cooperation.

What ideas will Noam Elkies bring to EG? He will have independence and space to express and develop in any...
The sole condition attaching to the post of originals editor is that top quality is paramount. In pursuit of the ideal of highest quality a responsibility lies on contributing composers. Studies submitted direct to Noam for consideration for publication should be already tested for soundness (and supplied with adequate supporting analysis) and checked for originality (by the best means available to the composer). Such precautions are no more than common sense and good etiquette. However, EG's studies editor will not take them for granted. In the quest for quality Noam will receive valuable aid from Harold van der Heijden, ARVES editor of EG's Dutch language counterpart EBUR. We are delighted that Harold has accepted the two-fold, indeed double-edged, responsibility of vetting the submissions for anticipations, and testing them for soundness. The computer will flex its muscles in both fields: the identification of whole or partial anticipations will be by use of Harold's steadily incrementing database of published studies - now 49,500 strong - and we are confident that the scope in Harold's system for identifying features which often correspond to 'themes' will steadily develop; and testing for soundness will be invoked by powerful contemporary chessplaying PC software.

If composers choose e-mail then it is recommended that positions be represented by the unambiguous, international and concise 'extended GBR code', defined many times in EG's end-pages. The ')' and ']' system for laying out serially numbered annotations to a solution - in order to eliminate nested parentheses - is also recommended. A schematic diagram of the initial position should always be included, for example:

```
__K-----
--Psk-P--
PP------
__b-----
--s-----
```

- for Rusinek's 1971 classic serial underpromotion study to draw, first prize-winner in the New Statesman tourney of that year.

Second preference. If e-mail is impractical, the postal address is:

Noam D ELKIES (for "EG")
Dept of Mathematics,
SCIENCE CENTER
CAMBRIDGE
Mass 02138
U.S.A.

We have every confidence that you, EG's readers, can look forward to many exciting studies that will be original, not just to EG's pages, but to the world.

---

**Instructions to composers**

A submission to the studies editor should carry the prominent indicator "EG ORIGINAL FOR PUBLICATION" on the diagram.

Preferred medium: electronic mail. Address:

elkies@math.harvard.edu

If composers choose e-mail then it is recommended that positions be represented by the unambiguous, international and concise 'extended GBR code', defined many times in EG's end-pages. The ']' and ']' system for laying out serially numbered annotations to a solution - in order to eliminate nested parentheses - is also recommended. A schematic diagram of the initial position should always be included, for example:

```
- - K - - - -
- - P s k - P -
P P - - - - -
- - b - - - -
- - s - - - -
- - - - - - -
```

- for Rusinek's 1971 classic serial underpromotion study to draw, first prize-winner in the New Statesman tourney of that year.

Second preference. If e-mail is impractical, the postal address is:

Noam D ELKIES (for "EG")
Dept of Mathematics,
SCIENCE CENTER
CAMBRIDGE
Mass 02138
U.S.A.
Noam strongly prefers non-electronic mail submissions to be sent to him on paper. (This is because the UNIX-based college system lacks a facility for convenient handling of the 3½" diskettes that are compatible with most personal computers (PCs)). Contributors are asked kindly to note that articles, with or without originals, should continue to be submitted direct to AJR.

40th FIDE PCCC Meeting held at Pula (Croatia) from 6th-13th September 1997

Although in practice principally a male 'festival' this happy event, at times almost a jamboree (with sun, swimming, outings, birthday celebrations, sideshows, much hugging and mutual congratulation, plus a concluding banquet) was enjoyed by wives and children as much as, if not more than, by the official delegates from nearly 30 countries, by the solvers at 'Open' and World Solving Chess Championship ('WCSC' - both team and individual) levels, and by the other indispensable and warmly appreciated organisers, assistants and participants.

Decisions affecting studies were four:

1. On the recommendation of the studies subcommittee no further action would be taken regarding the private initiative of a self-styled 'World Championship for Studies' announced and organised from Holland. [See EG121 p880.] If the award, which is expected to be promulgated soon, makes no mention of a 'world championship', then no further action by the PCCC will be called for.

2. The studies subcommittee worked hard on the newly published latest FIDE Album (it was on sale at Pula) to select a 'study of the year' for each of the three Album years 1989, 1990 and 1991. These studies are selected for their good publicity value so as to attract new enthusiasts and ought never to be described as 'best' - to do so is so misleading and, to speak plainly, downright untrue. The three new studies of the year will be circulated via a sheet annexed to the official PCCC minutes to be distributed to all delegates, who will be requested (by a special PCCC minute) to photocopy the sheet to as many newspaper and magazine chess columnists in their respective countries as possible.

3. Against the advice of an articulate minority, the full PCCC commission voted to institute an individual world championship for each major genre of chess composition - including studies. This reversed the decision of a previous PCCC meeting and was indeed a volte face with respect to discussions of the same topic over a number of years. A key justification for the present decision in the minds of delegates appeared to be the verbal promise made to PCCC President Bedrich Formanek of support for chess composition by Mr Kirsan Ilyumzhinov, the new President of FIDE, on the condition that a world championship (of some kind) would be inaugurated by the PCCC, so that compositional chess would no longer appear to the outside world as something apart from main stream chess. (In main stream chess there are many world championship titles.) The PCCC took its decision by a simple majority vote, not a two-thirds vote, on the basis that the championship would not be a 'title'. (Had it been a title then, according to the PCCC's statutes, a two-thirds vote in favour would have been required. However, avoidance of the word 'title' will require contorted circum-
locations by drafters of text.) The PCCC then approved (again by vote) the method of identifying the aforesaid champions: this will not be by any new competition but by totalling of straight Album points (rather than by judges' points) in the appropriate section. At least one dissenting voice deemed this undesirable because retrospective, with Album judges, now that they know that a world championship will result from their work, in future awarding Album points in a different manner. However, the chosen system can be changed - or even abandoned - by a vote at a subsequent meeting of the PCCC. [Readers' reactions to this pair of unprecedented and revolutionary decisions affecting compositional chess are invited for submission to EG's correspondence section.]

4. After many years and much work by relays of volunteers the full text of a Codex for chess composition was finally approved. It will be distributed in the English language to all delegates with the request to translate and distribute in their own countries. Of a non-decision nature, but perhaps of interest to EG's readers, was the suggestion (not in the adopted Codex) that a composition that has an identical solution whether considered as a moremover or as a study, ought to be treated as a moremover, and not as a study.

The 41st PCCC meeting will be held in St Petersburg, Russia, from 25vii-lviii98. Whoever is interested in attending (even if only as an interested observer) should write to:

Yakov VLADIMIROV
Petrozavodskaya 17, korpus 2, kvartira 157,
125502 MOSCOW A-502
Russia

At the St Petersburg meeting your editor is determined to initiate a proper discussion of the proper status of studies which have been extracted (rather than 'composed' in the classic manner) from 5-man (soon, no doubt, 6-man) 'oracle' databases. This is, and is likely to remain, a genuinely thorny topic: once more, readers, please don your most powerful thinking caps and present your cogent arguments for a specific resolution to EG's correspondence section.

AJR
14ix97

† Walter KORN 22v1908-20vii1997

Born in Prague, Walter Korn came to England before WW II, wisely joining the Jewish exodus from the Continent before it was too late. Primarily a player he nevertheless had a penchant for studies and some skill in their construction. His first prize in Bohemia (1932) is probably his best known study. He contributed to English newspapers, to Chess, and to the British Chess Magazine before moving on to the U.S.A. some time in the 1940's. Apart from the occasional sortie to Europe, there he remained, writing from time to time on a variety of topics, including in the correspondence columns, in American and other chess magazines - and producing the occasional book. In American Chess Art, re-issued in 1995, his sole title to concentrate on studies, Korn seemed unaware that a fad for florid phrasing not only obscures the meaning but tends to lose the audience. This weakness did not affect his writing on other topics. Since 1964 he held the FIDE judge's title (awarded to him for studies) and, either alone or jointly with others, judged tourneys, including New Statesman and FIDE Album selection events. He was responsible for the chess
entry in at least one edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica. It must have been poignant for him to revisit Prague following the collapse of the 'evil Empire', and, sadly, our invitation to him to reminisce in EG's pages about Réti, Mandler, Dawson, Lommer and other composers he had known was politely declined early in 1996 - he said he preferred to write pieces that aimed to popularise studies. A specialist in housing and health welfare, his last address was in San Mateo, California.

† TAMKOV, Lev Nikolaevich (Belarus)
2viii1937-31iii1997

Born in the Krapivensky district of Moscow region, Tamkov lived until 1960 in Zhlobin (Gomel region), and subsequently in the town of Gomel itself. His classmate E. Dvizov introduced him to chess composition in 1972. His first published study appeared in the Polish Szachy in 1973. (Cf. EGJ9.2268). In all he published about 50 studies and twice as many problems. He specialised in miniatures and malyutkas with themes of ideal mate and minor promotion. His studies were honoured by: first prizes - 1; second prizes - 5; others - about 10. He did well in Belarus championships, taking these places in the studies section: 1972-76 (II) - 2; 1977-80 (III) - 3; 1988-92 (VI) - 3. He played his part successfully with the Belarus composers who participated in the XI (1981-83) and XIV (1991-92) USSR team championships. Tamkov was an architect with many achievements and posts in Belarus to his name. In one of these he was from 1984 responsible for architectural matters in the oblast executive committee ('oblispolkom'), the seat of real power in the region. The last post he held was that of Chief Architect of Gomel region. The obituary in Gomelskaya pravda of 3iv97 bears 21 signatures.

(With acknowledgement and thanks to Evgeny Dvizov of Zhlobin.)

SPOTLIGHT

editor: Jürgen Fleck

Frequently studies "from the past" are cooked, and I intend to review these from time to time. In order to reduce the bulk of material I will confine myself to studies that a) were published in EG and b) are of special interest. Admittedly the latter is a rather vague criterion, but I am quite confident that the studies below fall under that category.

2.46, V. Bron, New Statesman 1964-65, 1st-2nd Prize. No solution: there are faults in the introductory play, but, worse, the finale is unsound: 1.... Kf2 8.Bxh1 Sg2 draw (Karel Husak and Emil Vlasak, Czech Republic, in EBUR 1997).


3.49.1747, J. Rusinek, Szachy 1971, 1st-2nd Prize. A dual: 2.Bxg5+ Kxg5 3.d8Q+ with a simple, though long winding, win: 3.... Qxd8 4.Qxd8+ Rf6 5.h4+ Kf6 6.Qg8+ Kh6 (6.... Kf5 7.Qg5+ and 8.Qb5) 7.Qg5+ Kh7 8.Qxh5+ Kg8 9.Qe5+ Kf7 (9.... Kh7 10.Qxf6 b1Q+ 11.Qf1) 10.Qd5+ Kg6 (10.... Re6 11.Qb7+ Re7 12.Qb3+ and 13.Kf1) 11.Qe4+ and White wins. There are two corrections, but unfortunately both are unsound, too: wPh2->h3, wBf6->h8,
bKg4->h4 (Studium Szachowe w Polsce 1983), which is cooked by I.g3+ Kxh3 2.Qf5+ g4 3.Qxh5+ Kg3 4.Be5+ Kf3 5.Qf5+ Ke2 6.Qd4+ Kf3 7.Qd5+ Ke2 8.Kg2, and wPh2->h3, wBf6->h8, bKg4->h4, add bSh2, remove wPc2 (source ?? 1988, with A.Ivanov), no solution after l.Be5 e2+ 2.Kh2 Qg1+ 3.Kxg1 b1Q+ 4.Kh2 Qh1+ 5.Kxh1 e1Q+ 6.Qf1 Qxf1+ 7.Kh2 Qxg2+ 8.Kxg2 Ra2+ and 9.... Rd2 (Dirk Augustin in “32er” 1996). It seems to me that the most natural way to amend this study is to add a bPf6 to the original position.


35.1997, Y.Bazlov, Nakhodinsky Rabochny 1972, 1st Prize. No win: 7.... Sf2 (I don't know who spotted this first).

36.2084, N.Kralin, Revista de Sah 1972, 1st Prize. There must be something wrong with the diagram, as there is obviously no solution after 1.... Rh6. Shakhmaty v SSSR xi1974 gave a slightly different position (wBe4-> d5, remove bPa3), but this is spectacularly cooked by 5.... Rh6 6.Bg8 Rd6+ 7.Kxa7 Be3 8.Ka8 Bd4 9.Bg7+ 10.Kxb8 Bxe5+ 11.Qxe5 stalemate (Andrey Khatchaturin in Shakhmaty v SSSR v1975).

42.2439, J.Rusinek, Ceskoslovensky Sach 1972, 1st HM. No solution: 3.... Kg7 4.Bg7 Be6 draw.

48.2986, J.Rusinek, Szachy 1975, 1st Prize (for some reason a bPf4 has been added afterwards). A simple dual: 7.Sd4+ Ke5 8.Bf3 Sxf3+ 9.Sxf3 h1Q+ 10.Kf2 (intending Kg8-d8-d4 or Rg8-p4-d4) h5 11.Rg2 followed by Rg2-h2-h4-d4 with a fortress.


with a "book win". It seems that the study can by saved by moving wSf4->c7.

87.6346, A.Zlatanov/V.Dolgov,


89.6549, V.Balanovsky, Shakhmaty v SSSR 1985, 14th Thematic Tournay, 3rd Prize. No solution: 2.... Kg6 3.Ka6 c5 4-bxc5 (4.b5 c4 draw, this line wins for White after 2.... Kh4, as Black would finally be mated by 14.Qg4 after mutual pawn promotion) Kh5 5.c6 Kh4 6.c4+ Kh5 7.8Q stalemate. This cook was mentioned in Schach-Report xii1996, but the magazine failed to name the attentive reader.


106(2).8633, J.Rusinek, Schach 1987-88, 1st Prize. No solution: 4.... Sb4+ 5.Kd2 Rh3 6.Sxg7 (6.Bxg7+ Kg8 7.Sf4 Rh2+ 8.Kc3 Kxg7 9.Kxb4 Rh4) Rh2+ 7.Kc3 Sc2 wins for Black. This cook is is hard to get rid of, as Black can return to this line at almost any time during the solution (e.g. 8.... Se5 9.Sf4 Sc6).

EG 102(1)
No 8153, E.Dobrescu. Harold van der Heijden points out that this is almost identical to 124.10624 (V.Balanovsky), but has a completely different solution! Anyway, it is unsound, too: Black draws by 1.... Sxh5 2.f7 Rh3+ 3.Kd2 Rh2+ 4.Kc1 Sc4 5.Kf1 Rh1+ 6.Kg2 Rh2+ 7.Kf1 Sc2 5.Rf1 Bxf1 draw. EG 110

EG 122
No 10400, V.Kalyagin/L.Mitrofanov. Also published as an original in Sakkelet 1989 (#1859) with wBb1 instead of h7.

EG 123
No 10514,

EG 124
In the following some remarks by Luis Miguel Gonzales (Spain), Marco Campioli (Italy) and Harold van der Heijden are worked in. As mentioned before in EG 124: all studies are now screened by a computer.
No 10548, P.Joita. No solution: 2... Sd4 3.Kg2 (3.Bh4 Sf5) Sg3 wins for Black (L.M.Gonzales).


No 10739 J. Vandiest (correction)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
g2\text{a}4 00\text{c}0 021\\
3/3 \text{Draw}
\end{array}
\]


No 10599, V.Prigrunov. This study was eliminated for being anticipated by 77.5238 (which is anticipated itself by Yakimtchik). The following studies were upgraded: No 10601 slipped into the prize ranks and No 10604 (the author’s name is not Rawican but Raican) became an honourable mention.

No 10616, L.Mitrofanov. Note i) is faulty. The correct answer to 1.b6 is 1... Bd4+ 2.Kf7 Ke5 draw, but not 1... Ke6 2.b6 a6 3.a6 and White wins (L.M.Gonzales).


p.90, T1, A.Troitzky. Harold van der Heijden points out, that the dual 6.Bg6+ and the correction (add b7Ph7) were already published by Cheron (#1567 in his tomes).

No 10644, P.Benko. According to Senor Gonzales this is anticipated by B.Raemdonck, Volksgazet 1950. Raemdonck’s initial position arises after 3 moves (mirrored), but with the white king on d4 instead of d6. His solution is a little shorter, but 1.Ke5 is a superb key.

p.104, A.Seletsky. Harold van der Heijden contributes some information concerning Seletsky’s output: “In my database are (only) 12 studies by this composer (among which 3 1st prize winners). His fantastic smothered-mate study is a classic.”.

p.104, J.Sulc. ‘since 1948 ... no ... connection of J.Sulc with studies has been traced’. Harold van der Heijden comments on this: „In fact 21 of his studies of the total of 85 in my database have been published after 1948 (mainly in Ceskoslovensky Sach), the last one known (by me) in 1960.”.

EG 125


No 10662, G.Costeff. I tried to find a win for White after 2.Ra1 a6 3.Ra1 d5 4.e6 d4 5.e7 d3 6.Sf7 d2 7.Rxd2 Sf3, but in vain: 8.Rf2 g1Q 9.Qe2 Qg3 10.Qd1+ Sg1 11.Qd5+ Sf3 (not the
flaishy 11.... Qf3+ 12.Rxf3 Sxf3 13.Qg8 Sg5; when 14.Kf7 wins by one tempo
12.Rxf3 Qxf3+ 13.Qg8 Sg5; when 14.Ke7 wins by one tempo)

No 10663, A.Manvelyan. No solution:
4... c4 (for... Rxh5) 5.Rf8+ Rxh8 6.Kxf8 e5 wins for Black.

No 10664, D.Gurgenidze. A dual:
2.Sbd5, and now 2.... Rc8 3.Sd3 Rc4+
4.Ke5 Rxa2 (4.... Rc2 5.Kc3+ Rxc3
or 2.... Re8+ 3.Kd4 Rd8 4.Sd3 Rxa2

No 10666, V.Pankov. Two essential supporting lines are missing: Why does Black walk into a fork by playing 11....
Be5? Because he intends to parry White's main threat 12.Sf5 by 12.... g4 13.Sg7 g3
14.h8Q g2 draw (this variation also motivates the play in the line 1.... g5).
And why does Black give ground in the 9th move instead of playing 9....
Kc6+c4? Because this allows 10.Sf7 g4

No 10671, J.Vandiest. A dual: 8.Qa5+
Kd4 (8.... Kb2 9.Qb4+ Kc1 10.Qe5+
mates) 9.Qa7+ Kc3 10.Qg7+ d4 11.Qc7+

No 10672, B.Sidorov. This is obviously an attempt at correcting 121.10300,
which had two solutions; so it is most surprising that both solutions still work:
3.Kg6, and now 3.... Ba5 4.Rh1 Be3
5.Rb1 Ba5 6.Rb8+ Bd8 7.Bxd3 Ke7
8.Bb5+ Kxd6 9.Rxd8+ wins; 3.... Bb6
4.Rb1 Ba7 5.Ra1 Bb6 6.Ra8+ wins; 3....
Bh4 4.d7+ Ke7 5.dQ+ Kxd8 6.Kf7 and
7.Rc8 mate; 3.... d2 4.Rh1 Be7 5.Rh8+

No 10673, Y.Solovyov. No solution; 2....
Kxc7 3.Sce6+ Kc6 4.Sxf8 g1O+ 5.Kb2
Qg2+ draws: 6.Kb3 Qg8+ and White must repeat moves, 6.Ka3 Qc2 7.d8Q
(7.Rd6+ Ke5) Qc3+ with perpetual check, while after other moves Black plays 6....
c2 and is even better.

No 10674, A.Botokanov. In the second
(more) line White has a different winning method: 5.Rb3 Bc4 6.Kc2 Bd5
7 Ra3+ Ba2 8.Kc3 and wins.

No 10684, V.Katsnelson. Undescribed. According to Marco Cambioli 2.Rf7+ Ke6
3.Rxg7 leads to a draw. However, more
accurate is 2.Rxg7 Bxg7 3.Rxg7 with a positional draw: Black is tied down to the
defence of his pawns and can only make progress by giving up his e-pawn, but
neither the immediate 3.... c2+ 4.Kf2 (not
Ra3+ (there is nothing else) 6.Kf2 Rd3+
7.Kg2 (not 7.Ke1 Rh3) nor 3.... Ke5
give any winning chances.

No 10689, V.Kailagin. No solution: 5....
Qd5+ 6.Kf4 Qd4 mates quickly: 7.dQ
Bc2+ 8.Kg5 Qd5+; or 7.Rf8 Bc2+ 8.Kg5
Qg7+ 9.Kf4 Qf3+ 10.Kh3 Kh3; or 7.Rg8
Bc2+ 8.Kg5 Kh3.

No 10693, L.Topko. Undescribed, instead of
11.Kc7 every other legal move draws,
too: 11.c5 Rb6 (11.... Bb7 12.a5) 12.a5
Ra6 13.Kc7 Bxa5(c5)+ 14.Kb7 draw;
11.Kd7 Rb7+ (11.... Rb5 12.a5) 12.Kb5
Rb6 13.Kc7 Be5 14.a5 Rb7 15.a6 draw;
or even 11.Sxh4 Rxh4 12.c5, though this is
the least reliable choice.

No 10696, A.S.Volchok. More or less
anticipated by 60.4016 (V.Krotov).

No 10697, G.Amiryan. Anticipated by
M Shapiro, Rheinische Volkswacht 1920
(cf. "1234", Cheron, Averbakh etc.).

No 10698, L.Topko. Undescribed, there are
some dual wins: 3.Ra7 Rh5 4.Rg7 Rh8
5.Rg2+ Kh4 6.Rg3+ Kh5 7.Sg2+ Kh5
8.Rh3+ wins; or 1.Kf1 c5 (1.... Rb2 is
similar) 2.Ra3 Rd1+ 3.Kf2 Rc2+ 4.Kg3
Re1 5.Sh2 followed by Sf3.

No 10700, B.Atanasov. It seems to me,
that the given solution not only fails to
reflect the study's real content, but also
gives a wrong key. Here is an attempt to
improve:
Black wants to play ... c4. 1.Bd3? does not prevent this; so White moves his king. 1.Kh7? intends 1... c4? 2.bxc4 a4 3.c5 a3 4.Bd5 Kxc2 5.e6 b3 6.e7 a2 7.Qe8+ Kxb2 8.Qh8+, but fails to 1... Ke3, when compared to the actual solution the king is too far away. 1.Kg7? needlessly calls for trouble on the long diagonal: 1... c4? 2.bxc4 a4 3.e5 a3 4.Bd5 Kxc2 5.e7 a2 6.Qe8+ Kb3 7.c4 Ke3, and the coming discovered check wins a crucial tempo to round up the c-pawn after both 8.c5 Ke4+ draw and 8.Bg6 Kb4+ 9.Qg8 Qd4 draw. The key steers clear of these difficulties.


No 10717, G.Kasparyan. “This looks very much like a study in Schach iii1994, #13116 (bBd1->g4, bSh3->h1). But the solution was completely different: 1.b6 Sg3 2.Se1 Sf1+ 3.Kh1 Bc8 4.b7 Bxb7+ 5.Sg2+ K- stalemate. Unfortunately, the study had a second solution: 1.Se5 etc.” (Harold van der Heijden).


No 10733, V.Klyukin. A dual win: 2.Rd6 and Black has no defence: 2... Qb7 3.Rxh6+ Kg8 4.Sf6+; or 2... Rxe8 3.Rxh6+ Kg8 4.Rg6+; or 2... Qa1+3.Rd1 Ra6 4.e3.

No 10734, V.Zhuk/V.Tupik. Unsound. 4.Rh6 Rxh6 5.Bd5+ is a dual win. Moreover there is no win after 3... Kxe6 4.Bd5+ Kxd5 5.a8Q+ Ke5, eg. 6.Qa3+ Kc6 (6... Kc4 is playable, too) 7.Qa4+ Kb7 8.Kxg5 Be3+ 9.Kf6 Rh6+ 10.Kg7 Rc6 draw.

No 10735, V.Zhuk. Unsound, there are many alternative wins. Particularly simple are 9.Bb6+ with a winning attack (9...
Ka6 10.Bc5 Ka5 11.Rb2; or 9... Kb8 10.Rf4 and 3.g3 (or 3.Sb5+ Ka6 4.Sc3 Ka7 5.g3) with a win on material.

No 10736, V.Zhuk. No solution: simply 1... Kd6. Senor Gonzales presumes that a wPd5 is missing, but even then 1... Kd6 2.Sxd4 exd4 3.a6 Sb3 (not 3... Ke7 4.d6+ 4.Bb7 Sd2+ 5.Kc2 Sc4 6.a7 Sb6 7.Kd3 Ke5 8.a8Q Sxa8 9.Bxa8 Kd6 leads to a draw.

No 10737, V.Zhuk. No solution: 7... Kxd7 8.Bc6+ Kxc6 9.a8Q+ Kd7 draw. Earlier Black has 4... Rh8 draw or 4... Bb6 followed by ... Rd7+/h3+ and ... Bxa8 draw.

p.152, B8, A.Baburin. Those who have studied Dvoretsky's "Secrets of Chess Training" (in particular the game Makarychev - Lerner) will feel a strong desire to play 3.Kf5 Re3 4.Kf4 Rc3 5.Ke5 c5 6.Ra4 (Baburin reaches this position via 2.Rb3) b5 7.exb5 Kb6 8.Ra1 Kxb5 9.Rb1+ Ke4 (9... Ke6 10.Kc4 draw) 10.Kb6 Rd3+ 11.Kc6 Kd4 12.Kb5 c4 13.Kb4 c3 14.Kb3 Rd2 15.Rh1 Rd2+ 16.Ka3 draw, when the white king, who had been hopelessly cut off on the king's side for so long, has performed the miracle of crossing the board in time to reach a standard draw on the other side. However, Black wins by 8... Rd3.


p.154, KP3a, A.Troitzky. The study is sound, and the alleged cook 1... Kb4 is in fact the main line: 1.Qd5 Kb4 2.Sd3+ Kc5 3.Sf4 (3.Sc5? Qd4 draw; 3.Sc6? Qc7 draw) with an exquisite domination: 3... a4(Qh8, Qf6) 4.Qc5+ Kd2 5.Qf2+ Ke3 6.Qb2+; 3... Qh6(Qh7) 4.Qc5+ Kd2 5.Qd4+ Ke1 6.Qe3+; 3... Qe7(Qe8) 4.Qd3+ Kb4 5.Qa3+; 3... Qg4 4.Qc5+ Kd2 5.Qd4+ Ke1 6.Sd3+; 3... Qa7 4.Qd3+ Kb4 5.Qb3+ Ke5 6.Qe3+; 3... Qc7 4.Qb3+ Kd4 5.Se6+; 3... Qg1(Qg3) 4.Sc2+; 3... Kb4 4.Qb3+ Ke5 5.Se6+.

p.156, KP5, N.Kralin/O.Pervakov. Unsound: 5.g8Q bxa2+ 6.Qxa2 (ouch!), and there is no stalemate. Consequently KP6 is unsound, too.

p.156, KP7a, A.Troitzky. According to Harold van der Heijden this is a correction of the following study from Novoye Vremya 1898: e1f4 0010.44 g1.b3b4d2f2a3d5f5h7 6/5+, the intended solution is 1.Kc2 a2 2.Bh2+ Ke4 3.f3+ Kb4 4.Bf4 a1Q 5.Bh6 Qg1 6.Be3+ etc., but 5... Qa6+ is a bust, while 1.f3+ Ke5 2.Ke2 a2 3.f4+ wins instead.

p.157, KP7, A.Troitzky. The authors forgot to mention the cook 3.Bf4 a1Q (3... a1S 4.b5) 4.Bh6 wins.

p.161, Macek database. The Prokes book refers to a compilation of 70,000 studies by Frantisek Macek. Harold van der Heijden comments: “This indeed is stated in the foreword of the book, but it is a typing error. I am co-operating with Mr Macek for a few years now. Mr Macek wrote me that at the time of writing of the book it should have been 47,000 studies. Now his cardfile is of comparable size as my database (although far from identical, but overlapping), i.e. almost 50,000 studies. I estimate we exchanged more than 2000 ‘new’ studies for our mutual collections.”.

OPINIONS
editor: Alain Pallier

What is the difference?
by A. Koranyi,
edited by A. Pallier

The development of the modern chess artistical study must have repercussions on our attitude towards studies: former independent motives as mate, stalemate or positional draw are no longer the main interest of studies: they only are instrumental in the construction of the study as a whole. Tourneys like the 3rd and 5th WCCT show how it is important to construct a study with a selection of coherent motives - otherwise studies are worthless (by the way, this explains the decreasing of valuable modern studies...) But ‘complete’ modern studies are often described as ‘partially anticipated’: here is the problem.

I am always annoyed when I read, after the solution of a study, a laconic comment like: ‘This is well known’ or ‘All this has already been shown by...’. I think that these remarks are irresponsible: today, the question should be: ‘In this study, what is new in comparison with precedent studies?’ or ‘What does it add to these ones?’ With such a mind, we could see, beyond the apparent contradiction, that the more a study is partially anticipated, the more it is original!

I should like to present one example from my own practice: some twenty-five years ago, I entered an original study in the Hungarian Chess Federation tourney. Judge was Jenő Ban, a very rigorous judge. In his award, he did me justice by writing that I had indicated myself partial anticipations, among which a Kasparyan study, 1956 Kc8/Kc4 [Shakhmaty v SSSR 1956, no 133 in GMK’s 1988 collection - AP] J.Ban estimated that the novelties contained in the study were at least as important than the similarities: a lot of judges would have criticized these similarities only. The study was rewarded with an honourable mention.

K1: A. Koranyi
Hungarian Chess Federation 1972 1hm
correction Sakkelet 1995

c7b5 0043.11

Draw
[The initial setting of this study appeared in EG35.2005. It was, then, a win study with an introduction:

\text{g5e2 0042.12 g1a3f2f6.h3c3h5 5/4+}.

After 1.S2e4 c2 2.Sc3 Kf3 3.Sa2 c1Q+ 4.Sxc1 Bxc1 5.Kh4 Bd2 we recognize the position - with reverse colours and mirrored - reached below after 1.Kf6 Sf3}
2.Bd7! See below in the article the explanation for the change of stipulation. This correction was published in Sakkelet in 1995. AP

The solution goes:

1.Kf6 Sf3 2.Bd7 with three variations:


II 2...Bf7 (Kxf7? Se5+) 3.Ba4 (Bc6/h5? Sd4) 3...Bg6 4.Bd1 Be4 - diagram K1b - 5.Kg7 and Black cannot make any progress

III 2...Ba2 3.Be8+ Kxh4 4.Kg6 h5 5.Kh6 Sd4 6.Bg6 (6.Bxh5? Sf5+ 7.Kg6 Bb1 +- this line is in Kasparyan's study) and now:

a) 6...Bb1 (6...Bb3? 7.Bxh5 as in I)

b) 6...Sf5+ 7.Bxf5 Bf7 8.Bd7 Kg3 9.Be6 (and not the losing 9.Kg5? as originally intended: 9...h4 10-12 -Bh3 13.Bc6 Bg4 14.Bg2 Be2 wins) 9...Be8 -diagram K1c 10.Bd7 positional draw

What is different in this study?

1. The whole construction is new, with a choice of black moves (for instance in III, with two different black sacrifices), with many tries and a rich counterplay.

2. "Simular" studies are less rich: for instance 6.Bg6 - delaying the capture on h5 - is original. This creates a strong artistical impression.

3. The typical features of the study (positional draw, mutual zugzwang, stalemate) are numerous in this miniature. I hope that the readers (colleagues-composers or judges!) agree with me. The most important lies in the difference(s).

25.11.1996 Budapest
SOLVING AT THE TOP LEVEL

In the Yugoslav (ie Serbia-based though not, I am sure, Serbia-biased) MAT-PLUS 13-14 (Spring/Summer 1997), which is published in English, our good friend John Beasley proposes that studies be dropped from the World Chess Solving Contests (WCSC) which decide annual world championship individual and team titles. The relevant paragraph below is edited for emphasis only.

Should the WCSC include an endgame study round? It is primarily a problem-solving competition, and I whole-heartedly support those who say it should be made honestly and unashamedly a problem-solving competition and the study round should be dropped. The chess problem came in existence because "find a mate in N moves" is a clear and precise objective for a solver whereas "find how White can win" is not, and for serious competitive solving this clarity and precision are essential. As the WCSC director in 1994, my sole objective was to get through the study round [there are five other rounds] with no protests; as the composer of four out of the nine studies that were used in the WCSC between 1994 and 1996, and also as a study column editor who regularly examines the originals he receives in the hope of finding one that can be forwarded for use in the WCSC before publication, I have observed that it is extremely hard to compose a study which is sufficiently clear-cut to provoke no argument but yet sufficiently difficult to challenge a world-class solver. I am a study enthusiast; I compose them, I write magazine columns about them, I have co-authored a book about them, and perhaps people will be surprised at seeing these opinions under my name; but no good at all is being done the cause of studies by using them in a competition to which they are not suited.

One has to either agree or disagree with what John writes. But study solving in some form must continue, and at a high standard, surely? So, while accepting John's case, there are as I see it only two possible remedies - though they are not mutually exclusive:

1. Retain a modified studies round in the WCSC.
2. Set up a separate studies-only solving event.

Taking the former, what modification(s) would have a chance of reducing (if never eliminating) the currently encountered difficulties? Frankly, only one modification suggests itself: without changing the time limit (90 minutes for the round, usually), to include 10, say, studies (only two or three studies are currently set in the WCSC studies round), but restricted to the type John describes as 'sufficiently clear-cut to provoke no argument'. This, one hopes, would continue to encourage strong players to enter for the WCSC, and would suitably reward their specialist solving skills.

Indeed, a like remedy is proposed by John himself for the two-mover solving round, where the current snag is that superbly fast solvers of the two-mover genre gain relatively little by solving within, say, 10 minutes the trio that is set with an allotted time of 20; while a quick solver of studies might gain 30 minutes in that round. (If solving scores are at the conclusion of all six rounds finally equal, then the title is decided 'on time': any competitor could become world champion by scribbling any odd moves and handing the 'solutions' in first - thereby scoring 0 points, but very fast - provided no one else solved anything either.)

As to the second remedy, this could be a championship event held anywhere at any time - if the FIDE PCCC approved. I know that there are moves afoot among the solving-starved international studies community to set up
some such event, and I am not alone in looking forward to hearing in more detail, perhaps at Pula in September 1997. But surely I am not alone either in dreading being asked to serve on a studies solving appeals committee!

Both remedies are in need of further practical elaboration. I hope EG's readers can provide the bright ideas that are clearly needed - such as some way to avoid having an appeals committee.

John Roycroft
29vii97

---

Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6.

This is a new and very welcome column in a magazine which circulates in the eastern half of the Czech Republic. Judge: IM Jan Sikora-Lerch. The award was preliminary, objections being allowed until 1iv1997. "I was not asked to judge this two-year tourney until the end of Spring 1996, and only then could proper testing begin. There were 74 entries from 18 composers, 31 being published, but only 15 (from 11 composers) proved to be correct. All appear in my award. Several studies received post-publication corrections, which are incorporated in the versions given here. In this connection I should like to thank Emil Vlasák, to whom I turned for help in locating anticipations and who to my pleasure also noted some analytic points which I had missed.

A feature of this tourney was that the column editor, Zdeněk Libiš, supplied works from the estates of two deceased problemists, Jiří Desensky (7xi1936-1991) and Zdeněk Molitba (4vi1945-19ix1992). Thanks are also due to him for seeking out new composers and corresponding with them.

"Only through becoming familiar with the ideas of many composers have I realized just how responsible the work of a judge is. It is not just a matter of ranking the studies (which is always subjective), but of deciding which of them will survive for the attention of future generations. As a practical player, I see a study as a stylized concluding fragment of a chess game, and I have therefore given greatest weight to the actual play incorporated, as opposed to the other aspects of a composition.

"This was a pleasant task, although an exacting one. For example, one author sent 29 studies in a form which aroused my suspicions. After two or three weeks of analysis and reconstruction I found a mere three correct works, which I sent to be checked for originality. Emil Vlasák sent them all back as plagiarisms, and dryly remarked that I had probably demolished another 26 studies previously published."

No 10740 Sergei Osintsev
1st prize Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

```
```

4½/5 BTM Win
mate) 11.Rh6 mate/v.
i) f2 2.Rh6+ Kg7 3.Rh1 Bb3 4.Sd3 Sg3+
wons.
Qa1+ 5.Sf5 Qf1+ 6.Kc7 Qh1/vii 7.Sf3
Qc1 8.Rb8+ Kh7 9.Sg5+ Kg6 10.Sf4+

This presents a whole complex of
studies in an individual way. The
endgame study is not yet threatened by
the escape into fairy realms that has come
to characterize the problem; but if this
study indicates the direction of future
development, we shall have to reconcile
ourselves to the fact that not only or-
dinary composers, but the great majority
of solvers, will be left behind.

No 10741 M.Matous
2nd prize Moravskoslezsky šach 1995-6

No 10742 J.Desensky
correction by Z.Libis
3rd prize Moravskoslezsky šach 1995-6

"This study contains some surprising
play. It is as if the author would draw
aside the veil for a moment, and let us
glimpse the fountain of eternal chess
fantasy."

A subsequent letter from the judge draws
attention to an anticipation.
No 10743 J. Fritz
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1951.

No 10743 J. Fritz
1.Rg1 Bf5+ 2.Kd1 Bc7

No 10744 W.D.Ellison and J.D.Beasley
1st hon.men Moravskoslezsky šach 95-6

No 10744 Wallance Ellison &
(zugzwang) f3 5.Bxf3.

No 10745 D.Bashkirov and I.Rediu
2nd hon.men Moravskoslezsky šach 95-6

No 10745 D. Bashkirov and I. Rediu
(Russia). 1.Kd6 a2 2.Rh7+ Kg2 3.Rg7+
Kf2 4.Rg7+ Kg2 5.Rc7+ Kd2 6.Ra7
Kc2/ii 7.Rc7+ Kh2 8.Rb7+ Ke3/iii

"An enrichment of an otherwise well-known theoretical position, with plenty of play. The comparison between the idea 'f4' in the try (after 1.Ba6+) and the solution is nice."

No 10746 D. Bashkirov and I. Rediu
3/4 Draw

No 10746 D. Bashkirov and I. Rediu
(Russia). 1.Kd6 a2 2.Rh7+ Kg2 3.Rg7+
Kf2 4.Rg7+ Kg2 5.Rc7+ Kd2 6.Ra7
Kc2/ii 7.Rc7+ Kh2 8.Rb7+ Ke3/iii
ii) Kd3 7.Sb7 a1Q 8.Sc5+ Ke2 9.Rxa4
Qd1 10.Kc5.
iii) Ka3 9.Kxd5 a1Q 10.Sc4+ Ka2
11.Rb2+.

"This study is included with reservations. The length of the solution tends to zero. The crucial position arises after the first move, which is hardly outstanding, and the rest is merely proof. But even such a study has a right to exist."
No 10746 Jíří Desenský (Orlová), corrected by Zdeněk Libis. The commendations were described as "rather average" and are presented in order of publication. 1.Bf3 Kxf3 2.a7 Sc7/i 3.Bxc7 h1Q 4.a8B+/ii Kg4 5.Bxh1.
i) Sc5 3.a8Q+ Se4 4.Kf5.
ii) 4.a8Q+? Kg4 and either 5.Qxh1 draw, or 5.Qd4+ Kh3 6.Qb3+ Kg2, or 5.Qe8+ Kf3 6.Qb7+ Kg4 7.Qb4+ Kh3.
"Underpromotion to avoid stalemate."

No 10747 Mario Matouš. 1.Bb2+ Rg7+ 2.Kh3 Kh7 (Kg8;Sf6+) 3.Se6 Re7 4.Ba3.
i) 2.Kh3 Kh7 3.Se6 Rg1.
"Another trifle, although many practical players may not know that this material is in general only a draw."

"A good study to solve, but the material is rather heavy for the content."
No 10750 Evžen Pavlovsky
comm Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

Kf8 8.Kf6 Kg8 9.Ra8+ Kh7 10.Ra7+
i) Kb8? 2.b5 g2 3.Re1 g1Q 4.Re8+ Ka7
5.a6+ wins. Or g2 2.Kc7 Ka6 3.Kc6
draw. Or h1Q+ 2.Rh1 cxb4 3.Rh7+
Ka6 4.Rh8.
"An extended version of a well-known
idea."

No 10751 V.Prygunov
comm Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

1.c8/i+ Ka8 2.Sb6+i Ka7 3.Rxa5+ Kb7
"A little out of fashion."

No 10752 A. Grin
comm Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

1.Rxd7 e2 (Kg2;Kd3) 2.Kf3 e1Q/ii
3.Rh7+ Sh2+i 4.Rxh2+i

"The solution has been shortened on
account of duals."

No 10753 Andrey Selivanov
comm Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

1.Kg6 (else 1...Kg5 wins) Sb4 2.f6 Sd5
3.f7 Sxf4+ 4.Kh6/1 Se6 5.RQe8 Sxf8.
i) 4.Kh7? Se6 5.Kg8 Bg7 6.RQe8 Bxf8
7.Kf7 Kf5.
"A saving of one wP in an otherwise
known setting."
No 10754 Z.Modlitba
comm Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

No 10754 Zdeněk Modlitba (Brno).
1.Qe2/i and now:
Qxd3 2.Qb2+ Kc4 3.Qb3+ Qxb3 (Kxb3) draw, or
Qg1+ 2.Bb1 (2.Ka2? Qc1;) Qe1/i
ii) Bbl 3.Qc2+ (Qb2+? draw) Kb4
4.Qb2+ Kc5 5.Qa3+ Kd6 6.Qa6+ Kd7
"Unfortunately a third stalemate variation
(1...Qg8) turned out not to be correct."

No 10755 J.Desensky
comm Moravskoslezský šach 1995-6

No 10755 Jiří Desenský (Orlová).
1.Kg8
Bxh7+i 2.Kxf8 Bg6 3.Ke7 Bxh7
(Sxf7;4.Bc4) 4.Kxd8 Be6 5.Kc7 Bxd7
6.Bb7 mate.
i) Bxf7+ 2.Kxf8. Or Sxf7 2.Kxf8 Bxh7
"The wK walk from h8 to c7 is achieved
only by sharp threats."

diagrammes 1994-95

Judge of this informal tourney was Brian
Stephenson, who considered 32 entries
(one withdrawn on account of
anticipation). He commented that all the
studies presented to him appeared to be
sound. "The standard of the originals was
good, with the four prizewinners standing
out quite clearly from the rest. In the
end, as always with judging, my own
personal preference dictated the order."
(Comments are in the judge's original
English.) For the first prize, by David
Blundell, see p.871 in EG12/1.
"Blundell's study has already been widely
quoted, and quite right too! It is based on
corresponding squares, a concept that
always gives a study a delightful apparent
mystery alongside a cold remorseless
logic."

No 10756 Marc Lavaud
2nd prize, diagrammes, 1994-95

No 10756 Marc Lavaud (France).
Black's threat is to play Re8+.;
1.Bc3/i
Bg3+ 2.Kc8/ii Ra7 3.Bd2+ (Sb6? Rc7+;)

186
Rc7+i(Rxd5+/Rb5;Kc6) 10.Kd6 Bf5

i) 1.Bal? Bg3+ 2.Kc8 Ra7. 1.Bb2?


iii) Kf6; leads to the same finish. If Black plays 3...Kg4, we reach the position after 10...Ba5, with hKg4 instead of f5, and now there is 11.Bd2 Ra7 (Bb6;Be3, repetition) 12.Bxa5 Rxa5 13.Kf6, with a draw.


v) Having lured bR to c5, White can throw wS to the wolves. "Black’s attempts to win one of White’s two pieces are ultimately successful, but then White counters by sacrificing his other piece and Black has to stalemate White in the middle of the board. Only the wPd5 stays immobile during the course of the solution. A very elegant piece of work, well worthy of its talented composer."

No 10757 Andrew Miller
3rd prize, diagrammes, 1994-95

No 10758 Jean-Claude Letzelter
4th prize, diagrammes, 1994-95


v) 9.Ka8 Qe8+ 10.Qb8 Sxb8 11.axb8Q Qxb8+ 12.Kxb8 Kd1

"Surely the white king cannot stop the hP from promoting? Yes it can, and a remarkable king march ensues. A tour de force!"

No 10759 Valery Kirillov
1st hon. mention, diagrammes, 1994-95

1.Rb1+ Kc2 2.Rc1+ Kxc1/i 3.Kf3+ Kd1


"White sacrifices both his rook and his knight, and then tries to get rid of his bishop as well! Black refuses this last offer and White is stalemated."

No 10760 Albert van Tets (South Africa).
2nd hon. mention, diagrammes, 1994-95


i) The start of a preliminary attack to deny f6 to b5. 1.g7? Sxh7 2.g8Q Sf6+.

ii) exd6 2.Rc7+ Kb6 3.g7 Sh7 4.Rf7, with advantage to White.


iv) Now White’s preliminary objective is attained, but 3...Kxe5 4.Rxe7+ Kd6 5.g7 Sh7 6.Re6+ wins.

v) 6.Kg6? Ke8 7.e6 Kd8 wins.

vi) b2 7.Kh6 Kg8, transposes into the main line. If a2 7.Kh6 Kg8 8.Rg7+ Kf8 9.Kh7, followed by mate, or here 8...Kc7 9.Rxe7.

vii) a2, transposes into (vi).

viii) Kh8 9.Rxe7 followed by mate.

"White’s forceful play leads to an interesting repetition."

No 10760 Albert van Tets (3195 x-xii94)
**No 10761** Michael Bent
commendation, diagrammes, 1994-95

Michael Bent (England). The commendations were not ranked. 1.Rd4+ Ke5 (Ke5;2.Sd7 mate) 2.Sc6+ (Sd7/Sg6)+ Kf5+; Kf5 3.Sc7+ Ke5 4.eSg6+ Kf5 5.Sxb4+ (g4+? hxg3;) Ke5 6.hSg6+ Bxg4 7.e4+ Sxe4 9.Rd5 mate.

"A logical study, based on the fact that White has to eliminate the bPh4 so that it cannot answer g4+. Following that, b5 and bB are lured into self-blocking positions. This is a forced #9. Does this make in a study or a problem? Does it matter? Of course, if published as a problem, the checking key would be criticised."

---

**No 10762** Albert van Tets
commendation, diagrammes, 1994-95


"The bK is forced all the way to h8. Then the wQ switches back to a1 and mate is unavoidable."
No 10763 Vitaly Kovalenko
commendation, diagrammes, 1994-95

1.e3 (d3? d4:) Kg1 2.d3 Kf2 3.e4 dxe4/i 4.dxe4 Ke3 5-6.e6 Ke5 7.e7, with
Kf6 8.e8R/ii and wins, Kxg6 9.Re6+
Kf7 10.Re6 g6 (K--;Rg6) 11.Rd5 Kf6
12.Rc5(Rb5/Ra5) K--; 13.Rxg5, or
Kf4 8.e8S/iii and wins, Ke5 9.Sxg7 Kf6
i) 3.d4 4.5.e6 Kxd3 5.e7 Kc2 7.e8Q d3
8.Qe6+ wins.
ii) Not 8.e8S+? after which White will
never be able to win bPq7.
iii) 8.e8R? stalemate.
"An attractive study with no deep
analytical justification. The rook duals
on move 12 are unimportant."

No 10764 Wallace Ellison (England).
Kd6 13.Kb7 and wins (for example,
13...Kd7 14.Sc5 Kd8 15.Sc6 Sc7
are the only ones to win, and 5.Sc6,
9.Sc6, 10.Sc4, and 12.Sc7 are the moves
which win most quickly. The positions
after 2.Kb5, 3.Sc3, 5.Sc6, 6.Ka6, 7.Sc6,
8.Sc7, 9.Sc6, 11.Sc5, and 12.Sc7 are
reciprocal zugzwang.
i) 1.Kb5? Kd5 draw, White is in
zugzwang.
ii) Sa6 2.Sc3 Sc6 3.Kb5 etc.
iii) Now Black is in zugzwang.
vi) 8.Sc6 Sa8 9.Sc6 also works,
ix) Kd7 9 Sc6 is the main line after move
11.
x) 11.Sc2 Sa8 12 Sc4 also works.
"Wonderful play by the two knights.
Wonderful indeed that there are only two
minor duals. A position similar to the
crucial reciprocal zugzwang appears in
Secrets of minor piece endings by John
Nunn, but the columnist informed me
that he received the study from the com-
poser before the Nunn book appeared in
print."
**No 10765 Michael Bent**

commendation, *diagrammes*, 1994-95

---

No 10765 Michael Bent.
1. Qh1+? Kf2
2. Sd1+?! Kg3 3. Sf5+ Kg4/iii 4. Qe4+ Kxe4 5. Kg4, and this quiet move forces mate, for if Bd4 6. Sg3 mate.

i) 1. Sxc6? Sf4+ and 2... Bxb2.

ii) 2. Qxd2+? Kf1 3. Qh3+ Kg1.

iii) Now After 4. Qf1+?, 4... Sf3 will win.

Impasse?

"WQ first vacates e4, then sacrifices herself there to great effect. Again, this is a forced mate."

---

**II Memorial Galitzky**

This international formal tourney, also known as Galitzky-130JT was judged by Arkady Khait and A.Kuryatnikov (both of Saratov). The award was published in the newspaper Gazeta Saratov of 24x1994. Only the main lines were in the published award but the judge kindly forwarded the original manuscript entries to AJR!

---

**No 10766 S.Zakharov**

1st prize II Memorial Galitzky

---

No 10766 S.Zakharov (Saint Petersburg)

1... Bf6+ 2. Kg8/i Bxe5 3. dxe5/ii h3 4. e6 dxe6/iii 5. Be7 e5/iv 6. Bxe5 Kc2 7. Bg3/v, and now, since the sacrifice of a black pawn can be forced, White is able to construct a fortress:


i) 2. Kxf6? f2, and promotion with check foils the fork.


iii) f2 5. Bxf2. h2 5. exd7.


vi) For 15. Bg7, possible thanks to the main line’s 2. Kg8!!


No 10767 A. Malishev
2nd prize II Memorial Galitzky

5/3 Win

d4h3 0055.00

No 10767 A. Malishev (Yaroslavl region)
1. Bf4 Se6+ 2. Ke3 Sxf4 (Bxel; Bf5+)
3. Bf1+ Sg2+/i 4. Sxg2 Bg5+ 5. Sf4+ Kg3
i) Kg3 4. Sf5+ Kg4 5. Sxh4 Sd5+ 6. Kd4

No 10768 V. Kalyagin
3rd prize II Memorial Galitzky

4/3 Win
c1/g3 0400.21

No 10768 V. Kalyagin (Ekaterinburg)
1. a6/i Rg8/i 2. a7 Ra8 3. Kf1/ii f3
4. Kg1/iv, with:
- f2+ 5. Kf1 (Kh1? Rh8+;) Rh8 6. a8B
  (a8Q; Rh1+;) Rd8 (Re8; Be4) 7. Ra1
  (Ke2? Rd1;) Re8 8. Ra3 Rd8 9. c4+ wins, or
- Rh8 5. Ra2/v Rd8 (f2+; Rxf2) 6. Ra1
  Ra8 7. c4/vi f2+ 8. Kf1 wins, for example,
  Kf4 9. c5 Ke5 10. c6 Kd6 11. Ra6 and Ke5
  12. c7, or Ke7 12. Kxf2.

No 10769 A. Chernenko
4th prize II Memorial Galitzky

6/4 Win

i) 1. Ke2? f3+ 1. Kf1? Rh4 and 2. a6
  Rh1+ 3. Ke2 f3+ 4. Ke3 f2 5. a7 Re1+
  6. Kd4 f1Q, or 2. Kg1 Rh7 3. a6 f3 4. Ra2
  (a7,f2;) Rd7 5. Ra1 Rh7 6. Ra2 Rd7 draw.
  iii) 3. c4? f3 4. c5 Re8+ 5. Kf1 Rd8 6. Ke1
  (Ra1,Rh8;) Re8+ 7. Kd2 f2 8. Ra1 Ra8
  9. Ke2 Kg2 10. Kd3 (Rf1, Re8+;) Rxa7
draw. In this, White's 7. Kd2, is the way
  he tries to avoid positional draw No.1 in
  this study.
iv) 4. Ra6? Rh8 5. Gg6+ Kf4 6. Rh6
  (Rb6, Ke3;) Rd8 7. Kf2 Rd2+ 8. Ke1 Ra2
  9. Rh7 Ke3 10. Re7+ (Kd1,f2;) Kd3
  11. Rc7 Ke3, positional draw No.2.
  v) 5. a8B? Rd8 6. Ra1 Rc8 7. Ra3 Rd8,
  positional draw No.3, because 8. c4, fails
  - no discovered check.
  vi) 7. Ra2? Rd8 8. Ra1 Ra8 draw. Or
    7. Kf1? Rh8 and 8. Ke1 Rh1+, or 8. Kg1
    f2+.

No 10769 A. Chernenko
Stavropol province

17e3 0302.32 6/4 Win

No 10769 A. Chernenko (Stavropol
province) 1. Sd1+ Ke4 2. h2f2+ Kxf5
3. Se3+ Kg5 4. Se4+ Kh5 5. Sf5 Rh7+
Kg5 10. Sh7+ Kh5 11. Sf7 and 12. Sf6
mate.
No 10770 Alain Pallier
special prize for romantic style
II Memorial Galitzky

1. Re7+i Kxe7/ii 2. g8S+ Kd7 3. Bf5+ Kc7
4. a8S+ (ii) Kd8 (Kb8;Rf8+) 5. Rf8+ Bxf8
(Be8(Qe8)? Bf6+) 6. Bf6+ Be7 (Ke8?
Sc7+) 7. Bxe7+ Kf8 8. Sc7+ Kf8 9. Be6+,
with:
- Kg7 10. Bf6+ Kg8 11. Be7+ Kg7
12. Bf6+, or
- Kg6 10. f5+ Kg7 11. Bf6+ (f6+? Kh8;)
i) Black was threatening f1Q+, so
White’s move is forced. 1. Bd3? a1Q
2. Re7+ Bxe7 wins - because Black’s
Be8; - see (ii) - would be with check.
ii) Bxe7? 2. Bf5+ Kc7 3. a8S+ Kd8
4. g8Q+ Be8 (not check here!) 5. Qxd5+
Bd7 6. Qa5+ Ke8 7. Sc7+ Kd8 8. See6+
Ke8 9. Sg7 mate.
iii) The composer tells us that his
inspiration came from a passage from the
game Salwe vs. Cohn, St Petersburg 1909
Bb7 3110.30 d46d3.a7e4g7 6/2 WTP.
The continuation was: 1. g8S+ Kd7
2. Bb5+ Kc7, and now 3. Rf7+ and 4.a8Q.
Note 3.a8Q? Qc3+ 4. Ka4 Qb4+ 5. Kxb4
stalemate, and the possibility 3.a8S+,
when 3...Kd8 or 3...Kc8 lose, but White
has nothing after 3...Kb7, or 3...Kb8.
This prompted the composer to set about
creating a drawing study with two
underpromotions to knight.

No 10771 V. Kostin
special prize for a debutant
II Memorial Galitzky

1. g6 Sc3
2. g7 f2 3. Bxf2 Sf5 4. g8S Kb1 5. Kd5 Sg7
9. Be3(Bc5) wins.

No 10772 O. Carlsson and L. Parenti
special prize for chess force seldom
encountered in a study
II Memorial Galitzky

1. ...Qf2+/i 2. Sd4/ii Qf6+
3. Ka5/iii, with:
- Kb8 4. Kb5/iv Qf1+/v 5. Kb6 Qb1+
6. Bb5 Ke8 7. Rf7+ Kd8 8. Sf6 mate, or
Kb8/x 6. Kb6/xi Ke8 7. Sb5 Qf2+
14.Bb3 Qb7+/xxiv 15.Ka5 Qa8+/xxv
iii) 3.Sc6? Qb2+ 4.Kc7 (Bg5,Qxb5+;) Qb6+ 5.Kd6 Qc7+ (Qxa6? Rd8+) 6.Kc6(Qxc7) stalemate.
15.Ka5 Qa8+/xxv

xxvi) Qf7 16.Rd6 Qe1+ 17.Kb6 Qe7


xxviii) 4.Sd4 Qe7 5.Sc6? Qe6+ 6.Kxc7 stalemate No.1 of 31 stalemates identified by the composers to be avoided by White. (We shall not list them all in EG!)


xxxii) 6...Qf8 7.Rb7+ Ke8 8.Bd7+ Kd8 9.Sc6 mate.


No 10773 V. Shupletsov
1st hon mention II Memorial Galitzky

No 10773 V. Shupletsov (Kurgan region) 1.Be4 g5+ 2.Kh7 Qxe4 (Qd1+;Kh6) 3.g8Q+ Bxg8 4.Sd6+ Kg7 5.Sxe4, with:
- Kxh8 6.Be5+ Kh7 7.Sxg5 mate, or

No 10774 S. Zakharov and V. Razumenko
2nd hon mention II Memorial Galitzky

No 10774 S. Zakharov and V. Razumenko 1.Sb1 Kfl (Kd1;Sc3+) 2.Sd2+ (Rc87 b2;) Ke1 3.Sxb3 Kfl 4.Sd2+ Ke1 5.Sb1/i Kf1 6.Re8 Kg1 7.Kg3 Kf1 8.Rf8+ Kii Kg1 (Ke1;Rc8+) 9.Re8 Kf1 10.Sd2+ mates.

No 10774 S. Zakharov and V. Razumenko 1.5.Kg3 Kfl 2.Rb8+ Kii Kg1 (Ke1;Rc8+) 9.Re8 Kf1 10.Sd2+ mates.

ii) Composer: "having eliminated the
logical' b3-pawn the white knight returns to the active square b1 to carry out the main plan. 


No 10775 A.Davranyan
3rd hon mention II Memorial Galitzky

4/5 Draw


i) Kc8 2.Kxb2 cxb6 3.Qxb6 Qd2+ 4.Ka3 Qc3+ 5.Ka4, and seeing that there is no check from c6 by a bishop, it's a draw. Or if Ka6 2.Kxb2 cxb6 3.Qa4 mate!

ii) If Bb3+, then there is still stalemate (after c8Q+) whenever Black plays Qxd4.

Composer: "A synthesis of underpromotion, perpetual stalemate and pendulum motifs."

No 10776 A.Golubev
commendation II Memorial Galitzky

7/6 Draw


No 10777 V.Kalyagin and L.Mitrofanov
commendation II Memorial Galitzky

5/5 Win


i) 1.Sxf7? Sf4+ 2.Kg4 Sxe6 draw.

ii) Sb7 2.Sxe6 wins. Or Sf4+ 2.Kg4 f2 3.f8Q f1Q 4.Qxf4 wins.


iv) Sf4+ 3.Kg4 f1Q 4.Bd4+ Kh7 5.f8S mate.
v) $Sf6+ 4.Kxg6 Qd3+ 5.Kxf6 and Qxf3+
vi) The prevention of Qxf8; here explains
2.Sc3!  
Composer: "A pure mate in a shortie."

No 10778 Viktor Petrovich Ivanov
commendation II Memorial Galitzky

![Chessboard diagram]

No 10778 Viktor Petrovich Ivanov
3.a6 Rd5 4.a7 Rd8 5.b5 Ra8 b6 Kf5 6.b6
Kf6 7.h5/v g4/vii 8.hxg4/viii e3/viii
unannotated moves are all that the award
(in a newspaper column) supplied.
However, there was more, as the as-
siduous reader is about to discover ....
i) .... from (thanks to the kindness of
judge Arkady Khait) the com-
poser-supplied hand-written continuations
following 6 other first moves by White to
show White losing in every instance.
They carry no guarantee, but a health
warning might be appropriate !
4.Kxb4 Rb8 5.e3/xi Rc8 6.b5 Re7 7.Kg3
11.Kf2 Kg5 12.Sc4 e5 13.Sg2 Ra8
14.Kg3 RB 15.Sc1 Rf1 16.Sg2 Rf3+
17.Kh2, and the composer's analysis to show a black win continues with
17...Kg4, which is an illegal move that
presumes wPh4, but it's wPh3. We
therefore assume: 17...Kh5 18.h4 Kg4,
and the composer's line: 19.Kg1 Kh3
20.Se1 (h5,Rg3+) Rxe3 21.Sc2 Re3
22.Sc1 Kh4 wins.
1.Sb3? Rxb4, and 2.Sc3 Rxd4 3.a6 Rxh3
4.Sc2 Rh1, or 2.Sc2 Rxh4 3.Sc3 Rxh3
4.a6 Rh1 5.Sxe5+ Kf6 6.Sc7+ Kg5.
1.a6? Rxb4, and 2.Sc3 Rxd4 3.Sc2 Ra4
4.Sc4 h5 5.xe5+ Kf6 6.Sc7+ Kg5 7.Sc8
h4, or 2.a7 Ra4 3.Sc3 Kf6 4.h5 Rad3+
1.h5? Rxb4 2.Sc3 Rd3 3.a6 Kf6 4.a7 Kh7
Rb7 5.Kxb6 Rxa7 6.Sc2 Ra7 7.Sc4+
Kf5 8.Sc5+ Kf4 9.Sc6+
(Sc4,Rxe2) Kg3 10.Sc3 Rxe2 11.Sc4
15.h6 e3 16.h7 Re8 17.Sf2 e2 18.Sc8
e1Q 19.Kg8 Qe5+ 20.Kh7 Ral 77...
1.Kxh6? gxh6 2.Kg7 f5 11.Kh7 f4+
Kf6, and 4.Sa2 Kf5 5.Sc3 Rxb4 6.a6 Ra8
7.a7 Ra8 8.Sc5 Ke5 9.Kh6 Ke5 10.Sc7
Rxa7 11.Kxh6 Rxe2, or 4.Kg4 Rb4
5.Sc2 Ra6 6.a6 Ke5 7.a7 Ra4 8.Sc3
Rxa7.
Rxe5 4.a6 Rd5 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7 Kf6 7.Sc5
e5.  
ii) Only three lines this time!
1.Kf6 2.a6 Rf6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
1.Kd4 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
Ke7 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
Kd7 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
Kc7 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
Kb7 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
Kc6 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
Kb6 2.a6 Rb6 3.Sc5 Re6 (Rxb4 a7)
4.Kxb4, and gxh4 5.a7 Ra8 6.Sc7+ Kg5
7.Sc8 Kg6 8.Kf6 Kg5 9.a4+, or Re8
5.xe5+ Kf7 6.g6+ Kf6 7.Sc8+ Ke7
8.g7 Kf7 9.Kh7.
14.Sb5 Rf7, or 7.Sb5 h5 8.Kh6 Ra5 9.e3
Ke7 10.Kg6 Kd7 11.Kf6 e5 12.e4 Ke6
If 2.a6? exd3 2.a7 d2 4.a8Q d1Q, and
3.Qa7+ Ke8 4.Qa8+ Kg8 5.Qd6 Qe7+
Qxe7 6.Qg7+ Kf8 7.Qf6+ Ke7.
Rh6 6.a7 Ra6 7.b5. Or Ke8 3.Sc6 Rh7+
4.Kxh6 Rc7 5.b5 Ke8 6.a6 Re8 7.b6 Ra8
8.a7.
Or Ke7? 3.a6, and Kd6 4.Sf7+ Ke7 5.a7
Kb7 6.Sd6+, or Kd8 4.a7 Rb7+ 5.Kxb6
Or Ke8? 3.h5 Rxb4/xvi 4.Kxe6 Rh5
5.Sc4 Re5 6.Kg6 Rxg5 7.hf6, and e3 8.h7
Rh4 9.a6, or Re8 8.h7 Ke7 9.Kg7 Ke6
10.hg8 Rxh8 11.Kxh8 Kg5 12.Kg7 Kxa5
16.h5 Kxe2 17.h6 e3 18.K7 KF2 19.h8Q,
v) 7.hxg5? hxg5 8.e3 e5 9.b7 Ra7
vi) e3 8.h4 e5 9.hxg5+xe7, and Kxe5
13.Kf7 Kf5 draw, or hxg5 10.b7 Ra7
11.Kh6 Rxb7 stalemate.
If e5? 8.e3, and g4 9.hxg4 Ke6 10.Kxh6
Kf6 11.g5+ Kf5 12.b7, or Ke6 9.Kxh6
Kf6 10.Kf7 Ke6 11.Kg7 Kd6 12.h6 Ke6
13.h7 Kxb6 14.hg8 Rxh8 15.exh8 Kxa7
19.h4 Kd3 20.h5 Kxe3 21.h6 Kd2 22.h7
e3 23.h8Q.
vi) 8.h4? g3 9.e3 g2 10.b7 g1Q
11.bxa8Q Qg7 mate.
ix) 9.b7? Rxa7 10.Kxh6 Rxh7 11.g5+
Kf5 12.g6 Kg4 13.g7 Rxe7 14.Kg7
Kxb5 15.Kf6 Kg4 16.Ke5 Kg3 17.Ke4
Kf2 18.Kd3 e5
x) hxg5 10.b7 Rxa7 11.Kh6 Rxb7
c4 stalemate.
Rxb+ 6.Kg3 e4 7.e3 Rb1 8.Sc2 e5 9.h4
Ra1 10.a6 Rxa6 11.Sc3Rg6+ 12.Kh3
Rg1 13.Kh2 Rf1 14.Kg2 Rf3, and 15.Sd5
Kd6, or 15.Sd1 Kg4.
xii) 4.Kxh6 e4 5.a7 Ra5 6.Sc5 Kf5 7.Sb7
xiii) 3.Kf4 Rxh4 4.Sa2 Rb2 5.Sc3 Re2
Ra7 13.Sd8 Rd7 and 14...Rxg8.
xiv) 2.Sa2 e4 3.Sc3 Rxb4 4.a6 Rb3 5.a7
xv) 4.g5 e4 5.Kg7 6.Kf7 Kf5 7.Kg6+ Ke5
8.Kh7 Kd5 9.Kg8 Ke5 10.Kh7 Kc5
xi) 6.Kxf7 Kc5 draw, or hxg5 10.Rf7+
Rg7 stalemate.
xii) 5.Sc3 Rxb4 4.a6 Rb7 stalemate.
xiii) 3.Kf4 Rxb4 4.a6 Rb2 5.Sxe4 Rxe2
Rg5+
xiv) The holograph manuscript also gives
3...Rxg5 here, but with no further con-
tinuation.
xv) 5.Sc3 Rxb4 4.a6 Rb7 stalemate.
xvi) 5.Sc3 Rxb4 4.a6 Rb2 5.Sxe4 Rxe2
Rg7.
xvii) But not 9a7? Rxh7 10.Kxh6 Rxg2
11.Sxe6+ Kg6 13.g8Q Rh6+ 14.Kg7 Rg6+15.
Kf7 Rxe8 18.Kg8 Rg4 19.Kf7 Kg3, while if,
in this, 15.g8S Rb7+ 16.Kh8
Kg6.
Kh5, and 18.Kc7 Ka6 19.Kc6 Re8+
20.Kd7 Kf7, or 18.a8Q Rxg2 19.Kxa8
Kg3 23.Kd5 Kg2.
Ixe) A.Foguelman (Argentina)
No 10779 A.Foguelman (Argentina)
1.Kxg5? g3 (fx3);Kf4 2.Kxf4 (Rh1? f3;)
g2 3.Rg8e1 g1R (g1Q;Rg6+ 4.Rd6+
Kg6; 5.Rd6+ Kc5 6.7.8.9.10.
ii) 3.Rh6 g1R 4.Rh6 (Rh3;Ke6) Rf1+
5.Kg5 Rf5 6.Rd8+ Ke6 7.Re8+ Kd7
iii) 5.Rxd5 is a dual.
No 10779 A.Foguelman
commendation II Memorial Galitzky

I: white switchback
Example:
H.G.Mesman, Tijdschrift 1959

II: 'split move': a movement by a line piece to a destination square on the same line of action is carried out in two moves. Optionally, the first half of the move achieves a logical effect.
Example:
G.Nadareishvili, "64", 1974

III: I and II in the same study
Example:
David Joseph, Sunday Express, xil1921

Joseph-100JT

This international formal tourney was organized by the magazine STES Journal (Harrie Grondijs), and closed on 21ii96 after which entries were circulated anonymously to all competitors. Judge was Harrie Grondijs (see award) and Geurt Gijssen was the director. The tourney was announced with three categories but with a single set of prizes: $500 $200 and $100, plus books for 'mentions' and 'special prizes'.

I: white switchback
Example:
H.G.Mesman, Tijdschrift 1959

II: 3/7 Draw

III: 2/3 Draw

The provisional award was published in STES Vol.3 No.1 (Feb 1997). The award was unsigned, but clearly Harrie Gron-
dijs. 17 entries from 7 countries. One was withdrawn, one incorrect, another had a dual, and two more were anticipated, 12 entries were published. The final award
will be published [on or about] 1vii1997'.

Text of award: "The contest has been conducted in three rounds. In the first round all the entries were compiled into a booklet with detailed analyses and further comments from the composers and the judge. This booklet was forwarded to all contestants and some experts who returned their comments on these studies. The remarks were distributed again, giving the composers a second chance to improve on their works - if necessary. In the third round the award is drawn up by the judge. The final award will be published per [sic] the qst of July 1997.

The relative low number of entries for what must be the endgame tourney endowed with the highest prize money 'since the world began', underlines that material rewards do not necessarily generate the creativity and constructive craftmanship that is required for producing thematic 'Type C' compositions. Perhaps the restrictions imposed by the set theme forewent [sic. Suggest 'precluded'] the production of unforgettable masterpieces that might rival Joseph's miniature classic (time will tell).

Of the 16 entries 12 appear to be correct and unanticipated. .... As it happens all the correct entries (ie without duals or anticipations) are included in the award. The judge expresses his gratitude for the creativity and patience of the contestants, and to Messrs Harold van der Heyden, Jan van Reek and Axel Ornstein for their valuable contributions in probing these studies."

Remarks: EG is reproducing all the studies in the provisional award. Details of the definitive award will be noted in EG's Spotlight column in due course.

No 10785 Yohanan Afek
1st prize Joseph-100JT

No 10785 Yohanan Afek (Israel) A 'category III' entry (see examples above).

In the solutions 'tm' indicates one of the required 'thematic move' types. 1.Se3 (Rd5? c2) d1Qi 2.Sxd1 Ra4+ (c2;Re3+) 3.Kb7 Rd4+ 4.Kc6/ic 2 5.Re3+ tm Rb3 6.Re1 tm c1Q (Rb1;Sc3) 7.Sc3 tm Qc3 8.Ra1+ draws.


"The split move is very nice, as is the construction of the web in which the queen is caught. The switchback is rather incidental, lacking 'inner necessity'. Therefore, although entered for 'category III' the study belongs in I. In the judge's eyes the most accomplished entry."


i) 1.Rh8+? Kxe7 2.Kb3 (Kxb4,a2) Kd6, after which h2 is a hidey-hole for bK,
ii) Now that there is a black pawn on h2, White no longer needs wPe7.
iv) 5.Rh7+? Kd6 6.Rd7+ Ke5 7.Re7+ Kb6, and Black wins.

No 10786 David Gurgenidze, Velimir Kalandadze and Ruzvelt Martvalashvili
2nd prize Joseph-100JT

No 10787 Julien Vandiest
3rd prize Joseph-100JT

No 10787 Julien Vandiest (Belgium)

"Category I" 1.Sg4+ Kh5/i 2.Kg3/ii d2/iii 3.Qxd5+ Qg5 4.Qf7+ Qg6 5.Qd7 tm
d1Q/iv 6.Qb5+/v, with:

Qg5 7.Qe8+ Qg6 8.Qh8+ Kg5 9.Qe5+ Qf5 10.Qg7+ Qe6 11.Qe7+ and mates, and
Qd5 7.Qxd5+ Qg5 8.Qf7+ Qg6 9.Qd7

Two composers' names were missing in the award.

No 10786
David Gurgenidze, Velimir Kalandadze and Ruzvelt Martvalashvili
2nd prize Joseph-100JT

No 10787 Julien Vandiest
3rd prize Joseph-100JT


Two composers' names were missing in the award.

No 10786
David Gurgenidze, Velimir Kalandadze and Ruzvelt Martvalashvili
2nd prize Joseph-100JT

No 10787 Julien Vandiest
3rd prize Joseph-100JT

No 10787 Julien Vandiest (Belgium)

"Category I" 1.Sg4+ Kh5/i 2.Kg3/ii d2/iii 3.Qxd5+ Qg5 4.Qf7+ Qg6 5.Qd7 tm
d1Q/iv 6.Qb5+/v, with:
No 10788 O.Pervakov and N.Kralin
1st honourable mention Joseph-100JT

vi) Compared with (i) White has gained time. If Rxh4 11.Ke8 Re4 12.d8Q+ Rxh4 13.Kxh4, after which Black is unable to seize the opposition.
"The main subject is struggle for domination between bishop and rook. Switchbacks by wK and wR, and split moves by wB. When wK treads on c8 Black must give check without allowing interposition on c8 by wB. White’s plan is to guard d3 with wBb5 when bR is on d1. This will force bRd6, after which wBc6 waits for bR to return to a square ‘below’ d4. With wK standing on the c-file a bR check is met by the sacrificial wBe4 - but before this bR must be persuaded to occupy d1, to achieve which wB abandons control of d7 and play to c4. This weakening is compensated for by wK playing to e8 and d8, threatening to hide behind wB on the c-file. The decoys are of a ‘logical’ nature.
"Note that White cannot make many fatal mistakes. Most of the time he can double back and try again [like solving a maze by trial and error. AJR]. The unexpected switchback (f8-d8 and back) brings life to the failed plan seen in (i), and the thematic strength, the study would have won a prize were it not for the ‘minor dual’ on move 7."

No 10789 Yo.Afek
2nd honourable mention Joseph-100JT

iii) Rxh3+ 7.Kd2 draws, but also 7.Ke2 Rf6 8.e8Q.
No 10790 Attila Korányi
3rd honourable mention Joseph-100JT

No 10790 Attila Korányi (Hungary)
'Category III' 1.b6/i Bd1/ii 2.Be6 tm /iii
Be4/(Bh1) (Bh3;Bb1) 5.Be6 tm /vii
Kh7/viii 6.Bf5+ Kh8 7.Sg6+ wins, but
draw.
i) For 2.Sf6, but not the immediate
1.Sf6?, when the reply Be2; threatens
Kg7, for example 2.Kxg2 Kg7 3.Kf2
Kxf6 draw, but not here, for Black: Bf3?
2.h6 Bd1 3.Be6, and 4.Bg4 with a won
position. After (1.Sf6?) Be2 2.h6 Bc4
3.Ba4 Bb5 4.Bc2 Bd3 5.Ba4 Be2, and
it's a draw by perpetual attack or
stalemate.
ii) 2.Sf6+ meets most bishop moves. If
BF3 2.Sf6 Bb7 3.Be6 Bc8 4.Bg4 - an
important position - Bd7 5.Bf2 Bf3 6.Bf5
Be7 7.Sh7 (for Sg5) Bd7 8.Bb1 Bc6
9.Sg5, and the bishop (via h3) will take
iii) If 2.Ba2? then not Bf3? 3.Sf6 fol-
lowed by Ba2-e6-g4, but Be2 3.Kxg2
(Sf6,Bb3; Bh8) Bb1 4.Bb3 Bc2 5.Bc4 Bd3
6.Bf7 Bg6, drawing by perpetual attack.
Also bad: 2.Bd5? Bf3 3.Ba2 tm Kh7
(Be4? Sf6) 4.Kf2 Bb7(Ba8) draws. And
bad again: 2.Bf7? Bh5, or 2.Be4? Be2
3.Ba2 Bd3 4.Sf6 (else Bb1;) Be4,
exploiting the fact that wSf6 covers d5
but not e4.
most bishop moves.
v) This threatens to play Bbl; while
if Bd1 4.Kxg2 (Sf6? Bb3;) Be2 5.Kf3 Bb1
Or Bf3(Kh7) 4.Sf6.
viii) Thematic switchback. Not 5.Bg8?
Bb7, nor 5.Kf2? Kh7 6.Sg8 Bb7 draw.
ix) Bf3 6.Bf5 - the second important
winning position - Bb7 7.Kf2 Bf3 8.Sc8
and Bb7 9.Sd6 Bd5 10.Kg1 Kg8 11.Se8
Bb7 12.Sf6+ Kf7 (Kh8;Sh5) 13.Sh7
wins.
"An intriguing dance around the critical
squares. In the main line first b3 is
drawn to f5, for wS to emerge via e7
with a threat, and then b3 is dislodged
from f5 by his opposite number."

No 10791 Karen Sumbatyan
4th honourable mention Joseph-100JT

No 10791 Karen Sumbatyan 'Category
III' "White is a pawn ahead but ... the
kings are exposed. White starts an attack
against bK so as to advance his pawns
without being checkmated." 1.Rd5+ tm
Bd5/v 4.cxd5/vi aRb7+ 5.Ka8 Ra7+
(Kc7;d6+) 6.Kb8 tm dRb7+ 7.Kc8 Rc7+
8.Kb8 tm aRb7+ 9.Ka8 tm Kd7
10.dxe6+/vii Kc8 11.Rd8+ Kxd8 12.e7+
Kd7 13.e8Q+ Kxe8 14.f7+ Kfl/viii
15.Bd4/ix Re7/x 16.Bg7+ Kxg7 17.f8Q+
Kxf8 18.g7+ Kf7 19.g8Q+ Kxg8
stalemate.
Kxd6 4.Re2 (else Ke6, c) Rc7+ 5.Kb8
aRb7+ 6.Ka8 Kd7 7.Rd2+ Kc6 (Ke8),
iid) Bxd5 2.exd5+ Kxd5 3.g7. Or exd5
Or Kb6 2.Rxd6+ Rxd6 3.c5+, but also
2.Rb5+ Ke6.g7.
iilii) 2.Rb5? aRc7 3.Ka8 Rc8+ 4.Rb8
Ke7 5.Rxg2 Rxh8+ 6.Ka7 Rd8 with
mate to follow. Or if 2.Rb2? aRc7
3.Ka8/xii exd5/xiii 4.g7/xiv Re8+ 5.Rb8
dxc4 6.g8Q Rxd8 7.Rxg8 Kb6+ 8.Kb8
iv) 3.c5+? Ke6 4.Rb2 aRc7 5.Rb6+ Kc5
erb66/v Kd7 7.Rc8+ Kd7 8.f7 Rxh7
9.gxf7 Rxf7 and Black wins.
v) Kc6 4.Rxd7 Rxd7 5.f7 Rd8+ 6.Ka7
Ke5 7.Bd4+ Kxd4 8.g7 draw.
vi) 4.Rxd5+? exd5 5.f7, and either Rxf7;,
or aRb7+; will win.
Rc8+ 13.Kb7 Rxb8 14.g7 aRa8 wins.
viii) Kd7 15.Bd4 Ke7 16.Bg7(Bh6+).
ix) 15.Bg7? Ke7 16.Bf8+ Kxf8 17.g7+ Ke8
18.Rg8 Ra7+ 19.Kb8 cRb7+ 20.Ke8
xii) If 3.Ra2, then Rc7+ (Rxax2? Rxax6+)
xiii) 3.Rb6+ Kxb6 4.e5+ Rxc5 5.Rxc5
dxc4 6.Kc8 Rd1 mates.
xivii) 3...Ra8+ also wins: 4.Rb8 Rxb8+
5.Kxb8 Rb7+ 6.Ka8 Bxd5 7.exd5+ Ke7
mating.
xiv) 4.f7 Rc8+ 5.Rb8 dxc4 6.Rxc8+
Kb6+.
"An impressive composing performance."
David Blundell points out that the position after the parenthesised 18...Bh8 is a squeeze and not a zugzwang, and asks if it is not time that there was an accepted symbol for 'squeeze'.

AJR comments: Unfortunately, David Hooper’s useful term ‘squeeze’ has not caught on in the world at large. The 1992 revision of the Oxford Companion to Chess was obliged to include the proviso ‘in this book’ before the definitions of squeeze and zugzwang. Regular EG readers will know that their magazine has so far avoided using symbols, preferring to keep to the 26 letters and 10 digits of traditional English. Things may be different in the future – even as your editor writes, Hong Kong has ceased to be a British ‘possession’. ... What could EG use to denote a ‘squeeze’ without creating more confusion, doubt or ambiguity than it removed? ‘qz’ as against ‘zz’ perhaps? With ‘z’ retained for the cases where we aren’t sure?! ... And another thing – which is more logical: to append ‘zz’ to the move that creates the zugzwang (the general practice followed also by EG), or to the weakening move that is an endeavour to reply (as computer people tend to)? A third possibility, namely to append ‘Z’ to the creating move and ‘z’ to the reacting move(s), might also get votes.

x) 17.Kc5? Kd7 18.b7 (Kd5,Bh8;’z’) Kc7

No 10793 A.Bezgodkov
6th honourable mention Joseph-100JT

No 10794 V.Samilo
7th honourable mention Joseph-100JT
No 10794 V.Samilo (Ukraine) 'Category I'

1.Kb7 (Kb8? Kxa2+; Kxa3+;)
5.Re6+ Kf5 6.Rf6+ Kg5 7.Rg6 Kh5
8.Rh6+ Kg5 9.Rg6 Kh5 10.Rh6+ Kg5
11.Re6+ Kh5 12.Rg6+ Kg5 13.Rh6+ Kh5
14.Rg6+ Kh5 15.Rh6+ Kg5
16.Rg6+ Kh5 17.Rh6+ Kg5 18.Rg6+ Kh5
19.Rh6+ Kg5 20.Rg6+ Kh5 21.Rh6+ Kg5
22.Rg6+ Kh5 23.Rh6+ Kg5 24.Rg6+ Kh5
25.Rh6+ Kg5 26.Rg6+ Kh5 27.Rh6+ Kg5
28.Rg6+ Kh5 29.Rh6+ Kg5 30.Rg6+ Kh5
31.Rh6+ Kg5 32.Rg6+ Kh5 33.Rh6+ Kg5
34.Rg6+ Kh5 35.Rh6+ Kg5 36.Rg6+ Kh5
37.Rh6+ Kg5 38.Rg6+ Kh5 39.Rh6+ Kg5
40.Rg6+ Kh5 41.Rh6+ Kg5 42.Rg6+ Kh5
43.Rh6+ Kg5 44.Rg6+ Kh5 45.Rh6+ Kg5
46.Rg6+ Kh5 47.Rh6+ Kg5 48.Rg6+ Kh5
49.Rh6+ Kg5 50.Rg6+ Kh5 51.Rh6+ Kg5
52.Rg6+ Kh5 53.Rh6+ Kg5 54.Rg6+ Kh5
55.Rh6+ Kg5 56.Rg6+ Kh5 57.Rh6+ Kg5
58.Rg6+ Kh5 59.Rh6+ Kg5 60.Rg6+ Kh5
61.Rh6+ Kg5 62.Rg6+ Kh5 63.Rh6+ Kg5
64.Rg6+ Kh5 65.Rh6+ Kg5 66.Rg6+ Kh5
67.Rh6+ Kg5 68.Rg6+ Kh5 69.Rh6+ Kg5
70.Rg6+ Kh5 71.Rh6+ Kg5 72.Rg6+ Kh5
73.Rh6+ Kg5 74.Rg6+ Kh5 75.Rh6+ Kg5
76.Rg6+ Kh5 77.Rh6+ Kg5 78.Rg6+ Kh5
79.Rh6+ Kg5 80.Rg6+ Kh5 81.Rh6+ Kg5
82.Rg6+ Kh5 83.Rh6+ Kg5 84.Rg6+ Kh5
85.Rh6+ Kg5 86.Rg6+ Kh5 87.Rh6+ Kg5
88.Rg6+ Kh5 89.Rh6+ Kg5 90.Rg6+ Kh5
91.Rh6+ Kg5 92.Rg6+ Kh5 93.Rh6+ Kg5
94.Rg6+ Kh5 95.Rh6+ Kg5 96.Rg6+ Kh5
97.Rh6+ Kg5 98.Rg6+ Kh5 99.Rh6+ Kg5
100.Rg6+ Kh5 101.Rh6+ Kg5 102.Rg6+ Kh5
103.Rh6+ Kg5 104.Rg6+ Kh5 105.Rh6+ Kg5
106.Rg6+ Kh5 107.Rh6+ Kg5 108.Rg6+ Kh5
109.Rh6+ Kg5 110.Rg6+ Kh5 111.Rh6+ Kg5
112.Rg6+ Kh5 113.Rh6+ Kg5 114.Rg6+ Kh5
115.Rh6+ Kg5 116.Rg6+ Kh5 117.Rh6+ Kg5
118.Rg6+ Kh5 119.Rh6+ Kg5 120.Rg6+ Kh5
121.Rh6+ Kg5 122.Rg6+ Kh5 123.Rh6+ Kg5
124.Rg6+ Kh5 125.Rh6+ Kg5 126.Rg6+ Kh5
127.Rh6+ Kg5 128.Rg6+ Kh5 129.Rh6+ Kg5
130.Rg6+ Kh5 131.Rh6+ Kg5 132.Rg6+ Kh5
133.Rh6+ Kg5 134.Rg6+ Kh5 135.Rh6+ Kg5
136.Rg6+ Kh5 137.Rh6+ Kg5 138.Rg6+ Kh5
139.Rh6+ Kg5 140.Rg6+ Kh5 141.Rh6+ Kg5
142.Rg6+ Kh5 143.Rh6+ Kg5 144.Rg6+ Kh5
145.Rh6+ Kg5 146.Rg6+ Kh5 147.Rh6+ Kg5
148.Rg6+ Kh5 149.Rh6+ Kg5 150.Rg6+ Kh5
151.Rh6+ Kg5 152.Rg6+ Kh5 153.Rh6+ Kg5
154.Rg6+ Kh5 155.Rh6+ Kg5 156.Rg6+ Kh5
157.Rh6+ Kg5 158.Rg6+ Kh5 159.Rh6+ Kg5
160.Rg6+ Kh5 161.Rh6+ Kg5 162.Rg6+ Kh5
163.Rh6+ Kg5 164.Rg6+ Kh5 165.Rh6+ Kg5
166.Rg6+ Kh5 167.Rh6+ Kg5 168.Rg6+ Kh5
169.Rh6+ Kg5 170.Rg6+ Kh5 171.Rh6+ Kg5
172.Rg6+ Kh5 173.Rh6+ Kg5 174.Rg6+ Kh5
175.Rh6+ Kg5 176.Rg6+ Kh5 177.Rh6+ Kg5
178.Rg6+ Kh5 179.Rh6+ Kg5 180.Rg6+ Kh5
181.Rh6+ Kg5 182.Rg6+ Kh5 183.Rh6+ Kg5
184.Rg6+ Kh5 185.Rh6+ Kg5 186.Rg6+ Kh5
187.Rh6+ Kg5 188.Rg6+ Kh5 189.Rh6+ Kg5
190.Rg6+ Kh5 191.Rh6+ Kg5 192.Rg6+ Kh5
193.Rh6+ Kg5 194.Rg6+ Kh5 195.Rh6+ Kg5
196.Rg6+ Kh5 197.Rh6+ Kg5 198.Rg6+ Kh5
199.Rh6+ Kg5 200.Rg6+ Kh5 201.Rh6+ Kg5
202.Rg6+ Kh5 203.Rh6+ Kg5 204.Rg6+ Kh5
205.Rh6+ Kg5 206.Rg6+ Kh5

Switchback of wK from d5 to a8 to d5, plus switchbacks of wRR as part of a systematic movement comprising switchbacks by bK. But the underlying manoeuvre has been shown before by Kakovin and the identical final position appears in a study by Arsenich, and an approximate version in one by Fritz.

No 10795 Yohanan Afek
8th honourable mention Joseph-100JT

No 10796 Velimir Kalandadze
9th honourable mention Joseph-100JT
A zugzwang (David Blundell: no, it's a squeeze), and curtain.

i) 1.Kb8? Qg8+ 2.Qc8 Qg3+ 3.Ka8 Qa3+ 4.Qa6+. This is not (says our watchdog DB) the 'waste of time' as stated in the award, but a win for Black after 4...Qxa6+ 5.Qxa6+ Kxa6.

ii) Zugzwang. bk cannot move, and bQ has to guard both a7 and b7. Here begins a systematic manoeuvre that repeats the zugzwang until bP can be captured with check and the zugzwang is reinstated for the last time.

"Although there are forerunners by Mazur, Bron, Ericsson and Vandiest (with respect to the central zugzwang) the interesting feature is the systematic manoeuvre including zugzwang that keeps grinding along until the F-pawn gets between its teeth. A pity that wK stands initially in check."

The front cover of the STES Journal issue carries a study by F.Joseph (Belgisch Schaakbord, 1970) depicting the capital letter J.

F.Joseph, Belgisch Schaakbord 1970

The overall 5.WCCT event was won by Ukraine with 177.5 points by a short head from Slovakia with 174 points, Russia coming third with 166 points. Germany, despite scoring 0 in three sections, scored 122 to come fourth. 86 studies were entered and judged anonymously - hence the D1-D86 numbering. The 24 judged best were selected and awarded points from 24 down to 1, except that no more than two from one country could count. Compositions in other genres, but no studies, were ranked equal. The ranked studies follow, with their scores.

Readers may recall (see EG/// p364) that the set theme was 'a win study with avoidance of stalemate away from the board's edge'. The judge: P.Joita (Romania).

Such a set of studies, supposedly linked by a 'theme', besides being played through for simple enjoyment and admiration, provide a heaven-sent opportunity for anyone curious to develop an informed opinion on the limits of the...
proper relationship, one that 'ought' to be applied, between a study and its 'theme'. It is a vexed question, especially since there still is no accepted list, let alone definition, of valid themes in studies.

Older readers (there must be some with EG46 to hand) will recall the late Genrikh Kasparian's expressed dislike of thematic tourneys, which, he said, stifle creativity. The best articulated view of which AJR is aware is that of the problemist who opined that 'tomato soup should taste of tomatoes'. In other words, if 'tomato favour' is set as the theme, then a rice pudding, however marvellous, does not deserve any honour, even if all the submitted examples of tomato flavour are rubbish.

Judge's report (translated and abbre-viated): "Although figuring in the interim observations circulated to participating countries, 11 other studies (unplaced in the award) qualified for consideration. This made the total of valid studies 40 out of the 86 submitted, lending weight to the jibe that for the WCCT it is harder to concoct a sound study than a good one.

"My award rests on two groups of criteria. The first group relates to the embodiment of the set theme:

a) the aesthetics of the stalemate trap - for example, repetition of the theme, echoed or with the stalemated king on different squares, or stalemates based on pinned/imprisoned pieces,

b) the logical connection between the trap and White's actual winning line,

c) the worth of White's play, which should be neither weaker nor less interesting than Black's.

The second group of criteria relate to the artistic effect of the whole work: inter-related play and counter-play, tactical points, exceptions to general rules, originality, and finally, economy of starting and thematic stalemate positions (a consideration of prime importance where stalemate is concerned).

This final point merits closer examination. Several efforts, despite exhibiting multiple stalemates, were marked down due to the presence of numerous blocked or passive pieces there merely to establish the material balance. This lent them a 'middle-game' character, which they may or may not have carried off with success. Composer should have in mind that studies are 'endgames'.

Other factors naturally influence a judge. Where multiple criteria apply, what relative weights should be given to the various components, and is there a hierarchy? We come back to our starting-point. Studies are works of art based on chess logic, taste applies, and taste is not a matter for discussion: after all is said and done the judge is a person, and is subjective, he is dependent on chess culture and his artistic creed.

Paul Jiota, FIDE International Judge
Bucharest, 27xii1996"
"A rare technical achievement: Black's defence comprises two thematic stalemates set at right-angles, met by a white counter-plan at the very first move. The study bears the characteristics of a strategic work, but, surprisingly, bPh6, modest as it is, is harmful to its owner, since without it the position is a draw."


No 10798 Emilian Dobrescu
2nd place 5.WCCT - 23 points

15h5 0313.31 5/4 Win
No 10799 Mario Matouš
3rd place 5.WCCT - 22 points


"A charming miniature where White has several stalemates to avoid. The sole defect in this ‘aristocratic’ (ie pawnless) study is the passivity of the black knight tamely awaiting capture."


No 10800 Oleg Pervakov
4th place 5.WCCT - 21 points

No 10800 Oleg Pervakov (D15, Russia) 1.g5/i h2/ii 2.xh6 (2.g6? Ke6 3.g7 Kf7) h1Q/iii 3.h7 Qxh5 4.hR (h8Q? Kxh8) Kd4+ 5.Ka4 (Rxh5?) Qxb4/iv 6.Kb3, and Q- 7.Bc3 mate, or Ke5 7.Bc3+.

"This work had the highest mark for artistic impression, with a pair of different stalemate positions, with an underpromotion, and a surprise checkmate. Brief, but rich."

i) 1.e5? h2 2.c6 Kd6 3.Kb6 h1Q 4.c7

No 10801 V.Gorbunov and V.Rudenko
5th place 5.WCCT - 20 points


"There is technical skill in the construction. There are four stalemates for White to avoid, but the associated play has less attraction than Black’s ripostes."
i) \( Rx\_f6 \ 2. Sd_3+ \ Kd_2 \ 3. Se_5 \) and \( 4. Qb_3+ \) and \( 5. Qd_5+, \) winning.


\( 5. g8Q? \) Ra1+ (Bd_5+? Qxd_5) 8.Kxa1 axb2+ 9.Ka2 Bd_5+ 10.Qxd_5 b1Q+ 11.Kxb1 stalemate. Or 7.Bc5+? Ke2 8.g8Q Bd_5+ 9.Qxd_5 Ra1+ 10.Kxa1 axb2+ 11.Bxb2 stalemate [thematic]. This is the rare mirror stalemate, but not quite pure, since d2 is twice covered.

\( 3. Rxf4 (Bf_7?) Rh_4+, \) Kxf4 4.Bg6, with:

- \( Kf_6 \) 7.e8S+ wins, not 7.e8Q? Rh4+/v
- 8.Kxh4 stalemate, or

\( Rh_4+ \) 7.Kxh4 Kf6 8.e8R wins, not 8.e8Q stalemate?

Two thematic stalemates combined with underpromotions!

"Good play and counter-play, with almost every move having its point. The jump-off position is original, with good motivation for the two underpromotions."


\( 1. Bf_7? - \) as main line to 4...Kf5 draw.

One might wonder about: 7...Rg5+ 8.Kh4 Rg4+ 9.Kh3 Rh4+ 10.Qg1 Kg4+ 10.Kf3 Rxg6, whether this would also draw, thereby destroying, not the study, but the thematicity of the 7.Rh4+ stalemate. However, the relevant Ken Thompson 5-man database confirms that the GBR class 1300.01 position is a win for White. [AJR]
10. Qa8+ Kg4 11. Qg8+ Kf3 12. Qd5+ Kg4 13. Qf5+ Kh4 14. Qg5+ Kh3 15. Qg3 mate. "This miniature conceals some complex play by wQ to skirt round the perpetual stalemate set up by Black."

i) 1. Bc7? Rb2 2. Kg6/vii h2 3. Bxh2 Rxh2 4. g5/viii Ke5 5. f7 (Kg7,Rg2;) Rf2 6. Kg7 Ke6 7. g6 Ke7 draw.

ii) 2. Kh4(Kh6)? h2, or 2. Kg6? h2 3. f8Q hQ 4. Qe8+ Re5 5. Qc6+ Rd5 draw.

iii) Rb2 3. Be7 h2 4. Bxh2 Rxh2 5. g5 wins.


vi) Kh4 7. Qg3+ Kh5 8. Qg6+ Kh4 9. Qh6+ Rh5 10. Qf4+ wins.


viii) 4. f7 Rf2 5. g5 Rf5; 5. Kg7 Rxf7+.

"Two stalemates refuted, plus a classic winning line after elimination of the spectator bB."


No 10805 G. Amiryan
9th place 5. WCCT - 16 points

1835 0740.31 6/5 Win

No 10805 G. Amiryan (D62, Armenia)


No 10806 Hillel Aloni and Y. Bracheko
10th place 5.WCCT - 15 points

No 10806 Hillel Aloni and Y. Bracheko
(D39, Israel) l.Rh2/i Qxh2/ii 2.Se8 Sc5+
7.Kd7/vii Qh7+ 8.Kxe6/viii Q-
(Qd7+; Kxd7) 9.Bd4 mate.

"The best complex 'middle-game'. Hard
to solve."
Sxb2 wins. Or 1.Se8? Qxf3 2.Sf7+/ Ke4
3.Sg5+ Ke3 4.Sxf3 Sxb2 5.Se5 Sd3
6.Sxd3 Kxd3 7.Sxg7 Kxe4 8.Sxe6 Rg1
2.Bf7+ Kxg6 3.Rd2 Qxf3 4.Rh2 Qh5
5.Re2+ix Kh7 6.Sxe6? Qxf7 wins. Or
Ra8+ 4.Kc7 c5 5.Kxd6? Ra7+ wins. Or
1.Re2+? Kf6 2.Rxe6+ Kg5 3.Se8 c5
4.Sf7+ Kh4 5.Sxe7 cxb4, and 6.exb4 Re1
7.Rf6 Se5+ 8.Kxc7 Qf1, or 6.Re8 Sc5+
7.Kxc7 bxc3 winning for Black.
ii) Qxh3 2.Sf67+ Ke4 3.Sg5+ Ke3
4.Sxf3 Kxf3/xii 5.Sxe6 Kg3 6.Rd2 Se5+
Sa4+ 8.Kb7/xvii Qb6+ 9.Kc8 Qa6+
Qxb7+ 13.Kxb7 stalemate. Or if
Qd7+ wins.

e5 7.Sxh5/xix Kxc4 8.g7 Qh7 9.Sf6?
Qxf5 10.g8Q e4 11.fxe4 Qxe4 draw,
v) 6.Kc7 Qd8+ 7.Kxd8 stalemate. Or
e4 13.Ke5 Kg5 14.fxe4 g3 15.exf5 Kg4
16.f6 Kg3 17.f2 g2 18.fQ QfQ 19.Qxg4+
Qg5? 7.Bd4+ Kd6 8.c5 mate.
stalemate. Or 7.Ke7? Qh7+ 8.gxh7
stalemate.
viii) 8.gxh7 stalemate? Or 8.g? Qxg7+
ix) 5.Sh8+ Qxh8 6.Rh8 f3.
x1) 3.Kxc6 Qf1 4.Bxd6+ Kf6 5.Rd4
Qxd3+.
xiii) c5 5.Sxe6 exb4 6.Sxd4 wins. Or
Sxb4 5.Rh3 Sa6 6.Sxex6 wins. Or e5?
Sd7+ 8.Kb7 Sc5+/xxi 9.Bxex5 Qa8+
6.Sf7+ Rxf7 7.gxh7 Qd7+ 8.Kxc5 Qxf7
wins.
xvi) 7.Sxc5(Bxex5) Qxc5+
8.Kxc5(Bxc5/Qxc5) stalemate.
Qa2+ 11.Kxa2 stalemate.
stalemate.
xix) 7.Sxex6+ Kxex4 8.Sxe5+ Kd4
9.Sf7/xxiii Ke3 10.Sg5 Qb8 11.Sf5+
Kf2 12.g7 Qg8 13.Kc7 e5 14.Kf6 e4
15.Sc7 Qa8 16.gQ Qxg8 17.Sxg8 c3
draw.
8.Kxc7 stalemate.
xxi) \( 8.g7? \text{Qxg7}+ 9.Kxc6 \text{Qb7}+ 10.Kxb7 \text{stalemate.} \)
xxii) \( 9.Sc6+ \text{Kd5} 10.\text{Sc7} \text{mate.} \)
xxiii) \( 9.\text{Ke6?} \text{Qa2}+ 10.\text{Kf6} \text{Qa6}+ 11.\text{Se6}+ \text{Kd5} \text{wins.} \)
xxiv) \( 9.\text{Qxe7?} 7.\text{Kxe7} \text{c5} 8.\text{Sf6, not} 8.\text{K-? stalemate.} \)
xxv) \( 7.\text{Bxb4 stalemate?}, \text{or} 7.\text{S-?} \text{Qxe7?} + 8.\text{Kxe7} \text{stalemate.} \text{If} 7.\text{Sf6??} \text{Qxf6} 8.\text{Bxf6+} \text{Kxf6, and Black wins.} \)

No 10807 Angel Zlatanov
11th place 5.WCCT - 14 points

No 10807 Angel Zlatanov (D82, Bulgaria) 1.\text{Be7+/i} \text{Kf7} 2.\text{Bb3+} \text{Ke8} 3.\text{Ba4} \text{Bb8} 4.\text{Bxb5+} \text{Kf7} 5.\text{Be4+} \text{Kg7} 6.d7 (\text{Bxa7}?) a1Q 7.Bf8+ (d8Q? \text{Qd1+}) \text{Kf6} 8.d8Q+ \text{wins.}
"The only study showing imprisonment. The win is banal."

i) \( 1.d7? \text{Bc3} 2.\text{Bb5+} \text{Ba5} 3.\text{Bb6} \text{Kf7} 4.\text{Ba1} \text{Ke7} 5.\text{Ba4} \text{Bc3} \text{draw.} \)

No 10808 Michal Hlinka and Emil Klemanić (D40, Slovakia) 1.\text{Bc2+} 2.\text{Rb1+} \text{Kc5/i} \text{3.Ra5+} b5 4.\text{Rxb5+i/ii} \text{Kd6} 5.\text{Rd1+} \text{Bd3} 6.\text{Rxd3+} \text{Qxd3} 7.\text{fxe7} (7.\text{Bxd3}?) \text{Rxf8+} 8.\text{exf8R/iv wins}, \text{Qxb5} 9.\text{Rf6+} \text{Ke5} 10.\text{Kf5+}. \text{Set stalemates are circumvented by two underpromotions. The introduction is violent, the setting on the heavy side.}"

i) \( 1.c7? b5 2.\text{Bxb5+} \text{Kb6} 3.\text{fxe7} \text{Rxf8+} 4.\text{e8Q} \text{Qd5}+ 5.\text{Bd7} \text{Rxe8+} 6.\text{Kxe8} \text{Qe5}+ 7.\text{Kd8} \text{Qf6+} \text{draw.} \)

No 10808 M.Hlinka and E.Klemanić
12th place 5.WCCT - 13 points

d8a7 3550.32 8/6 Win

No 10808 M.Hlinka and E.Klemanić
12th place 5.WCCT - 13 points

No 10809 Sergei Kasparyan and S.Varov
13th place 5.WCCT - 12 points

c7a4 3082.44 9/8 Win

No 10809 Sergei Kasparyan and S.Varov
(D29, Armenia) 1.\text{Sc3+} \text{Kxb4/} 2.\text{Sd5+} /\text{ii} \text{Kc5} 3.\text{Sb4/ii} \text{Qxe4} 4.\text{Sd3+} \text{Kd5} 5.\text{Bb7+} \text{Kxe6} 6.\text{Bxe4 a1Q} 7.\text{Bd5+} /\text{iv} \text{Kxd5} 8.\text{Bxa1} e5 9.\text{Kd7} \text{wins.} \text{"Four stalemates, and play of interest, but the two bB8 cemented on f8 and h1 right at the start lessen the impression."}"


No 10810 Amatzia Avni
14th place 5.WCCT - 11 points

No 10811 M. Muradov
15th place 5.WCCT - 10 points

The solution is likeable but linear.
No 10812 Andrzej Lewandowski
16th place 5.WCCT - 9 points

"Exactly the same idea as the previous study, but the play is poorer."

No 10813 A.Zidek
17th place 5.WCCT - 8 points

"Three distinct stalemates, but the play in both parts is lacking in interest."

No 10814 M.B.Markovich
18th place 5.WCCT - 7 points

"The introduction is clever enough, but the stalemate avoided and the underpromotion fail the originality test."
ii) Kf2 3.e6 e2 4.Bxb4 g3 5.e7 g2 6.e8Q g1Q 7.Be5+. Or Kf1 3.e6 e2 4.Bg3 Kg2 5.e7 Kxg3 6.e8Q.
iv) 7.e8Q? g1Q+ 8.Bxg1 e1Q+ 9.Qxe1 stalemate.
v) Kf2 6.e7 e2 7.e8Q e1Q 8.Bg3+ wins.
No 10815 Attila Korányi
19th place 5.WCCT - 6 points

No 10816 Z.Mihajloski and B.Miloseski
20th place 5.WCCT - 5 points

No 10815 Attila Korányi (D59, Hungary)
1.Se7 (Sd4? Kg4), with:
f1Q/i 2.Sf5+ Kg4 3.Se3+ Kxf4/ii 4.Sxf1
h4 5.Bxe4 h3 (Ke4;Kg5) 6.gxh3 g2 7.Sg3
(Bxg2? [lovely stalemate]) g1S/iii 8.h4
Kxg3 9.h5 wins; or
Kg4? 2.Bc6(b7)/iv h4?/v 3.Bb5 (Bd7+?)
Kh5) h3/iv 4.Be2+ Kh4(Kxf4) 5.Sf5(Sd5)
mate.

[iii) Kxg3 8.Bxg2. g1Q 8.Se2+ Kxe4

No 10816 Z.Mihajloski and B.Miloseski
(D27, Macedonia) 1.Bd4 Ke4 2.f6 a2
3.Sd2+ Kxd4 4.f7 Ke3 5.BQ a1Q
6.Qh8+ Sg7 7.Qxg7+ Kb4 8.Qe7+
(Qxa7?) Ka4 9.Qa7+ Kb4 10.Qc5+
(Qxa7?) Ka4 11.Qxb5+ Ka3 12.Qb3
mate.

"There is a similarity to the 7th placing,
but the play is less rich. Besides, bPb5
serves no purpose."

No 10817 Jan Rusinek
21st place 5.WCCT - 4 points

No 10817 Jan Rusinek (D81, Poland)
Ke7 4.Sc4 Rh6+/iv 5.Kg5/v Rh5+
6.Kxh5/vi Qxh4 7.Se5+vii Kf6 8.Sg4+
"A surprising thematic stalemate. The
play is no more than schematic."
    Kf6 5.Se6+ Kf5 6.Se4+ Kf6 7.Sxe4
iii) Ke8 3.Sec4 Re5+ (Rf6;Kg5) 4.Kg6
     Qb1+ 5.Kf6 wins.
     wins.
vi) 6.Kg6? Qb1+ 7.Kxh5 Qh7+ 8.Kg4
     Qg8+, and 9.Kf5 Qe6+, or 9.Kxh4 Qxh4+
    stalemate.

No 10818 A.Korányi and P.Gyarmati
22nd place 5.WCCT - 3 points

No 10819 D.Bišcan
23rd place 5.WCCT - 2 points
No 10820 Wladimir Naef
24th place 5.WCCT - 1 point


i) 1.Rh6+? Kg1. Or 1.Seg4+? Kg3 2.Rxg5 Kf4 3.Sx2 Kg3 4.c6 Bb8 draw,
i) Kg1 2.Rxg5 f1Q 3.Sx3+ win.
 Se4 4.Rf3+ Kg2 draw.
 iv) f1Q 3.Sx3+ Kh4/viii 4.Rg4+ Kh3
 5.Sxf1 wins.
 v) Threat f1Q.
 vi) 7.Rxf1? stalemate. 7.Sf2+? Ke3
 vii) Kxc5 8.Sd7+(Sg4+) wins.

**GBR code**

(after Guy/Blandford/Roycroft) concisely denotes chessboard force in at most 6 digits. Examples: two white knights and one black pawn codes into 0002.01; wQ bQ wR codes as 4100; wBB vs bN codes as 0023; the full complement of 32 chessmen codes as 4888.88. The key to encoding is to compute the sum '1-for-W-and-3-for-B' for each piece type in QRBN sequence, with white pawns and black pawns uncoded following the 'decimal point'. The key for decoding is to divide each QRBN digit by 3, when the quotient and remainder are in each of the 4 cases the numbers of Bl and W pieces respectively.

The GBR code permits unique sequencing, which, together with the fact that a computer sort of several thousand codes and the reference attached to each is a matter of a second or two, enormously facilitates the construction of look-up directories.

A consequence of the foregoing is the code's greatest overall advantage: its user-friendliness. The GBR code has the unique characteristic of equally suiting humans and computers. No special skill or translation process is required whether the code is encountered on a computer printout or whether it is to be created (for any purpose, including input to a computer) from a chess diagram.

A natural extension of the GBR code is to use it to represent a complete position. A good convention is to precede the GBR code with the squares of the kings, and follow the code with the squares of the pieces, in W-before-Bl within code digit sequence, preserving the 'decimal point' to separate the pieces from the pawns, if any (where all W pawns precede all Bl). The 223-move optimal play solution position in the endgame wR wB bN bN would be represented: a7d3 0116.00 b2h3c6d6 3/3+. The '3/3' is a control indicating 3 W and 3 Bl men, with '+' meaning W wins, while '=' would mean White draws. The win/draw indicators are optional. Note that although in this example there are no pawns the GBR code decimal point and immediately following pair of zeroes are obligatory (enabling a scan of a text file searching for encoded chess positions) but the absence of a decimal point in the list of squares confirms that there are no pawns.
A position with pawns but no pieces would be coded in this manner: a2c4 0000.32 d4e3f2e4f3 4/3 WTM. To indicate Black to move (but still with the implied win or draw for White) it is suggested that '-' and '=-' be employed. Where the position result is unknown or undecided or unknowable it is suggested that the computer chess convention 'WTM' (White to move) and 'BTM' be followed. The redundancy check piece-count (including the '/' separator) and terminating full stop are both obligatory.
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