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This time Spotlight's contributors were Marco Campioli (Italy), J.R. Coward (England), Mario Garcia (Argentina), Jan Lerch (Czech Republic), Alain Pallier (France) and Michael Roxlau (Germany).
140.11812, G.Amiryan. At the end of the line $3 \ldots \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{MR}$ improves Black's play by $12 \ldots \mathrm{Ra} 8$, intending Rd8 and Rd1, when it is not clear how White wins.
140.11820, A.Kuryatnikov, E.Markov. According to Spotlight EG 141 this is unsound. However, MR thinks that the line $9 . c x b 4$ wins for White after 17.a3+.
141.11835, G.Sonntag. A dual, pointed out by JL: 4.Kh3 d6 ( $4 . . . \mathrm{Qg} 8$ is always answered by a check on 6th rank, which mates or wins the queen; 4...d5 5.Rc7 d4 6.Kh2 wins) 5.Kh2 Qb2+ (5...d5 6.Rb7 d4 7.Rc7 wins) 6.Kg3 Qh8 7.Kh3 Qc8+ (7...d5 8.Rc7 d4 9.Kh2 wins) 8.Kh2 Qh8 9.Bc2 d5 10.Rc7 d 4 11.Bd3, and finally $11 \ldots \mathrm{Qg} 8$ 12.Rc6+ wins.
141.11839, S.Zakharov. A misprint: the first move by Black should read $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 2$. According to AP , the $2^{\text {nd }}$ move, which is praised in the notes, is not original, e.g. V.Kalandadze, Akhalgazrda komunisti 1958, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Special Prize, d8e1 0140.02 a7a1a6.f3g3 3/4=,
1.Rg7 f2 2.Sc2+Kd2 3.Se3! Kxe3 4.Rxg3+ etc.
141.11846, A.Jarik (shouldn't this read Jasik?). A dual: 2.Sxc3 Kxc3 (2...Bc6 3.Rb3!) 3.Rb5 Bf7 (3...Bxb5 stalemate) 4.Rc5+ Kd3 5.Rd5+ Bxd5 stalemate. Furthermore, there seems to be no win for Black after 1.Rb5.
141.11855, H.Klug. Anticipated by N.Grigoriev, K novoi armii 1920, d2f3 0000.21 b4d3b5 3/2+, 1.Kc2 Kf4 2.Kb2 Kf3 3.Kb3 Kf4 4.Kc2 Ke5 5.Kd1 etc., which has an extra triangulation at the beginning.
141.11858, F.Vrabec. A difficult, deep study, that remains incomprehensible without notes. Consequently it caused a lot of confusion among Spotlight's contributors. However, one single variation is enough to understand what is going on.
Black's 3...Bg4 looks a little cooperative, as the dry reply $4 . \mathrm{Bg} 2$ nails it down and leaves Black with no defence against Ke5-f6-g5 and Be4. So why did Black play like that? Well, $3 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 4$ is the only move to defuse the threat that White has set up: 4.Be6? Kb7 5.Bxf5 Be 2 6.Be6 Kxb6 (6...Bd3? 7.Kd4 and 8.Kc5) 7.f5 Kc7 8.f6 Kd8 9.Bf7 (Now White intends to bring his king up to g 7 , when thanks to his control of the key squares f7 and g6 he can wrest both the a2-g8 and e8h5 diagonals from Black and finally promote his pawn. Black can counter this plan only by marching his own king over to g 5 !) Kd 7
10.Kf5 Kd6 11.Kg6 Ke5 12.Bb3 (12.Kg7 Kf4) Bh5+ 13.Kg7 Kf4 (not 13...Kf5? 14.Bf7) 14.Bc2 (14.Bf7 Bd1) Kg5 with a draw. The move 12...Bh5+ explains why Black had to play $3 . . . \mathrm{Bg} 4$.
141.11859, E.Iriarte. 14.Kd2 looks like a misprint, as $14 \ldots \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ draws (the c-pawn advances with check). Correct is 14.Ke2 Ka2 (14...c5 $15 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{~Kb} 2$ and now not $16 . \mathrm{h} 4$ ? Kb3 but 16.Kc4 Kxa3 17.Kc3 wins) 15.h4 c5 16.h5 c4 17.h6 c3 18.Kd3 Kb3 19.h7 c2 20.Kd2 Kb2 21.h8Q+ (check!) and wins.
141.11866, Y,Bazlov, A.Skripnik, V.Kovalenko. No solution: 5...Qd8+6.Kh3 Qh8 wins for Black. 141.11868, V.Ryabtsev. The solution should end with $9 . \mathrm{Se} 7$, as the following play is not unique any more. Perhaps the try 7.Kf6? Kb6 8.c8Q Rxc8 9.Sxc8+ Kc7 10.Se7 (contrary to the solution this is not threatening Sd 5 ) Kd 8 draw is worth a mention.
141.11879, S.Varov, S.Chudemyan. This looks unsound: 5...Qf4 6.Bc5 (6.Qxf4 Sxf4 7.Be4 (b1) Sge2 8.Kxh7 Sc3 wins the bishop) $6 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 7$, and I don't see a move for White, e.g. 7.Qxf4+ Sxf4 8.Be4 Sge2 9.Kxh7 Sc3 10.Be3 Sxg 2 and wins. Furthermore the finale is anticipated by V.Berg, EG 109.8881.
141.11880, N.Rezvov, S.N.Tkatchenko. A dual: 7.Kxc5 Be7+ 8.Kb6 Bd8+ 9.Ka6 Sd6 10.Qb3 Bb7+ 11.Qxb7+ Sxb7 12. Ba 7 and wins.
141.11884, G.Amiryan. This does not compare favourably with 81.5672 by V.Kozyrev, Shakhmaty v SSSR 1982, Special Prize, which shows the same theme in perfection (maximal economy, 2 excelsior runs): f6h2 $0300.20 \mathrm{~h} 8 . \mathrm{c} 2 \mathrm{~g} 2 \mathrm{3} / 2=$, $1 . \mathrm{g} 4 \mathrm{Kg} 32 . \mathrm{g} 5 \mathrm{Rf} 8+3 . \mathrm{Ke} 6$ and now 3...Kg4 4.g6 etc., or 3...Rg8 4.c4 Rxg5 5.Kd6 Rg6+ 6.Kd5 etc.
141.11885, M.Pastalaka. A dual: 3.Bd5 Bd3 (3...Rfl? 4.Sh3 glQ 5.Sxg1 Rxg1 6.h6+ Kf8 7.h7 even wins) $4 . \mathrm{h} 6+\mathrm{Kf8} 5 . \mathrm{Sh} 3$ draws, too. White intends to bring his king back and capture the pawn g2. On the other hand it is difficult for Black to make progress, as $5 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 6$ fails tactically: 6.Bxg2 Rxg2 7.Sg5 Rh2 (7...Rf2 8.h7 draw) 8.Kf6 draw. 141.11888, A.Varitsky. This is after J.Moravec ("28. rijen" 1927), of course. However, apart from the flashy 2.Sf7 there are two good tries: 2.Be4? Ba2 3.Bb1 Bd5 4.Bf5 b3 5.Kb1 b2 6.Kc2 Ka2 7.Kc3 a3 $8 . \mathrm{Kb} 4 \mathrm{~b} 1 \mathrm{Q}+9 . \mathrm{Bxb} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ (both minor pieces are dominated!) 10.Ka4 Be4 11.Bxe4 a2 wins and 2.Se6? b3 3.Bf5 b2+ 4.Kb1 Bf7 5.Kc2 Ka2 6.Kc3 Bxe6 7.Bxe6+ Ka1 8.Bf5 a3 wins.
141.11889, Sh.Chobanyan. A dual: $8 . \mathrm{Qg} 2+$ is a much simpler draw.
141.11892, E.Kuryatnikov, E.Markov. Useful to compare with P.Benkö, Chess Life iii1992,
h5b1 0007.02 a7a2b2.c7h7 2/5=, 1.Sb5 c5 2.Sd6 (now Black even has a free move, but cannot benefit from this: 2 ...Sc3 3.Kh6 draw; or $2 \ldots \mathrm{Sb} 4$
3.Se4 draw) Kal 3.Se4 c4 4.Sd6 c3 5.Sb5 c2 6.Sd4 c1S 7.Sc2+ Kb1 8.Sa3+ draw.
141.11893, V.Kondratev. At several points of the solution Black has a long-winding and difficult database win: $6 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 1 ; 3 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 3$ 4.Sxb5+ Kb3; or 3...Kd1 4.Sxb5 Kc1.
141.11895, J.Fleck. Another difficult study with no notes, a misprinted solution, and one of Spotlight's editor's best works on top of it. So here is the correct solution with some brief notes:
1.Kf1/i Sg2 2.Bb7/ii Sg3+ (Shf4; Bf3) 3.Kf2 Se4+ 4.Kf3 Sc3/iii 5. Kg3 Se2+6.Kh3 Sg1+ 7.Kg4 Se2 8.Bf3 Sd4(gl) 9.Be4/iv Se2 10.Kh3 $\mathrm{Sg} 1+$ 11.Kg3 Se2+ 12.Kf2 Sef4 13.Kf1 and wins, as $13 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 2$ 14. Bxg 2 is NOT stalemate.
i) 1. Kf 2 ? Sg 2 2. $\mathrm{Bb} 7 \mathrm{Shf4}$ leads to a positional draw based on pinstalemates: $3 . \mathrm{Kf1} \quad$ (3.Bxf4? stalemate, 3.Be4? Kh2; 4.Bxg2 stalemate) Sd 5 4. Ba 7 (4.Bxd5 stalemate) $\mathrm{Sgf4} 5 . \mathrm{Bg} 1 \mathrm{Sg} 2$ 6.Bxd5 stalemate. In the course of the solution White will revert to this line, but only after he has played his bishop over the critical square d 5 to e4, when Black's $3 \ldots .$. Sd5 is not effective any more.
ii) 2.Be5? Shf4 3.Bb7 Sd5 is the draw from note i).
iii) 4 ... Sc5 5.Bc6 Kg1 6.Ba7 Se1+ 7.Kg3 Sed3 8.Bg2 Sf2 9.Bb6 Sfd3 10.Bh3 Kh1 11.Bf5 is an important sideline.
iv) Mission complete, the bishop
has crossed d5. Now the king can safely return to fl .
141.11898, J.Fleck. A black pawn a5 is missing in the diagram. The study itself is not an original composition, but a correction of A.Herbstmann, Shakhmaty v SSSR 1952, $1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{HM}$, which I cooked some years ago.
141.11903, Gh.Umnov. Anticipated by A.Kakovin, Shakhmaty v SSSR 1960, 4th Prize, a4f3 0130.12 g5d1.a2b3d2 3/4=, 1.Ka3 bxa2 2.Kb2 a1Q+ 3.Kxal Bb3 4.Rg1 etc. The idea even dates back to J.Fritz, Ceskoslovensko Republika 1931.
141.11904, N.Kralin. A diagram misprint: the knight h1 belongs on h2.
141.11907, Yu.Bazlov. AP wonders (and so do I) what exactly this adds to the many studies with three knights vs. one.
141.11911, V.Kalyagin, B.Olympiev. No solution: 5...Kf6 draws, e.g. 6.Be5+ Kg5 7.Bxb2, and the draw is confirmed by Thompon's 6-man-database.
141.11916, V.Tupik. A dual: 8.Bf6 Kc1 9.Bxc3 wins (9...b1Q 10.Rh8). S1 p.388, Al.Kuznetsov, B.Sidorov. A dual: 2.Rxc4 Ka2 3.Ra4+ Kb1 4.Kc7 c5 5.Kd6 c4 6.Rxc4 Ka2 7.Ra4+ Kb1 8.Bd3 g5 9.Bxe2 wins.

S7 p.390, B.Sidorov. A dual: 10.Qxg5 hxg5 11.Kxg5 Qe5+ 12. Kh6 wins.

S8 p.390, B.Sidorov. This is 135.11487. White even wins after 3.Ke6 Kxe8 4.Be7 and mate next
move, as reported in Spotlight EG 136.

## World Congress of Chess

 Composition (WCCC), Wageningen (The Netherlands) 28vii-4viii2001The overriding impression of the week is of meticulous check-list planning and smooth organisation by our Dutch problem hosts, the 70th anniversary of whose parent body it was. The venue was the Wageningen international conference centre (WICC), a relaxed, open facility for meeting people, whether resident or nonresident. Almost 200 persons came and went. Accommodation, thank goodness without television, was more than adequate and the food admirable. The computer room had four or five PCs, probably the right number. Although there was no complaints book - but it would have been empty anyway - there was a 'letter box' for comments and entries for quick composing tourneys.

The 44th FIDE PCCC session was well attended by 28 countries - 26 delegates with voting rights were present. Work, conducted largely behind the scenes in up to 11 subcommittees, was productive.

Decisions made affecting studies:

1. Virgil Nestorescu (Romania) was awarded the Grandmaster (one delegate referred several times to 'grandmother') title.
2. Quick composing tourney awards will in future not be allowed in support of applications for the title of FIDE judge.
3. Each section in the 7.WCCT will be judged for the first time by a 'panel' of 5 qualified countries. For studies the countries are: Belgium, Georgia, Israel, Romania, Russia. If a judging country fails to reply by a limit date the event will proceed without them. The organising country is Makedonia.
4. The FIDE Album 1998-2000 announcement is delayed.
5. The term 'chess composition' was preferred to 'compositional chess'.
6. The 1992-94 FIDE Album was announced as available for distribution or purchase at the meeting. See mini-review.
7. The closing date for entries for the WCCI, an individual world championship for each of eight genres, the closing date for entries is $31 \times 2001$.
7.1 For studies: no more than six published during 1998-2000 to be sent in 5 copies to the director: Marko Klasinc, Nusdorferjeva 5, SI1000 LJUBLJANA, Slovenia. Joint compositions do not qualify, and entries may not be submitted by a third party. Algebraic notation and full publication (source) details are obligatory. The judges: A.Selivanov (Russia), I.Akobia (Georgia), L.Ugren (Slovenia).
7.2 The sum of a composer's best four placings by the judges determine his points, and the
composer with the best total is awarded the genre title.
8. The Qualifications Subcommittee produced a form for applicants for the judge's title to complete. It had not been done before!
9. If a composition included in a FIDE Album is subsequently shown to be incorrect, a decision has to be taken about the counting of points towards FIDE titles. The question of precisely when qualification points are final was, it was agreed, a matter of principle to be decided by the Qualifications sub-committee.
10. The new FIDE Album (1992-94) is too cumbersome. Suggestions for omitting repetitive data were considered - informally.
11. All is ready for the 2002 FIDE PCCC in Portoroz (Slovenia), but the prospects for Truskavets (Ukraine) in 2003 remain unclear, despite the favourable reception of a transport recommendation to get to the Carpathian resort by a custom (comfortable!) coach from Warsaw. 12. No fewer that 19 FM composition titles were awarded. Among them: Pavel Arestov (Russia), Amatzia Avni (Israel), Vladimir Kos (Czech Republic) and Sergei Zakharov (Russia). (The contents of the congress bulletin distributed at the closing banquet do not include decisions of the PCCC, so no official list is yet to hand.)
12. The judge's title (studies) was awarded to Harold van der Heijden.
13. The solving GM title was awarded to Noam Elkies and the solving master title to David Gurgenidze.

Peripheral matters - 'central' to many participants.
The traditional Open Solving preceded the 6 -round WCSC team event (won by Israel), followed by the always spectacular Solving Show elimination contest, won this time by Crisan of Romania. There were numerous quick composing events, mostly with alcoholic rewards. These were wisely presented at an afternoon speechifying session, eliminating prolonged and eventually tedious and embarrassing interruptions at the concluding banquet.

## II:. Informal minutes of Studies Sub-Committee

No country responded to chairman AJR's invitation to propose items for discussion within the subcommittee, so the sole item of business was the selection of a studies theme for the 7.WCCT. This was at the request of the latter's subcommittee (chairman, Uri Avner, Israel), which had no studies specialist among its members.
The 'study of the year' for the FIDE Album years 1995, 1996 and 1997 will be chosen (via e-mail contacts) when the selection judges have finished their work on the 640 entries. In this way it is hoped to
avoid selecting unsound work this time! The selections will be 'published' on the web-site maintained by Hannu Harkola.

## III: SNIPPETS

1. The selection of the 640 published studies entered for the 1995-97 FIDE Album tourney was boosted when the list of points awarded by the third and last judge was passed to the section director (AJR) by hand. Quick progress - see elsewhere - is now a real prospect.
2. The ARVES-cum-Euwe-Centre evening was a great success. Yochanan Afek, Harm Benak and Harold van der Heijden all delivered lectures on, respectively, a pet theme, studies/moremovers, and Valladao (the problem idea in which en passant, promotion and castling must all appear). The remarkable definitive results of the Euwe Centennial tourney were presented by Hans Bouwmeester and distributed (the single double-sided sheet has the 15 diagrams, all the solutions, the names of all participants, and a report). We understand the full award is scheduled for imminent publication in New in Chess. Certificates showing his own prize-winning position as a perspective image were presented to each winner who was present, in particular Henk Enserink and Marcin Banaszek. An ARVES fact-sheet and free copies of EG134, the issue with the complete award in
the unique USSR vs Rest-of-theWorld match, were freely available.
3. Harold van der Heijden drove AJR to his Deventer home one evening. AJR is still recovering from the shock of experiencing - not the drive, for driving excellence must be added to the long list of Harold's qualifications, but Harold's bravura performance at the computer.
4. A private visit to $A R V E S$ president Jurgen Stigter's home (and its not-quite-out-of-control collection of books and magazines) was worked into the group excursion to Amsterdam, which included a canal trip.
5. bernd ellinghoven informed AJR that three FIDE ALBUM studies have been demolished. Details tba. [That's 'to be advised'.]
6. The informal but prestigious "Finlandia Vodka" award (from Finland, conducted by Hannu Harkola) is always made to a person who has made a major contribution to the composition scene but who has had no other recognition. It went for the first time to a studies personality: Harold van der Heijden, primarily, but not exclusively, for having compiled his unique, and still growing, database of 50,000 studies marketed by ChessBase.
7. By agreement between David Gurgenidze and AJR the award in a just-añnounced Georgian tourney (not the first) in memory of the late Gia Nadareishvili will be published more or less simultaneously (e-mail
facilitating) in EG and the series Study Mosaic produced from time to time by Gurgenidze and Akobia in Tbilisi.
8. For cosmopolitan wordsmiths:
8.1 PCCC President Bedrich Formanek's response to the greeting 'in this changing world you are the one constant star' (that was in English) was: 'yes, ochen star' (Slavic resonance).
8.2 Advertisements in The Netherlands aimed at recruiting staff for telephone call centres have asked for workers happy not to wear any clothes. Well, I didn't encounter any such workers, but there were road signs pointing to NUDE.
8.3 When a thorny question tested the skills of a committee of the European Parliament someone said that they needed 'la sagesse normande', promptly interpreted as 'the problem called for Norman Wisdom'.
AJR

## The studies section in 6 WCCT

When Finnish veteran composer and many times world champion solver Pauli Perkonoja (who reached 60 on 19vii2001) describes the studies award by Georgian Kalandadze in the 6th WCCT as 'the poorest he has ever seen' (in Suomen Tehtäväniekat $3 / 2001$ ) we pay attention. But did Pauli perhaps pronounce in haste? Here we adopt an 'innocent until proved guilty standpoint and
examine the facts in some detail before either agreeing or disagreeing with him.
Pauli raises a number of interesting points in his article but the main bone of contention centres on a position in the study by the judge's countryman David Gurgenidze placed 5th. This is the position, with Black to move:

a5f2 0070.20. 4/3 BTM, Win
1...Bb7 2.Bg3+ Kxg3 3.cxb7 Bf4 4.Ka6 Bb8 5.Kb5 Kf4 6.Kc6 and 8.Kc8, winning.

In the world championship team events there is time for teams to comment, with claims of analytical flaws, anticipations, or thematic irrelevance. During this time attention was drawn to Gurgenidze's 4th prize in The Problemist for 1982-83:

The Problemist, iii 1983


After 1.c6 Ba6+ 2.Kb4 Sd3+3.Ka5 Se5 4.Bxe5, we have essentially our first diagram, and the solution proceeds the same way. It is a clear prima facie case of self-anticipation.

No analytical or thematic objections were raised (the set theme required a piece sacrifice that is refused), so we can concentrate on the anticipation claim. Gurgenidze told me at Wageningen that the 1983 study was unsound, and although I find no printed record of this (the study was not eliminated), nevertheless 'no solution' seems to be the case, with 2...Be5 3.Bxe5 Sd3+. Since there is no Codex-based objection to a correction (by the same composer) competing again (though etiquette advocates publication in the same outlet as the original), while there remain grounds for niggling, the WCCT placing hinges on the judgement of the judge, not on the anticipation. One can argue over the placing, but

Kalandadze is entitled to defend his decision, and critics should bear in mind that his task was not to evaluate on some absolute scale but only to rank what was placed in front of him.

Whether Gurgenidze drew attention to the 'correction' content of his submission, we do not know. We do think the onus was on him to do so, this consideration weighing more heavily than the desideratum of anonymity in such competitions. But all such matters are tangential.

The absence from the award booklet of any discussion of the relative qualities of the 24 placings is to be deplored. Perkonoja calls this 'strange'. We put it more strongly. The judge had both the right and the duty to defend his decisions. By his failure to do so he has not only let himself and us down but left himself open to suspicions of partiality. What can be said in his defence? Well, it is conceivable that the judge supplied comments which were omitted from the booklet for reasons of translation difficulty - see below but on this we are in the dark.

Turning to other, loosely connected, matters the judging of the 6th WCCT studies had a tragi-comic background. At no time did the German organisers know Kalandadze's address. (They didn't ask AJR!) Nor was e-mail contact made, though this might just have
been possible. Instead, advantage was taken of the presence of a German Jehovah's Witness (Tüngler, with some knowledge of the Georgian language) travelling to Tbilisi who was ready to hand over the analytical etc., comments (received from competing teams) which he did, via Gurgenidze, so the package reached judge Kalandadze. (The two native Georgians effectively know little English or German.) This serendipitous conjunction collapsed when the Jehovah's Witness was expelled from Georgia. We understand that the whole post-comments judgement was completed by the judge within a single month and handed to Günther Büsing at the Pula meeting early in September 2000 , there being no subsequent correspondence or communication.

The late David Hooper judged the 1982-83 event for The Problemist when the erratic Arriaga dropped out, and no definitive award seems to have been published. Such is the flavour of the 'real' world of studies!

AJR (who had function, either official or unofficial, in the 6th WCCT) 11viii2001

DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS
editors: John Roycroft
Harold v.d. Heijden

WORLD
CHESS COMPOSITION

## TOURNAMENT OF THE FIDE -

 6.WCCT - 1996-2000This formal international team event in seven sections ( 1 for studies) has as theme: In order to gain or lose a tempo, White refuses to capture a piece (not a pawn). Win or draw.
The award is in a 60-page booklet published by Die Schwalbe v2001
Velimir Kalandadze (Georgia) judged the 73 entries, sent in a neutral sequence to team captains, FIDE delegates and the judge. The brochure, dated vi1999, reproduced the composers' notes. After eliminations, 24 remained, all of which are in the award, whose solutions effectively contained no non-move text.
The provisional entries were circulated to the team captains of all 36 participating countries, and the comments. received by the organising country, Germany (in the person of Hemmo Axt) were conveyed to the judge. The final award is in the 2001 booklet.
judge's report/AJR remarks: The best pair (of the maximum of three entries allowed per country) counted towards the championship. This explains why the studies placed 19th and 22 nd carry no score. As is probably wise - considering the alternative - 'ranking' here excludes equal placings. EG follows the published booklet's solutions, but not slavishly - at several points the
punctuation, smacking of the computer, confused us.

## SIXTH WORLD CHESS

 COMPOSITIONS TOURNEY OFF.I.D.E. 1996-2000
studies section - all 24
placed entries
No 11930 D.Gurgenidze lst place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT- 24 points

c2h4 0431.21
5/4 Win
No 11930 David Gurgenidze
(Georgia). 1.d7 Rc1+2.Kd2 Rd1+
3.Ke3 Rxd3+4.Kxf2 Rf3+
(Bc6;Sg6+) 5.Kg1 (Kxg2? Rxf8zz;)
Rf1+ 6.Kh2 Rxf8 7.Kxg2, wins:
Kh5 8.Kg3 Kh6 9.Re7 Rd8 10.Kf4.
The critical zugzwang is 436 in
Nunn's Secrets of Rook Endings (2nd ed.).

No 11931 M.Miljanovic 2nd place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 23 points

flg3 0133.13 3/6 Draw
No 11931 Mirko Miljanovic (Yugoslavia). 1.Rb5 Se6/i 2.Rxd5/ii Be2+ 3.Ke1/iii Sf4 4.Rxe5/iv Sd3+ 5.Kd2/v Sxe5 6.Kxe2 Sc6 7.a6 h5/vi 8.Kfl h4 9.Kg1 h3 10.Kh1 draw. i) Sd3 $2 . \mathrm{a} 6 \mathrm{e} 4 / \mathrm{vii} 3 . \mathrm{Rb} 1 \mathrm{Bf} 3(\mathrm{Ba} 4$ ? Rb6) 4.Rb3 Sc5 5.a7 Sxb3 6.a8Q draw. Or Se4 2.Rxd5 Be2+ 3.Ke1 draw. Or Sa6(Sb3) 2.Rxd5 draw. ii) 2.a6? $\mathrm{Be} 2+$ wins. If $2 . \mathrm{Rb} 6$ ? Sf 4 3.Rxh6 (a6,Be2+;) e4 4.a6 e3, and Black's attack wins.
iii) 3.Kg1? Sf4 4.Rd2 (Kh1,Sh3;) Sh3+ 5.Kh1 Bf3+.
iv) 4.Rd6? e4 5.a6 e3 6.a7 Bf3 wins. v) 5.Kxe2? Sxe5 6.a6 Sc6 7.Kf1 h5 8.Kg1 h4 9.Kh1 h3 10.Kg1 h2+ 11.Kh1 Sb4 12.a7 Sd3 13.a8Q Sf2 mate.
vi) $\mathrm{Kg} 28 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{~h} 5$ (Sb4+;Ke4) 9.Kc4
h4 10.Kc5 h3 11.Kxc6 h2 12.a7
h1Q 13.Kb7(Kc7) draw. Or Sa7
8.Kfl Sc8 9.Kg1 draw, but not
9.Ke2? Kg2 (h5? Kf1) wins.
vii) A suggestion that Black can win with: 2...Sf4 3.a7 (Rb2,d4;) Be2+
4.Ke1 Bxb5 5.a8Q e4, seems (AJR
thinks) not to be the case if White improves with the prophylactic 3.Kg1.

No 11932 S.N.Tkachenko N.Rezvov 3rd place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 22 points

e2d4 0038.22
5/6 Draw
No 11932 Sergei N.Tkachenko, Nikolai Rezvov (Ukraine). 1.Sef5+/i
Ke4 2.Sd6+ Kd4 3.Sdf5+ Kc5 4.Sxg4 Bf3+/ii 5.Kxe3 Sxg4+ 6.Kf4/iii h3 7.Kxf3zz Kxc4/iv 8.Sg7/v Se3/vi 9.Sf5 Sg4/vii 10.Sg7 Se3 11.Sf5 Sxf5 12.g4 Se3 13.Kg3 draw.
i) 1.Sxg4? $\mathrm{Bf} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kel} \mathrm{Sd} 3+$ and 3...e2+. 1.hSf5+? Kc5 2.Sxh4 Be4 and the threat of $3 \ldots \mathrm{Bd} 3+$ secures Black a winning material advantage. ii) h3 5.fSxe3. Sxg4 5.gxh4 6.Sxe3 draw.
iii) 6.Kxf3? h3zz 7.S- Se3 8.- h2 9.- h1Q, Black wins! iv) Kb6(Kb4) 8.Se7 Se3 9.Sd5+ draw. Or Kc6 8.Sd4+ Kc5 K9.Se2 Se3 10.g 4 h2 11.Sg3 draw. v) 8.Sh6? Sxh6 9.g4 Sf7 10.Kg3 Sg5 wins. Or 8.Sd6+? Kd4 9.Se4 Se5+ 10.Kf4 h2 11.Sf2 Sd3+ wins.
vi) Kd3 9.Sh5 Se3 10.g4 h2 11:Sg3 draw.
vii) h2?? 10.Sxe3+K- 11.Kg2, and White actually wins.

No 11933 G.Slepian
4 th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 21 points

a7d8 0342.12
$5 / 5$ Win
No 11933 Grigori Slepian (Belarus).
1.Sc6+ Kd7 2.Se5+ Kd8 3.Sg7 Rxf3
4.Sxe6+ Kc8 5.f8Q+/i Rxf8 6.Sc4

Kd7 7.Sxf8+K- 8.Sxg6 White wins.
i) $5 . \mathrm{Sc} 4$ ? Ra3+ $6 . \mathrm{Sxa} 3 \mathrm{Bxf7}$ draw.

No 11934 D.Gurgenidze 5th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 20 points

a5f2 0070.20
BTM Win.

No 11934 David Gurgenidze (Georgia). 1...Bb7 (Bxf4;Kxa6) 2.Bg3+/i Kxg3 3.cxb7 Bf4 4.Ka6 Bb8 5.Kb5 Kf4 6.Kc6 Ke5 7.Kd7 Kd5 8.Kc8 White wins.
i) 2.cxb7? Bxf4 3.Ka6 Bb8 4.Kb5 Ke3 5.Kc6 Kd4 6.Kd7 Kc5 draw. For a discussion on originality see elsewhere in this EG.

No 11935 B.Gusev, K.Sumbatyan 6th place $6^{\text {li }}$ WCCT -19 points

d5h8 0163.10
3/4 Draw
No 11935 Boris Gusev, Karen Sumbatyan (Russia). 1.Kc6/i Se3/ii 2.Rh6+/iii Bh7/iv 3.Rh1/v Bf2 4.f6 Sg4/vi 5.f7 Se5+6.Kd5/vii Sxf7 7.Rf1 Bg3 8.Rf3/viii Be1 9.Rf1 Bh4/ix 10.Rxf7 Bg8 11.Ke6, and Bd8 12.Kd7, or Bg5 12.Kf5 draw. i) 1.Ke5? Bh2+. 1.Ke4? Sc3+. ii) Sc 3 2.Rh6+ Bh7 3.f6 Bd4 4.Kd6 Se4+ 5.Kd5 Bxf6 6.Rxh7+Kxh7 7.Kxe4 draw. The attempt to show a win by $1 . . . \mathrm{Sb} 2$ can be contested, AJR suggests, by continuing: 2.Rh6+ Bh7 3.Rh1 Bd4 4.Kd5 Bc3 5.Ke6 Sd3 6.f6 Bb4 7.Kf7 Se5+ 8.Ke8 Sg6 9.Kf7 Sf8 10.Rh4.
iii) 2.Rg6? Bf2 3.f6 Bf7 4.Rg7 Sc4 5.Kd7 Se5+6.Ke7 Bc5+7.Kd8 Bf8. iv) Kg 7 ? 3.Rg6+Kf7 4.Rxg1 draw. v) 3.f6? Sg4 4.Rh1 Be3 5.f7 Se5+ 6.Kc7 Sxf7 wins.
vi) Sf5? 5.f7 Se7+ 6.Kb5 Sg6 7.Rf1 draw.
vii) 6.Kb7? Sxf7 7.Rf1 Sd6+ wins. Or 6.Kc7? Sxf7 7.Rf1 Bg3+ wins. viii) 8.Rxf7? Bg8 9.Ke6 Bh4 wins. ix) Ba 5 10.Rxf7 Bg8 11.Ke6 Bd8 12.Kd7 draw.

No 11936 A.Manvelian 7 th place $6^{\text {ti }}$ WCCT - 18 points

g7e8 $0443.31 \quad 6 / 5$ BTM, Win. No 11936 Aleksandr Manvelian (Armenia). 1...Rg6+/i $2 . \mathrm{Kh} 7$ Rxe6/ii 3.Rb8+ Kd7/iii 4.Rxa8 Re7+ 5.Kg8/iv Ke6 6.Kxh8zz Kf6 (Kf7;Rg8) 7.Rf8+ Kg6 8.Rg8+/v Kh6 9.Rg6+ Kxg6 10.a8Q wins. i) Ke7 2.Kxh6 Kxe6 3.Rb8 Sf7+ 4.Kg7 Bxf3 5.a8Q Bxa8 6.Rxa8 wins. Or Rxe6 2.Rb8+ Kd7 3.Rxa8 Re8 (Re7+;Kf6) 4.Rxe8. ii) Ke7 3.Rb8 Bxf3/vi 4.Bc8 Rg2 5.Bb7 Rh2+ (Kf7;Bxf3) 6.Kg7 $\mathrm{Rg} 2+7 . \mathrm{Kxh} 8 \mathrm{Kf7} 8 . \mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Kxf8}$ 9.a8Q Kf7 10.Bd5+.
iii) But $K f 7$ 3:Rxa8 Re7, the witty line advanced by Pauli Perkonoja, draws.
iv) 5.Kh6? Ke6. $5 . \mathrm{Kxh} 8$ ? Ke6zz 6.Kg8 Kf6 7.Rf8+ (Kh8,Ke6;) Kg6 8.Rf6+ (a8Q,Rg7+;) Kxf6 9.a8Q

Re8+ 10.Qxe8 stalemate.
v) $8 . a 8 Q$ ? Rh7+ draw. If $8 . R f 6+$ ? Kxf6 9.a8Q Re8+ 10.Qxe8 stalemate.
vi) 3...Bc6 4.Bxf5 Rg1 5.Kxh8 Ra1 6.Be4 Bxe4 7.fxe4 Rxa7 8.Rb4 White wins.

No 11937 B.Sivák, M.Hlinka 8th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 17 points

b3f5 0134.23 5/6 Win No 11937 Bohuslav Sivák, Michal Hlinka (Slovakia). 1.Rb8 Bd5+/i 2.Sc4 Sc6 3.Rh8/ii Se5/iii 4.Rh5+/iv Kf6 5.Rxe5 Bxc4+ 6.Kc3 (Kxc4? Kxe5zz;) Kxe5/v 7.Kxc4zz Kf6 8.c6 Ke7 9.Kc5 Kd8 (e5;Kb6) 10.Kd6/vi Kc8 (e5;Kxe5) 11.Kxe6 Kc7 12.Kd5 Kc8 13.Kd4/vii Kd8 (Kc7;Kc5) 14.Kc4 Kc8 15.Kd5 Kc7 (Kd8;Kd6) 16.Kc5 Kc8 17.Kb6 Kb8 18.Kxa6 (Kxa5? Kc7;) Kc7 19.Kb5 wins.
i) Kxe5 2.Rxa8 Sc6 3.Kc4 Sb4 4.Rd8 wins.
ii) 3.Rf8+? Ke4 4.Kc3 Bxc4 5.Kxc4 Se5+ 6.Kc3 Kd5 7.Ra8 Kxc5 8.Rxa6 Sc6 9.Ra8 Kd5 10.Re8 e5 draws.
iii) Ke4 4.Kc3 Bxc4 5.Kxc4 Se5+ 6.Kc3 Kd5 7.Rh5 Ke4 8.Rxe5+ Kxe5 9.Kc4, as in the main line. iv) 4.Rh4? Bxc4+5.Rxc4 Sxc4 6. Kxc4 Ke5zz and Black wins. Or 4.c6? Sxc4 5.c7 Sd6+ 6.Kc3 Bb7.
v) Bb5 7.axb5 Kxe5 8.bxa6 wins.

Or Bd5 7.Kd4 Bb3 8.Re1 Bxa4
9.Ra1 White wins.
vi) 10.Kb6? Kc8 11.Kxa6 Kc7 12.Kb5 e5 draw.
vii) 13.Kc5(?) is a 'waste-of-time' dual: Kc7 14.Kd5 Kc8, ie not a dual at all.

No 11938 J.Rusinek 9 th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -16 points

h7d8 $3002.67 \quad 9 / 9$ Win
No 11938 Jan Rusinek (Poland). 1.Sb6/i b2/ii 2.Sc6+ dxc6 3.a7 Qxg6+ 4.Kg8/iii Qh7+ 5.Kf8/iv Qh8+ 6.Kf7 Qe8+ 7.Kxg7 Qg6+ 8.Kxg6 b1Q+9.Kxh6 Qa2 $10 . \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{Q}+$ Qxa8 11.Sxa8 e4 12.g5 White wins.
i) 1.Sb5? Kxc8 2. Kxg7 e4 wins. Or 1.c6? dxc6 wins.
ii) Qxg6+ 2.Kxg6 b2 3.c6 b1Q (dxc6;Sxc6+) 4.Kxg7 Qxb6 5.c7+ Qxc7 6.dxc7+ Kxc7 7.Sb5+ Kb8 8.a7+ wins.
iii) 4.Kxg6? b1Q+5.Kxg7 Qa2 6.a8Q Qxa8 7.Sxa8 e4, and 8.Kxh6 exf3, or $8 . S b 6$ e3, or $8 . S c 7$ exf3 draw.
iv) $5 . \mathrm{Kxh} 7 ? \mathrm{~b} 1 \mathrm{Q}+6 . \mathrm{Kxg} 7 \mathrm{Qa} 2$ 7.a8Q Qxa8 8.Sxa8 e4 9.Kxh6 draw. 5.Kf7? g5+ draw.

No 11939 Z.Mihajloski 10th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -15 points

h2h4 $0631.76 \quad 9 / 10$ Win
No 11939 Zlatko Mihajloski
(Makedonia). 1.g3+ Kh5 2.Sg8 (f8Q? Rc1;) Rh1+3.Kg2 Rg1+
4.Kf2 Rf1+5.Ke2 Re1+6.Kd2

Rd1+7.Kc2 (Kc3? a1Q+;) Rc1+ 8.Kb3 Rc3+ 9.Ka4/i Rxa3+ 10.Kb5 Ra5+ 11.Kb6(Kc6) Ra6+ 12.Kxc5 Ra5+ 13.Kb4 (Kd4? a1Q+;) Ra4+ 14.Kb3 Ra3+ 15.Kc2 Rc3+ 16.Kd2 Rd3+17.Ke2 Rd8 18.Sf6+ Kh6 19.Se8 Kh7 20.f8Q Rxe8 21.Qf7+ wins, not 21.Qxe8? Rh5 22.Qa8 alQ 23.Qxa1 Rh2+ 24.Kd1 Rh1+.
i) 9. $\mathrm{Kxa} 2 \mathrm{Rxa} 3+10 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 3+$ 11. $\mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 3+12 . \mathrm{Kd} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 3+13 . \mathrm{Ke} 2$ Rd2+ draw.

No 11940 J.Rusinek 11th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 14 points

a7e8 $0002.57 \quad 8 / 8 \mathrm{Win}$ No 11940 Jan Rusinek (Poland). 1.d7+ Kd8 2.Kxb7 f1Q/i 3.Se2/ii Qxe2/iii 4.c6 Qa6+5.Kb8/iv Qa7+ 6.Kxa7 alQ+7.Kb8 Qc3 8.Kb7 b5 $9 . \mathrm{b} 4 \mathrm{~d} 4$ ( $\mathrm{g} 6 / \mathrm{g} 5$;Sh6) $10 . \mathrm{Se} 5$ wins. i) alQ 3.c6 Qc3 4.Se2 f1Q 5.Sxc3 Qf4 6.Sxd5(Sb5) wins. fxg1Q 3.c6 Qc5 4.Se5 wins.
ii) 3.c6? Qf4. Or 3.Se5? Qa6+ 4. $\mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Qa} 8+5 . \mathrm{Kxa} 8 \mathrm{alQ}+$ and 6...Qxe5. iii) a1Q 4.c6 Qc3 (Qc1;Se5) 5.Sxc3 wins.
iv) 5.Kxa6? $\mathrm{alQ}+6 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Qc} 37 . \mathrm{b} 4$ b5, and 8.h3(h4) Qg3, or 8.S- Qe5, or 8.Kb6 Qd4+.

No 11941 A.Zidek 12th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -13 points

alf7 4661.76 g6g7 10/12 Win
No 11941 Alexander Zidek
(Austria). 1.Qc4+Ke8 2.Qc8+Kf7 3.e6+Kg8 4.Qe8 Rb1+5.Ka2 Rb2+ 6.Kxb2 Rb7+ 7.Sb5 Rxb5+ 8.Kc3 Rc5/i 9.Kb3/ii Rb5+ 10.Qxb5 axb5 $11 . a 6$ b4 12.a7 bxa3 13.a8Q a2 $14 . \mathrm{Qe} 8$ wins.
i) $\mathrm{Rb} 3+9 . \mathrm{Kd} 4 \mathrm{Rb} 4+$ 10.Ke3 wins. ii) 9.Kd4(?) Rd5+ 10.Ke3(?) Re5+ 11.fxe5? f4+ and stalemate. In this, White's moves 9 and 10 , unlike 11 , are reversible errors.

No 11942 F.Ziak 13th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 12 points

b3h7 0653.47
7/12 Win

No 11942 Friedrich Ziak (Austria) 1.Bc8 Ra4 2.Bd6/i R6a5 3.Ba6

Rxa6 4.Bf8 R6a5 5.Bg7 a6 6.Bxh8 Kxh8 7.d4 Bh7 8.d5 Kg8 9.d6 Kf8 $10 . \mathrm{d} 7$ wins.
i) After 2.Bxa6? White can achieve nothing better than a draw stalemating Black.

No 11943 G.Slepian
14th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 11 points

c2a2 0342.01
4/4 Win
No 11943 Grigori Slepian (Belarus).
1.Se2 (Sxd3? Bxd3+;) Rxd4/i
2.Sc1+/ii Ka1 3.Sb3+Ka2 4.Sc3+

Ka3 5.Sxb5+Kb4/iii $6 . S 5 x d 4$ a5 7.Kb2 a4 8.Sc2+ Kc4(Kb5) 9.Sa3+ and White wins, however long it takes!
i) $\mathrm{Rd} 2+2 . \mathrm{Kxd} 2 \mathrm{Bxe} 23 . \mathrm{Sc} 3+$ wins.
ii) $2 . \mathrm{Sbc} 3+$ ? $\mathrm{Ka} 33 . \mathrm{Sxb} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 4$ 4.bSxd4 Kc4 5.Kb2 Kd3 draw. iii) Ka 2 6.S5xd4 a5 7.Sb5 a4 8.Sc1+ and mate follows.

No 11944 S.Nahshoni, H.Aloni 15 th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 10 points

g5h1 4453.24
7/9 BTM Win
No 11944 Shuki Nahshoni, Hillel Aloni (Israel). 1...Bh4+/i 2.Kxh4 Qh7+ 3.Kg3 (Kxg4? Rxf6;) Qxh3+/ii 4.Kxh3 Sf2+ 5.Qxf2/iii Rh6+ 6.Qh4/iv Rxh4+7.Kg3/v Rg4+/vi 8.Kf3 (Kf2? Rf4+;) Rf4+/vii 9.Kxf4 (exf4 stalemate??) Kg2 10.Rb1 h1Q (b2;Bd4) 11.Rxh1 Kxh1 12.Bd4 c5/viii 13.Bal c4 14.Ke4 Kg2 15.Kd4 c3 16.Bxc3/ix bxc3 17.Kxc3/x Kg3 18.Kxb3 wins. i) Qd5+ 2.Kxg4 Qe4+ 3.Kxg3 Rxf6 4.Rb1+ Qxb1 5.Bg2+Kg1 6.e4+ Rf2 7.Bxf2 mate. Re5+ 2.Qxe5 Qd8+ 3.Qe7 Qg8+ 4.Kh5 Qh8+ 5. Kxg4 wins. Bf4+ 2.exf4 Qd5+ 3.Kxg4 Qe4/xi 4.Kg3 Rxf6 5.Rb1+ Qxb1 6.Bg2 mate.
ii) Qc7+? 4.Qf4 wins. Rxf6(Sxf6)? 4. $\mathrm{Bg} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 1$ 5.e4+ wins.
iii) $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ ? Se4+ 6.Kh3/xii $\mathrm{Sf} 2+$ draw.
iv) $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 4(\mathrm{Kg} 3)$ ? $\mathrm{Rg} 6+7 . \mathrm{Kf} 4(\mathrm{Kf} 3)$ Rf6+ 8. Kg3.Rg6+ 9. Kh3 Rg3+ draw.
v) 7.Kxh4?? Kg 2 8.Rb1 h1Q 9.Rxh1 Kxh1 10.Bd4 c5, when Black wins.
vi) Rh3+ 8.Kf2 Rf3+ 9.Kxf3.
vii) Rg 5 ? 9. Rbl +Rg 1 10.Rxb3
$\mathrm{Rf} 1+$ 11. Kg3 Kg1 12.e4+ Kh1 13.e5
Rg1+ 14.Kh3 Rg8 15.Rb1+ Rg1
16.Bxg1 hxg1Q 17.Rxg1+Kxg1
18.e6 b3 19.e7 b2 20.e8Q b1Q
21.Qe3+Kf1 22.Qf3+Kel 23.Qh1+ wins.
viii) Kg2? $13 . \mathrm{e} 4$ c5 14.Ba1 Kf2
15.e5 c4 16.Ke4 Kxe2 17.Kd4 wins.
ix) 16.Kd3? b2 17.Bxb2 cxb2
18.Kc2 Kg3.
x) 17.Kd3?? Kf2 18.e4 b2 19.Kc2

Kxe2 - Black wins.
xi) 3...Qxc5 4.Qxe6 Qg1+ 5.Kf3 wins.
xii) 6.Kf3? Rxf6+ 7.Kxe4 Kg2, when Black wins.

No 11945 S.N.Tkachenko, N.Mansarliisky 16th place $6^{\text {li }}$ WCCT - 9 points

e6el 0047.11 4/5 Draw
No 11945 Sergei' N.Tkachenko, Nikolai Mansarliisky (Ukraine). 1.Sf4 (Sg1? g3;) Bf5+ 2.Kf6 gxh3 3.Kg5 Sf7+/i 4.Kxf5 Sg3+ 5.Kg4 h2 6.Sd3+ Kf1 7.Sf2 Sxe5+ (Kxf2;Bxg3+) 8.Kh3/ii Sg4 9.Kxg3 Kg1 10.Sh3+ Kf1 11.Sf2 draw.
i) h2 4.Sg2+Kf2 5.Bxh2 Sxh2 6.Sh4 draw.
ii) 8.Kxg3? Sg4 9.Sh1 Kg1 Black wins.

No 11946 A.Gasparian 17 th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -8 points

h4h7 $3135.43 \quad$ 8/7 BTM Win No 11946 A.Gasparian (Armenia). 1...Qc4/i 2.g6+ (Rxf8? g3+;) Kh6 3.Sg8+ Qxg8 4.Sxg4+/ii Sxg4 5.f7 Be7+/iii 6.Kg3/iv Qf8 7.Kxg4zz/v c5 (B-;Re3) 8.c4 Bd6 9.Re3 wins, but not 9.Re1? Qa8.
i) Bxe7 2.Sxd3. $\operatorname{Sg} 6+2 . \mathrm{fxg}^{6}+$. Sf3+ 2.Kh5.
ii) 4.f7? Sxg6+/vi 5.fxg6 Qh8 6.Re6 Be7+.
iii) Qh8? 6.Kxg4 wins. Qxf7 6.gxf7 wins.
iv) $6 . \mathrm{Kxg} 4$ ? Qf8 7.c4 c5zz. 6.f6?

Sxf6 draw (Bxf6+? Kxg4).
v) This is what it's all been about behind the scenes!
vi) Not 4...Be7+? 5.Kg3 Qf8 6.Sxg4+, and Sxg 4 7.Kxg4, or Kg 5 7.Sxe5 Bd6 8.Kf3 Kxf5 9.Sd7 wins.

No 11947 J.Tazberík, M.Hlinka 18th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - 7 points

c8h6 $0341.42 \quad 7 / 5$ Draw
No 11947 Ján Tazberík, Michal Hlinka (Slovakia). 1.Sf5+ (Bxb5? fxe3;) Kxh5 2.Bxe4/i Bd7+/ii 3.Kc7 Bxf5 4.Bf3+/iii Bg4 5.Kxd6 Bxf3 6.Ke5 Kg4 7.h5/iv Bxd5 8.h3+/v Kg5 9.h4+ Kg4 10:Kxd5 Kxh5 11.Ke4 Kg4 12.h5 f3 13.h6 f2 14.h7 f1Q 15.h8Q Qe2+ (Qc4+;Ke3) 16.Kd5 draw. i) 2.Sxd6? Bxd3 Black wins. 2.Bxb5? Rxd5 3.Be8+ Kg4 Black wins.
ii) $\mathrm{Rf} 63 . \mathrm{Bf} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 64 . \mathrm{Se} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 7$ 5.Sc6+ "draw".
iii) 4.Bxf5? Rxd5 Black wins. 4.Kxd6? Bxe4 5.Ke5 f3 6.d6 Bc6 wins.
iv) 7.d6? Bc6 8.h5 f3 9.h6 f2 10.h7 flQ 11.h8Q Qa1+ wins.
v) 8.Kxd5? Kxh5 9.Kd4 Kh4
10.Kd3 Kh3 11.Ke4 Kg4zz 12.Kd4 Kf3 13.h4 Kg2 14.h5 f3 15.h6 f2 16.h7 f1Q 17.h8Q Qa1+.

No 11948 J.Tazberík, M.Hlinka 19th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - (3rd entry)

c5g4 3534.20 6/5 Draw
No 11948 Ján Tazberík, Michal Hlinka (Slovakia). Black's threats include Rb5 mate. 1.Rg8+ Kh3/i 2.Rh8+Kxg3/ii 3.Rg8+Kh3 4.Rh8+/iii Kg4 5.Rg8+Kf5 6.Rxg2 Rb5+/iv 7.Kc6 Bxg2+ 8.d5/v Rxd5/vi 9.Kb6/vii Rb5+ 10.Ka6/viii Re5 11.Kb6/ix Rb5+ 12.Ka6 Re5 13.Kb6 Re6+ 14.Kc5 draw, but not 14.Kb5? Sd6+, nor 14.Ka5? Re1 15.Kb6 Rb1+ 16.Ka5 Sd6 17.Rb8 $\mathrm{Ra}+18 . \mathrm{Kb} 6 \mathrm{Ke} 6$.
i) Kf4(Kh4) 2.Sh5+. Kf3 2.a8Q. ii) $\mathrm{Kg} 43 . \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 34 . \mathrm{Rh} 8+$. iii) $4 . \mathrm{Rxg} 2$ ? Rc1+5.Kb6 Rxc8 6.Ra2 Bg2, with a black win, but Perkonoja contests this on White's 6th with: 6.Rg5 Bg2 7.Rc5 Sd6 8.d5 Rh8 9.Kc 7 Se 4 10.Ra5 and a draw. Despite this AJR proposes 10 ...Sf6 for a win.
iv) Rc1+7.Kb6 Rxc8 8.Rf2+ draw. v) 8.Kxb5? Sd6+ 9.Ka6 Sxc8 Black wins. 8.Kd7? Sf6+ 9.Kd8 Rd5+ (Ra5 10.Rc5+ Rxc5 11.dxc5 Sg4 12.c6 Bxc6 13.Kc7 Se5 14.Kb8 draw) 10.Kc7(Ke7) Rd7+.
vi) $\mathrm{Bxd} 5+9 . \mathrm{Kxb} 5 \mathrm{Sd} 6+10 . \mathrm{Kc} 5$

Sxc8 11.Kxd5 draw.
vii) 9.Rxe8? Rd8+ wins.' 9.a8Q?

Ra5+ 10.Kd7 Rxa8 (or Sf6+ first) 11.Rxe8 (Rxe8,Bc6+) Sf6+ 12.Ke7 Bxa8 wins.
viii) 10.Kxb5? Sd6+ 11.Ka6 Sxc8 wins.
ix) 11.a8Q? Bxa8 12.Rxa8 Sc7+ wins.

No 11949 B.Sidorov 20th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -6 points

h8a7 $0304.75 \quad 9 / 8$ Draw
No 11949 Boris Sidorov (Russia). 1.f7/i Sd6+/ii 2.Sxa8 Sxf7+ 3.Kg8/iii Sh8 4.b6+/iv Kb8/v. 5.a7+ Kxa8 6.Kg7 g2 7.Kxh8 g1B (g1Q draw) $8 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 / \mathrm{vi}$ Bxd4+ 9.Kg6/vii Bh8 10.Kf5 (Kg5) draw.
i) 1.Sxa8? Sxf6 and 2...Sxh7.
ii) Kxb6 2.f8Q Sc7 3.Qxa8 Sxa8 4.Kg7 g2 5.h8Q g1Q 6.Kh7 Qb1+ 7.Kg7 Qg1+ (Sc7;Qc8) 8.Kh7, claimed as a draw. iii) 3.Kg7? Sh8 4.b6+ Kb8 5.a7+ Kxa8 6.Kg8 Sg6 (g2? 7.Kxh8 g1Q draw) $7 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{~g} 2$ (Sh8? Kg 8 ) 8. Kxg 6 $\mathrm{glQ}+9 . \mathrm{Kf7} \mathrm{Qxd4}$ wins.
iv) 4.Kxh8? g2 5.b6+ Kb8 6.a7+

Kxa8 7.Kg7 g1Q Qxd4+. 4.Sc7?
g2 5.Se6/viii g1Q 6.Kxh8 Qg6 7.Sf8
Qf7 8.Sg6 Qf6+ 9.Kg8 Qxg6+
10.Kh8 Qf7 11.b6+ Kxb6 and
12...Qf8 mate.
v) Kxa8 $5 . \mathrm{Kxh} 8 \mathrm{~g} 26 . \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ stalemate. Kxa6 5.Sc7+ Kxb6 6.Sxd5+ and 7.Sf4.
vi) $8 . \mathrm{Kg} 8$ ? Bxd4 9.Kf7 Bh8 10.Kg8 Be5 11.Kf7 d4 12.Ke6 Bh8.
vii) 9.Kh6(?) Bf6 10.Kg6 OK (time-
loss), but not $10 . \mathrm{Kh} 5$ ? d4 11.Kg4 d3
12.Kf3 Bd4, when Black wins.
viii) 5.Sxd5 g1Q 6.Kxh8 Qxd4+
7.Kg8 Qxd5+8.Kg7 Qg5+ 9.Kf7

Qh6 10.Kg8 Qg6+ 11.Kh8 Qf7
12.b6+ Kxb6.

No 11950 Yo.Afek
21st place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -5 points


No 11950 Yochanan Afek (Israel). 1.a7+ (d4? bxa6;) Ka8 2.d4/i

Bxe5+/ii 3.dxe5 Sf4 4.Se6/iii
Sxe6/iv 5.h7 (Kxg8? g2;) Sf6 (Sh6 stalemate) 6.exf6 Sd8/v 7.f7/vi Sxf7+ 8.Kg8/vii Sh8 9.Kg7 g2 10.Kxh8 g1Q(g1R) draw.
i) $2 . \mathrm{h} 7$ ? $\mathrm{Bxe} 5+3 . \mathrm{Kxg} 8 \mathrm{~g} 2$ wins.
ii) Se7? 3.Se6 Sd5 4.Sc7+ Sxc7
5.bxc7 White wins. Bg5? 3.h7
(Se6? Bd8;) Se7 4.Se6 White wins.
iii) This move (for $\mathrm{Sc} 7+$ ) has been in the air from the start, restricting Black's deceptively broad freedom of movement. 4.Kxg8? g2 and 5.g1Q+. 4.h7? Sh6/viii 5.Se6/ix Sf7+ 6.Kg7 Sxe6+ 7.Kxf7 Sg5+ 8.Kg7 Sxh7 wins.
iv) Sd5? 5.h7 Sge7 6.Kg7 White wins.
v) g2? 7.f7 Sf8 (g1Q f8Q) 8.Kg8 g1Q 9.Kxf8 draw.
vi) 7.Kg8? g2 8.h8Q g1Q 9.Qg7/x Qxb6 10.f7 Qe6 wins.
vii) 8.Kg7? Sh8 9.Kg8./xi Sg6 $10 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{~g} 2$ wins.
viii) 4 ...Se 7 5.Se6, and Sxe6 stalemate is actually Black's best!/xii.
ix) $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 ? \mathrm{~g} 26 . \mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ g1Q 7.Kf6 Sg8+ 8.Kf5/xiii Se7+ 9.Ke4 Qe1+ 10.Kd4 Qb4+ 11.Ke3 Qc3+ 12.Kf2 Qd2+ wins.
x) $9 . \mathrm{Kxh} 8$ ? $\mathrm{g} 210 . \mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q} 11 . \mathrm{Kf7}$ Qd4 12.Kg8 Qxb6 wins. xi) 9.Kh7 Qxb6 10.f7 Qc7 wins. xii) Other black 5th moves lose: 5...fSd5? 6.Kg7. Or 5...eSg6+ 6.Kg7 Sxe6+ 7.Kxg6 Sf8+ 8.Kf5 Sxh7 9.e6, when White wins. One soon loses one's way when there are nested errors.
xiii) 8.Kf7? Qg6+ 9.Kf8 Qxb6 10.Ke8 Qb5+ 11.Kf7 Qd7+ wins.

No 11951 An.Kuznetsov,
E.Kolesnikov

22nd place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT - (3rd entry)


No 11951 Anatoli G.Kuznetsov, Evgeni Kolesnikov (Russia). 1.Bf5+/i Kxf5/ii 2.f7/iii Rc8 3.Se7+

Kf6 4.Sxc8 Bxc8+ (Kxf7;Sd6+)
5.Ke8 Bd7+ 6.Kf8 Bf5 (Be6;h7)
7.Kg8 Bh7+/iv 8.Kh8/v Kxf7/vi
9.Kxh7 Kf8 10.Kg6 Kg8 11.Kg5

Kh7 12.Kh5 Kh8 13.Kg4 Kh7
14.Kxg3 White wins.
i) 1.h7? Kxh7 2.f7 Kg7 3. $\mathrm{Ke} 7 \mathrm{Re} 4+$
4.Be6 Rxe6+ 5.Kxe6 Bxd5+ 6.Kxd5

Kxf7 7.Ke4 Kg6 8.Kf4 Kf6 9.Kxg3
Kg5 draw.
ii) Kxh6 2.f7 Rc8 3.Ke7 Rh8/vii
4.Sf6 Kg7 5.Se8+ Kh6 6.Bh3 Rh7
7.Sf6 Rg7 8.Ke8 Bc6+ 9.Sd7 Bxd7+
$10 . \mathrm{Bxd} 7$ and $11 . \mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q}$ winning.
iii) 2.h7? Rc8 3.Se7+ Kxf6 4.Sxc8 Kg 7 .
iv) Be6 8.h7 Bxf7+ 9.Kf8.
v) 8.Kf8?? Bg6 9.h7 Bxh7 10.Ke8

Bg6 Black wins. 8.Kxh7? Kxf7
9.Kh8 Kf8 10.h7 Kf7 draw.
vi) $\mathrm{Ke} 7 ? 9 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ and $10 . \mathrm{f8Q}$.
vii) But 3...Rb8 4.Sb6 Rh8 5.Bh3 Kg 7 6.Sd7 Bc8, and no win for

White, is Perkonoja's paralysing pronouncement.

No 11952 M.Campioli 23rd place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -4 points

f6h7 0324.22
6/5 Draw
No 11952 Marco Campioli (Italy).
1.c8Q/i Sxc8 2.Bc6/ii g1Q/iii
3.Be4+ Kh6 4.Sf5+/iv Kh5/v
5.Bf3+/vi Qg4 6.Sg3+/vii Kh4
7.Bxg4/viii Kxg3/ix 8.Bc7+/x

Kxg4/xi 9.Bxh2 draw: Rxh2 10.f8Q
(or Kg7 first) Rf2+ 11.Kg7 Rxf8
12.Kxf8.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Ba} 4$ ? g1Q 2.Bc2+ Kh6
3.Bd2+/xii Kh5 4.Bg6+ Kh4 5.Sf5+

Kh3 wins. 1.Bd7? g1Q 2.Bf5 + Kh6
3.Bd2+/xiii Kh5 4.Bg6+Kg4
5.Bf5+ Kf3 wins. Or 1.Sg6? g1Q
2.f8S+/xiv Kh6 3.Bd2+ Kh5
4.Sxh8+ Kg4 5.Bd7+ Kg3 wins. Or
1.Sg8? Rxg8 2.fxg8Q+ Kxg8
3.Bf7+ Kh8 4.Bc3 g1Q wins.
ii) For $2 . \mathrm{Ba} 4$ ? or $2 . \mathrm{Sg} 8$ ? or $2 . \mathrm{Bd} 7$ ? see (i), same moves. 2.Bb5? Sxe7 3.Bd3+ Kh6 4.Bd2+ Kh5 5.Be2+
$\mathrm{Kh} 46 . \mathrm{Bg} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 3$ wins. $2 . \mathrm{Sg} 6$ ? g1Q
3. $\mathrm{Sxh} 8 \mathrm{Qg} 7+4$.Ke6 h1Q wins.
iii) h1Q 3.Be4+Kh6 4.Sf5+(Sg8+? Kh5;) Kh7 (Kh5;Bf3+) $5 . \mathrm{Sg} 3+\mathrm{Kh} 6$ $6 . \mathrm{Bd} 2+$ mate.
iv) Other checks lose as usual: 4. $\mathrm{Bd} 2+$ ? or $4 . \mathrm{Sg} 8+$ ?
v) $\mathrm{Kh} 75 . \mathrm{Sg} 3(\mathrm{Sg} 7)+\mathrm{Kh} 66 . \mathrm{Bd} 2+$.
vi) $5 . \mathrm{Sg} 7+? \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 6.Bf5 $+\mathrm{Kf} 37 . \mathrm{Bxc} 8$ Qd4+.
vii) $6 . \mathrm{Bxg} 4+? \mathrm{Kxg} 4$ 7.Sg3 Sd6 8.Sh1/xv Rf8 9.Ke6 Rxf7 10.Kxd6

Rf1 11.Ke6 Rxh1 wins. $6 . S g 7+$ ?
Kh4 7.Sf5 + Kh3 8.Bxg4+ Kxg4
9.Sg3 Sd6 10.Sh1 (Bc7,Sxf7;) Rf8 wins.
viii) 7.Sf5+? Kh3 8.Bxg4+ Kxg4 9. Sg 3 Sd 6 as seen already.
ix) Kxg 4 8.Bc7 Sb6 9.Bxb6 Kxg3 10.Bc7+ Kg2 11.Bxh2 Rf8 12.Bd6

Rxf7+ 13.Kxf7 draw. Sd6 8.Bc7
Kxg3 9.Bxd6+ Kxg4 10.Bxh2 draw.
x) $8 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ ? h1Q wins. $8 . \mathrm{Bxc} 8 ? \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ 9.Bc7+ Kh4 wins. 8.f8Q? Rxf8+ 9. Kg 7 h 1 Q wins.
xi) Kg 2 9.Bxh2 ( Kg 7 ? h1Q;) Kxh 2 10.Kg7 Rd8 11.f8Q Rxf8 12.Kxf8 draw.
xii) $3 . \mathrm{Sf} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 54 . \mathrm{Sg} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 4$ 5.Bf5+ Kf3 wins. $3 . \mathrm{Sg} 8+\mathrm{Rxg} 84 . \mathrm{Bd} 2+$ Kh5 wins.
xiii) $3 . \mathrm{Sg} 8+\mathrm{Rxg} 84 . \mathrm{Bd} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 5$ 5.fxg8Q Qxg8 wins. xiv) 2.f8Q Qf2+3.Ke7 Rxf8 wins. 2. Sxh8 Qg7+ 3.Ke6 h1Q wins. xv) 8.Bc7 Sxf7 9.Sh1 (Kxf7,Rh7+;) Kf3 10.Bg3 Kg2 11.Kxf7 Kxh1 wins.

No 11953 A.Pallier 24th place $6^{\text {th }}$ WCCT -3 points

c5g3 0040.21 4/3 Draw.
No 11953 Alain Pallier (France). 1.Bc6 (b5? h2;) Bxc6 2.b5 Bxb5/i 3.a7/ii Bc6 4.Kxc6 h2 5.Kb7(Kc7) draw, not 5.a8Q? h1Q+. i) h2 3.bxc6 h1Q 4.Kb6/iii Qb1+ 5.Kc7/iv Qa2 6.Kd7/v Qd5+ 7.Kc7 Qa5+ 8.Kd7. Qd5+ 9.Kc7 Kf4 10.a7 Qa5+ 11.Kb8 Qb6+ 12.Ka8 Qa6 13.Kb8 Qb6+ 14.Ka8 Qxc6+ 15.Kb8 draw. Ba8 3.b6 h2 $4 . \mathrm{b} 7$ h1Q 5.b8Q draw.
ii) 3.Kxb5? h2 4.a7 h1Q wins. iii) 4.a7? $\mathrm{Qg} 1+5 . \mathrm{Kd} 6 / \mathrm{vi} \mathrm{Qd} 4+$ 6.Kc7 Qxa7+ 7.Kd8 Qb8+ 8.Kd7 Qb5 9.Kd6 Kf4 10.c7 Qf5 wins. 4.c7? Qh6 5.a7/vii Qa6 6.Kd5 Kf4 wins. 4.Kd6? Kf4 5.a7/viii Qal 6.Kd7 Qxa7+ 7.c7 Ke5 8.Kd8 Kf6 9.c8Q Qe7 mate.
iv) 5.Ka7? Qf5, and 6.Kb7 Qb5+, or 6.c7 Qc8. Black wins.
v) 6.Kd6? Qxa6 wins. $6 . \mathrm{Kb} 6(\mathrm{~Kb} 7)$ Qb2+ 7.Kc7 Qa3 8.Kb6(Kb7) Qb4+ 9. Kc7 Qa5+ 10.Kd7, is a 'dual' in the minor sense that while 6. $\mathrm{Kb} 6(\mathrm{~Kb} 7)$ is another move that doesn't lose one can maintain that it
only delays wK's occupation of d7 in (i).
vi) 5.Kd5 Qxa7 6.Kd6 Qd4+.
vii) 5.c8Q Qc1+ wins. 5.Kb5 Qe6
$6 . a 7$ and either Qd5+ or Qc8 will win.
viii) 5.Kc7 Ke5. 5.c7 Qa8 6.Kd7

Qa7 7.Kd8 Qd4+ 8.Kc8 Ke5 9.Kb7
Qd5+10.Kb8 Qb5+ 11.Ka7 Qc6
12.Kb8 Qb6+ 13.Kc8 Kd6 wins.

## Leonid Topko-60

This formal international tourney was judged by L.Topko. 61 entries by 40 composers from 6 countries. The provisional award was published in Krivoi Rog 16vi1999 and has a 3 months conf. time. Remarks: the entries were computer-tested (but exactly how is not stated)

No 11954 A.Manyakhin 1st prize Topko 60JT

e6h5 $0110.02 \quad 3 / 3$ Win
No 11954 Alexander Manyakhin (Lipetsk, Russia). 1.Bf3+ Kh6 2.Kf7 e1Q 3.Rxg6+ Kh7 4.Rg5 Qh4/i 5.Be4+ Kh6 6.Rg6+ Kh7 7.Rg4+

Kh6 8.Rxh4+ wins.
i) Qe3 5.Rh5+ Qh6 6.Be4+ Kh8 7.Rxh6 mate.
"An ultra-miniature with good play by both sides from an elegant setting. The free to roam black queen cannot handle White's threats."

No 11955 Yo.Afek and N.Kralin 2nd prize Topko 60JT

h6h8 0316.41 6/5 Draw
No 11955 Yochanan Afek (Israel) and Nikolai Kralin (Russia), 1.c7 Sg4+ 2.Kh5 Sxe5 3.Bxe6 Sxe6 $4 . \mathrm{b7}$ $\mathrm{Sg} 7+5 . \mathrm{Kh} 6 / \mathrm{i}$, with:

- Sf7+ 6.Kg6 Se5+ 7.Kh6 Sf7+ 8.Kg6 Rc6+ 9.Kxf7 Rxc7+ 10.Kf8 Se6+ 11.Ke8, and Rxb7 stalemate, or $\mathrm{Sg} 7+12 . \mathrm{Kf8}$ draw, or
- Sf5+ 6.Kg5 Sf7+ 7.Kf6 Rc6+ 8.Kxf5 Sd6+ 9.Ke6 Sxb7+ 10.Kd7 Rd6+ 11.Ke7 Rc6 12.Kd7 draw.
i) $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 5$ ? $\mathrm{Sf} 3+6 . \mathrm{Kf6} \mathrm{Rc} 6+7 . \mathrm{Ke} 7$ Rxc7+ 8.Kf8, Black mates in 2.
"A pair of positional draws, one with successive stalemates. A luminous effort by the international duo!"

No 11956 O.Skrinnik
3rd prize Topko 60JT

d3fl $0445.04 \quad 5 / 8 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11956 Oleksandr Skrinnik (Ukraine).
1.bSd2+ Kf2 2.Sg1 Sb4+ 3.Ke4/i

Kxg1/ii 4.Kf3 Rh3 5.Bb2+ Kh2
6.Rg1 Kxg1/iii 7.Bxd4+ Kh2 8.Bg1+ Kxg1 9.Ke2 and 10.Sf3 mate.
i) 3.Kxd4? Kxg1 4.Ke3 Sc2+ 5.Kf3(Ke2) Sd4+ draw.
ii) Sc2 4.Bb2 Sxal 5.Bxd4+ and 6.Bxa1.
iii) Sc2 7.Ke2 d3+ 8.Kxd3 Sd4 9.Ke4 Kxg1 10.Bxd4+.
"Triple white piece sacrifices on g 1 lead up to an unexpected mate."

No 11957 Aleksei Gasparyan and Aleksandr Manvelyan (Armenia). 1.h7 Bd7+ 2.Kh4 Rh5+ 3.Kxh5 Bxe8+ 4.Kh6 g1Q 5.h8Q+ Qg8 6.Qf6+ exf6/i 7.d7+Kf7 8.d8S mate. i) Qf7 7.dxe7+ Kg8 8.Qg5+.
"An ideal mate with three active self-blocks."

No 11957 A.Gasparyan and A.Manvelyan 4th prize Topko 60JT

h3f8 $0341.22 \quad 5 / 5 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11958 I.Bondar and O.Kovbasa 5th prize Topko 60JT

h5f4 $0030.74 \quad$ 8/6 BTM Win No 11958 Ivan Bondar and O.Kovbasa (Belarus).
1...g6+ 2.Kh4 Bb2 3.e3+ Kf3 4.d4

Kg2 5.h8Q Bc3 6.Qa8+ d5 7.Qb8 $\mathrm{Be} 1+$ 8.Qg3+ Bxg3+ 9.hxg3 Kf3 10.a4 Kxe3 $11 . a 5$ e5 $12 . \mathrm{a} 6$ wins.
"The white queen arriving on the scene only to depart, does one more thing: it induces the advance of a black pawn (to d5) to block the black king's future path" - i.e. $10 \ldots \mathrm{Ke} 4$ is a
cul-de-sac.
No 11959 V.Vlasenko
1st honourable mention Topko 60JT

d3b3 $0350.11 \quad 4 / 4 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11959 Valery P.Vlasenko (Ukraine). 1.Bdl Bbl 2.Bc3 a4 3.d5 a3 4.d6 Ka2 5.d7 (Bxc2? Bxc2+;) Rf2+ 6.Kc4 Rf4+ 7.Bd4 Rf8 8.Bb3 mate.
"Stalemate play leads to mate."
No 11960 V.Sizonenko 2nd honourable mention Topko 60JT

b6b8 $3111.00 \quad 4 / 2 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11960 Viktor Sizonenko (Ukraine). 1.Be4/i Qf2+ 2.Rc5 Qb2+ 3.Rb5 Qf2+/ii 4.Kc6+ Ka7 5.Rb7+ Ka6/iii 6.Bd3+ Ka5 7.Sd5 Ka4/iv 8.Bc4 Qd4 9.Rb4+ Ka5 10.Rb5+

Ka4 11.Sb6+ Ka3 12.Rb3+ Ka2 13.Rd3+ Qxc4+ 14.Sxc4 wins.
i) 1.Rb5? Qd4+ 2.Ka6+ Kc7 3.Rb7+ Kd8 4.Sd5 Qc4+(Qa1+/Qd3+) 5.Kb6 Qd4+ 6.Kb5 Qb2+ 7.Sb4 Qe2+ 8.Ka4 draw.
ii) Qd4+ 4.Ka5+Kc7 5.Rb7+ and an S-fork.
iii) Ka8 6.Rb4 Qf4 7.Kc5+.
iv) Qd 4 8.Rb5+ Ka 4 9.Bc2+ Ka3 10.Rb3+ wins.
"A concerted struggle between one specific force and another."

No 11961 M.Hlinka
3rd honourable mention Topko 60JT

a5b7 3811.21
$7 / 5$ Win
No 11961 Michal Hlinka (Slovakia). 1.Rb8+ Kxc7 2.bRc8+ Kd7 3.e6+ Qxe6 4.cRd8+ Kc7 5.Bg3+ f4 6.Bxf4+ Kb7 7.Rb8+ Ka7 8.Rxe6 Rh5+ 9.Re5/i Rxe5+ 10.Sxe5 Rxf4 11.Sc6 mate.
i) 9.Se5? $\mathrm{Rxb} 8 \quad 10 . \mathrm{Ra} 6+\mathrm{Kb} 7$
11.Rb6+ Ka7 draw.
"Both sides play inventively."

No 11962 V.Katsnelson 4th honourable mention Topko 60JT

h1f6 $0401.24 \quad 5 / 6$ Draw
No 11962 Vladimir Katsnelson (St Petersburg). 1.Rb1 Rg8 2.Rf1+ Kg6 3.Se6 Rc8 4.Kh2 Rc1 5.Sf8+ Kg7 6.Se6+ Kg6 7.Sf8+ Kh6 8.Rf7 Rh1+ 9.Kxh1 d1Q+ 10.Kh2 g4 11.h4 g3+ 12.Kxg3 draw.
"Double-edged play leads to a position that is a draw ..."

No 11963 M.Roxlau
5th honourable mention Topko 60JT

alc8 $3114.53 \quad 9 / 6 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11963 Michael Roxlau (Germany). 1.Rh7 Sxe1 2.d7+ Kc7 3.Se6+ Kc6 4.d8S+ Kb6 5.Rb7+ Qxb7 6.Sxb7 d3 7.Sc7 Kxc7 8.Sd6
d2 9.Sxb5+ Kd7 10.Sc3 Sc2+ 11.Kxa2 Sxb4+ 12.Kb3 Sd5 13.Kc2 Sxc3 14.Kxd2 Se4+ 15.Kd3 wins, not 15.Ke3? Sg3.
"Realising White's advantage entails drawing the sting from Black's possibilities."

No 11964 V.Kalyagin 1st commendation Topko 60JT

flh3 $0163.10 \quad 3 / 4$ BTW Draw No 11964 Viktor Kalyagin (Russia). 1...Bc1 2.Rh5+ Kg3 3.Ra5 Bg2+ 4.Ke1 Sxc3 5.Rg5+, and Bxg5 stalemate, or Kh2 6.Rxg2+ Kxg2 stalemate.
"A pair of ideal mirror stalemates." No, not 'mirror'! If we cheapen the term in this way what should we call the far superior case where the maximum of 8 squares in the king's field are unoccupied?

$$
\text { c1f1 } 0320.12 \quad 4 / 4 \mathrm{Win}
$$

No 11965 Nikolai Ryabinin (Russia). $1 . \mathrm{b} 7 \mathrm{~g} 2$ 2.Be3/i Ra3/ii 3.Bb6 (b8Q? Rxe3;) g1Q 4.Bxg1 Rb3 5.Bc5 Rxb7 6.Bd3+ Kel 7.Bd6 (for mate!) Kf2 8.Bc4 (Kc2? Kf3;) Ke3 9.Ba6 Rb3 10.Kc2 wins.
bK actually cuts off bR's escape route. Everything is done without capture.
i) Suicidally relinquishing control of b4, surely? But 2.b8Q? g1Q will not win.
ii) $\mathrm{Rc} 4+3 . \mathrm{Kd} 2$ threatens mate. And the natural $2 \ldots \mathrm{Rb} 4$ is met by $3 . \mathrm{Bd} 3+$ Ke1 4.Ba6 d5/iii 5.Kc2 (for Bc5) d4/iv 6.Bd2+ Kf2 7.Bxb4 g1Q 8.b8Q, winning.
iii) 4...d6 5.Kc2. Or Re4 5.b8Q Rxe3 6.Qb4+ Kf2 7.Qd2+.
iv) 5...Re4 6.b8Q Rxe3 7.Qb4+ Kf2 8.Qd2+ Kf3 9.Qxd5+ Kg3 10.Qg5+ Kf2 11.Kd2 g1Q (Re2+;Bxe2) 12.Qxe3+ Kg2 13.Bb7+ Kh2 14.Qh6+ Kg3 15.Qg5+.
"Domination of the bishop pair over a rook."
AJR (who added the analyses): On
top of the fabulous domination climax there's an airy setting, unbelievably quiet moves, a solution whose length with this material is itself staggering, variations slotting in with supreme economy, and the same moves recurring but with a difference - all in all, a study to be the envy of Liburkin himself. An anticipation, anyone?

No 11966 E.Markov
3rd commendation Topko 60JT

d7d5 $3500.33 \quad 6 / 6 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11966 Evgeny Markov (Russia). 1.e8Q Rxe8 2.Rd6+ Qxd6+ 3.exd6 Re6 4.Rc5+ Kxc5 5.Kxe6 e3 6.h7 e2 7.h8Q e1Q+ 8.Qe5+ Qxe5+ 9.Kxe5, with:

- h3 10.d7 h2 11.d8Q h1Q 12.Qa5+ Kc6 13.Qa8+ K-14.Qxh1 wins, or
- Kc6 10.Ke6 c3 (h3;d7) 11.d7 c2
12.d8Q clQ 13.Qc8+ K- 14.Qxc1 wins.
"Line-wins of bQ."


No 11967 Volodimir Samilo (Ukraine). 1.Ka8 Rg7 2.b8Q+ Rg8 3.Qxg8+ Kxg8 4.Kb7 Ba5 5.c7 Bxc7 6.Kc6 h5 7.Kd5 h4 8.Ke4 h3 9.Kf3 draw.
"Freeing a path for wK."
No 11968 B.Sidorov 5th commendation Topko 60JT

h8c73150.23 6/6 Win
No 11968 Boris Sidorov (Apsheronsk, Russia). 1.Bd6+ Kd8 2.Ra2 b6 3.Ra7 Bb7 4.Rxb7 Qh1+ 5.Kg8 Qxb7 6.Bf4 Qg2/i 7.Be3 Kc7 8.Bxb6+ Kxb6/ii 9.d8Q wins.
i) $\mathrm{Ke} 77 . \mathrm{Bg} 5+\mathrm{Kxe} 68 . \mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{K}-$
9.Sxb7 wins.
ii) Kd6 9.d8Q+ Kxe6 10.Qe8+ Kd6 $11 . \mathrm{Bc} 5+$, and bQ is lost.
"Both sides oppose, and offer, bishops."

No 11969 A.Dashkovsky 6th commendation Topko 60JT

f2b7 $0000.22 \quad 3 / 3 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11969 Aleksandr Dashkovsky (Ukraine). $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kc} 62 . \mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 5$ 3.Kh5 Kd4 4.Kg6/ii Ke4 5.Kg5 a6 6.a3 a5 7.a4, reci-zug and therefore a win for White.
i) 1.a4? Kc6 2.Ke3 Kd5 3.Kd3 a5, and White will not win.
ii) 4.Kg5? Ke4. Or 4.Kh6? Ke3, reci-zug again.
"Circuitous route by wK. Mutual zugzwang." Standard stuff.

No 11970 H.Grondijs special prize Topko 60JT

f2e4 0000.12 2/3 Draw No 11970 Harrie Grondijs (Netherlands). 1.Ke2 Kd5 (Kxd4;Kxd2) 2.Kd1 Kc4 3.Kc2 Kd5 4.Kd1 Ke4 5.Ke2 draw.
"Positional [repetition] draw of some interest in a P-ending."

No 11971 G.Amiryan special honourable mention Topko 60JT

c8bl $0300.20 \quad 3 / 2$ Win
No 11971 Gamlet G.Amiryan (Armenia). 1.c6 Rh2 2.a6 Ra2 3.Kb7/i Rb2+ 4.Ka8 Rb6 5.a7 Rxc6 6.Kb7 win.
i) 3.c7? Rxa6 4.Kb7 Ra2 5.c8Q Rb2+ draw.
"Avoidance of perpetual pursuit in the symmetrical variation. A happy find in the ending of pawns against a rook."

No 11972 S.Borodavkin special commendation Topko 60JT


$$
\operatorname{c3d1} 0003.11 \quad 2 / 3 \mathrm{Win}
$$

No 11972 Sergei Borodavkin (Ukraine). 1.c6, with:

- Se2+ 2.Kb2 a3+ 3.Ka1 (Kxa3? Sd4;) or - a3 2.c7 Se2+ 3.Kb3 Sd4+ 4.Ka2 wins.
"Swapping Black's move order (Se2+; and a3;) makes a difference. A problem idea in a study!"
AJR: much as it pains a 70 -year-old to castigate a 60 -year-old, this award is a disgrace. EG's policy of giving complete awards (and not just the top prizewinners) continues to be justified as long as bad judging places studies such as the 2nd commendation by Ryabinin so low.


## Kralin jubilee tourney (55 years)

The award of this formal international tourney was published in a dedicated tidy booklet (edition size: 500) in Russian but with English language cover. Date: 14xii2000, Moscow. "Russian Chess Federation. Russian National Public Library for Science and Technology - J.T. Kralin - 55".

Nikolai Kralin (Moscow) judged the 128 studies by 84 composers from 13 countries. 104 in main section, 24 in miniatures section. US dollar (\$900) prize fund.
judge's report/AJR remarks: "... the tourney entries were creative enough. But the presence of so much quality led to the separation into two independent events. Alas, about $50 \%$ were defective. About 20 of these could otherwise have been prize-winners. To begin with the judge had adventitious electronic aid from chessplaying programs, later supplemented by the analytical power of ChessBase 8.0 under the guidance of Yu.I.Shvirkov, to whom I am most grateful. Cooperation between man and machine was far from straightforward, and now and then raised eyebrows, as is illustrated by the Visokosov example supplied here as a postscript."
main section

No 11973 A.Visokosov 1st prize Kralin 55 JT

e4f1 0513.14
5/7 Win
No 11973 A. Visokosov (Moscow). 1.h8Q? e1Q+. 1.Rxe2? alQ. So: 1.Rc1+! Rd1/i 2.Rxe2 Kxe2/ii 3.Rc2+/iii $\quad \mathrm{Rd} 2 / \mathrm{iv} \quad 4 . \mathrm{Rxd} 2+/ \mathrm{v}$ Kxd2/vi 5.Ba5+ Kc2/vii 6.Bc3/viii f5+ 7.Kf4/ix Sg6+/x 8.Kxf5 Kxc3/xi 9.Kxg6 Kc2 10.h8Q Kb1 11.Qb8+, winning because bPh6 is still on the board, having been mystically metamorphosed from a strength into a weakness!
i) e1Q+ 2.Rxe1+ Kxe1 3.Rxa2 f5+ 4.Ke3 f4+/xii 5.Ke4 Rh8/xiii 6.Bf2+ Kfl/xiv 7.Bxh4 Rxh7 8.Kf3 Kg1 9.Bf2+ Kh1 10.Ra5 h5 11.Ra1+ Kh2 12.Bgl+ Kh3 (Kh1;Be3+) 13.Be3 Kh4 14.Bxf4 wins. ii) Rxcl 3.Rf2+ Ke1 4.Rxa2 wins.
iii) 3.h8Q? is precipitate, f5+ 4.Ke5(Kf4) $\mathrm{Sg} 6+$. But so is 3. Rxd1? , an important try because it is thematic, Kxd1/xv 4.Bd4/xvi f5+ 5.Kf4/xvii Kc1 6.Bf6 Kb1 7.Bg7 Kcl 8.Bd4/xviii Kbl 9.Bf6 (Ke5,Sf3+;) Kc1 10.Bal Kb1 11.Bc3 (Ke5,Kxa1;) Kc2 12.Ba1 (Ke5,Kxc3;) Kb1, a positional draw.

We hope EG readers can take this on board! "The role in this of bPh6, denying wK access to g 5 , needs to be appreciated and borne in mind for later. Where have we gone wrong? It turns out that we have to invert everyday common-sense logic!"
iv) Kf1 4.Rf2+ Ke1 5.Rxa2 Sg6/xix 6.Rg2 Rd7 7.Rxg6, and Rxh7 8.Kd3 Rd7+ 9.Bd4, or f5+ 8.Kf3 Rxh7 9.Be3 Kd1 10.Rc6+ wins.
v) $4 . \mathrm{Rxa} 2$ ? $\mathrm{f} 5+5 . \mathrm{Ke} 5(\mathrm{Kf} 4) \mathrm{Rxa}$.
vi) "So, what is different here if we compare with the thematic try of (iii)? The only thing is bK's more active position on d2. After 5.h8Q there follows $5 \ldots$ alQ, and after $5 . \mathrm{Bd} 4$ there is $5 . . \mathrm{Kcl}$, securing the draw. Well, here comes the paradoxical rabbit out of the hat White's main line move 5."
vii) "White's last looked stupid, impossible, a blunder. But if we now look at the defence (after 5.Ba5+) 5...Kc1 6.Bc3 f5+ 7.Ke5 and there is no longer the bS fork on f 3 , the wB has slipped out of the noose. But naturally we have to do something about Black's stronglooking (main line) reply (5...Kc2)." viii) "Into the lion's jaws! We can see now that $6 \ldots$...Kxc3 7.h8Q a1Q 8.Qxf6+ will win.
ix) "This padlocks the reci-zug gate against Black. We should mention at this point that White has reached this position of mutual zugzwang BTM (cf. (iii)) by a different route from the normal one: not by a tempo-struggle, but by a logical
manoeuvre (3.Rc2+ and 5.Ba5+). If now bK chooses to limpet himself to $\mathrm{wB}(7 \mathrm{~F} . . \mathrm{Kb} 3(\mathrm{Kd} 3))$ his own P blocks him off on the subsequent move, and if $7 \ldots \mathrm{Kbl}$, there is suddenly 8.Ke5 Kc2 and wK safely traverses the critical e5 square with 9.Ke6 Kxc3 10.h8Q + , when the win is trivial: Kb3 11.Qb8+ Kc2 12.Qa7 Kb2 13.Qb6+ Kc2 14.Qa5 Kb3 15.Kd5 Sf3 16.Qb5+ Ka3 17.Qd3+ Kb2 18.Qe2+ Kb1 19.Qb5+ Kc1 20.Qa4+ wins."
x) h5 8.Bf6 Kb1 9. Kg 5 wins.
xi) $\mathrm{Se} 7(\mathrm{Sh} 4)+$ 9.Ke6 Sg6 10.Kf7 wins.
xii) 4 ...Re8 +5 .Kd3 Kf1 $6 . R f 2+\mathrm{Ke1}$ 7.Rf4+.
xiii) There were the threats of 6.Bxd8, and 6.Bf2+ (for Bxh4).
xiv) $6 . . . \mathrm{Kd1} 7 . \mathrm{Kd} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 8+8 . \mathrm{Bd} 4$.
xv) f5+? 4.Kd5 Kxd1 5.h8Q wins.
xvi) 4.h8Q alQ 5.Qd8+ Ke1 6.Ba5+ Kf1 7.Qd3 $+\mathrm{Kg} 28 . \mathrm{Qe} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 3$ draw. xvii) $4 . \mathrm{Kd} 3(\mathrm{Ke} 3) \mathrm{Sg} 6$. Or 4.Kd5 Sg 6 , ruling out 5 .Ke6 Sf8+, when wK does not reach bS , while if 4.Ke5 there follows 4..Sf3+ and 5.Sxd4.
xviii) 8.Ke5 a1Q+. Or 8.Ke3(Kg3) Sg6.
xix) 5 ...f5 5 6.Ke5 Sg6+ 7.Kxf5, and Sh4+ 8.Ke4 Sg6 9.Ke3 Rb1 10.Re2+, or Rd6 8.Rg2 Sh4+ 9.Ke5

Rxb6 10.Rg1+ wins, though Hew Dundas (who has played it all through) would like some guidance at this point...
"Pullulating play exhibiting one of the most promising directions of development of the contemporary
study, namely the synthesis of complex paradoxical ideas."

No 11974 Yu.Zemlyansky =2/5th prize Kralin 55 JT

ald5 $0071.44 \quad 7 / 7 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11974 Yuri Zemlyansky
(Russia). 1.h7 d2 2.Sf4+ Kc6
3. $\mathrm{Bg} 2+/ \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kb5} 4 . \mathrm{Bf} 1+\mathrm{Ka} 4 / \mathrm{ii}$
5.Sd5/iii Bxf6+ 6.Sxf6 Bf3 7.Be2/iv

Bxe2 8.Se4 d1Q+ 9.Kb2 Qd4+ $10 . \mathrm{Sc} 3+$ wins.
i) 3.h8Q? $\mathrm{Be} 24 . \mathrm{Bxd} 7+\mathrm{Kxd} 7$
5.Qh3+Kd6, and Black has found a way to escape the checks.
ii) Kc6 5.h8Q Bf3 6.Be2 Bxe2
7.Qh1+ and 8.Sxe2.
iii) Threatening to play $\mathrm{Sc} 3+$ and h 8 Q . But the best is still to come. iv) "Great sacrifice on the very square Black offered his bishop in (i)."
"Dynamic stuff, bubbling over with subtleties and pointed play."

No 11975 O.Pervakov, J.van Reek =2/5th prize Kralin 55 JT

c8g5 4500.21 6/4 BTM, Win
No 11975 Oleg Pervakov
(Moscow), J.van Reek (The
Netherlands). 1...Qg4+ 2.Kd8, with:

- Qxg3 3.Rh5+ Kxh5 4.Rf5+ Rg5
5.Re5/i Qxe5/ii 6.Qh7+ Kg4 7.Qh3+

Kf4 8.Qf3 epaulette mate, or

- Qe6 3.Rh5+ Kxh5 4.Rf5+ Kg4
(Qxf5;Qh7+) 5.Qd4+Kxf5 6.Qf4
chameleon echo epaulette checkmate.
i) Black is now in zugzwang.
ii) Qh4 6.Qf7+ Kh6 7.Qf6+ Kh5
8.Re8 Qg3 9.Rh8+ Kg4 10.Qe6+.

Or Qf4 6.Qh7+ Kg4 7.Qh3 mate.
Or Qxg2 6.Qh7+ Kg4 7.Rxg5+
Kxg5 8.Qg7+.
"Mating picture shifted up a rank. By Pervakov's admission the second line was a computer discovery!"


No 11976 David Gurgenidze (Georgia). 1.Kb1 Kb4 2.Kxb2 h2 3.e6 h1Q 4.e7 Qh5 5.e8Q Qxe8 6.Sd5+Ka5 7.b4+Ka4 8.a3, and to stop mate Black must abandon his queen.

No 11977 S.N.Tkachenko, N.Mansarliisky $=2 / 5$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

e6g73061.30 5/4 Draw.
No 11977 Sergei N.Tkachenko, Nikolai Mansarliisky (Ukraine). Black's threat of Qf6+; urges White to act first. 1.e8S+ Bxe8 2.Sxe8+ Kg6 3.Kd5/i Qf3+4.Kc4/ii Qe4+
5.Kb5 Qb4+ 6.Kc6 Qb6+ 7.Kd5 Qb3+ 8.Kc6 Qf3+ 9.Kb5 Qxb7+ 10.Kxc5/iii Kg5 11.Kd6/iv Kg6 12.Kd7 draw.
i) 3.Kd7? Qb5+/v 4.Kd8 Qxb7
5.c8Q Qe7 mate.
ii) Non-capture to win a tempo:
4.Kxc5? Qxb7 puts W in zugzwang:
5.Kd6 Kf7 6.Kd7 Qb5+.
iii) Now it is Black who is in zugzwang.
iv) The crucial tempo is won with this move.
v) $3 . . \mathrm{Qf7}+$ ? $4 . \mathrm{Kc} 6 \mathrm{Qf3}+5 . \mathrm{Kb5}$, and the author has his way.

No 11978 E.Kolesnikov $=6 / 9$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

d5b4 0430.41 6/4 Win
No 11978 Evgeny Kolesnikov (Moscow). 1.Rb6+ Rxb6 2.c7 Rd6+ 3.Kxd6 Bf4+ 4.Kc6 Bxc7 5.a6 Bb8
6.Kb7 Ka5/i 7.h3/ii h6 (h5;h4)
8.Kxb8 Kxa6 9.Kc7 Ka5 10.Kd6

Kxa4 11.Ke6 Kb5 12.Kf6 Kc6
13.Kg6 Kd7 14.Kxh6 Ke8 15.Kg7 wins.
i) The Q-wing set-up is the familiar one in which the outcome depends
on manipulating the K -side pawns on the h-file.
ii) 7.Kxb8? Kxa6 8.Kc7 Ka5 9.Kd6 Kxa4 10.Ke6 Kb5 11.Kf6 Kc6 12. Kg5 (Kg7? h5;) Kd7 13.Kh6 Ke7 with a draw.

No 11979 L.Katsnelson
$=6 / 9$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

e8c7 $0500.14 \quad 4 / 6 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11979 Leonard Katsnelson (St
Petersburg). 1.Ra4 e3 2.Rc4+ Kb6/i
3.Kd7 exd2 4.Rc6+ Kb7/ii 5.Rc7+

Ka6 6.Ra8+ Kb5 7.Rb8+ Ka6
8.Rc6+Ka7 9.Kc7, with:

- Rc1 10.Rb7+ Ka8 11.Rb1 d1Q
12.cRxcl (bRxcl? Qa4;), or
- Ral 10.Rb7+ Ka8 11.Rb1 d1Q
12.Rxdl wins.
i) Kd 6 3. $\mathrm{Rxd} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 54 . \mathrm{dxe} 3$.
ii) Kb5 5.Rb8+ Ka5 6.Rc5+ Ka4
7.Rc7 Rh5 8.Rbl wins.

No 11980 Aleksandr Manvelyan (Armenia). In the source brochure the diagram is misprinted and the solution garbled. We hope we've guessed right in amending both. Competitions suggests themselves: to correct an 'indecipherable' study;
to enumerate all possible classes of misprint; for the most comic misprint! 1.Qc2+ b3 2.Qd1 Rxe1 3.Qd4+b4 4.Qd7+b5/i 5.Qxc7/ii Rxe6+ 6.fxe6 Rxe6+7.Rxe6 Qd8/iii 8.Qa5+ Qxa5+ 9.Kb7 Qd8 10.Ra6+ Qa5 11.Rd6 wins, though it is not quite a reciprocal zugzwang as WTM can repeat the position, implying waste-of-time duals by wR along the rank on move 11.
i) c6 5.Qxc6+ b5 6.Qb6 Rxe6 7.fxe6 Rxe6 8.Rxe6 Qd8 9.Qxb5 mate. Dual: 9.Qa5+-main line. ii) 5.Rf8? Rxe6+6.fxe6 Qc5 7.Rb8 Rxe6+ 8.Qxe6 Qc6+ 9.Qxc6 stalemate.
iii) Despite material plus it's not easy for W to avoid the stalemate traps, for instance 8.Kb7? Qa8+ 9.Kb6 Qc6+, or 8.Qa7? Qc7 9.Qa8 Qb8 10.Qa7 (Qb7,Qd6+;) Qc7 11.Rb6 Qv8+. White extricates himself with his own Q-sac.

No 11980 A.Manvelyan
=6/9th prize Kralin 55 JT

a6a4 4800.34
7/8 Win

No 11981 V.Nestorescu $=6 / 9$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

g7f5 $0435.11 \quad 5 / 5 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11981 Virgil Nestorescu
(Romania). 1.Sh6+/i Ke5 2.Rxe6+ Kf4 3.Re8/ii Rxh3 4.Se6+ Kg3 5.Sg5, with:

- Rh4/iii 6.Rxe3+ Kf4 7.Rf3+ Kxg5 8.Rf5 mate, or
- Rh5 6.Rxe3+ Kf4 7.Re4+ Kxg5 8. Rg4 mate.
i) 1.Sxe6? Rxh3 2.Sh6+ Ke5 3.Sf7+ Kf5 4.Ra5+Kg4 5.Se5+Kg3 6.Ra3 Kh4 draw.
ii) 3.Re7? Rxh 3 4.Se6+ Kg 3 5.Sg5 Rxh6.
iii) Rh1 6.Rxe3+ Kf4 7.Rh3 wins. Hew Dundas comments that it is curious to put (iii) as a note rather than as a third alternative 'main line'. We think the composer and judge probably considered the checkmates deserved highlighting as being 'thematic'.

No 11982 N.Plaksin
special prize Kralin 55 JT

e1c1 3888.78
14/16 Draw
No 11982 Nikolai Plaksin
(Moscow). From the position and the composer's name senior or experienced solvers will divine that we are in traditional '50-move rule' territory, where the assumption is that if we can prove conclusively that at least 50 consecutive moves by both sides have been played without a capture or a pawn move, then a draw is the 'correct' result or, in this case, the 'solution'. The subjoined diagram (before 0...g7-g6) shows the 'critical' position from which play must have proceeded, with a dash indicating any irrelevant move: 1.- Bh6 2.- Kf8 3.- Kg7 4.Kf6 5.- Kg5 6.- Kh4 7.- Kh3 8.- Kg2 9.- Kf1 10.Kf3 Ke1 11.- Kd1 12.Kc1 13.- Kb2 14.- Ka3 15.Rc3 Ka4 16.Rb3 Sc5 17.Rb1 Se4 18.eRb3 Sc3 19.Rg1 Bg7 20.R3b1 Bd4 21.Rg2-22.bRg1 Sb1 23.Rh2 Rc3
24.Kg2 Qf4 25.Kf1-26.Kel -27.Kd1-28.Ke1 Ka3 29.Kb2 30.R1g2 Rg1 31.Rh4-32.gRh2 Rg2 33.Kcl Rb3 34.Kd1 Bb2 35.R2h3

Bc1 36.Rh2 Rb1 37.R2h3 Ra1 38.Rh2 Sb1 39.R2h3 Bb2 40.Rh2 Bg 7 41.Kc1 Sc3+42.Kb2 aRg1 43.R2h3! Sd1+ 44.Kc1 Rh2 45.Kbl

R1g2 46.Kc1 Se3 47.Kb1 Sf1
48.Kc1 Ka3 49.Kd1 Kb2 50.Ke1

Kcl.
In this position the threats of $1 \ldots$ Qxf1, $1 .$. Qxd2, or $1 \ldots$...gxf are deadly, but the 50 -move rule comes to White's rescue and it's a draw.
critical position - before g7-g6: e4e8 3888.78 d6c4e3a1c6a5h5f8g8a8h8d3h1.a2b5 c2d2e2f2g4b4b6c7d7e7f7g3g7= 14/16.

No 11983 A.Visokosov honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

e8b8 $0146.25 \quad 5 / 9 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11983 A.Visokosov (Moscow). 1. $\mathrm{Bg} 4+/ \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Sc} 8$ 2.Rxc8+ Ka7 3.Rxc2 Sxd6+4.Kf8 b3/ii 5.Rb2/iii Bxg4 6.Rxd2/iv Bh5/v 7.Rxd6 b2 8.Rd7+ Ka6 9.Rd1 Bxd1 10.e8Q blQ 11.Qa8 mate. i) 1.Bxh3+? Sc8 2.d7 bSd6+ 3.Kf8 c1Q 4.e8Q Qc5 draw. ii) $\mathrm{Bxg} 45 . \mathrm{Ra} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 76 . \mathrm{Rxd} 2$ wins.
iii) 5.Rxd2? Bxg4 6.Rxd6 b2 7.e8Q b1Q 8.Rf6/vi Qb4+ 9.Kg8 Bf3, draw! White is juggling with tempos so as to bring about this position with Black to move.
iv) Reci-zug, forcing Black to lose control of either d1 or d7.
v) b2 7.Rxb2 Bh5 8.Rh2.
vi) 8.Qf7+ Ka6 9.Rd8 Qb4+ 10.Kg8 Bc8.

No 11984 M.Matouš
honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

h1g4 $0471.01 \quad 4 / 5$ Draw
No 11984 Mario Matouš (Czech Republic). 1.Rf4+/i Kxh3 2.Bg4+ Kh4 3.Rxd4 Bf2 4.Bf3+/ii Be4 5.Rxe4+ (Bxe4? Ra1+;) Kg3 6.Re3, with:
$-\mathrm{Ra} 1+7 . \mathrm{Bd} 1+\mathrm{Bxe} 3$ stalemate, or

- Rh8+ 7.Bh5+ Bxe3 stalemate.
i) 1.Rf8+? Bxd1 2.Rxa8 Bf3+ wins. Or 1.Kg2? Be4 2.Sf2+ Bxf2 3.Kxf2
Ra2+ wins. Or 1.Rd3+? Bxd1
2.Rxd4+Kxh3 3.Rxd1 Rf8 wins.
ii) 4.Rf4? Be4+ 5.Rxe4 Kg3 wins.
"Two effective stalemates in the Czech composer's style - with a bishop pinned."

Bc1 36.Rh2 Rb1 37.R2h3 Ra1
38.Rh2 Sb1 39.R2h3 Bb2 40.Rh2

Bg7 41.Kc1 Sc3+ 42.Kb2 aRg1 43.R2h3! Sd1+ 44.Kc1 Rh2 45.Kb1

R1g2 46.Kc1 Se3 47.Kb1 Sf1
48.Kc1 Ka3 49.Kd1 Kb2 50.Ke1

Kc1.
In this position the threats of $1 \ldots$ Qxf1, $1 .$. Qxd2, or $1 \ldots$ gxf are deadly, but the 50 -move rule comes to White's rescue and it's a draw.
critical position - before g7-g6: e4e8 3888.78
d6c4e3a1c6a5h5f8g8a8h8d3h1.a2b5
c2d2e2f2g4b4b6c7d7e7f7g3g7 = 14/16.

No 11983 A.Visokosov honourable mention Kralin 55 JT


No 11983 A.Visokosov (Moscow). 1.Bg4+/i Sc8 2.Rxc8+ Ka7 3.Rxc2 Sxd6+ 4.Kf8 b3/ii 5.Rb2/iii Bxg4 6.Rxd2/iv Bh5/v 7.Rxd6 b2 8.Rd7+ Ka6 9.Rd1 Bxd1 10.e8Q b1Q 11.Qa8 mate.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Bxh} 3+? \mathrm{Sc} 82 . \mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{bSd} 6+3 . \mathrm{Kf} 8$ c1Q 4.e8Q Qc5 draw.
ii) $\mathrm{Bxg} 45 . \mathrm{Ra} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 76 . \mathrm{Rxd} 2$ wins.
iii) 5.Rxd2? Bxg4 6.Rxd6 b2 7.e8Q blQ 8.Rf6/vi Qb4+ 9.Kg8 Bf3, draw! White is juggling with tempos so as to bring about this position with Black to move.
iv) Reci-zug, forcing Black to lose control of either d1 or d7.
v) b2 7.Rxb2 Bh5 8.Rh2.
vi) 8.Qf7+ Ka6 9.Rd8 Qb4+ 10.Kg8 Bc8.

No 11984 M.Matouš
honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

h1g4 0471.01 4/5 Draw
No 11984 Mario Matouš (Czech
Republic). 1.Rf4+/i Kxh3 2.Bg4+
Kh4 3.Rxd4 Bf2 4.Bf3+/ii Be4
5.Rxe4+ (Bxe4? Ral+;) Kg3 6.Re3, with:
$-\mathrm{Ra} 1+7 . \mathrm{Bd} 1+$ Bxe3 stalemate, or
$-\mathrm{Rh} 8+7 . \mathrm{Bh} 5+\mathrm{Bxe} 3$ stalemate.
i) 1.Rf8+? Bxd1 2.Rxa8 Bf3+ wins.

Or 1.Kg2? Be4 2.Sf2+ Bxf2 3.Kxf2
Ra2+ wins. Or 1.Rd3+? Bxd1
2.Rxd4+ Kxh3 3.Rxd1 Rf8 wins.
ii) 4.Rf4? Be4+ 5.Rxe4 Kg3 wins.
"Two effective stalemates in the
Czech composer's style - with a bishop pinned."

No 11985 D.Gurgenidze, A.Selivanov honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

f1d8 0146.13
4/7 Draw
No 11985 David Gurgenidze (Georgia), Andrei Selivanov (Russia). 1.Rd7+ Ke8 2.Rxd3 h2 3.Kg2 Sh4+ 4.Kh1 Sxf5 5.Re3 Sg3+ 6.Kxh2 Sf1 + 7.Kh3 g4+ 8.Kh4 Sxe3 stalemate, following on from stalemates Black has avoided on moves 5 and 7.
"A pair of 'Troitzky' stalemates is added to with a third, though the play to start with leaves something to be desired."

No 11986 E.Eilazyan honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

e4a4 0343.22
4/6 Draw
No 11986 Eduard Eilazyan
(Ukraine). 1.f7 Rc3 2.Bxd7+, with:

- Kb4 3.Bg4 Bg2+ 4.Kf5 Rc8
5.Kg6 e6 6.Bxe6/i Rd8 7.Kg7 Sc7
8.d5 Se8+ 9.Kf8 Sd6+ 10.Ke7 Sxf7
11.Bxf7 Ra8 12.d6 Kc5 13.d7 Ra7
14.Be6, positional draw, or
- Ka5 3.Bg4 Bg2+ 4.Kf5 Rc8
5.Kg6 e6 6.Kg7/ii Sc7 7.f8Q Rxf8
8.Kxf8 Kb5 9.Ke7 Bd5 10.Kd7
positional draw again.
i) $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ ? Sc7 7.f8Q+ Rxf8 8.Kxf8

Be4 9.Ke7 Bf5 10.Bf3 Kc4 11.Kd6
Sb5+ 12.Ke5 Sxd4 13.Bb7 Kc5 wins.
ii) 6.Bxe6? Rd8 7.Kg7 Sc7 8.Bf5 Se8+ 9.Kg8/iii Sf6+ 10.Kg7 Sh5+ wins.
iii) 9.Kf8 Sd6+ 10.Ke7 Sxf7.
"Two subtly differentiated positional draws hinging on the retreat square chosen by bK on move 2."

No 11987 E.Markov
honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

b7d4 $3270.41 \quad$ 8/5 Draw
No 11987 Evgeny Markov (Russia). 1.Rg4+ Ke5 2.Rb5+ Bd5+ 3.Rxd5+ Kxd5 4.Rg5 Qxg5 5.f4+ Qg2 6.Bxg2+ hxg2 7.a7 g1Q 8.a8Q Qb6+ 9.Kc8+ Kc5 10.Kd7 Qd6+ 11.Ke8 Qe6+ 12.Kf8 Qf6+ 13.Kg8 Qg6+ 14.Kf8 Bb4 15.a3 Bxa3 16.Qf3 Bb4 (Kb4;Ke7) 17.Qb3 draw.
"Assorted plans: phase 1 is combinational based on a wP battery, while in phase 2 White neutralises Black's king battery."

No 11988 M.Roxlau honourable mention Kralin 55 JT


No 11988 Michael Roxlau (Berlin).
1.Kc7, with:

- Rxa5 2.bxa5 Ka6 3.Kc6 Kxa5+/i
4.Kc5 Bb3 5.Rd8 Ka6 6.Rb8 Bc2
7.Rb6+ Ka7 8.Kc6 Bg6 9.Kc7 Bf7
10.Rd6 h4 11.Rd7 Be8 12.Re7 wins, or
- Be6 2.Re2 Bf7 3.Rf2 Be6 4.Rf8

Bd5 5.Rf1 Rxa5 6.bxa5 h4 7.Kd6
Bg2 8.Rf7+ Ka6 9.Kc5 h3 10.Rh7
Bfl 11.Kb4 Bg2 12.Rh6+ Ka7 13.a6 Bf1 14.Ka5 wins.
i) h4 4.Kc5 Bb5 5.Kb4 wins.
"Subtle analysis in two variations."
No 11989 S.Zakharov, S.Matveev honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

h7a70030.53 $\quad 5$ Draw
No 11989 Sergei Zakharov, S.Matveev (Russia). 1.Kg6 Bb4 2.cxb4/i d5 3.Kf5/ii Kb6 4.Kg4 Kxb5 5.Kf5/iii Kxb4 6.Kxf6 d4 7.f5
e3 8.dxe3 dxe3/iv 9.Kg7 e2 10.f6 e1Q 11.f7 draw.
i) 2. $\mathrm{Kxf6}$ ? $\mathrm{Bxc} 3+3 . \mathrm{Kf5} \mathrm{Bxd} 2$
4.Kxe4 Bb4 wins. 2.Kf5? Bxc3
3.Kxe4 Bxd2 4.Kf5 Bc3 wins.
ii) 3.b6+? Kxb6 4.Kf5 Kb5 5.Kxf6
d4 6.f5 e3 7.dxe3 dxe3 8.Kg7 e2
9.f6 elQ 10.f7 Qg3+ 11.Kh7 Qf4
12. Kg7 Qg4+ 13.Kh7 Qxb4 14.Kg7 Qg4+ wins.
iii) Cf. (ii) after $4 \ldots \mathrm{~Kb} 5$. where it is WTM, whereas now here it is BTM. Reci-zug.
iv) d3 9.Ke7 d2 10.f6 d1Q 11.f7 draw.

No 11990 E.Kudelich honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

g8d8 $4576.12 \quad 6 / 9$ Win
No 11990 Eduard Kudelich
(Russia). 1. $\mathrm{Kg} 7+\mathrm{Se} 8+2 . \mathrm{Rxe} 8+$ Kxe8/i 3.cxb7+ Kd8 4.Rc8+ Rxc8 5.Qe8+ Kxe8/ii 6.bxc8Q+ Bd8 7.Qc6+ Qd7 8.Qg6+ Bxg6 9.Bxg6+ Sf7 10.Bxf7 mate.
i) Kc 7 3.Rxe7+ Kb6 4.Qd4+ Ka6 5.Qxd3+b5 6.Rxa7+ wins.
ii) Kc7 6.bxc8Q+ Kd6 7.cQc6+ Ke5 8.Qf6+ Ke4 9.Qa4+ Ke3 10.fQf4+ Ke2 11.Bxd3+ Kxd3 12.aQc4 mate.

No 11991 E.Iriarte honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

alg5 $0042.13 \quad 5 / 5$ Draw
No 11991 Eduardo Iriarte
(Argentina). 1.Sf4 d2 2.Sh3+Kg4
3.Sf2+Kf3 4.Sd1 Ke2 5.Sb6 Kxd1
6.Sc4 Kc2 7.Se3+Kd3 8.Bxg7

Kxe3 9.Bh6+ Kd3 10.Bxd2 Kc2/i
11.Bc3 Kxc3 12.h4 draw, not
$12 . \mathrm{Kbl}$ ? h 4 , when Black wins.
i) Kxd 2 11.Kb2 Ke2 12. Kxb 3 Kf 3
13.Kc3 Kg2 14.h4 Kg3 15.Kd3

Kxh4 16.Ke2 draw.

No 11992 A.Golubev
honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

d1f7 3111.15
5/7 Win
No 11992 A. Golubev (Russia). 1.Bb2 e5/i 2.Sxe5+ Kg7 3.Rc3

Qe6/ii 4.h8Q+ Kxh8 5.Sg6+
Qxg6/iii 6.Rc8+Kh7 7.Rh8 mate.
i) Qxc4 2.Rf3+Kg6 3.h8Q wins.
ii) Qf5 4.h8Q+ Kxh8 5.Sf7+

Qxf7/iv 6.Rh3+Kg8 7.Rh8 mate.
iii) Kg 8 6.Rc8+ Kf7 7.Sh8 mate.
iv) $5 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 76 . \mathrm{Rh} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 67 . \mathrm{Sh} 8$ mate.

No 11993 A.Kazantsev, An.Kuznetsov
special honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

e7e4 $4473.22 \quad 6 / 8$ Win
No 11993 Aleksandr Kazantsev, Anatoly Kuznetsov (Moscow). 1.Qa4+ Bd4 2.Rxd4+/i Ke5 3.Qa5+ c5 4.Qxc5+/ii d5 5.Re4+ Bxe4 6.Qd4+ Qxd4 7.Bb8+ Sc7 8.Bxc7+ Rd6 9.Bxd6 mate, and a pure midboard one at that.
i) 2.Bxd4? Re6+3.Kxd7 Bxd1
4.Qxa8+ Kxd4 5.Qh8+ Re5.
ii) $4 . \mathrm{Bxc} 5$ ? Re6+ 5.Kf7 Rf6+ $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ Qb1 draw.

No 11994 N.Ryabinin special honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

b1f1 0350.14
$4 / 7$ Win
No 11994 Nikolai Ryabinin (Russia). 1.b7 Bd6 2.Bxe7 Rc6 3.Bc4+/i Ke1 4.Bxd6 Rb6+5.Kc1 Rxb7 6.Kc2, with Kf2 7.Ba6, or Rb6 7.Be7, winning - the defence Rh6;, to the latter being ruled out by the presence of bPh 5 .
i) 3.Bxd6? Rb6+4.Kc1 Rxb7 5.Bc4+ Kf2 6.Ke2 Ke1 7.Kc1 Kf2 8. Kc 2 Ke 1 draw.

The central domination idea which won Ryabinin a lowly 2 nd commendation in the Topko-60JT, and a special prize in the Pushkin200MT, is shown again - to our renewed admiration.

No 11995 Grigori Slepian (Belarus). 1.Sf5 Rxg6 2.Rxg6 Bh5+ 3.Kf2 Bxg6/i 4.Sg3+Kh2 5.Sf1+Kh1 6.Sf3 Re2+ 7.Kxe2 Kg2/ii 8.Sh4+ Kg1 9.Sxg6 c5 10.Sf4 c4 11.Sd2 c3 12.Sf3+ Kh1 13.Kf2 c2 14.Sh5 c1Q 15. Sg 3 mate.
i) $\mathrm{Re} 2+4 . \mathrm{Sxe} 2 \mathrm{Bxg} 6$ 5.fSg3+ Kh2
6.Sf1+ Kh3 7.Sf4+Kg4 8.Sxg6 Kf5
9.Se7+ Ke6 10.Sc6 Kd6 11.Sa5 c5 12. Sc4+ wins.
ii) $\mathrm{Bh} 58 . \mathrm{Sg} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 29 . \mathrm{Sxh} 5 \mathrm{c} 5$ 10.Sf4+ Kg3 11.Sd5 c4 12.Sc3 wins.

No 11995 G.Slepian
special honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

elh1 0732.11
5/5 Win
No 11996 S.Zakharov
special honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

d2f3 0131.23
5/5 Win
No 11996 Sergei Zakharov (St Petersburg). 1.Kc1 a2 2.Rf1+Kxg4 3.Kb2/i Bc5 4.Ka1 Bd4+ 5.Sb2 Bc3 6.Rf7/ii Kh3 7.Rh7+ Kg4 8.Rh6 Be5 9.Re6 Bc3 10.Re3 wins.
i) $3 . \mathrm{Sf} 2+$ ? Kh4. 3.Se3+? $\mathrm{Kg} 54 . \mathrm{h} 4+$ Kg6 5.h5 +Kg 7 6.h6+ Kg6.
ii) 6.Rf2? Kh3 7.Re2 Bd4 8.Rd2

Bc 3 9.Rf2 Kg 4 , positional draw. No 11997 A.Skrinnik commendation Kralin 55 JT

alh6 $0173.42 \quad 7 / 6$ Draw
No 11997 Aleksandr Skrinnik
(Ukraine). 1.Rf1 h2 2.Bxh2 Bg7
3.Rxf3 Sc4+ 4.Rf6+/i Bxf6+ 5.Kb1

Sxd2+6.Kc2 Sf3 7.g4 Sxh2 8.g5+ draw.
i) $4 . \mathrm{Kb} 1 ? \mathrm{Sxd} 2+5 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{Sxf} 36 . \mathrm{Kb} 1$ Sxh2 would fall for Black's ploy.

No 11998 A.Oleinik commendation Kralin 55 JT

elc1 3111.31
$7 / 3 \mathrm{Win}$
No 11998 Aleksandr Oleinik
(Russia). 1.Se2+ Kb2 2.0-0/i Qg5+ 3.Kh2 Qxb5 4.Rb1+Kxb1 5.Sc3+

Kc1 6.Sxb5 e2 7.a7 e1Q 8.a8Q Qf2+ 9. Qg2 wins.
i) 2.Rh2? Qxd6 3.Sf4+Kb3 4.a7 Qb4+ draws.

No 11999 A.Grin, K.Tarnopolsky commendation Kralin 55 JT

f8g4 0003.42
5/4 Draw.
No 11999 Aleksandr Grin, Klimenty Tarnopolsky (Moscow). 1.Kg7 Sf5+ 2.Kf6 Sxe3/i 3.Ke5 Kf3 4.Kd4 Kxf4 $5 . \mathrm{b6}$ axb6, not just stalemate, but an ideal midboard variety. i) Sd6 3.Ke5 Sxb5 4.f5 Kg5 5.e4 Sxc3 6.Kd4 Sxe4 7.Kxe4 draw.

No 12000 S.Kasparyan commendation Kralin 55 JT

f4h6 3126.11

No 12000 Sergei Kasparyan
(Armenia). 1.Bg5+/i Kxh7 2.Bf6
Sg 7 3.Kg5 Se6+ 4.Kh4 Sg7
(Sxf8;Bxh8) 5.Kg5 Se6+ 6.Kh4
Qxf6+ 7.Rxf6 Sxf6 stalemate.
i) 1.Bxg8? Qd4+2.Kxf5 Qc5+
3.Kxg4 Qxf8 4.Bg5+Kg6 5.Be6

Qb4+ 6.Bf4 Qb5 wins.
No 12001 V.Kirillov, A.Manyakhin commendation Kralin 55 JT


$$
\text { h3g8 } 3040.32 \quad 5 / 5 \text { Draw }
$$

No 12001 Valery Kirillov, Aleksandr Manyakhin. 1.h7+ Kh8 2.Bg7+Kxg7 3.h8Q+ Kxh8 4.b8Q+ Kg7 5.Qxf4/i Bg2+6.Kg4 Bh3+ 7.Kh5 Bg4+ 8.Kh4 Qxf4 stalemate. In fact it's the third stalemate by Qxf4;, the earlier ones being avoided at Black's moves 5 and 7. i) 5.Qc7+? Kh6 6.Qh7+ Kg5 7.Qh4+ Kf5 8.Qg4+ Kf6 9.Qh4+ Ke6 10.Qg4+ Kd6 11.Qd1+ Bd5.

No 12002 Vladimir Kozhakin, Vitaly Kovalenko (Russia). 1.Qd2 Kh1 2.Qd5 Kh2 3.Qa2 Kh1/i 4.Qa8 Kh2 5.Qh8+ Kg1 6.Qf8 Kh2 7.Qh6+ wins.
i) Kg1 4.Qe2 Kh1 5.Qe4 Kg1 6.Qf5

Kh2 7.Qh7 +Kg 1 8.Qf7 Kh2
9.Qh5+ wins.

No 12002 V.Kozhakin,
V.Kovalenko commendation Kralin 55 JT


No 12003 V.Kondratev commendation Kralin 55 JT

h2h4 $4110.05 \quad 4 / 7$ Draw
No 12003 V.Kondratev (Russia). 1.Qxd6 f1S+/i 2.Kg1 h2+ 3.Qxh2+ Sxh2 4.Rh6+Kg3 5.Be5+Kf3 6.Rf6+ Qxf6 7.Bxf6 Kg3 8.Be5+ Kh3 9.Bxh2 g3 10.Khl g4 11.Kg1 gxh2+ 12.Kh1 g3 stalemate.
i) f1Q 2.Qh6+ Qh5 3.Bel+ Qxe1
4.Qxh5 + Kxh5 5.Rh6+ Kxh6 stalemate.

No 12004 A.Gasparyan commendation Kralin 55 JT

d4al 0161.23 $\quad 5 / 6$ Win
No 12004 Alexei Gasparyan
(Armenia). 1.a7 $\mathrm{Bb} 6+2 . \mathrm{Kxc} 3 \mathrm{Bxa} 7$
3.Rd7 Bd4+ 4.Kxd4 b2 5.Ra7+ Kb1
6.Ke3 Kcl 7.Kxe2 b1Q 8.Ra5
(Rb7? Qa1;) b4 9.Ra4 b3 10.Sd3+
Kxc2 11.Rc4 mate.
No 12005 V.Maksaev commendation Kralin 55 JT


$$
\text { g7g5 0403.31 } \quad 5 / 4 \mathrm{Win}
$$

No 12005 V.Maksaev (Russia).
1.Re5+ Kg4 2.Rb5 Rxd2 3.b7/i

Rd7+ 4.Kh6 Sf8 5.Rb4+ Kf5 6.Rf4+
Kxf4 7.b8Q+ wins.
i) 3.Rb4+? Kg5 4.b7 Rd7+ 5.Kg8 Sf6+ is a draw.

No 12006 I.Bondar, N.Ageiko special commeridation Kralin 55 JT

c7a6 $0032.24 \quad$ 5/6 Draw
No 12006 Ivan Bondar, N.Ageiko (Belarus). 1.Kb8 Bh2+ 2.Ka8 f2 3.Se7, with:

- f1Q 4.Sd5 Qf3 (Qf8;Bxc7+)
5.eSc7+ Bxc7 stalemate, or
- f1R 4.Sc6 Rf8 5.Sd8 Rxe8 (Bg3;Sc7+) stalemate.
Stalemates with pinned knight on three different squares - d5, e8 and d8.

No 12007 V.Maksaev special commendation Kralin 55 JT

f6al 0407.11
4/5 Draw

No 12007 V.Maksaev (Russia). 1.Rc1+Kb2 2.Rxc6 Se8+ 3.Kg5 Sxg2 4.Re6 Rg7+ 5.Kh6 Rg8 6.Kh7 Rf8 7.Re2+ Kb3 8.Rxg2 Sf6+ 9.Kh6 Rh8+ 10.Kg5 Rg8+ 11.Kh4/i Rxg2 stalemate.
i) $11 \mathrm{Kxf} 6 ? \mathrm{Rxg} 212 . \mathrm{h} 4 \mathrm{Rh} 2$ wins.

No 12008 A.Tarasov
special commendation Kralin 55 JT


$$
\text { d7a8 } 0031.36 \quad 5 / 8 \text { Win }
$$

No 12008 A.Tarasov (Russia). 1.d6 cxd6 2.Kc8 Ka7 3.Sd5/i exd5 4.Kc7 e2 5.b6+ Ka6 6.b7 e1Q 7.b8Q, with:

- Qe7+ 8.Kc6 Qa7 9.Qb5 mate, or
- Qb4 8.Qa8+ Kb5 9.Qb7+ Ka5
10.Qa7+ Kb5 11.Qb6 mate.
i) The d5 square must be blocked.
3.Sd7? d5 4.b6+ Ka6 5.b7 Bh2.

No 12009 E.Zimmer special commendation Kralin 55 JT

e7h8 0372.01
4/5 Draw
No 12009 E.Zimmer (Poland). 1.Sxf7+ Bxf7 2.Sxe5 Rxh7 3.Kf8 Bh5 4.Sg6+ Bxg6 stalemate. "A sketch, calling for further development."
section for miniatures
No 12010 B.Gusev
$=1 \mathrm{st} / 2 \mathrm{nd}$ prize Kralin 55 JT

h8f6 0301.21
4/3 Win
No 12010 Boris Gusev (Moscow). 1.Sb4/i Rd2 2.a7/ii Rd8+ 3.Kh7 Ra8 4.Sc6/iii Ke6 5.Kg7 Kd6 6.Se7 f5
7.h7 Kc7 8.Sg8, and White will promote.
i) 1.Sc3? Rg 1 2.a7 $\mathrm{Ral} 3 . \mathrm{Sb} 5 \mathrm{Ke} 7$
4. $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Rg} 1+$ drawn.
ii) Thematic try: $2 . S c 6$ ? $\operatorname{Re} 2$ 3.a7 Re8+ 4.Kh7 Ra8 puts White in zugzwang.
iii) We've seen this before - in (ii). But the difference of the move is crucial.
"We are impressed by the subtle manoeuvre of wS!"

No 12011 Y.Afek
$=1 \mathrm{st} / 2$ nd prize Kralin 55 JT


$$
\text { a8a4 } 3110.11 \quad 4 / 3 \text { Win }
$$

No 12011 Yochanan Afek (Israel). 1.b7 Qc6 2.Bd7 Qxd7 3.Rxe4+/i Ka5 4.Re5+/ii Kb6 (Ka6;b8S+) 5.b8Q+ Ka6 6.Rb5 (Rc5? Qd5+;) Qxb5 7.Qa7 mate. i) 3.b8Q? Qd5+4.Qb7 Qd8+5.Ka7 Qd4+ 6.Qb6 Qd7+ 7.Kb8 Qc8+ 8. Qxc 8 stalemate.
ii) 4.b8Q? Qd5+ 5.Qb7 Qd8+ 6.Ka7 Qb8+ 7.Kxb8 is another stalemate. "Black's stalemate hankerings on three ranks unexpectedly lead up to something we already know."

No 12012 Gh.Umnov $=3 \mathrm{rd} / 5$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

h1d5 0430.10 3/3 BTM, Draw
No 12012 Gherman Umnov
(Russia). "At the outset we sniff
Bianchetti, but here there is an elaboration - two symmetrical lines."
Either:
1...Ke5 2.Rf1/i Re2+ 3.Kg1 Rg2+ 4.Kh1 Be4 5.a7 Ba8 6.Rf5+Kd4 7.Rf4+ Ke3 8.Rf1 Kd3 9.Rf3+ Bxf3 10.a8Q Rf2+ 11.Kg1 Rg2+ 12.Kh1 $\mathrm{Rg} 3+$ 13.Kh2 Rg2+ 14.Kh1 Bxa8 stalemate.
Or:
1...Kd4 2.Rh3/ii Rg4+ 3.Kh2 Rg2+
4.Kh1 Be4 5.a7 Ba8 6.Rd3+Ke5
7.Re3+ Kf4 8.Rh3 Kf5 (Kg4;Rh8)
9.Rf3+ Bxf3 10.a8Q Rg3+ 11.Kh2
$\mathrm{Rg} 2+$ 12.Kh1 Rf2+ 13.Kg1 Rg2+
14.Kh1 Bxa8 stalemate.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Rh} 3 ? \mathrm{Rg} 4+3 . \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Rg} 2+4 . \mathrm{Kh} 1$

Kf4 5.a7 Ba8, and it's reci-zug in Black's favour.
ii) 2.Rf1? Re2+3.Kg1 Rg2+ 4.Kh1 Ke3 5.a7 Ba8 wins.
"An interesting and successful construction, but as with most
symmetrical play there is a lack of the element of big surprise."

No 12013 D.Gurgenidze
$=3 \mathrm{rd} / 5$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

h7cl $0500.02 \quad 3 / 4 \mathrm{Win}$
No 12013 David Gurgenidze (Georgia). 1.Rxe2 Ra7+2.Kg8/i Ra8+ 3.Kf7 Ra7+ 4.Ke8 Ra8+ 5.Kd7 Ra7+ 6.Kc8 Kd1/ii 7.Rf2 $\mathrm{Ra} 8+8 . \mathrm{Kd} 7 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Ra} 7+9 . \mathrm{Ke} 8 \mathrm{Ra} 8+$ 10.Kf7 Ra7+ 11.Kg6 Ke1/iv 12.Rxa2 Rxa2 13.Rh1+Kd2 14.Rh2+ wins.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Kg} 6 ? \mathrm{Ra} 6+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Rxh} 6$ draw. ii) $\mathrm{Ra} 8+7 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Ra} 7+8 . \mathrm{Kxa} 7 \mathrm{a} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ 9. $\mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Qbl}+10 . \mathrm{Kc} 7$ wins.
iii) Having achieved the switch of bK to dl, wK retraces his steps. iv) $\mathrm{Rg} 7+$ 12. Kh 5 Ra 7 13. Kg 4 wins. "Notwithstanding the clumsy capture on e2 this is a good notion with logical overtones."

No 12014 V.Razumenko, B.Sidorov $=3 \mathrm{rd} / 5$ th prize Kralin 55 JT

g4a8 $0131.11 \quad 4 / 3 \mathrm{Win}$
No 12014 Viktor Razumenko (St
Petersburg), Boris Sidorov
(Apsheronsk). wK is in check. 1.Kg5/i Bg4 2.Rf2/ii d1Q/iii 3.Ra2+ Kb8 4.c7+ Kb7 5.Rb2+Ka7 6.c8S+ Ka6 7.Sc5+Ka5 8.Sb7+Ka4 (Ka6;Rb6 mate) 9.Sb6+ Ka3 10.Sc4+ Ka4 11.Sc5 mate. i) 1. $\mathrm{Kf} 4 ? \mathrm{Bg} 42 . \mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Ka} 73 . \mathrm{Rd} 8$ d1Q 4.Rxd1 Bxd1 5.Ke5 Bf3 6.c7 Kb7 7.Kd6 Bg4 8.Sc5+ Kb6 9.Sd7+ Kb7 10.Sf6 Bh3 11.Se8 Kc8 12.Sf6 Kb 7 13.Sg8 Bg4 14.Sh6 Be6 draw. ii) 2.Rf1? d1Q 3.Rxdl Bxdl 4.Kf6 Bf3 5.c7 Kb7 6.Ke7 Bg4 7.Kd6 Bxe6 draw.
iii) Bxe6 3.Rxd2 Kb8 4.Kf6 Bg4 5.Rd7 Bf3 6.c7+ Kc8 7.Re7 Bc6 8.Ke5 Bd7 9.Kd6 wins.
"After a tangled introductory bout White assembles an attack with mundane mates."

No 12015 I.Yarmonov 1st honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

a7b1 0110.03
3/4 Win
No 12015 I. Yarmonov (Ukraine).
1.Bg5+/i Kc2 2.Rc1+Kb2 3.Be3 b3
4.Ka6, with:

- Ka2 5.Rxc3 b2 6.Bc1 b1Q 7.Ra3 mate, or
- c2 5.Kb5 Kc3 6.Ra1, and b2
7.Ra3 mate, or Kb2 7.Bd4 mate.
i) 1.Bh6+? $\mathrm{Kb} 22 . \mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{~b} 3$ 3.Bxf6

Kc2 4.Rh1 b2 draw. Or if 1.Be3+?
Kc 2 2.Rc1 +Kd 3 3.Bc5 b3 4.Bb4 b2 5.Rxc3+Kd2 draw.
"Amalga-mate-d."

No 12016 L.Topko 2nd honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

f3f1 0042.01
4/3 Win

No 12016 Leonid Topko (Ukraine). 1.Sh5/i Bd5+ 2.Kg4 Bxh1 3.Sg3+ Ke1/ii 4.Bc3+Kf2 5.Bd4+ Kg2 6. Kh4 Kf3 7. Kh3 Bg2+ 8. Kxh 2 , after which bB is lost through a familiar zugzwang.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Sf5}$ ? Bd5+ 2. Kg4 Be6 draw.
ii) Kg 1 4.Bd4+ Kg2 5.Kh4 wins.

No 12017 J.Pospisil
3rd honourable mention Kralin 55 JT

d2fl 0031.02 2/4 Draw
No 12017 Jaroslav Pospisil (Czech
Republic). 1.Sd1/i, with:

- Bb3 2.Sc3 Kf2 3.Sb5 c5 4.Sc7

Bc4 5.Kc3 Bf7 6.Kd2 Kf3 7.Sa8 b5
8.Sc7 b4 9.Sa6, draw, or

- b5 2.Ke3 Ke1 3.Sc3 Bc4 4.Kd4

Kd2 5.Se4+ Kc2 6.Kc5 Kd3 7.Sf6
c6 8.Kb4 Be6 9.Se8 Kd4 10.Sc7
Bc8 11.Sxb5+ draw, or

- Kg2 2.Sc3 Bc4 3.Ke3 Kg3 4.Kd4

Bf7 5.Sb5 c5+6.Ke5 Be8 7.Sd6 Bc6
8.Sc4 b5 9.Sa5 Bf3 10.Kd6 c4
11.Kc5 c3 12. Sb3 draw.
i) Not 1.Sd3? Bc4 2.Se5 Bd5 3.Sg6 Kf2 4.Sf4 Bf7 5.Sd3+ Kg3 6.Se5 Bd 5 7. Ke 3 Bb 7 wins. Nor 1.Sg4? Kg2 2.Ke3 Bd5 3.Se5 Kg3 4.Kd4 Bb7 5.Sd7 Kf4 6.Kc4 Bc6 7.Sb8

Be8 8.Sa6 c6 9.Sc7 Bf7+ 10.Kd4
c5+ 11.Kc3 Ke5 wins. Nor 1.Se4?
Bd5 2.Sf6 Bc6 3.Sg4 Kg2 4.Se5
Bb7 5. Ke3 Kg3 wins.
"Value for theory here."
No 12018 N.Chebanov
special honourable mention Kralin 55 JT


$$
\text { a8h5 0001.13. } 3 / 4 \text { Win }
$$

No 12018 N.Chebanov (Moldova). 1.a7/i g3/ii 2.Kb7 g2 3.a8R/iii Kg4 4.Rg8+Kf3 5.Se5+Kf2 6.Rf8+Ke3 7.Sg4+ Kd4 8.Rd8+ Kc3/iv 9.Rd1 wins.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Kb} 7$ ? h3. 1.Kb8? g3. 1.Se3? g3 2.a7 h3 3.Kb8 g2 4.a8Q g1Q.
ii) h3 2.Kb8 h2 3.a8Q.
iii) 3.a8Q? g1Q 4.Qh8+ Kg4
5. Qg8+Kh3 draw.
iv) Ke4 9.Sf2 + Kf3 10.Sh3 Kg3
11.Rd3+ Kh2 12.Sf4+ wins.
"The interest is in the interpretation of the familiar."

o 12019 Andrei Selivanov, Klimenty Tarnopolsky (Russia). 1.Kf6 Kg8 2.e3 Kf8 3.e4 Ke8 4.e5 Kd8 5.e6/i Ke8 6.e7 draw.
i) $5 . \mathrm{Kf7}$ ? g5 6.e6 Bg8 wins.
"Pointed miniature based on tempo loss."

No 12020 G.Egorov
2nd commendation Kralin 55 JT

c2e3 $3111.01 \quad 4 / 3 \mathrm{Win}$
No 12020 G.Egorov (Russia).
1.Rb3+ (Rxe5+? Kf4;) Kd4/i 2.Se6+

Kc4 3.Bd5+ Kxd5 4.Sf4+ exf4
5.Rb5+ Ke4 6.Rxh5 wins.
i) $\mathrm{Kf} 22 . \mathrm{Se} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 13 . \mathrm{Rb} 1+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ 4.Rh1+ Kxh1 5.Sg3 mate (or Sf6+). "Straightforward study with classic material."
The material satisfies the set theme of the Hero-Towns Match 19992000 - see EG138.11646-11662.

No 12021 R.Martsvalashvili 3rd commendation Kralin 55 JT

a6f1 0411.01 4/3 Win
No 12021 Ruzvelt Martsvalashvili (Georgia). Yes, $w K$ is in check. 1.Kb7 b3 2.Rxa2 b2 3.Bb6 b1Q 4.Rf2+Kel 5.Sg2+ Kd1 6.Rf1 wins.
"Effective 'sprint'."
No 12022 A.Golubev
4th commendation Kralin 55 JT

a4c5 0040.21

No 12022 A.Golubev (Russia).
1.Ka5/i d4 2.b8Q Bxb8 3.Bxb8 d3
4.Bd6+ (Bf4? Kc6;) Kxd6 5.a7 d2
6.a8Q d1Q 7.Qd8+, winning bQ on the file.
i) 1.b8Q? Bxb8 2.Bxb8 Kb6 3.a7 Kb7 draw.

No 12023 V.Maksaev special commendation Kralin 55 JT

g1b1 0130.03 2/5 Draw
No 12023 V.Maksaev (Russia). 1.Kf1 f3 2.Rd2 (Rd1+? Kc2;) Kc1 3.Rf2 Kd1 4.Rxf3 e2+ 5.Kg2 h4/i 6.Rf1+ exflQ $+7 . \mathrm{Kxf1} \mathrm{~h} 3$ stalemate. i) e1S+ $6 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ draw. Kd2 6.Rf1 Bd4 7.Rbl draw. "A synthesis of known stalemates: $2 \ldots$..exd2, $3 \ldots$..exf2, and 7...h3."

An appendix reports on the use of chess-playing programs, including ChessBase 8.0, for testing. The next study was one of the eventual casualties, many of which were initially high on the list of candidates for honours.

No 12024 A.Visokosov
Kralin 55 JT

g8b1 $3041.23 \quad 5 / 6 \mathrm{Win}(?)$
No 12024 A.Visokosov. 1.e8Q
Bxh7+ 2.Kh8 Qxf3 3.Qe1+Ka2 4.Qa5+Kb1 5.Sa3+Kc1 6.Qe1+ Qd1 7.Qc3+ Qc2 8.Sxc2 bxc2 9.Kxh7!?/i Kb1/ii 10.Qxd3 Kc1 11. Qe2 g5 12. Kg 6 g 4 13. Kf5 g3 14.Ke4 g2 15.Kd3 g1Q 16.Qxc2 mate.
i) Had White played 2.Kxh7? it would now be White's move, and after: 9.Qxd3 g5 10.Kg6 g4 11.Kf5 g3 12.Ke4, when wK stands in the way of his consort so that there is no mate on c2. However, White having wisely chosen to play $2 . \mathrm{Kh} 8$, the move is now with Black.
ii) "For a long time this study stood as favourite in the judging stakes. It was time for the final verdict when a defect came to light - 'no solution' because of $9 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 510 . \mathrm{Kg} 6 \mathrm{~g} 411 . \mathrm{Kf} 5$ and g3 12.Ke4 Kb1, draw."

The version which follows came too late for inclusion in the award, but not too late for inclusion, with the composer's consent, in the booklet.

No 12025 A.Visokosov Kralin 55 JT

h8d1 0441.33 7/6 Draw No 12025 A.Visokosov. 1.Sb3 Rd8+2.Bf8/i c2 3.Rxc2 Kxc2 4.Sxd4+ Rxd4 5.Bc5 g1Q 6.Bxd4 Qxd4 7.f7 Qd8+ 8.Kh7 Qf8 9.g6, with:

- Kdl 10.d4 Ke2 11.d5 Kf3 12.d6 Kf4 13.d7 Qd8 14.Kxg7 Qxd7 15.Kh8, or
- Qb8 10.d4 Kc3 11.d5 Kd4 12.d6 Ke5 13.d7 Qd8 14.Kxg7 Qf6+ (Qxd7;Kh8) 15.Kg8 Qxg6+ 16.Kh8 Qxf7 17.d8Q, Excelsior!! i) 2.Kh7? c2 3.Rxc2 Kxc2 4.Sxd4+ Rxd4 5.Bc5 g1Q 6.Bxd4 Qxd4 7.f7 Qd8zz 8.g6 Qf8zz 9.d4 Kd3 10.d5 Ke4 11.d6 Kf5 12.d7 Qd8 wins. "A superb piece of work in which the real reward has to be sought beyond the family circle (of the printed page)! How full of surprises and how inexhaustible chess is!"

REVIEWS
editor: John Roycroft

## WORLD CHESS

COMPOSITION TOURNAMENT OF THE
F.I.D.E. 6.WCCT 1996-2000

Preisberichte - awards. In mixed
English and German. No ISBN. Die Schwalbe has produced this clear and fact-packed 60 -page booklet. 36 countries participated in the seven sections. Russia came first with a record total. All 24 studies surviving scrutiny from the 73 submitted in section $D$ for studies are set out solutions with nested parentheses and sometimes baffling punctuation - on seven pages, with a brief introductory paragraph. See elsewhere in EG for a discussion.

## BULLETIN 44th World Congress

 of Chess Composition.Wageningen July 28 - August 4, 2001. Lists of participants, WCSC scores in team and individual detail, quick tourney awards - are set out (no photos), not even omitting your chief editor's humiliating score of 2 (max: 48) in the Open Solving. Harold van der Heijden's 'Jenever' studies award is there. However, the positions set in the Open, WCSC and 'Show' solving events have not been bound in. The 32-page production was distributed at the closing banquet.

FIDE ALBUM 1992-1994. xiv + 672 pages. 600 copies. The production - selection was by the teams of judges - is by Denis Blondel (Paris) and bernd ellinghoven (Aachen). 77 studies in Section D, indexed by Alain Pallier, from 531 entries. David Gurgenidze tells AJR that D19 was jointly composed by himself and Velimir Kalandadze - you saw it here first! A fine co-operative effort showing what can be done - even on an international scale - given goodwill and unpaid labour by dedicated specialists.
Alleged unsoundnesses:
D19 Gurgenidze (and
Kalandadze! Not in EG) a dual by 5.Kb4

D27 Gurgenidze EG114.9583

- cook by 2.Sxe2.

D72 Gogberashvili EG116.9914-no solution after 1.R8h6+ Kg7!! 2.Rh7+ Kf8 3.Rh8+ Ke7 4.R8h7+ Kd6 5.Rd7+ Ke6 6.Rh6+ Kf5 7.Rc7 Re8+ 8.Kb7 Rd7 9.Rxd7 clQ. Correction: omit move $1 \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{Bl}$.

## DE ARTISTIEKE

SCHAAKSTUDIE - Geschiedenis in drie delen. 1st edition, three volumes, self-published, at Capelle a/d IJssel, May 2001. By H.G.A.Mesman. 268, 255 and 344 pages. 1396 diagrams and many illustrations. ISBN: 90-800396-2-4 (sic), 90-800396-2-4 (sic), 90-000396-2-6 (sic). In Dutch, with extensive citations in German,

English (and French, but next to no Russian). Total weight: 2 kgs .
A commented and well researched history of the endgame study from its origins, with copious use made of the facilities of the collection housed in the Dutch Royal Library at The Hague. Mesman's own delving is now and then prominent, notably with his 'scoop' on Chapais. The chronological narrative follows the major personalities, but tails off with no account of the Russo-Soviet era, though Troitzky is present in extenso. Indexed, but with no GBR retrieval directory. The work seems to have taken even the Dutch endgame fraternity by surprise!

## DE ARTISTIEKE

SCHAAKSTUDIE - Inzicht en
Compostieleer. 2nd edition, May 2001. By H.G.A.Mesman. ISBN: 90-000396-1-6. 100 pages. In Dutch. The Dutch composer has revised his 1989 work on terminology, themes, classifications, and principles of good composing with many examples.

## PAUL KERES THE

COMPOSER. 1999. By Alexander Hildebrand. No ISBN. 28 pages. 89 problems and 21 studies by the strongest player never to win the world championship have been assembled by the man who knew and admired him. Van der Heijden's figure (for 'studies') is 65, but they include QPQ and other didactic positions. In a conversational aside
at Wageningen Hildebrand himself regretted omitting three studies 'bust' by the computer demonstration decades later that two bishops win against a knight. Background details are here but indepth discussion of the studies themes favoured by Keres and the technical merit of his productions would have provided welcome added value.

URALS CHESS MELODIES. By
Yu.Gorbatenko, A.Selivanov, R.Usmanov. Moscow 2001. No. 13 in the Urals Problemist series. 160 pages. In Russian. In an edition size of only 300 this volume records the formidable contribution to chess composition made by the late A.G.Kopnin. Mainly an anthology with biographical detail, nowhere else will 126 well sourced studies and the substantial monograph on bishop against rook and pawn be so easily referred to. It is a pity that Kopnin's two articles on 6-man pawnless endgames (GBR classes 0107 and 0134) contributed to EG see EG70 and EG74 - are not included.

## 155 BEST STUDIES. By

B.Olimpiev. Moscow 2001. No. 12 in the Urals Problemist series. 64 pages. In Russian. Joint compositions, corrections, and entries for tourneys in progress are included in this well annotated selection from over 200 published studies. The autobiographical note -

Olimpiev's year of birth was 1937 is fascinating with its explicit reference, the first we have seen in such a context, to gulag construction work in reinforced concrete (had he refused to go his diploma would have been withheld), and to supervisory responsibility in the aftermath of the 1986 nuclear explosion at Chernobyl.

BEST STUDIES. By Velimir Kalandadze. Tbilisi 2001. ISBN 99928-34-70-6. Bi-coloured figurine algebraic. Diagrams have piececounts (no. 25 doesn't match). In English - sort of! 112 pages, 108 studies, each with a stated theme, in no discernible sequence, published between 1956 and 1996. We wince at the source 'Peckover JT (USA)' it was a tourney of EG.

## OBITUARY

$\dagger$ COLIN VAUGHAN 1917-2001
Colin unobtrusively left his mark on whatever he touched. When he was general editor of The Problemist he revamped the whole appearance of the magazine to improve clarity and increase content without requiring more pages. He never composed a study but, independently of AJR, and about the same time, he devised the 'extended GBR code' for representing a full chess position without recourse to letters for the pieces. David Friedgood has suggested 'GBRV' as the proper alternative name.

## SNIPPETS

1. Two web-sites for the curious.

### 1.1. Tim Krabbe's:

www.xs4all.nl/~timkr/chess2/diary

- with a contribution on Saavedra.
1.2. AJR contributes to a language site::
www.meirionnydd.force9.co.uk
- link via 'English' to 'Autumn

Endgame' (a 10-part, fully
contemporary, serial).
2.1 Andrew Ballam, an Englishman in Melbourne (Australia), has presented over 450 studies on a 'Chess Chat' radio programme broadcast for 10 years $(88.9 \mathrm{MHz}$ on FM). It runs from 8 pm to 10 pm on Sunday evenings. As part of the formula a juicy study will be presented, perhaps with a musical intermezzo at a climactic moment of the commented solution. Listeners are encouraged to follow on a board set up at home or in pub or club.
2.2 The Melbourne team don't just enjoy - they work. They cooked a Kasparyan (c5a8 3140.43, Schach 1993, 458 in ' 545 ') by the immediate 1.Kb6 instead of waiting till move 4: cooked 'and on the first move!'
3. One of the British Chess

Federation President's awards 'for services to chess' - up to three are awarded annually - goes this year to Charles Michael Bent. One might
guess that Michael has composed as many studies as all other Britons put together, and taken more tourney honours, and given more pleasure to solvers.
4. The judging of the FIDE Album 1995-97 (studies) is almost complete at the end of August 2001. 82 of the 640 entries have provisionally been selected. In their respective countries (Romania, Russia, Slovakia) the three judges, now apprised of the points awarded, and comments made, by their colleagues, are having a final scrutiny for confirmation or otherwise. [AJR is section director of the selection process, probably for the last time. It's a richly enjoyable responsibility for anyone who is a mild linguist and who has a yen for coordinating. Unpaid, of course.]
5. HvdH writes that 1792 as a publication year occurs in his database for the first 931 positions due to a quirk of ChessBase. In the absence of a second date (for example with Stamma, Lolli, Ponziani) it is best interpreted as 'year unknown'. The code o000 signifies 'source unknown'.
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