Ed van de Gevel trying to figure out the rules of a futuristic chess set.
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Our last column, dedicated to the WCCT-7 Studies theme, included an arguably thematic original that stretches the theme definition.

The merits of that study, such as they be, do not include economy of material: it uses 15 men, including all but one of Black's pawns. Putting the WCCT-7 aside, we turn to Albert van Tets for an economical setting of a similar drawing device:

No 12077 Albert van Tets
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No 12077 Albert van Tets

The introduction seems clear: White will Queen just in time to interpose the threatened Bb7#. After 3...Kxe2 we reach a standard draw: Black can only relieve the Knight from his guard duty by stalematting White on h1. Black can try to avoid this by leaving White's pawn on the board, but after 3..Kf4 4.e4! (but not 4.Kh1? Kg3 or 4.e3+? Ke4 5.Kh1 Ke5 5.Kh1 Kf4 6.Kg2!, or 3...Ke4 4.e3! Black must concede the draw.


What else can we do? The one hole remaining in our analysis is the very first sentence:

1.g8R!! Bb7+/i 2.Rg2 Bxg2+/ii 3.Kxg2+/iii and it's a draw as above after Ke4(f4) 4.e4(e3+!). A remarkable use of a 5-man mutual Zugzwang. For some time now van Tets has been investigating economical settings for drawing R-promotions. He has recently found a way to combine this challenge with extended Zugzwang play, and by coincidence sent the resulting study for this column (via post to AJR) as the last column was going to print.

By a further coincidence, Harold van der Heijden had just completed a different miniature based on the same mutual Zugzwang when I sent him the van Tets diagram for testing. It is a pleasure to welcome Harold to this column as a composer after all the work he has contributed in testing other composers' studies for soundness and originality:

No 12078 H van der Heijden
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5.Kh1! Ke4/vi 6.Kg2, and having successfully
lost the move White has
secured the draw,
i) Black wins easily after
1.Sxfl? e2 or 1.fxe3?
Sxd2

ii) Other normal Knight
moves lose to exf2,
including the stalemate try
2.Sg1? exf2 3.Sxh3 due to
Sg3+!

iii) 3.Sd3? e2 wins
technically, e.g. 4.Se1 Sd2
5.Kh2 Kg4 and Sf3

iv) Not yet 4.e4? Kg4 or
even Kxe4 5.Kg1 Kf3!

v) The thematic Zugzwang
try is 5.Kg2? Ke4, and
now 6.Kh1 Kg4 7.e4 Kg3
and mate in two as in the
van Tets study

vi) 5...Kf5(d5) 6.e4+! and
7.Kg2, again avoiding
6.Kg2? Ke4

We have no Unoriginals
this time, but our final
Original is rather
heterodox. Its author,
Andrew Buchanan, is the
inventor of "Dead
Reckoning", which hinges
on the FIDE rules
for "dead positions" (see
Andrew's recent articles
in the Problemist and
StrateGems, or his tutorial
at <http://www.geocities .com/anselan/deadreckoni
ng.html>.

More recently Andrew
noticed a similar
opportunity in the Codex

treatment of the 50-move
rule. This rule is generally
ignored by composers,
who recognize it as
an arbitrary and imperfect
approximation to the idea
that the game is drawn if
neither side can make
progress.

But there is a genre of
remarkable positions that
are retroanalytically
proved to have reached or
be on the verge of
reaching the 50-move
limit. The Codex
recognizes this by stating:
"Unless expressly
stipulated, the 50 moves
rule does not apply to the
solution of chess
compositions except for
retro-problems." What
Andrew discovered was an
unintended consequence
of this convention.

No 12079 Andrew Buchanan

Black's material advantage
is winning (L.Stiller), but
here White has
counterplay. Is it enough?

A) By default the
stipulation means "WTM
and Draw", which is done
by 1.Kb4! Bc2 2.Kc3!
simplifying to a 0301
draw, e.g. Bb3 3.Nb4+ or
Ne4. According to
Thompson's online
database, White's first two
moves are unique; White
has several inferior
alternatives on move 2 or
3, such as 2.Kc4?, that
lose in some 200 moves,
but the fact that this is well
beyond the 50-move limit
is irrelevant.

B) A familiar paradox:
despite appearances, this is
not equivalent with (A),
since Black has no last
move (0...cxbl=B works
only on White's side of the
board). So it is Black's
turn, and 1...Bf7+
disentangles and wins.

But now the new twist:
since we have invoked
retroanalysis, this is a
"retro-problem", and
White still draws
starting 2.Kg5! Kg8!
3.Kf5(f6)! as long as he
can hold Black at bay
for at least 50 moves.
Several more examples
can be found at

Andrew's No 12079 is

---

a4a2 0332.00 3/3 Draw
(a) Diagram (b) rotated
180 degrees

No 12079 Andrew Buchanan Generically
the only example so far with no captures before the 50-move span. It is also the only one with a 180-degree twin, which raises a further conundrum:

to check that White may move in (A), we must find the unusual 0...cxb1=B; doesn't that make (A), too, a retro-problem, to which the 50-move rule applies?..

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

Gaprindashvili-60JT
"Nona-60" 2001

This tourney, apparently for Georgians only was judged by David Gurgenidze. 42 studies entered by 13 composers, all, it seems, from Georgia. AJR remarks: a typical Georgian initiative - oodles of talent, character, assertiveness and energy, and a consistent absence of conformity, adherence to formality, objectivity, rules or regulations! Well, what do you really want? Do actual prizes and knowing what they were matter all that much?!?

section for wins

No 12080 D.Makhatadze
1st prize "Nona-60"

No 12081 V.Neidze
(Tbilisi). 1.e8Q b1Q
(Qxa4+;Re4) 2.Rxb1
Qxa4+/i 3.Kh3 Kb1
4.Qe1+ Kc2 5.Sb4+ Kb2
6.Qd2+ Kb1 7.Qd1+ Kb2
8.Qd4+, with:
- Ka3 9.Qc3z Qb5
(Qxb4;Qa1 mate) 10.Sc2+
Ka4 11.Qa1 mate, or
- Kb1 9.Qe4+ Kb2/i
10.Sd3+ Ka3 11.Qe7+ d6
12.Qxd6+ Ka2 13.Qh2+/ii
Ka3 14.Qb2 mate.

i) Kxb1 3.Qe1+ Kc2
4.Sb4+ Kb2 5.a5 Qa4 6.a6
Qb5 7.a7 Qc4+/iv 8.Kh3
Qc8 9.Qe5+ Kc1 10.Qa1+
wins.

ii) Ka1 10.Sc2+ bxc2
11.Qxa4+ wins.

iii) If we had wondered about White's choice of square with 3.Kh3, we need wonder no longer.

iv) 7...Qb7 8.Qd2+ Ka3

"Three checkmates with active self-blocks by bQ."

No 12082 Sh.Tsurtsumia,
R.Tsurtsumia
=2nd/3rd prize "Nona-60"

No 12080 Dzhemal
Makhatadze (Zestafoni).
1.e8Q Qd7 2.Sd8+ Kd6
3.Sb7+ Kc6 4.Sxa5+ Kd6
5.Sb7+ Kc6 6.Bd5+ Bxd5
7.Sd8+ Kd6 8.Qxe5+ Rx5
mate.

"A mating position we see in a helpmate! Elegant." To our taste, too many checks for a first prize - though the Georgian 'style' does go in for checking sequences.

No 12081 V.Neidze
=2nd/3rd prize "Nona-60"

No 12082 Sh.Tsurtsumia,
R.Tsurtsumia
=2nd/3rd prize "Nona-60"

No 12080 D.Makhatadze
1st prize "Nona-60"

No 12081 V.Neidze
(Tbilisi). 1.e8Q b1Q
(Qxa4+;Re4) 2.Rxb1
Qxa4+/i 3.Kh3 Kb1
4.Qe1+ Kc2 5.Sb4+ Kb2
6.Qd2+ Kb1 7.Qd1+ Kb2
8.Qd4+, with:
- Ka3 9.Qc3z Qb5
(Qxb4;Qa1 mate) 10.Sc2+
Ka4 11.Qa1 mate, or
- Kb1 9.Qe4+ Kb2/i
10.Sd3+ Ka3 11.Qe7+ d6
12.Qxd6+ Ka2 13.Qh2+/ii
Ka3 14.Qb2 mate.

i) Kxb1 3.Qe1+ Kc2
4.Sb4+ Kb2 5.a5 Qa4 6.a6
Qb5 7.a7 Qc4+/iv 8.Kh3
Qc8 9.Qe5+ Kc1 10.Qa1+
wins.

ii) Ka1 10.Sc2+ bxc2
11.Qxa4+ wins.

iii) If we had wondered about White's choice of square with 3.Kh3, we need wonder no longer.

iv) 7...Qb7 8.Qd2+ Ka3

"Three checkmates with active self-blocks by bQ."

No 12082 Sh.Tsurtsumia,
R.Tsurtsumia
=2nd/3rd prize "Nona-60"

No 12080 D.Makhatadze
1st prize "Nona-60"

No 12081 V.Neidze
(Tbilisi). 1.e8Q b1Q
(Qxa4+;Re4) 2.Rxb1
Qxa4+/i 3.Kh3 Kb1
4.Qe1+ Kc2 5.Sb4+ Kb2
6.Qd2+ Kb1 7.Qd1+ Kb2
8.Qd4+, with:
- Ka3 9.Qc3z Qb5
(Qxb4;Qa1 mate) 10.Sc2+
Ka4 11.Qa1 mate, or
- Kb1 9.Qe4+ Kb2/i
10.Sd3+ Ka3 11.Qe7+ d6
12.Qxd6+ Ka2 13.Qh2+/ii
Ka3 14.Qb2 mate.

i) Kxb1 3.Qe1+ Kc2
4.Sb4+ Kb2 5.a5 Qa4 6.a6
Qb5 7.a7 Qc4+/iv 8.Kh3
Qc8 9.Qe5+ Kc1 10.Qa1+
wins.

ii) Ka1 10.Sc2+ bxc2
11.Qxa4+ wins.

iii) If we had wondered about White's choice of square with 3.Kh3, we need wonder no longer.

iv) 7...Qb7 8.Qd2+ Ka3

"Three checkmates with active self-blocks by bQ."

No 12082 Sh.Tsurtsumia,
R.Tsurtsumia
=2nd/3rd prize "Nona-60"
No 12082 Sharko Tsurtsumia, Romanoz Tsurtsumia (Georgia). Both sides underpromote - see the main line and (i) - from this P-ending diagram. 1.b7 f1Q 2.b8R+/i Ka4 3.Rxb2 Qa1 4.Kc2 Qa3 5.c8R (c8Q? Qc5+;) Qb3+ 6.Kb1 Qd1+ 7.Rc1 Qd6 8.Rc4+ Ka3 9.Rc3+ Ka4 10.e3 (Ka2? Qc5;) fx3 11.Ka2 Qd4 12.Ra3 mate. i) 2.b8Q+? Ka4 3.c8Q b1S+ 4.Kc2 Sa3+ 5.Kd2 Sbl+ and it's a draw.

No 12083 Velimir Kalandadze 4th prize "Nona-60" b8g1 0400.12 3/4 Win


No 12084 K. Mestiashvili sp. pr. "Nona-60" (malyutka) "A 'logical' systematic manoeuvre."

No 12084 K. Mestiashvili sp. pr. "Nona-60" (malyutka) 1.g7 Rd8 2.Sf6, with:
- Rh8 3.Kd2 Kc6 4.Sg8 Rh2+ 5.Kc3 and so on...
"A new name."

No 12085 E. Chumburidze 1st hon men "Nona-60" c6a7 3711.20 6/4 Win


No 12086 G. Mzhavanadze 2nd hon men "Nona-60" d8b6 0041.12 4/4 Win

No 12086 Guram Mzhavanadze (). 1.a7/i Kb7 2.a8Q (Sc6? Bd4;)
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"The checkmate is bland, but there are sultanas in the play."

No 12087 R.Martsvalashvili 3rd hon men "Nona-60"

No 12088 V.Kartvelashvili commendation "Nona-60"

No 12089 V.Kalandadze 1st prize "Nona-60"

No 12090 M.Gogberashvili 2nd prize "Nona-60"
11.Sg4+ with a straightforward perpetual check.

"Content-ful."

No 12091 Iurii Akobia
3rd prize "Nona-60"

b7a5 3141.23 6/6 Draw

No 12091 Iurii Akobia
(Tbilisi). 1.Ka7 b4 2.Bxb2 Qxb2 (Qd5;Rf8) 3.Re8 Qxg7 4.Re5+, with:
- Bb5+ 5.Sb7+ Qxb7+ 6.Kxb7, when Black is stalemated, or
- Qxe5 5.Sc6+ Bxc6/i, when it's White's turn to be stalemated.

i) Hew Dundas asks for analysis of: Kb5 6.Sxe5 Be6, and AJR proposes:
"Yes!"

No 12092 V.Neidze
4th prize "Nona-60"

No 12092 Vazha Neidze
(Tbilisi). 1...axb2+ 2.Kb1 Kd8 3.Qa5+ administers perpetual check, so Black tries
1...Kd8+ 2.Rc3 axb2+ 3.Kb1 Qxc3 4.Qa5+ Qc7 5.Qa8+ Qc8 6.Qa5+ Ke8 7.Qh5+ Rf7
8.Qh8+ Rf8 9.Qh5+ Kd8 10.Qa5+ Ke8 11.Qh5+ draw.
"Original mechanism manipulating geometrical motifs."

No 12093 D.Makhatadze
special prize "Nona-60"

No 12093 Dzhemal Makhatadze
(Zestafoni).

a7e8 0800.22 5/5 Draw

No 12094 V.Kalandadze
(1st) hon men "Nona-60"

No 12094 Velimir Kalandadze
(Tbilisi). Just rooks - so odds-on it's a Kalandadze special.
"Stalemate and positional draw."
Does it make sense to talk of the 'right' way to set out...
a solution of this kind, having regard to a 'proper' length? [AJR disapproves of artificial lengthening of a solution. What about you?]

No 12095 V.Kartvelishvili
1st comm "Nona-60"

No 12096 N.Gavashelashvili
2nd comm "Nona-60"

Vandiest-80 JT *H*
This theme tourney was organized under the auspices of the "Koninklijke Schaakfederatie van Antwerps Handel" KFSAH (Royal Chess Federation of Antwerp's Commerce) and celebrated the 80th birthday of Julien Vandiest. The set theme was to correct or improve a published study, and restricted to miniatures. Harold van der Heijden was consulted for anticipation and correctness testing, keeping in mind that the studies for this tourney had to be anticipated! 56 studies from 17 countries were submitted, but only 9 studies survived! One joker seriously held that an old study by Behing he favoured was even better off when starting from a mirrored position! A provisional award, undated, was published early 2001, and the final award, again undated, appeared some months later. One study was eliminated because of duals.

No 12097 Roger Missiaen
1st prize Vandiest-80 JT

This study improves on several studies: J. Fritz, Vecherny Pravda 1962, a6a8 0133.10 3/4+. 1.Rxc7 Kb8 2.Re7 Ke8 3.Rxe6 Bb4 4.Kb5 Kd7 5.Re7+ Kxd6 6.Re3 Bc5 7.Rd3+, but recently Helmut Conrady (Germany) cooked this study by 3...Bd2. Further two studies by Bazlov et al are given (EG#10834, EG#10825).
"Perhaps the original Fritz looks 'more natural', but it needs a take-key - and so does the second Bazlov. Furthermore, while Missiaen's solution is more treacherous, its first move resists the temptation of taking either Sh7 or pg6. A superb work of art!"

No 12098 Michael Roxlau
2nd prize Vandiest-80 JT

6.Kc7. Further the studies by V.Kondratjev & A.Kopnin (EG#6861) and S.Radchenko (EG#11534) were referred to.

"A delicious maijutka with a richer content than its forerunners and heading for the outcome with clockwork precision. Has something of an anthology piece".

No 12099 1 Vandecasteele
3rd prize Vandiest-80 JT

d6g6 0400.01 2/3 Draw


Also this study improves on several older studies: H.Mesman, Tijdschrift v.d. KNSB 1960, d8a8 0400.01 2/3=: 1.Kc8 a4

v) 7.Qg5+? Kd1 8.Qg4+ Kc1 9.Qg6 Qb8+ 10.Bb4 Qg8+ draws.

vi) Qx5 8.Qc2 mate, or Qf2 8.Bf4+ Kd1 (Qxf4; Qc2 mate) 9.Qd3+ Ke1 10.Bg3 mate.

vii) Qc8 9.Bf4+ Kd1 10.Qd3+ Kc1 11.Bg3 mate. This is part of a series of improvements of an idea that Vandiest had as far back as 1984 (although the award states '1884'!). See EG#10518, and also: J.Vandiest, Finales...y Temas 2000, g6g8 4010.01 b1a7/a8.a3 3/3=: 1.Be7 Qa6+ 2.Bf6 Qa7 3.Qb3+ Ke8 4.Bd4 Qa6+ 5.Bb6, etc. or I.Vandecasteele, EBUR 2000, g6g8 b1a7/a8.a5 3/3=: 1.Be7 Qa6+ 2.Bf6 as in the previous study, or I.Vandecasteele, EBUR 2000, c4a1 4010.01 c6f2a5.g7 3/3=: 1.Be3+ Kb1 2.Qg6+ Kc1 3.Kb3 Qh2 4.Be5, etc.

"So there are three moves more. 'Connoisseurs' will readily confirm it: knitting a (correct) extension to a miniature handling Queens is extremely difficult. Moreover, the awarded study conceals some insidious ideas. The whole of the winning manoeuvre exhibits a refined series of moves, honouring the consumer's point of view".

No 12099 Ignace Vandecasteele
Belgium

b3b1 4010.01 3/3 Win


i) Kb1 3.Qe4+ Kc1 4.Qh1+ wins. 

ii) Qc2 4.Qd4+ Kc1 5.Qa1 mate. 

iii) Kd1 5.Qh5+ Ke1 6.Qh1+. 

iv) Qc2 7.Qg5+ K-1 8.Qg1+; Kd1 7.Qh5+ and
No 13000 Harold van der Heijden (The Netherlands) 4th prize Vandiest-80 JT


while 4.Qa7+ Kf1 5.Qa6 Kg2 6.Qg6+ Kf1 7.Qa6 Kg2 positional draw.

iii) Ke2 4.Qc3+ Kd1 5.Qa1+ and 6.Qxa2.


v) 1st reciprocal ZZ, this time with BTM.


vii) 2nd reciprocal ZZ, but again with BTM.


"In a simple looking lining-up of pieces, the winning manoeuvre fosters surprising and instructive elegance. And the reversals of zugzwang dig impressively into endgame strategy".

No 13001 Peter Schmidt (Germany) 1st HM Vandiest-80 JT

b4e1 0000.23 3/4 Win

No 13001 Peter Schmidt


ii) Kg3 6.Re4, or Kf3 6.Rh3+, or also Ke3 6.Rh3+ Sf3 7.Rh1.


"Another anthologymaluitka! Lengthening the solution while reducing the material succeeds quite convincingly".
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No 13002 V. Kalandadze
2nd HM Vandiest-80 JT

No 13002 Velimir Kalandadze (Georgia)
1.Bg8/i Kgl 2.Bd5 g2
3.b8Q h1Q 4.Qg3 Kfl
5.Qf3+ Kgl 6.Kg5 Kh2
7.Qf4+ Kgl 8.Kg4 Qh2
9.Qc1+ Kf2 10.Qd2+ Kfl

i) 1.Kg7? Kgl 2.Bd5 g2
3.b8Q h1Q 4.Qg3 Kfl
5.Bd3+ Kgl 6.Kb2 Qb6
7.Qa5 Qb6 stalemate.

This study has several forerunners: EG#1134,
EG#4686, F. Richter, 2nd prize Ceskoslovensky Sach
1953, a6b6 0030.21
a2.a6b6 2/3: 1.a7 Kb2
2.Kb8 Bd5 3.b7 g1Q 4.aQ
Qb6 5.Kc8 Be6+ 6.Kb8
Bd7 7.Qa5 Qxa5 stalemate,
V. Kalandadze &
D. Gurgenidze, Vechnoe
Dvizhenje 1980, g8h1
0010.12 f1.b5g5h2 3/3:,
1.Be4 Kgl 2.Bd5 g4 3.b6
g3 4.b7 g2 5.b8Q h1Q
6.Qg3 Kf1 7.Qf3+ Kgl
8.Kg7 Kh2 9.Qf4+ Kgl
10.Qg3 Kfl 11.Qf3+ Kgl

12.Kg6 Kh2 13.Qf4+ Kgl
14.Qg3 Kfl 15.Qf3+ Kgl
16.Kg5 Kh2 17.Qf4+ Kgl
18.Kg4 Qh2 19.Qe1+ Kf2
22.Qe1 mate, S. Malishev,
1st prize Bulletin of the Central Chess Club of the USSR
1986, d1g1 4010.01
D3f1h1.01 3/3+: 1.Kc2
Qh7+ 2.Kb2 Qb8+ 3.Kb3
Qhl 4.Be4 Kfl 5.Kc2 Kgl

"A worthy coronation of a delightful series. Would
even have ranked higher,
had there not been the Malishev".

No 13003 Axel Ornstein
3rd HM Vandiest-80 JT

No 13003 Axel Ornstein
(Sweden) 1.d5 Bb7 2.d6
Bc6 3.Bd7 Bxd7 4.a5 h4
5.a6 h3 6.a7 Bc6 7.a8Q
Bxa8 8.d7 wins.
i) 7.d7? h2 8.d8Q+ Kc2.

Previous art: C. Raina,
Rumanian Championship
1948, a1c1 0040.33
c2f1.a5d4h3a6h6 5/5:,
1.Be4 Kd2 2.Bb7 Ke3 3.d5
Kb4 4.Bxa6 Bxh3 5.Bf1
Bc8 6.Bh3 Bd7 7.d6 Bc6
8.Bg2 winning. But Black
has a better line of play:
Kd4! 4.Bxa6 Bxh3 5.Bf1
Bc8 6.Bh3 Kxd5 7.Bxc8
Ke5 8.Ka2 h5 9.Kxa3 Kb5
10.a6 Kb6, drawing.

No 13004 Wouter Mees
spec prize Vandiest-80 JT

No 13004 Wouter Mees
(The Netherlands) 1.Kf5/i
Kxb4 2.Bf7 a5 (d2; Bh5)
3.Kc4 d2/ii 4.Bh5 a4 (Kc3;
Bd1) 5.Kd3 a3 6.Kc2
draws.
i) 1.Bb1? d2 2.Bc2 Kxb4
a3; 1.Be6? Kxb4 2.Kf5 d2,
or here 2.Kf6 a5 3.Ke5 a4
4.Kd4 d2 5.Bg4 a3; 1.Bd5?
Kxb4 2.Kf5 a5 3.Ke4 d2,
or here 3.Kf4 d2 4.Bf3 a4
5.Kc3 a3; 1.Bb3? Kxb4
a3.

ii) Kc3 4.Be8 d2 5.Ba4,
or Kd5 5.Ba4 Ke2 6.Kd4 d2
"The famous Dutch problemist and endgame-freak Ir. W.J.G. Mees confesses to be guilty of this youthful transgression": W.Mees, De Schaakwereld 1940:

b4f5 0031.21 glh7.e5h6f7
4/3+: 1.Sg5 Kg6 2.Sxh7 Kxh7 3.e6 Bd4
5.h8Q+ Kxh8 6.e7 wins.

"Previous and posterior art is quite impressive here, e.g.:

H.Otten, The Boys Own Paper 1892, e4f6 0030.20
g7.a4g4 03/+: 1.a5 Bf8 2.Kd5 Bh6 3.g5+ Bxg5
4.Ke4 Bh4 5.Kf3, or A.Selesniev, Deutsches Wochenschach 1917, e5e3
0010.02 e6.b4h4 2/3=:
1.Kd6 Kd4 2.Kc6 Ke3
0030.20 b2.b6g2 3/2+: 1.Kd5 Be5 2.g3+ Kf5
3.g4+ Kf6(4) 4.g5(+ ) Kf5
5.g6 winning, or F.Bondarenko & M.Liburkin, 2nd prize Russian Championship 1950, f5h1
0031.33 a1g2.a6b5e4a7b6h2 5/5+: 1.Sh4 Kg1 2.Sf3+ Kg2
3.Sxh2 Kxh2 4.e5 Bxe5
5.Ke6 Kg3 6.Kd7 Kf4
7.Kc8 Ke4 8.Kb7 Kd5
9.Kxa7, or Bc3 5.e6 Bb4
10.e7 Kxe7 11.Kxa7 winning, or W.Mees, 1st/2nd HM Tijdschrift van de KNSB 1958, e3g4
0030.41 g2.b5e3f4f5b6
5/3+: 1.f6 Bd5 2.Kd4 Bg8
3.Ke4 Bb3 (Be4 4.Ke5 Kf3
7.Kxb6 Ke5 8.Kc5, or Bf7
Kxf7 9.Ke6, or Kg3 4.Kf5
Kf3 5.Kg6 Kxe3 6.f7)

"Special prize because of 1) highly imaginative transforming ability, 2) the amazing fact that all duals could be banned, 3) all this in an open position with only 6 pieces on the board".

Afanasiev-90MT

This formal international tourney was judged by V.Sichov (Minsk) and was published in Zvyazda 10/24xi2000 and 5xii2000. 15 studies were entered by 10 composers.

AJR remarks: We have failed to translate the comments from the Belorussian.

published in Zvyazda 10xii2000

No 13005 I.Bondar
1st-3rd pr Afanasiev-90MT

No 13006 E.Dvizov, A.Foguelman
1st-3rd pr Afanasiev-90MT

No 13006 E.Dvizov (Zhlobin), A.Foguelman (Argentina).
1.Rb5+ Ka4
2.Sa6 Sb4+ 3.Rxb4+ Ka5
4.Rb3 b1S 5.Sc5i gxflQ
6.Rb8 Qa6+ 7.Sxa6, with:
- f1Q 8.Sc5 Qa6+ 9.Sxa6 f2 10.Sc5 f1Q
11.Ra8+ Qa6+ 12.Rxa6+ Kb4 13.Ra4 mate, or

- 5.Rxh1 cxb1S 6.Sc5 f1Q 7.Rb8 e2 c2 draw.
published in Zvyazda 24x2000

No 13007 L.Palguev
=1st-3rd pr Afanasiev-90MT

f3a8 1600.11 3/4 Win

No 13007 L.Palguev

i) Kb8 2.Qb1+ Ke7 (Ka8/Ka7/Qh7) 3.Qe2+ Kd7 4.Qd3+ Rd6 5.Qh7 wins.

ii) Rb6 3.Qd4, and gRb8 4.Qf2, or Ra8 4.Qd7+, winning.

- a6 4.bxa6 Bd4 5.a7+ Bxa7 6.Be5 mate.

No 13010 L.Palguev
1st-3rd hmt Afanasiev-90MT

No 13008 Evgeny Dvizov

No 13009 V.Bartosh, I.Bondar
1st-3rd hmt Afanasiev-90MT

d8b7 0053.21 5/4 Win

No 13009 V.Bartosh
(Minsk), I.Bondar. Yes, wk is in check. 1.Kd7 Sxb5 2.Bf3+ Kb8 3.axb5
No 13011 V Zhuk, V Tupik =1st-2nd commendation Afanasiy-90MT

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
6.Kb8 & Bb7 & 7.Sd6 & Ba8 \\
\end{array}
\]

No 13013 E Borisovich, E Dvizov special pr Afanasiy-90MT

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
Kxc4 & 4.h5 & b3 & 5.Ka3/ii Kc3 \\
6.h6 & b2 & 7.h7 & b1Q 8.h8Q+ draw. \\
i) 3.h5? b3 & 4.h6 & b2 & 5.h7 b1Q 6.h8Q Qa2 mate. \\
ii) 5.h6? b2 & 6.h7 & b1Q 7.h8Q Qa2 mate.
\end{array}
\]

Diagrammes 1998-1999

Albert van Tets (South-Africa) judged the bi-annual tourney of the French composition magazine Diagrammes. 26 studies competed, 5 studies proved to be incorrect. The judge appreciated the general high level and found it difficult to select the best ones. The award, dated February 2000, was published in Diagrammes 136-137 bis, January-March 2001.


\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
h3g8 & 4033.12 & 3/6 Draw \\
Kxc4 & 4.h5 & b3 & 5.Ka3/ii Kc3 \\
6.h6 & b2 & 7.h7 & b1Q 8.h8Q+ draw. \\
i) 3.h5? b3 & 4.h6 & b2 & 5.h7 b1Q 6.h8Q Qa2 mate. \\
ii) 5.h6? b2 & 6.h7 & b1Q 7.h8Q Qa2 mate.
\end{array}
\]

Diagrammes 1998-1999

H
A study with various subtleties, sacrifices, a mate trap, and three stalemate offers.

"Although White lost the first battle, the wS remaining manages to accomplish an unexpected domination of the bBs".

No 13017 Michael Bent
HM Diagrammes 1998-99
x-xii/1998

b7c4 3427.22 7/7 Draw


No 13018 Michael Bent
HM Diagrammes 1998-99
i-iii/1999

a5c5 3045.34 7/8 Win


No 13019 Jan Rusinek
comm Diagrammes 1998-99
vii-ix/1999

g2e1 4040.22 5/5 Win

No 13019 Jan Rusinek (Poland) 1.Qc7 h3+ (Bd5+; Kg1) 2.Kg1/i h2+ 3.Kxh2/ii Bxb3/iii 4.Qc1+ Bd1 5.Kg1/iv Qxd4


iii) Qxb3 4.Qc1+ Qd1 5.Qc6.

iv) 5.Qc6? Qf8 6.Qh1+ Qf1 draws.


Springaren 1997

This informal tourney was judged by Axel Ornstein
The provisional award was published in Springaren 73 (May 1998, pp68-69), the definitive in Springaren 74 ix1998 p129

No 13020 Nikolai Rezvov
prize Springaren 1997

h8e8 0040.23 4/5 Draw
No 13020 Nikolai Rezvov
(Odessa, Ukraine) 1.Bg7/i
Kf7 2.Kh7 c5 3.Kh8 c4
Bb2/i 7.Ba3 Ba1 8.Be1
i) 1.Kg8? Bg5 2.Bg7 c5
3.Kxh7 Kf7 4.Kh8 c4 5.h7
6.Bh6 Bh4 7.Bd2 c2
8.Be3 (Bf4,Bf2;) Bg3
9.Bf4 (Be3,Bg1) Bh2
zugzwang.
ii) Bg5 5.Bh6 c3 6.Bg5
fxg5 7.f6 draw.

No 13021 Jarl H.Ulrichsen
1st hm Springaren 1997

No 13022 Lennart Werner
2nd hm Springaren 1997

No 13023 Roman Caputa
(Czeladz, Poland)
1...Qa8+ 2.Kh2 Qb8+
3.Kh1 Qb7+e6+6-d5-e5+9.Kh1/i
Qe4+ii 10.Kh2 Rh2+11.Rf2
Rb1/i 12.Rf1 Qe2+
13.Qf2/i v Qe5+ 14.Qg3
Rh1+i 15.Kxh1 Qxg3
16.Rf5+ Kg4 17.Rg5+
Kxg5 stalemate.
i) "Harold van der Heiden
analysed Caputa's study in
deepth and found several
additional variations. After
1-8...Qa8-b8-b7-c7-c6-d6-
d5-e5+9.Kh1, Black can
play 9...Re3!? which wins
after 10.Qf2? Qe4+11.Kg1
h2+12.Qxh2+Kg4.
However, White holds the
draw by 10.Rf2 or 10.Rf7,
and Black gets no more
than the stalemate found in
the solution. Van der
Heijden also indicates the
interesting possibility:
9...Re3 10.Rf2 Re1
11.Rf1 Qe4+
12.Kh2 Qe2+
13.Qf2!? Qxh1 14.Qf3+
and White draws by
checking along the third
rank."
ii) Black can also play
9...Re3? and only the reply
10.Rf2 will suffice
followed by stalemate. Nor
can Black win after
10...Kh4+11.Rf1.
After Qc7+, Rc1 and Qe2+
White puts his queen on f2
with check.
iii) Qf4+ 12.Kh1 Rf2
13.Qxf2 Qxf2 stalemate.
iv) "After 13.Qf2, Black can perhaps avoid checks from wQ."
"My opinion: a fantastic position, but a position does not make a study."

No 13024 Christer Brundin
2nd comm Springaren 1997

No 13025 Axel Ornstein
1st hm Springaren 1998

Springaren 1998 *H*
This informal annual tourney was judged by Vladimir I. Vinchenko of Novosibirsk. 10 composers competed with 14 studies. The provisional award, dated 3-9-99, was published in Springaren 77 (vi/1999), and the final award in Springaren 79 (xii/1999).

No 13026 Alexander Hildebrand (Sweden)
i) 4.Kh3? g2.5.Kg2 Rg4 and Rg7=.
ii) Kg4 5.Se(g)6 Ra2 6.Kf1 Rf2+ 7.Kg1 wins.
v) After Rg8!? not 8.fxg8? stalemate, but Bg5 or K-.

No 13027 H van der Heijden
3rd hm Springaren 1998
No 13028 Christer Brundin
1st comm Springaren 1998

No 13029 Jarl Ulrichsen & Alexander Hildebrand
(Norway) & Alexander Hildebrand (Sweden)
1. Sh5+ Kf8/i 2. Sg6+ fxg6
3. Be5+ Qe7+ 4. Sf6+i Qxc5
i) Kh3 2. Sg6+ fxg6 3. Bd4+
wins.
ii) 4. Bxe7+? Kxe7 5. Sf4
Kf6 =.

No 13030 V. Nikitin
3rd comm Springaren 1998

No 13031 E. Kudelich
spec comm Springaren 1998
Kg6/vi 3.Sf8+ Kf7 4.Bc3
Kxf8 5.h8Q+ Qxh8 6.Bxh8
e3 and Black wins.
iii) Ke4 8.Sf6+ Kxe3
9.Sxh7 a4 10.Sf6 Kd4
11.g5 draws.
iv) 10.Sg5? a4 11.Se6 a3
14.Sd4+ Kb2 15.Se6 a2
wins.
v) 12.Sg3? Kd3 wins.
vi) But not e3? 3.Bxe3+
Kf5 4.Sf8 Qa1 5.Bc5 Qg7
6.Kd8 a4 7.Bd6
Kf6 8.Ke8 Qf7+ 9.Kd8 and
Black is unable to win.

Shakhmatnaya
kompozitsia 2000

This informal international
tourney was judged by
Oleg Pervakov (Moscow).
The award was published
in Sh.komp. 40 (on sale
2001), 44 studies were
entered by 27 composers.

No 13032 A.Visokosov
1st prize Shakhmatnaya
kompozitsia 2000

No 13033 Gh.Umnov
2nd prize Shakhmatnaya
kompozitsia 2000

"Pointed play, an
exceptionally original
clench of pieces, leading
up to subtleties of a
reciprocal zugzwang - all
of this wins us over to
awarding this the first
prize. Without
exaggeration we can say
that the year 2000 is the
year this composer 'leaped'
to prominence, and this
is before the publication of
awards still outstanding in
Russia and elsewhere."

No 13033 Gh.Umnov
2nd prize Shakhmatnaya
kompozitsia 2000

f6e2 0330.50 6/3 Win
No 13033 Gh.Umnov
(Podolsk). 1.a7 Rh6+
2.Kg5/i Ra6 3.h6 Ra5+/ii
4.Kh4/iii Ra4+ 5.g4
Rxg4+ 6.Kh5 Rxg8 7.h7/iv
Rf8/v 8.a8Q Bg4+ 9.Kxg4
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Rxa8 10. Kf5/vi Re8
11. Kf6 Kd3 12. Kf7 Re8
(Ra8; Kg7) 13. Ke6 (for
Kd7) Rh8 14. Kd5 Ke3
15. Kc5 Rc8 16. Kb6 Rh8
17. a4 Kc4 18. a5 Kd5
19. a6 Kd6 20. a7 Rc8/vii
21. a8Q/viii Rxa8 22. Kb7
Rh8 23 c8Q wins.

i) The 7th rank is booby-
trapped: 2. Ke7? Ra6 3. h6
Rxa7, as is the square e5:
2. Ke5? Ra6 3. h6 Rxa7
4. h7 Ra5+ and 5...Rg5.

ii) Hoping for perpetual
check after...

iii) 4. Kf4? Ra4+ 5. Kg5

iv) 7. a8Q? Ba7+.

v) To provoke: 8. Kh6?
Be6 9. Kg7 Rf7+ 10. Kg6
Rf8 positional draw.

vi) "Without aP it would
be a 'pendulum' draw
known from Reti. One
thinks that Black will
easily neutralise the
potentially dangerous
class 0441.0.0, seeing
that the bishops run on
opposite hues.

vii) Would you believe it?
A non-stop excelsior!


"All-board stuff on a
definition in the interests of
the valiant foot-soldiers
raises the eyebrows. And
Black plays his part too. A
duel of worthy
protagonists."

No 13034 A. Visokosov
3rd prize Shakhmatnaya
kompozitsia 2000

b2h4 0753.21 6/6 Draw

No 13035 P. Arestov
4th prize Shakhmatnaya
kompozitsia 2000

h3a6 0307.41 6/5 Win

No 13035 Pavel Arestov
(Moscow region).
1. Shb8+/i Ka5/ii 2.fQ
Rh4+ 3. Kg3 (Kxb4?
Sg6+;) Sf3+ 4. Kf3/iii
Rx4+ 5. Kxf4 Sg6+
6. Kg5/iv Sxf8 7. Kxf5,
with:


ii) Why bK neither captures on b6 nor plays to b5 will emerge in (iv) - both sides are playing for tempo in the looming SvS endgame, in which White plans Sd7,Sxd7;e6.


iv) The over-trumping tempo move. Black's point buried in (ii) is that after the obvious 6.Kxf5? Sxf8, and:

- 7.Sd7 Sxd7 8.e6 Sxb6 9.e7 Sc8, when 10.e8S is forced, or

v) "Alas for bK, the b6 square is out of bounds."

vi) 3.Kf3 Sxc6 4.Qe5 cSe7 draw.

"Witty play by both sides precedes a fresh and interesting reci-zug."

No 13036 A.Visokosov
1st hon men Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 2000

Thematic try: 2.Rd3? dIQ 3.Rxd1 Rxd1+ 4.Kxe8 a2 5.a8Q a1Q 6.Bxb7+ Sxb7 7.Qxb7+ Kg1 8.Qb6+ Rd4 9.Qg6+ Kxh1, and Black wins thanks to the timely centralisation of bR. However, the guilty party in what follows is the doomed knight stranded on h1!

iii) The difference between this and the try is a stalemate resource. Black, here, cannot interpose his rook so lacks the wherewithal for winning.

"Deep thought here. To my way of thinking the solver is given no chance. Is this good or bad? It's a tricky question. We need all kinds of studies. For myself I like the out of the ordinary and the puzzlesome. But in this case to the unprepared gaze there is a lack of unity between introductory and concluding positions, and the latter is also unsatisfactory due to the extensive supporting analysis that is called for."
No 13037 V.Kondratev
2nd hon men Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 2000

No 13038 V.Kondratev
3rd hon men Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 2000

No 13039 Gherman Umnov
special hm Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia 2000

c8b3 0450.24 6/7 Win
No 13037 V.Kondratev (.).
1.Bd1+ Ka3 2.Bb4+ Kxb4
3.Rc4+ Kb5/i 4.Ba4+ Kb6
5.Rc6+ Ka7 6.Rc7+ Ka6
(Kb6;Rb7+) 7.Kb8 Rc1
8.Ra7+ Kb6 9.Rb7+ Kc5
10.Kc7 Kd5+ 11.Kd7 a1S
12.Rxb2 Rc3 13.Rb5+ Rc5
16.Rxc6 Sb3 17.Rd6+ Ke5
18.f5, winning: Kb4 19.Ke8 Sc5
i) Here, as also on moves 3, 6, and 9, Black has to avoid mate on the spot.

"As with the previous study, some analysis at the end is required: 18...Kb4
19.Ke8 Sc5 20.Rxd4+ Kb3
21.Rd5."

No 13038 V.Kondratev (.).
1.Ba5+ Kd1/i 2.Sxd4 c1Q
3.gSe2 Qa1/ii 4.Sc3+ Kd2
5.Sa2+ Kd3 6.Sb4+
Ke4/iii 7.f3+ Kf4 8.Bc7+
Kg5 9.Bd8+, and Kh5
10.Sf5, or Ke4 10.Bc7+, in
the latter case perpetual
check.
i) There's mate in wait for
1...Kd3??
ii) Qg5 3.Sc3+ Kc1
iii) Ke3 7.bSc6+, the salvo
of the second battery
securing the draw.

"In the author's style, as
already seen, spoilt only
by bR."

No 13039 Gherman Umnov
(Podolsk).
1.Rf3/i, with:
- g1Q 2.Rg3+ Qxg3+
3.Kxg3 Kg6 4 Kg4, or
- g1S+ 2.Kg3(Kg2/Kg4)
(Kc5? Ke6;) Ke7 5.Kd3
Kb6 8.Kb4 draw.
i) Thematic try: 1.Rf4?
g1Q 2.Rg4+ Qxg4+
3.Kxg4 Kg6 is a simple
"opposition" win for Black.
"Familiar, yes - but a
malutka. Irreproachable
technique."

No 13040 V.Kovalenko
(Maritime Province).
1.Bf7 Bf5 2.Be6 Rh8+
3.Ka7 Rf8 4.Rb8 Rxb8
"A pleasing snatch of
geometry."
ARTICLES
editor: John Roycroft

It is a pleasure for EG to rescue from obscurity a series of 63 studies composed by Albert van Tets of South Africa and published in the chess column of the house magazine of the organisation he worked for. A handful that suffered from duals are omitted at the author’s request. We shall publish them in three stages.

---

f3h5 0160.01 2/4 Draw

"An analytical effort in 0160.01 that is not without its tactical nuances."

---

"An analytical effort in 0160.01 that is not without its tactical nuances."

---

No 13042 G.Amiryan (Erevan). 1.a7, with:
- Sb5 2.a8Q Rg8+ 3.Sd8 Rxd8+ 4.Kb7 Sd6+ 5.Ka7 Sb5+ 6.Kb7, or
"... short on novelty" is the judge's comment, and Hew Dundas concurs.

---

No 13041 E.Kudelich

f1h1 0030.64 7/6 Win

No 13041 E.Kudelich (O. 1.h8Q Be4 2.Qa8 Bxa8 3.b7 Bxb7 4.axb7 h3
5.b8R Kxh2 6.Rh8+i Kg3 7.Re8 Kg4 (Kf4;Rg8) 8.Rf4+ wins.
"You can't help smiling."

---

No 13040 V.Kovalenko

No 13042 G.Amiryan

"An analytical effort in 0160.01 that is not without its tactical nuances."

---

No 13040 V.Kovalenko

No 13042 G.Amiryan

"An analytical effort in 0160.01 that is not without its tactical nuances."

---

No 13040 V.Kovalenko

No 13042 G.Amiryan

T1 Albert van Tets

South African house magazine *NDABA* of the Atomic Energy Board. The column 'Chessnuts' (or *Skaakpitte*) was alternately in English and Afrikaans. Most of the compositions were the work of Albert van Tets, though the column was nominally run by P.A. Rossouw. van Tets worked in the 'Physical Metallurgy' section.

iii) 6.bxc6? b3 7.c7 b2 8.c8Q b1Q+ should draw, e.g. 9.Kf6 Qb6+ 10.Kg7 Qa7+ 11.Kg8 Qb6 12.c4 Qg6+ 13.Kf8 Qf6+ 14.Kg8 Qh8+ 15.Kd7 Qxc8+ 16.Kxe8 Kxg4 draws because both sides can queen their last pawn.

This was the first composition (original or otherwise) to appear in the small chess column of the
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This study links to van Tets' article in EG48.

---

**T5 Albert van Tets**  
22v1977

---

**T7 Albert van Tets**  
22v1977

---

**HvdH**

White will have to trade both RPs against only one, but if he manages to sacrifice his last one on the fourth rank he will come just in time to stop the remaining black pawn from promoting. Therefore: 1.h4 is forced. Black can refute all other moves by occupying the same critical square. There are now three lines to examine:

**1.h4:**  

---

**1.h4:**  
a4/ii 2.Kc2 Kd4 3.Kf3 Ke5 4.Kc3. All forced in order to protect the best pawn from falling first. If Black attacks the pawn on the third rank, on his second or third move, White proceeds as before.

---

**T8 Albert van Tets**  
17v1978

---

**c4e6 0013.01 2/3 Draw**


iv) Kf5 4.Bg3 Kg4 5.Bb8 Kf5 6.Bg3 draw.

v) "Otherwise bK closes on bP."

vi) Sg4 5.Kf3 Kf5 6.Kg3 h2 7.Kg2 draw.

T9 Albert van Tets 7viil1978

b5c3 0033.11 2/4 Draw
1.Kc6/i Sa3(Sd2) 2.a7/ii Sc4 (Kd4(Kc4);Kxe7) 3.a8S draws, not 3.a8Q? Bd5+ 4.Kxd5 Sb6+ 5.Kc6 Sxa8.


T10 Albert van Tets 12iil1979

f1h3 0103.00 2/2 Win

i) As a waiting move 3.Rf7 also wins, but not 3.Rxg2 stalemate?

A solving contest started in the column from this date.

T11 Albert van Tets 9iil1979

flg8 0400.11 3/3 Win
Mr van Tets did not miss this winning opportunity during the 1977 "Pretoria Chess Day".

1.Re4/i, with:

T12 Albert van Tets 23ii1979
T13 Albert van Tets 6iv1979


i) 1-4.Sa8-b6-c8-xa7-b5? leads to a classic book draw after 4...Ke6 (for Kb6;) 5.a7 Kb7.


T14 Albert van Tets correction to 22iv1979

f6h8 3340.23 4/7 Win

As originally published wB was on c3 and there was no bPf4.

Apparently this correction has not been published until now.

T15 Albert van Tets 3viii1979

T16 Albert van Tets 12x1979

e6d3 0331.10 3/3 Draw

1.Sf5 Bc3 (Rg5;Sxd4) 2.g7 Rg5 3.Kf7 Rxf5+ 4.Kg6 Rf6+ 5.Kh5 draws, not 5.Kg5? Rf1 6.g8Q Rg1+, nor 5.Kh7? Rf7 6.Kh8 Bxg7+. 7.exd3.

T17 Albert van Tets 9xii1979

v4e4 3130.20 4/3 Draw


i) 2.Kg4 Qc8. 2.Kg5 Qe5+. 4.Sxd3.

Not 1.Be5? Ra5 2.Bxb8 Rf5 mate. So: 1.e8Q, with the following lines:

- Qxe8 2.dxe8Q 3.Be5,
- Qd6 2.Be5,
- Qb5 2.Be5 Qe2/
- Qxa8 2.Qe2 Qe5+ 3.Qxe5 (Qxe5+ 4.Qe5)
- Qxd4 Rxh6 4.Qe5.

i) Rxh6 3.dxe8Q Qxe8 4.Kg5 mate.

T12 Albert van Tets 12x1979

1.Sf5 Bc3 (Rg5;Sxd4) 2.g7 Rg5 3.Kf7 Rxf5+ 4.Kg6 Rf6+ 5.Kh5 draws, not 5.Kg5? Rf1 6.g8Q Rg1+, nor 5.Kh7? Rf7 6.Kh8 Bxg7+.
The stipulation is 'who wins, and how?'
The light wB is obtrusive.
1.g3+i Kh5/i2.c4 Qe8 3.Ke1 Qa4, and whether White plays 4.bxa4 b3 5.Bc6 Kg6, or 4.Kd1 Qxb3+ 5.axb3 a2, it is Black that wins.
ii) But not 1...Kh3? for then either 2.cxb4, or 2.c4, and Qe6 3.Kg1 for 4.Bg2 mate.

T19 Albert van Tets 4iv1980


T20 Albert van Tets 25iv1980

The light wB is obtrusive.
1.g3+i Kh5/i2.c4 Qe8 3.Ke1 Qa4, and whether White plays 4.bxa4 b3 5.Bc6 Kg6, or 4.Kd1 Qxb3+ 5.axb3 a2, it is Black that wins.
ii) But not 1...Kh3? for then either 2.cxb4, or 2.c4, and Qe6 3.Kg1 for 4.Bg2 mate.

T21 Albert van Tets Ndaba 31x1980


T22 Albert van Tets 31x1980


T23 Albert van Tets 31x1980


T24 Albert van Tets 31x1980

The Porterfield Rynd Affair
John Roycroft

J.A. Porterfield Rynd (1847-1917) was a strong Anglo-Irish player. Mark Orr's website devoted to Irish chess history confirms that he won the first and fourth Irish championships, played in 1865 and 1892. He gave simultaneous displays, could play blindfold, and - so Porterfield Rynd himself tells us - defeated Amos Burn 3-1 in a short 'match' played in Liverpool in 1887. We place the word *match* between inverted commas because Richard Forster's on-going website devoted to Amos Burn so far fails to confirm any such match, recording only a short game in Liverpool lost to Porterfield Rynd on 2nd October of 1887. In the 1890's Porterfield Rynd edited a chess column which regularly appeared on the back page of the Saturday issue of Dublin's *Evening Herald*. Typically it reported the achievements of major international figures, quoted from other sources, set a couple of problems for solving, and now and then appended local Dublin club news, especially about the team competition for the recently instituted Armstrong Cup. International composing tourneys - one for two- and one for three-movers - were successfully organised. In other words the column - always carrying 'Irish Champion' at its head alongside the name Porterfield Rynd - was fluent, well-connected, and wide in its range.

To come to the matter in hand. In his Dublin *Evening Herald* column of 25th May 1895 Porterfield Rynd quoted G.E. Barbier's *Weekly Citizen* (Glasgow) column of a week earlier, in which the attached diagram featured, climaxing a theme Barbier had developed for a month in his own Saturday column following the death of the player W.N. Potter.

![Chess Diagram]

1.c7 Rd6+ 2.Kb5 Rd5+ 3.Kb4 Rd4+ 4.Kb3 Rd3+ 5.Kc2 Rd4. At this point Barbier reported that Father Fernando Saavedra, a member of the Glasgow club, had announced that the position reached, drawn after 6.c8Q Rc4+ 7.Qxc4 stalemate, could be won by playing a different sixth move.

The winning manoeuvre - 6.c8R Ra4 7.Kb3, with mate or win of the black rook - was published on the same day (25th May 1895) in both Barbier's column in Glasgow and...
Porterfield Rynd's column in Dublin. Saavedra, a self-effacing priest with no chessplaying pretensions, in due course became a chess legend.

The difference between the Dublin and Glasgow columns of 25th May was that Porterfield Rynd claimed that he had actually had the position and chose the underpromotion in a simultaneous exhibition he had given at the Clontarf club 'three or four' years before. Porterfield Rynd further pointed out that Saavedra had been a member of the Clontarf club at the time and could therefore be expected to have been already familiar with this very underpromotion. In other words Porterfield Rynd claimed priority for himself for having discovered the underpromotion. Finally, Porterfield Rynd not only named his simultaneous opponent as Lt-Colonel Lynam ("President of the Club") but reproduced this position and play:

```
h5h1 0300.20 3/2 WTM
```

Porterfield Rynd's claim remained unnoticed until research, principally by David McAlister, unearthed it in August 2001 and passed it to Tim Krabbe, who developed the theme, considering arguments for and against authenticity, and placed it on a website with the heading 'the Saavedra myth exposed'. The material was repeated subsequently in the *EBUR* for September 2001 and *CHESS Monthly* for October 2001, - and referred to by Paul Valois in The Problemist for November 2001 (on p.256) - with no seriously dissenting voice.

So the question arises: was Porterfield Rynd telling the truth? The present writer, in contrast to the prevailing view summarised above, takes the opposite stance.

Here is the argument.

Consider:

- Porterfield Rynd failed to report the adduced Clontarf antecedent incident either at the alleged time or subsequently (the date is unclear so we cannot relate it to the date of Porterfield Rynd's first column in Dublin's *Evening Herald*)
Porterfield Rynd had the opportunity to react to the earlier Barbier columns but failed to do so. We know that the latter's columns reached him because his own column had quoted Barbier more than once.

Except with respect to Saavedra's prior membership of the Clontarf club (which fact supplied Porterfield Rynd with the tempting opening to make his claim), the Porterfield Rynd account remains uncorroborated to this day.

It would have been easy for Porterfield Rynd to contact Barbier, Saavedra, or Lynam, either at the time or subsequently, but he did not do so (or if he did he failed to report the outcome, and if they contacted him he did not report this either).

When the position became world famous (in 1902 - see EG122 in October 1996), Porterfield Rynd stayed dumb.

John Selman, the Dutchman who researched the Saavedra position over decades, nowhere mentions Porterfield Rynd in his (largely unpublished) monograph account.

If Porterfield Rynd had 'manufactured' his version, he did so in a way to favour belief in its accuracy, seeing that few club simultaneous games are recorded, almost nobody recalls one after the passage of time, and it was a safe ploy to use a figurehead club president, a weak player, as the 'opponent'.

Assuming Lynam to have been a weak player, the likelihood of him having survived to reach a 5-man endgame a rook ahead against a player of Porterfield Rynd's strength and experience strains credibility.

The position in its Porterfield Rynd manifestation is mirrored right-for-left, and there is a capturing introduction; both devices are tricks typical of a plagiarist motivated to obfuscate.

If Porterfield Rynd could remember the adduced position and the play (he failed to tell us the exact year of his simul) he might also have remembered how Black's king found itself on h1, but he doesn't say.

The best defence of the Porterfield Rynd contention is that coincidences do happen - there are indeed well documented cases, for instance of innocently duplicated chess problems. On the other hand, if Porterfield Rynd perpetrated a deception on this occasion, and got away with it, might he not have been tempted to a second venture of the kind? If so, evidence would be in his column, which continued for a year or so.

We acknowledge that Porterfield Rynd's column cannot be faulted for any lack of: interesting content, variety, topicality, international flavour, style, good advice, or a high standard of chess; and responsibility for fuzzily printed diagrams cannot be laid at the Porterfield Rynd door.

However, where Porterfield Rynd himself is concerned a different picture emerges. He claimed - and did so more than once - to have invented the helpmate genre some 20 years earlier: he names a very obscure column in an Irish farming periodical, while the Oxford Companion to Chess gives priority to Max Lange in 1854, the year in which Porterfield Rynd had his seventh birthday.
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Turning our attention to endgame studies, Porterfield Rynd, who had already cited notable positions by Van Vliet and Lasker in his column, showed an instinctive affinity for the genre which was making its artistic great leap forward in the person of A.A. Troitzky in Russia at the very moment that Porterfield Rynd was writing. With enthusiastic accolades Porterfield Rynd reproduces almost half-a-dozen recently published Troitzky pieces. It is no big leap of our own to conclude that Porterfield Rynd would have liked to have composed them himself.

Now for the crux. In Porterfield Rynd’s column of 19th October 1895 we find:

```
a1a4 4017.33 7/7 BTM.
```

Porterfield Rynd was White, we read, in a game against C.Yates, the position occurring with Black about to play move 37. Porterfield Rynd gives the conclusion:

```
37...Sd3 38.Qxf3 Qb3 39.Qxd3 Qxd3 40.Bf7 Qxc2 41.Ka2 f4 42.gxf4 Qc4+ 43.b3+ Qxb3+ 44.Bxb3 mate.
```

As in the Saavedra case we have according to Porterfield Rynd a specific venue: Miss Barr’s Lucan Spa Hotel (instead of the Clontarf Club); an unknown weak opponent; and a plagiarism of a study since become a classic, for after 39...Qxd3, there is on the board the exact position by H.Cordes of Berlin newly published with the 1895 Rigaer Tageblatt study composing tourney award, where it took second prize. Exact, that is, except that it is, again, reflected right for left. (The award is mentioned in passing in the July 1895 BCM. Thank you, Ken Whyld, for this reference.) Again we have the tell-tale prepended capturing sequence, and again Porterfield Rynd stays silent when the Cordes position, which is no.830 in C.E.C. Tattersall’s 1910-1911 anthology *A Thousand End-Games*, becomes better known.

We can sum up. If Porterfield Rynd’s only transgression were that of poetic licence in the interests of making study ideas popular - more players will look at a game than at something ‘artificial’ - he could perhaps be forgiven. However, as he not only failed to own up later but implied both his own brilliance and a degree of deception on the part of Saavedra, we feel compelled to take a dim view of the Anglo-Irish barrister’s claims.
[With insignificant differences the above article is in the December 2001 number of the *British Chess Magazine*. Tim Krabbe reacted on this BCM article on his webpage (http://www.xs4all.nl/~timkr/chess/chess.html - Open Chess Diary) with a piece called “Duck of the century” from which we quote: “my great scoop The messenger – the Saavedra myth exposed where I related how Rynd had anticipated the famous Saavedra study in a simul game, was in fact a canard. I’ll have to rewrite that piece.”]

A puzzle remains: why has no trace of Porterfield Rynd being tackled - in public or in private - come to light? One of the Dublin *Evening Herald* solvers was “W.H.S.M.”, i.e. W.H.S.Monck, later a leading *Chess Amateur* solver in several sections until his death (reported in October 1915). If anyone we are aware of had both the opportunity and the knowledge to confront Porterfield Rynd it would have been Monck. Could Irish researcher David McAlister delve into private papers that may survive? Monck lived in Northern Ireland. [AJR]

**EG COMPETITION - ANNOUNCEMENT!!**

An EG challenge (no prizes!):
to concoct a convincing game of the right length (37 moves!) leading to the position before 37...Sd3, in the alleged game between Porterfield Rynd and C.Yates.

Closing date: 31vii2002
Send to: AJR

---

**COMPUTER SECTION**

**KEN THOMPSON’S 6-MAN STATISTICAL GRAPHS**

Guy Haworth

This note addresses some questions about Ken Thompson's graphs at http://cm.bell-labs.com/cm/cs/who/ken/chesseg.html.

These give some statistics about 6-man BTM White wins: there is no information about WTM or Black-win positions. There are two graphs per endgame and the metric is DTC or Depth to Conversion, i.e. to mate or change of force. The horizontal axis is linear in five equal parts; the vertical one is logarithmic having marks at 25%, 50% and 75%; the ‘floor’ is 0.1%. DTC = 0 is not credited with the *btm mated* positions.
One graph gives the number of lost BTM positions at each depth: the depth (usually 1) featuring most positions is highlighted. The other shows the percentage of BTM positions lost in DC or fewer moves. The maxDTC and percentage of lost BTM positions is given.

Thus, for KQQKQQ, we can see that, according to the statistics:

maxDTC = 44; 18.22% of BTM positions are lost; more positions have DTC = 1 than any other depth; 231,246,870 have DTC = 1; from DTC = 17 on, the numbers are too small to show on the 'positions per depth' graph. In fact, 318,444 positions have DTC = 17.

Some caveats. These statistics are affected by symmetries which Ken has not factored out. For example, the 231,246,870 positions mentioned above are not all different: exchanging two wQQ or bQQ makes another position in the count but not on the chessboard.

Although Ken did not include the btm_mated position, it appears that he did include them in the count of all BTM positions so his percentages are underestimates. For KQQKQQ BTM White wins, Wirth gives 20.05% and Nalimov gives 20.01%: they handle symmetries differently but both show that Ken's 18.22% is low.
1. Snapshots of memory
The vi2001 issue of the International Computer Games Association journal includes a number of personal and technical tributes to Ken Thompson, who has now retired from the \*C\* arena.

Three 'snapshots' are high on the list of my personal memories of Ken Thompson. The first snapshot is of being consulted by Ken early in 1983, by post and by phone. Ken wanted to know for which pawnless endgame he should create the first 5-man pioneering oracle database. My answer was 'two bishops against knight'. The result is in EG74 in the same year.

The second is in the late autumn of 1985. We were looking down on what must have been New York's twin World Trade Centre towers from the small plane that Ken was expertly piloting, having hedge-hopped the bridges down the long Manhattan stretch of the Hudson River. We banked steeply into a 180-degree turn.

The third occurred in the same visit. This time it was in Ken's New Jersey home when we were both seated at a table. Ken had just explained how 121 million bits can represent all BTM positions of a 5-man pawnless endgame. A bit 'on' denotes a win for White, otherwise no win. In a flash I saw that if a like number of WTM bits were compared bit for bit with the BTM set then nothing more was needed to identify all positions where White did not win WTM, but did BTM: reciprocal zugzwangs. Ken silently disappeared into his sanctum and programmed it, coming back within half-an-hour with the unique result for 0023. The now routine sniffing out of reciprocal zugzwangs was born. Lists for other endgames followed thick and fast from Ken; for instance, that for GBR 1006 was created on 7xii1985, though not until viii1988 was it published (in EG).

2. Symbiotic research
The reci-zug story illustrates the computer's 'brute force' capability to produce same-day, and indisputably final, output of eye-opening significance for the non-computer specialist. There has to be untapped potential for more of the same. The inhibitor for this to happen is, we think, unsatisfactory channels of between-the-ears communication between programmer and 'domain specialist', the latter term being
artificial intelligence jargon for what is (in the present context) an acknowledged scholar in endgame theory.

Here is a current scenario. A key to how to win winnable endgames which are still mysterious is to understand what lies behind 'pinch effects'. A pinch effect is a passage in a full-length optimal solution where play always funnels into a relatively small family of closely related positions. There could be more than one pinch effect in any endgame. A pinch-effect arises when the defence chooses a stable configuration that is not a fortress. To oust the defender a sequence of unique or near-unique optimal moves is unavoidable. The classic example of a pinch-effect is 0023, with the Kling & Horwitz pseudo-fortress based on a protected bS on b7 (or b2 or g2 or g7). The forcing exits are (probably) four only - see EG84. A lesser pinch-effect in the same ending occurs later in the solution with the defending duo trying to hover mid-way between two adjacent corners. Knowing how to handle these two bottlenecks enormously eases the winning process.

Now the generalised 'brute force' computer application would be to identify pinch-effects from already existing statistical data, namely:
- frequencies at all WTM and BTM depths,
- moves optimal and non-optimal and their comparative depths.

Pinch effects will rarely be as spectacular as the Kling & Horwitz position in 0023, but the 'brute force' approach can only grow in sophistication and sensitivity to the target. See 4. below.

If the brute force scenario is implemented first for 0023, it will have the not inconsiderable advantage, as a pilot project, of prior knowledge of the principal result: the four K&H 'exits', which the computer is required to search for and identify 'automatically'. This is an ideal test situation for a computer program - a verification procedure: we shall know when it has succeeded.

Once a pinch-effect family of positions has been identified the endgame scholar takes over, but still with the computer at his elbow. His skill will be concentrated on where it will be most productive instead of being dissipated over the whole, unmanageable, domain; the computer will check his conjectures and hypotheses. Each doing what he, or it, is best at.

Cooperation, symbiosis.

3. *C* and the tingling spine

Since the end of 2000 Ken Thompson's legacy web-site (see Guy Haworth's exposition in this issue) has donated the internet-enabled world with direct and straightforward access to optimal play in any legal position of 84 6-man pawnless endgames. In addition to this God-like facility, for each endgame Ken supplies - under the heading 'freq' for frequency - a laconic chart of which Guy dissects the QQ-QQ sample. AJR having struggled with this, it may serve a useful purpose to try to say the same thing as Guy but in more 'popular' vein.

All 84 charts are the same size and follow the same pattern: to understand one is to understand them all.
A chart has two graphs running left to right from the bottom left corner - the origin. One graph - we shall dub it Matterhorn - climbs to a swift peak, then plunges, often erratically, into (indeed, through) the base line at some point. The other graph - Tibet is our pet-name for it - rises steeply at first, levelling off to a plateau and impacting the chart's right-hand vertical edge close to the top. A pair of numbers accompanies both Matterhorn's peak and Tibet's roof of the world.

The vertical y-axis has three notches towards the top. The notches are not evenly spaced, suggesting a logarithmic scale. The horizontal x-axis sports four notches that reassuringly divide it into five equal sections.

Matterhorn and Tibet represent the same phenomenon, namely the frequency of white wins in BTM positions. As Guy points out, Ken provides no information about WTM. That Matterhorn and Tibet intersect has no significance - it is a consequence of Matterhorn racing mostly downhill and Tibet steadily uphill.

All that is missing to make the charts' messages clear is to demystify the number-pairs and the vertical/horizontal scales.

Consider the chart for the "Q-BBN" 6-man endgame. The left number of the two associated with Tibet states the maximum depth (to conversion - DTC). The right number is always less than 1, namely a decimal quantity taken to four places. This is probably interpreted most simply as a percentage: take the first two digits after the
point. So the meaning is that White wins 26%, say, of the BTM positions. To apply these figures to the graph we spread the DTC depth - in this case 51 - evenly across the divisions of the x-axis. Now, if we know the vertical scale, we can read off the percentage of wins at a point, i.e. depth, of our choosing. In other words the Tibet graph plots DTC cumulatively from the origin, with a dot for every move according to the depth: if the maximum DTC is 51 moves there will be 51 dots hovering above 51 equally spaced notional dots on the x-axis. Joining up all the graph dots, as Ken has chosen to do, provides clarity on the page (or screen).

Now for Matterhorn. This plots the number of wins for White at any depth, for which purpose it is a relief to know that the x-axis is exactly as for Tibet. Of the two Matterhorn numbers the first is the depth (usually it has the value 1) at which most white wins occur; the second, always a number in the millions, is Ken's figure for that maximum. For Q-BBN (the GBR code - 1063 here - hasn't caught on!) the number is 183,731,386.

However, for both Matterhorn and Tibet the logarithmic y-axis still has to be clarified. Guy Haworth had to refer to Ken for this. The y-axis origin turns out not to be value 0 (which would be illogical for a logarithmic scale) but a number slightly less than 1, with the top of the chart representing '1,000'. This unusual scale facilitates wine-press compaction. However, Ken does not use the top 10% of the space available to him, reserving the gap for displaying the statistics. We can now see that the reason Matterhorn plunges in mid-base is that very small frequencies - those at the greatest depths - are off the chart: the graph might need plumb a kilometre (on the chosen scale) if Matterhorn were to be seen to hit the projected right-hand edge.

The consequence of Ken's normalising ingenuity is that: although actual numbers can be read off only by a Carol Vorderman talent; although WTM is ignored; and although Guy draws attention to technical anomalies, one can nevertheless get a futuristic feel for the behaviour of any 6-man pawnless endgame, while conducting one's own private man/machine investigation using the optimal play interface Ken provides. A tingle jolts AJR's spine every time he sees one of Ken's graphs.

4. The pinch-effect and Matterhorn
Please refer to the Ken Thompson FREQ chart for "RB-BN (opposite)". Do 'pinch effects' stand out from a Matterhorn downhill graph? Yes, but not prominently, maybe not all of them show, and we should not expect crystalline simplicity in a topic where it behoves us to be tentative. The pattern of pinch-effects will vary unpredictably between one endgame and another. In particular, for endings with a pawn we need more detailed graphs than are currently available: we need them not just for each pawn's file but for each rank. In principle a dip, or brief uphill passage, should indicate a pinch effect: a jump in the downhill ski run, or a 'gate' in the slalom. These are readily identified by computer. See 2.
This time Spotlight’s contributors were Gady Costeff (Israel/USA), Guy Haworth (England), Valery Krivenko (Ukraine), Virgiliu Nestorescu (Romania), Alain Pallier (France), Michael Roxlau (Germany), Ignace Vandecasteele (Belgium), Valery Vlasenko (Ukraine), as well as EG’s editors Harold van der Heijden and John Roycroft.

126.10772, O.Carlsson, L.Parenti. An interesting battle of human analysis vs 6-man-database (Harold drew my attention to this): Spotlight’s editor attempted to cook this, the composers published a reply in Finales y Temas, and now an omniscient database has the last word. To put it shortly, Spotlight came up with a much better defence for Black (1...Qf6+ 2.Rd6 Qf8 3.Bb7+ Kb8 4.Rd4 Qe7 5.Be4 Qa7+ 6.Kc6 Qb7+ 7.Kc5 Qe7+ "and White is pushed back"), but, as the database proves, White is still winning after 8.Kc4. This represents best play for both sides, but the winning procedure after this is not unique, so the study is unsound after all.

134.11411, V.Nestorescu. The composer submits the following correction: c3a7
311.1.01 a8h6d6a3.c6 4/3+, 1.Be5+ Kb7 2.Rh7+ Ka6 3.Kb2 etc.

141.11863, Y.Zemliansky. Alain Pallier points out that this is almost identical with 8.318 (A.Koranyi, Troitzky MT 1966, 4th Prize). After three half-moves the only difference is the position of the white king (Koranyi’s king is on c6). This gives rise to a different solution (7.Bh5). Zemliansky must have known the Koranyi, as he took the 1st Prize of the Troitzky MT!

141.57 p.390, B.Sidorov. The dual spotted in Spotlight in EG 142 is caused by a diagram error: wPf6 should be on f5.


142.11936, A.Manvelian. No solution, 3...Kf7 4.Rxa8 Re7 draws. Now after 5.Kh8 Ke6 it is Black who wins the thematic zugzwang battle: 6.Kg8 Kf6 7.Rf8+ Kg6 8.Rf6+ Kxf6 9.a8Q Re8+ 10.Qxe8 stalemate. However, the real analytical problem is the tricky rook endgame arising after 5.Kh6 Ke6 6.Rxh8 Rxa7 7.Kg6. Now Black must be careful not to end up in a lost ending rook+pawn vs rook with his king cut off, e.g. 7...Ra4 8.Re8+ Kd7 9.Re3 Rxf4 10.Kg5 Ra4 11.Kxf5 wins (this is a marginal case) or 7...Ra3 8.Re8+ Kd7 9.Re5 Rxf3 10.Kxf5 wins or 7...Ra6 8.Rb8 Rc6 9.Rb5 Ke7+ 10.Kg5 Rc3 11.Re5+ Kd6 12.Kf6 Rfx3 13.Kxf5 wins. Instead Black should try to bring his king in front of the pawns as quickly as possible: 7...Ra6 8.Rb8 Ke7+ 9.Kxf5 (9.Kg7 Ra1 draw, but not the greedy 9...Ra4? 10.Rb3 Rfx4 11.Re3+ Kd7 12.Kf6 and White still wins). I have not seen any serious analysis on this ending, but there seem to be 2 safe plans for Black: 9...Kf7 keeping the rook on the 6th rank (Spasski defended like this against Petrosian in the Candidates tournament Amsterdam 1956) and 9...Ra3 (aiming at the pawn) 10.Rb7+ Kf8 11.Kg4 Rc3 12.f5 Ra3 13.f4 Ra4 14.Kg5 Rxe4 15.Kg6 (what else? 15.f6 Rc1) Rxf4 16.Kf6 Kg8 with a standard draw.

Two more snippets: Perhaps even 5.Sg6 6.Kg5 Kg7 7.Rg8+ Kxg8 8.a8Q+ Sf8 is good enough for a draw. The play is partially anticipated by S.Belokon, IX USSR team championship 1976, 53.3436.

142.11949, B.Sidorov. There is a “very partial anticipation” (Gady Costeff’s apt words) to this by G.Bernhardt, Schach-Echo 1961, c6h8 0003.56 a8.a3a7e4g6h7a4a5b3e5e6g7 6/8=, 1.Kb7 b2 2.Kxa8 b1B etc. The similarity becomes even more striking if we improve Bernhardt’s setting by starting with wKb8 (1.Kxa8?, 1.Kb7?)

142.11950, Y.Afek. Frankly, this study with its resourceful dynamic play seems underrated, especially when compared with the static 142.11949, which shows a similar idea.
142.11954, A.Manyakhin. 7.Re6+ mates even faster than the intended 7.Rg4+. A simple remedy is the addition of a bPe7 (Ignace Vandecasteele).


142.11968, B.Sidorov. 3...Qh1+ 4.Kg8 Bb7 5.Rxb7 is a more precise move order, as it sidesteps the dual 4.Bc7+ Kxc7 5.Rxb7+ Kxb7 6.d8Q and wins.


142.12017, J.Pospisil. There are duals in all 3 lines: after 1...Bb3 there is 4.Sc3 Kf3 5.Kc1 Ke4 6.Kd2 Bf7 7.Kf3 and finally after 1...Kg2 there is 7.Sa3 Kf3 8.Kd5 draw. One probably cannot expect rigorous exactitude in a position like this.

142.12036, M.Roxlau. The composer is a little critical of his own oeuvre. He points out that Sh2 is superfluous (it only serves for a try), and suspects that there may be duals in the final phase of the solution, as the material balance 0143 with different coloured bishops is a database win for White.

142.12039, A.Gasparyan. There is a very nice dual: 7.Be5 Rxh6+ (7...Bxe5 8.g7) 8.Kg7 Rh4 9.Bf6 followed by Kg7 with a draw.

142.12047, V.Kalyagin, V.Olympiev. Instead of 1...Qb3+ Black has 4 immediate wins: 1...Qg2, 1...Qd4, 1...Qb7 and 1...Qe1.

142.12048, N.Rezvov, S.Tkatchenko. There are duals in the line 5...Kg6 (6.Kf4 Rc8 and now 7.Sf8+, 7.Ke5, 7.Sg5), so 5...Rc8 should figure as the single main line.

142.12053, V.Kalandadze. There is an obvious cook (4.Ra6+), so one must assume a diagram misprint (bRh6->h7).


142.12058, P.Arestov. A dual: 3.Re1 Qh6+ 4.Rg5+ leads to mate or a 6-man-database-win after the capture of Pf3.

142.12061, V.Kondratchev. A dual: 3.Sb4+ Kc5 4.a5 Kd6 5.a6 Kc7 6.a7 Kb7 7.Sc6 wins. Earlier Black may improve by 1...Kxd3 2.a5 Ke4 3.a6? (3.Kg2 draw) Kf3 4.a7 g2+ 5.Kxh2 Kf2 and mates.


142.12066, I.Bondar. Sent to more than one tourney, see 112.9331.


142.12050, G.Umnov. Strictly speaking 8.Rh1 mate is no unique winning move (8.Ra1 etc.). However, more serious is the flaw 4.Sf5 and wins.

M1 p.453, A.Manyakhin. The play is only unique up to 9...Qf3 (10.Sf5 is the first
There are duals from move 4 on, e.g. 4.Sd3 a2 5.Sxh6 a1Q 6.Sg4.

M7 p.456, A. and S. Manyakhin (also 108.8768). As Gady Costeff points out this is completely anticipated by I. Infantozzi, Ajedrez Postal Americano 1985, f7b7 0300.32 c6.a4.d4.e5.d5 4/4+ 1.e6.Rc7 2.e7.Kc6 3.Kf8 and now 3...Kd6 4.e8S+ and 3...Rc8+ 4.e8R. There is an even earlier study showing similar motifs: Y. Afek, G. Costeff, Israel Ring Tourney 1983, Commented (99.7659), e7.g7 0301.31 h3.g8.f5.g3.g4.g5 5/3+, 1.f6+ (sometimes the study is stripped of its first move, as 1.Sf6 introduces unnecessary analytical difficulties) Kg6 2.f7.Rh7 3.Sh6.Kxh6 4.Kc8 and now 4...Kg6 5.f8S+ and 4...Rh8+ 5.f8R.


M12 p.458, A. und S. Manyakhin (also 139.11723, please note that Bh7 should be white). Unsound, as pointed out in Spotlight before (8.Bb3 Kbl 9.Ke2 is a dual win). However, according to Ignace Vandecasteele the study can be saved by making 6...d5 7.Bxd5 Qc2 the main line, thereby shortening the solution by 2 moves.

B7 p.462 I. Bondar. No first publication, as stated in the article, but 1st/3rd Prize Afanasiev MT 2000.

B11 p.463, A. Khait. A difficult study with many murky lines, not a joy to analyse. However, 4...Sg7 is a mistake, as 5.Sd5 Sb5 6.Sbc6 leads to instant mate.

B17 p.464, A. Troitzky (a bPb7 is missing in the diagram, the source is Shakhmaty Zhurnal 1896). Unsound, both 1...Sd6 2.d8Q (or 2.cxd6) g2 3.Kf2 Sd1+ 4.Kg1 Sc3 and 1...Sc4+ 2.Sxc4 g2 3.Kf2 Bxe7 throw a spanner in White’s works.


REVIEWS
editor: John Roycroft

This is a major work. It is 60 years since the publication of Reuben Fine's *Basic Chess Endings* (1941), dedicated to Emanuel Lasker. As both volumes have the same didactic aim, a comparison is tempting, *BCE* vs. *FCE*: 574 smallish pages - 416 larger ones; 8 chapters (plus a conclusion-cum-summary with 15 'Rules for the Endgame') - 10 chapters (plus an 'Endgame Strategy' chapter with 10 'General Endgame Principles') [see below]; no index or exercises or bibliography - all three; original price, one guinea - £19.99. The two extra chapters in *FCE* home in on: rook plus minor piece(s), and Q-endings; they arise largely from computer input not dreamed of by Fine.

The German authors are essentially chess trainers, drawing on, and acknowledging, many sources - apart from Berger and Hooper. The studies cited may be few, but they are always greeted with enthusiasm. Analysis is only occasionally oppressive.

The book is well-written and well translated, with plenty of useful pointers, and is excellently presented. Obvious errors are few - a Philidor position is given the date 1792. We should have liked the index to have pointed the reader to named themes, and to where 'exclusion' is expounded; 'exclusion' is presumably a solving technique invoked here as a learning tool.

If we were to raise a single issue with the authors it would be the unacknowledged conflict between the fashionable faster time limits being introduced in 2001 and the need to master enormous quantities of formidably complex material - a conflict which is skirted round where the 50-move rule is concerned, while the listing of computer-generated 5-man and 6-man statistical data, apparently just because it is available, is similarly remote from practicality.

GAMBIT Publication's chess director, a *FCE* reviewer (syndicated in BCM, Chess, and *Rochade-Europa*), the author of the foreword, the name quoted most frequently in the text, the typesetter, and the husband of GAMBIT's German editor - all are roles taken by the well known quick-change artist IGM John Nunn!

---

Reuben Fine's 15 rules in *BCE* (1941):
1. Doubled, isolated and blockaded Pawns are weak: Avoid them!
2. Passed Pawns should be advanced as rapidly as possible.
3. If you are one or two Pawns ahead, exchange pieces but not Pawns.
4. If you are one or two Pawns behind, exchange Pawns but not pieces.
5. If you have an advantage do not leave all the pawns on one side.
6. If you are one Pawn ahead, in 99 cases out of 100 the game is drawn if there are Pawns on only one side of the board.
7. The easiest endings to win are pure Pawn endings.
8. The easiest endings to draw are those with Bishops of opposite colors.
9. The King is a strong piece: Use it!
10. Do not place your Pawns on the color of your Bishop.
11. Bishops are better than Knights in all but blocked Pawn positions.
12. Two Bishops vs. Bishop and Knight constitute a tangible advantage.
13. Passed Pawns should be blockaded by the King; the only piece that is not harmed by watching a Pawn is the Knight.
15. Rooks belong behind passed Pawns.

FCE's 10 General Endgame Principles (2001):
1. An endgame is not a middlegame!
2. When up on material, exchange pieces; when down on material, exchange pawns.
3. Do not rush (if it is not a race situation, of course!).
4. The role of the king changes completely compared to the middlegame: in the endgame it is a strong fighting unit and is especially good at supporting friendly passed pawns.
5. Wing pawns are often more valuable than centre pawns as they are easier to queen. Rook's pawns are especially strong against knights; however, in other endings they may be less valuable.
6. Don't forget about the bishop and wrong rook's pawn draw!
7. The rook is a very strong counterattacking unit. It is not so strong in blockading enemy passed pawns.
8. Rook endings occur very often in practice. Study them carefully!
9. No rule can replace concrete calculation. All 'rules' have exceptions. Calculation in the endgame is at least as important as in the middlegame.
10. The art is to find the exceptions, but you are already a strong player when you know how and when to apply the rules!

SNIPPETS

1. The August 2001 issue of "64", the Russian magazine that most nearly reflects an official view, reproduced EGJ39.11715, Tolya Kuznetsov's last, to the wider Russian chess public. A prefacing dialogue between their staff reporter on studies matters (Oleg Pervakov) and Karen Sumbatian, Tolya's co-composer, broached the topic of joint authorship, then shifted to why Tolya selected EG as his outlet, when, alleges Pervakov, Tolya had no high opinion of the West. In response Sumbatyan drew attention to Tolya's respect for people who succeeded where he had failed - a specific reference to publication of the USSR vs. Rest-of-the-World match - prompting this rejoinder from Pervakov: "What you say smacks of the pathetic". Sumbatian's riposte: "What did you expect? Prose?" Each of us will have our own comment on this exchange, varying according to which stereotype we adhere to.

2. IGM Hans Ree e-mailed for suggestions how he might respond to the invitation of a Dutch intellectual journal to contribute something chessic on 'donkeys', the reason for the invitation being that 'donkey thought' is a supposed enlightened state of consciousness. The journal title, Ezelsgedachte, very happily suggested EG!

3. What do the letters GBR stand for? Did you think of Great Barrier Reef and Guinness Book of Records?
4. EG142
4.1 p400, col.1: Ignace Vandecasteele, winner of the third prize, was also present at the Wageningen presentation.
4.2 p400, col.1: contrary to our prognostication, the complete Euwe Centennial award was not in New in Chess. In its 2001/7 issue there was only a selection, by IGM Timman, who included an original of his own.
4.3 p403, col.1: the word not was unfortunately omitted from the phrase who had no function.

5. The cosmopolitan Harold Lommer's family origins are obscure. We find it intriguing that Lommersdorf and Lommersweiler are small but ancient localities lying to the south of Aachen.

6. The tragically early death of otb IGM Tony Miles (1955-2001) recalls the only occasion we met. When he took over the New Statesman chess column in 1976, was he aware, I asked him, that his predecessor ASSIAC, who had been chess editor since the column's inauguration in 1949, had been ousted from above without warning? Tony's answer was in the negative. The IGM, who died in his sleep from a heart attack, was a diabetic who said no to orthodox medical treatment.

7. The Taliban in Afghanistan forbade chess while they were in power.

8. The 0309(111) position on p243 of EG139 was the basis of a talk All in One to the British Chess Problem Society in London on 30xi2001. The idea was to present an easily memorable study position in which many generic features would be suggested - by their presence, by their absence, or by an opposite.

9. The FIDE Album 1998-2000 selection tourney, including a section for studies published in this 3-year period, has been announced with a closing date of 31viii2002. Harold van der Heijden is the studies section director, to whom entries must be sent. The announced judges: Oleg Pervakov (Russia), Oscar Carlsson (Argentina) and Virgil Nestorescu (Romania). 5 copies of each entry (your best only, please!) are required from composers, with full source details. And see 10 below.

10. The web-site maintained by Hannu Harkola (Finland) for the FIDE PCCC has much valuable information, including the Guidelines for Formal International Tourneys for Original Endgame Studies, which in our opinion ought to be compulsory reading for all tourney organisers!

11. It is a delight to report that Pauli Perkonoja, the Finnish solving and composing guru, has abandoned a decades long silence with a series of articles on aspects of studies. Unfortunately for most of us the series is in Suomen Tehtäväniekat, so in the Finnish language.
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