Tim Krabbe 60 Compositie Toernooi / Composing Tourney

After nearly half a century of enjoying the beauty of endgame studies and problems, and reproducing many of them in my chess publications, I felt it was time to do something in return: to organize and sponsor a composing tourney - if only because I would like to spend my 60th birthday, 13 April 2003, admiring some fine studies and problems that might otherwise not have been there.

Composers are invited to submit original compositions in two sections:

1) Endgame Studies
2) Problems - direct-mate moremovers

Prizes in both sections will be 400, 200, 100, 2x50 and 2x25 Euro.

1) Endgame studies.
Themes are free. Entries no later than 31 December 2002 to the Tournament Director, Rene Olthof, Achter het Schaapshoofd 7, 5211 MC 's-Hertogenbosch, NEDERLAND; e-mail: <raj a@newinchess.com>

Judges: Harold van der Heijden and Tim Krabbe.

2) Problems - direct-mate moremovers.
Themes are free. Entries no later than 31 December 2002 to the Tournament Director, Henk le Grand, Heimanslaan 5, 6705 AD Wageningen-hoog, NEDERLAND; e-mail: <hlegrand@nl.packardbell.org>

Liburkin Memorial Theme Tourney

ARVES announces a composing theme endgame study tourney in memory of Mark Liburkin (1910-1953).

The theme: Echo-Chameleon shown in its partial or complete form in variations, try, twins, or along the main line. Example: M.Liburkin, 1st prize Shakhmaty v SSSR 1946,
e8e6 0560.10 a8f5h4h6d4.a7 4/4 Draw
1.Rb4 Be3 2.Kd8, and:
A) 2...Rh8+ 3.Kc7 Rxa8 4.Re4+ Bxe4 stalemate.

Liburkin MT theme A final position A
Liburkin MT theme B final position B

Judge: Yochanan Afek
Deadline: March 31st, 2003
Send studies marked “Liburkin-MT” to: Harold van der Heijden, Michel de Klerkstraat 28, NL-7425 DG Deventer, The Netherlands E-mail: harold_van_der_heijden@wxs.nl
Editorial Board

John Roycroft,
17 New Way Road,
London,
England NW9 6PL
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EG Subscription

EG is produced by the Dutch-Flemish Association for Endgame Study ('Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor schaakEindspelStudie') ARVES. Subscription to EG is not tied to membership of ARVES.

The annual subscription of EG (Jan. 1 - Dec. 31) is € 22,- (or $20,- or £14,-) for 4 issues. Payments should preferably be in EURO's and can be made by bank note's, Eurogiro, Worldgiro, bankcheques and postal money orders.

To compensate for bank charges payments via Eurogiro should be €27,- (or $24,- or £17,-) and all other should be €32,- (or $28,- or £20,-). Subscribers with American Express cards can also pay €22,- with their card. They have to send their number, expiration date plus signature by post to the Treasurer. The accountnumber of ARVES (not EG!) is 54095.

Subscribers who want to pay via their bank should take notice of the following information;
The name of the bank is: Postbank.
The SWIFT-code of the bank is: PSTBNL21
The accountnumber of ARVES is: 54095
The address of the bank is:
Bijlmerdreef 109
1009 CD Amsterdam

All payments can be addressed to the treasurer (see Editorial Board) except those by Eurogiro which should be directed to: Postbank, accountnumber 54095, in the name of ARVES, Leiderdorp, The Netherlands.

It is of course possible with any kind of payment to save bank charges by paying for more years or for more persons together, like some subscribers already do.
Eduard Kudelich sends a very successful essay in consecutive construction. By move two many readers will recognize Fritz's classic miniature (Cesk. Sach 1965):

**White to play and draw**

J. Fritz

1. Ka6 Re7 2. Bb7! Rxb7 and now not Kxb7? a5 winning but first 3.b5!! and Re7(h7) produces stalemate while Rb8 4.Kxa7 R- 5.Kxb6 is an easy draw.

Kudelich, using the same men, gets a substantial improvement from a slight shift in their position:

3. Ka6 with the plan Kb5, Bc6.

i) Reaching Fritz but with Kf3 instead of f2, so Black can make a more serious winning attempt in the R vs. P ending.

iv) From here on the composer's analysis is corroborated by the *C* databases.


vi) Ka6? Kd5 6.b6 Kc6 7.Ka7 Rh8 8.b7 would also work after Rh7? 9.Ka8, but Black has time for 8...Kc7! winning.

vii) This is the drawback of 3...Rc8, which prevented the 5.Kc6 draw but allowed 7.b7 with gain of time.

viii) Artistically linking the two phases of this study:

**twice White prevails with a stalemate sacrifice on b7!**
On the occasion of the 100th birthday of the former Dutch World Champion (1935-37) Machtgielis (Max) Euwe (1901-1981), the "Max Euwe Centrum" in cooperation with the "Nederlandse Bond van Schaakprobleemvrienden" and the "Alexander Rueb Vereniging voor Schaakendspelstudies" (ARVES) organized a formal international tourney. The total prize money was almost 1000 EUR, with a first prize of 750 NLG (340 EUR). 103 composers of 25 countries submitted no less than 132 endgame studies (with a maximum of two studies per composer allowed). Tourney director Harold van der Heijden signed for correctness and anticipation checking (and spotted one case of plagiarism!). The judge was IGM Jan Timman, who decided that all incorrect studies (almost 50%) were eliminated without giving the composers a chance to correct their work. The (definitive) award was presented on the opening day of the World Conference of Chess Composition in Wageningen by IM Hans Bouwmeester (unfortunately, Timman was not able to attend the conference because of a chess tourney in Curacao to honour his own 50th birthday!). During the conferences a summary award with the results of the tourney was available (only main lines of the studies), and this was also sent to all participants. Later, an extensive article by Jan Timman was published in New in Chess Magazine (no. 7, 2001), but not all studies were included. Therefore, this is the first publication of the full award. The comments by judge Timman were translated by HvdH.

No 13045 Henk Enserink
1st prize Euwe-100 MT

| c1h7 0440.12 4/5 BTM, Draw |

"Independent of any pre-selection I could have made, or what standards would be applied, and which main line would be the most impressive, there is one study that clearly stands out from all others."
It harbours and exploits a theme that is so close to my heart that I felt green with envy after playing through the main line with the breath-taking cross pin I have pursued for such a long time.

Timman suggested another setting (first published in Schaaknieuws no. 15 18-8-2001) with wR at d4, an extra wBb4 and bBb8, giving White the first move: 1.Bd6 Bxd6 2.Rxd6.

No 13046 Marcin Banaszek 2nd prize Euwe-100 MT

Through an ingenious network of pins and counter pins, White succeeds to sacrifice all his pieces in order to reach a pure stalemate.

"The initial position is more or less natural; the finish is breath-taking. Euwe would have been very impressed by the various elements that make this study so great".
mate.


x) Ra2 11.Bc7(d6).

xi) 2.Kf1 Re1+ 3.Kg2 f1Q+ wins.


"The initial position is very natural. "The very subtle play of Rook and pawn against Bishop gains something extra because White has to co-ordinate his forces very careful. Pal Benko, a long time ago, also composed a brilliant study with this limited material. The tempo play that leads to the technical position after White's 7th move is very ingenious. Also during the technical phase White has to play very accurate. This study is a small but important contribution to endgame theory".

No 13048 Jarl Ulrichsen
1st Hon.Men. Euwe-100 MT

g3f7 0313.20 4/3 Win

No 13049 Fred Arnrehn
2nd Hon.Men Euwe-100 MT

13.Kxc6 stalemate V.


"This miniature is also phantastic and good enough to win first honourable mention, but it lacks the important theoretical element of the third prize study. The main issue is here the foreplay. The way Black sacrifices his Knight to prevent promotion is brilliant. The further tempo play is more or less known, but it is still a pleasure to see how it precisely works".

No 13049 Fred Arnrehn
2nd Hon.Men Euwe-100 MT
stalemate.
i) Kxd7 4.Sc5+; Qxd7 4.Sf6+; Kf7 4.Sf6, but also
4.Sg5+ Ke8 5.Se4; Qa6 4.Sd6+ Kxd7 5.e8Q+ Kxd6
and now both 6.Qg6+ Be6 7.Qd3+ Qxb3 stalemate, or
6.Qb5 Qxb5 stalemate, or Qa7 7.Qb8+ Qxb8 stalema-
tate.
"The initial position is very
natural. At first sight one
wonders why White should
loose anyway considering
his enormous material
advantage. When looking
more closely, it turns out
that Black has a very
dangerous attack. Only by
systematically sacrificing
all his pieces, White is able
to achieve a pure stalemate.
A beautiful study".

No 13050 Boris Gusev &
Karen Sumbatyan
3rd Hon.Men. Euwe-100 MT

a1e4 0431.22 5/5 Win
No 13050 Boris Gusev &
Karen Sumbatyan (Russia)
1.a6/i Be3+ii 2.Ka2/iii
4.Sd7+/vii Ke4/viii
5.Rxd4+ Kxd4 6.a7
Rg2+ix 7.Kb3/x Rg3+
8.Kb4 Rg8 9.Sb8 a2
10.a8Q Rx8b8+ 11.Qxb8
a1Q 12.Qh8+wins.
i) 1.Re2+? Kg8 2.a6 Kxe2
3.a7 Rg8 4.Sb8 Bc3+
5.Ka2 Bxe5 6.a8Q Bxb8
7.Qd5 Bf4 draw
ii) Rg6 2.e6/xf6 3.a7 +-
Kxd4 6.a7 a2+ draw, but
not Rg1++ 7.Ka2 Rg2+
8.Kb3 wins.
iv) Bxe5 3.a7 Rg8 4.Sb6
Ke3 5.Rd7 wins.
v) Thematic try: 3.Rxd4+?
Kxd4 4.a7 Rg2+ 5.Kb3
Rg3+ 6.Kb4 Rg8/xii 7.Sb8
a2 8.a8Q Rx8b8+ 9.Qxb8
a1Q, or 5.Ka3 Rg3+
6.Kb4 Rg1 7.Sb6 Rg8
8.Kb5 Kxe5 9.Sd7+ (Kc6;
Ke6) Kd6 10.Sb8 Kc7
draw; 3.Sb8? Bg1 4.Sc6
Bb6 5.Rd7 Rf3 6.a7 Bxa7
7.Rxa7 Kd5 draw.
vi) Ke3 4.Rxd4 Rg2+
5.Kb3 a2 6.Ra4, or here:
Kxd4 6.a7 wins.
vii) 4.Rxd4+? Rg2+xii
5.Kxa3 Kxd4 draw, or here:
5.Kb3 Kxf6 draw.
viii) Kd5 5.a7 wins; Kd6
5.Rxd4+ Ke7 6.a7 Kb7
7.Ra4 Rg8 8.Sb6 wins.
ix) Rg8 7.Sb8 Rg2+
8.Kxa3 Rg3+ 9.Kb4 Rg1
10.Se6++ wins.
x) 7.Kxa3? Rg3+ 8.Kb4
Rg1 draw.
xi) Not 2.Sf6+? Kxe5 3.a7
Bxd2 4.Sd7+ Kd6 5.Sf(b)8
Rg2 draw.
xii) Not Kg1? 7.a8Q Rb1+
8.Ka4 a2 9.Qa7+ Kd3
(Ke4; Sc5+) 10.Qa6+ Ke3
11.Qh6++ wins.
xiii) Not Kxd4? 5.a7 Rg2+
6.Kb3 wins; Kxf6 5.Rd8
Rg2+ 6.Kxa3 Rg3+ 7.Kb4
wins.
"White's victory is based
on the strength of the white
a-pawn. Black tries
everything to stop it. But
through a switch-back on
move 3 and 4, White
succeeds. The study has
subtle play".

No 13051 Nikolai Kralin
4th Hon.Men. Euwe-100 MT

h1a8 0034.31 5/4 Draw
No 13051 Nikolai Kralin
(Russia) 1.g4/i Bxg4/ii 2.f6
Bf3+ 3.Kg1/iii Se5 4.f7
Sd7 5.Sg6 Bxe4 6.bQ+
Sxf8 7.Sxf8 Bf5 8.Kf2 Kb7
9.Kc3 Ka7 10.Kf1/iv c4
13.Sd7+ Kb5 14.Se5 e2
15.Sd3 draws.
i) 1.Kg2? (Sg6?; Sd6) Se5
2.Kf2 Kb7 3.Ke3 Ke6
4.Kd2 Kd7 5.Ke3 Ke7
wins, or here: 2.g4 c4
3.gxh5 c3 4.Sg6 Qf6 wins.
ii) Be8 2.Kg2 Be6 3.Kg3
Bxe4 4.Kf4 Be2 5.g5 Sb6
6.g6; Se5 2.gxh5 c4 3.Sg6.
iii) Thematic try: 3.Kh2
Se5 4.f7 Sd7; 5.Sg6 Bxe4
6.f8Q+ Sxf8 7.Sxf8 Bf5
8.Kg3 c4 9.Kf3 Kb7
10.Kf4 Ka7 reciprocal
zugzwang: 11.Kxf5 c3
iv) Tempo: 10.Kf4? c4
v) Reciprocal zugzwang.
vi) But not Sxf7? 5.Sxf7 c4
6.Sg5 c3 7.Sd3 Bxe4 8.Sb4
Sb6 9.Kg3 Kb6 10.Kf4
Bb7 11.Ke3 draw.

"At first sight the position
is totally lost. Only by firm
action, in which a possible
promotion of the f-pawn
plays an important role,
White is able to save
himself. "A very subtle
composition, almost a
miniature".

No 13052  F. Benko
5th Hon.Men. Euwe-100 MT

h1b8 0404.44 7/7 Win

No 13052 Francisco

Benko (Argentina) 1.Re2/i
Re7 2.Re1/c exb5 3.Sd5/ii
Re8 4.Sb6/iv Re7 5.Sc8
Re7(e8) 6.Sd6 Re7 7.Rxe5
Rxe5 8.Sf7+ wins.
i) threatens 2.Sd3.
iv) threatens 5.Sd7.
"The initial position is so
natural that it looks like it
stems from an o.t.b. game.
The pin along the e-file
finishes Black up." "A
knight manoeuvre resulting
in a phantasy-check".

No 13053  O. Pervakov
6th Hon.Men. Euwe-100 MT

a2g3 3052.13 6/6 Win

No 13053 Oleg Pervakov
(Russia) 1.Bb3/i Be6
Qxf6/iv 4.Sb4 Qf2/+v
5.Kxa3 Qe3+/vi 6.Ka4
b5+/vii 7.Bxb5 Kxb4
8.Be1+ Kh5/viii 9.Be8+
Kg5/ix 10.Bd2+x Qxd2
11.Sf3++ Kxf6 12.Sxd2/xi
wins.
i) 1.f7? Be6+ 2.Bb3 (Ka1;
Qc8) Bxb3+ 3.Kxb3 a2
4.RQ Qxf8 5.Bxf8 a1Q

wins.
Qxe5 5.f7 +; Qa4 3.Bd6
Qe2+ 4.Kxa3 Qc3+ 5.Ka4
Qc2+ 6.Ka5 Qc3+ 7.Kb6
Qb2+ 8.Kc7 wins.
iii) Thematic try: 3.Be4?
Qxf6 4.Sb4 Qf2+ 5.Kxa3
Qe3+ 6.Ka4 Kxb4 (b5+; Bxb5)
7.Be1+ Kh5 8.Bf7+
Kg5 9.Bd2 Qxd2 10.Sf3+
Kf6 draws, since the
Bishop is on f7!; 3.Bb3?
Qe2+ 4.Kxa3 Qa6+ 5.Kh2
Qe2+ 6.Kc1 Qb5 draw;
draw; 3.Bc8? Qf6+ 4.Sh4
Qf2+ 5.Kxa3 Qe3+ 6.Ka4
b5+.
v) Qe2+ 4.Kxa3 Qa6+
5.Kb3 Qxf6 6.Sh4 +; Qb6
4.Sd3 Qc7 5.Ba4 Qd4+
6.Bb3 Qxd3 7.f7 Qe2+
8.Kxa3 Qa6+ 9.Kb2 Qe2+
10.Kc1 wins.
v) Qxe5 5.Bd6 first
sacrifice Qxd6 6.Sf5+;
Kxb4 5.Be7 second
sacrifice Qxe7 6.Sg6+; Qa6
5.Sh6 wins.
vii) Kxb4 6.Be1 third
sacrifice Qxe1 7.Sf3+.
vi) Qe2+ 7.Sh3 wins.

i) Qh3 9.Bf1+ Kh2
10.Sg4+.
ix) Kh6 10.Sg4+.
x) fourth sacrifice.

xi) compare with thematic
try: now the Bishop is on
e8!
"Although partly
anticipated, this study has
such a rich content of
sacrifices, in order for
White to be able to co-
ordinate all his pieces, that I became more and more impressed”.

No 13054 G. Umnov
1st Comm Euwe-100 MT

No 13054 German Umnov
(Russia) 1.g3/i Rd1/ii
Rb4 8.Be2 Rb2 9.Bd1 Rb1
Ra8+ 14.Kb7 draws.

i) 1.Be2? Rd2 2.Bb5 Ra2+
3.Ba4 Rxg2 wins; 1.Bf1?
Rd1/x 2.Bb5 Rb1 3.Bd7
Rb7 4.Bc8 Rb8/xi 5.Ba6
Rb1; 1.Ka6? Rd6+ 2.Ka5
5.Bd1 Ra2+ 6.Ba4 Rxg2
wins; 1.g4? Ra8+ 2.Ba6
Ra7 3.g5 Ra8 4.g6 Ra7
5.g7 Rxg7 wins.
ii) Rg8 2.Bf1 or 2.Be2
draw.
iii) 2.Ba4? Rd3 3.g4 Rd8
4.Bb5 Ra8+ 5.Ba6 Ra7
wins.
iv) Re1 3.Ba4 Re3 4.g4
draw.
Rf3 6.Ka4 draw.

vi) 6.g4? Rb3 7.Bd7 Rb7
8.Bc8 Rb8 9.Ba6 Rb1
wins.

x) Ra8+? 2.Ba6 Ra7 3.g4
Ra8 4.g5 Ra7 5.g6 draw.
xi) Ra7+? 5.Ba6 Ra8 6.g3
Ra7 7.g4 Ra8 8.g5 Ra7
9.g6 draw.

“The tempo play in this
miniature is partly known,
but it is an enormous joy to
see the points that the
composer has included”.

No 13055 J.M. Quesada
& J. Rodriguez Ibran
2nd Comm Euwe-100 MT

No 13055 Jose Miguel
Quesada & Javier
Rodriguez Ibran (Spain)
1.Kb5 Ba3/i 2.c6 Bd6 3.c7
Bd6 6.Kxd6 Ke8 7.e7 f5
8.Kf6 f4 h5 gxh5 10.gxf4
g3 11.f5 g2 12.f6 g1Q
13.f7 mate.

No 13056 Ilham Aliev &
Rahim Gasimov
3rd Comm Euwe-100 MT

No 13056 Ilham Aliev &
Rahim Gasimov
(Azerbaijan) 1.h8Q+
Kxb8 2.Bf4+ Kb7 3.Ka5/i
b1Q/ii 4.Rc7+ Kb8
5.Re1+/iii Ka8 6.Re8+
Ka7/iv 7.Re7+ Qb7
8.Rxb7+ Kxb7 9.h7 Qc4
10.h8Q Qa6+ 11.Kb4

i) 3.Rc7+? Kb6 wins.

ii) Qe4 4.Rxe4 dxe4 5.h7
b1Q 6.h8Q; Qb3 4.Rxb3+
(or 4.Rc7+) axb3 5.h7.

iii) On the 5th move other
checks of the Rook on the
c-file are also sufficient.
But after 5.Rc2+ Ka8
White cannot play 6.Rxa2?
iv) Kb7 7.Re7+.
"The initial play is not very gracious, but then a fascinating fight rolls that ends in a logical way in a draw".

No 13057 Pietro Rossi 4th Comm Euwe-100 MT

c8b3 1008.03 4/6 Win
No 13058 Gerd Homing 5th Comm Euwe-100 MT
d2b2 0140.37 6/9 Win

"Although the final mate is well known, this study contains an element of humour".

iv) Kb7 7.Re7+


Although the final mate is well known, this study contains an element of humour."


The tempo play has some points, like we saw in a recent study by Smyslov.
4. Qe3+ Kb8 5. Sb6 Sxa5
6. Qe5+ Ka7 7. Sxa8 Sc6
8. Qe8 wins, or here: Ka7
iv) 3. Qh8+? Ka7 4. Qd4+
Kb8 5. Qe5+ Ka7 6. Qe3+
Kb8 draw.
v) 4. Qh8+? Ke7 5. Qe8+
Kf6 8. Qe5+/xiii Kg6
9. Qxa1/xiv Qxc4 10. Qb1+
Kg5 11. Qxb7 Qc5+;
4. Sxe4? Qg6 draw;
4. Qxa1? Bf1 5. Qh8+ Kc7
6. Qxe4+ Kb8 7. Qd5+
Qa8 6. Qb6 mates.
vi) Ka7 5. Sc8+ Kb8 6. Qd8
wins.
vii) 5. Qf4+ Ka7
6. Se8+/xviii Ka8
7. Sb6+ Ka7 draw.
viii) Ka7 6. Sc8+ Kb8
7. Qd8 wins.
ix) Kc6 9. Sb4+ Kb5
10. Sxa6 Kxa6 11. Qc5, or
here: bxa6 11. Qa3, or Sc2
11. Qc5+ Ka4 12. Sc7 Sb4
x) 2. Qe3 Qg8; 2. Qe5 Qg8;
2. Sc8+ Qxe8 3. Qxc8 Bb8
fortress.
xii) Qxb6+ 3. axb6 wins;
Be4 3. Qxg3 mate.
xiii) Ka7 5. Sd7+ b6 6. Qxb6
mate; Bc7 5. Qh8+; Kc7
5. Sxa8+; Sb3 5. Qxd6+ Ka7
6. Sxa8 wins.
xiv) 8. Qd6+ Qxd6 9. Sxd6
Sb3 10. Sxb7 Sxa5 draw.
xv) 9. Qc3 Qf6+ 10. Qxf6+
Kxf6 11. Sd6 Sh3 draw;
9. Sb6 Sb3 10. Qe6+ Kg5
11. Qxb3 Qxa5 draw; 9. Sd6
Sh3 draw; 9. Qe4+ Kg6
draw; 9. Qg3+ Kh6
10. Qf4+ Kg7 draw.
xvi) 5. Qxf1 Qxa5 draw;
5. Qe5+ Ka7 6. Sc8+ Ka8
draw, or here: 6. Qd4 Qe2+
wins.
xvii) 6. Qe5+ Kd8 7. Sd5
h5 10. Kd3/xxi h4 11. Sf4
Ka7 14. Sh3 Kb8 15. Kb6
Ka8 draw; 6. Qg7+ Kd6
7. Qf6+ Kc5 8. Qe5+ Kb4
9. Sd5+ Ke4 10. Sc7/xxi
Qe6 11. Kf1/xxii Qf3+
12. Kg1 (Ke1; Qc3+) Qd1+
15. Qxc3+ Kxe3 draw.
xviii) 7. Qg6+ Ke5
8. Kg1/xxiii Bd3 9. Qg7+
Kf5 10. Qd7+ Kf4
Qc4 13. Qxb7 Qd4+
14. Kg2 Qg4+ 15. Kf2
Qh4+ 16. Ke3 Qd4+ draw.
xix) 6. Qd4 Sb3 7. Qc3
Qxa5 8. Sc4+ Qc5, or here:
7. Sc8++ Kb8 8. Qd8 Sxa5.
xix) 7. Qf8? Qxa5.
x) 10. Kf3 Kd7 11. Sb4 h4
x) 10. Kxh1 Kb3+ and
Qxa5 draw; 10. Se3+ Kb3
draw.
xixii) 11. Qf4+ Kb3 12. Kxf1
Qc4+ draw.
xv) 7. Sd7+ Kd5; 8. Qg5+
Kc6.
xxix) 11. Qf2 Qb5 12. Qc7+
Qe5 13. Sd5+ Ke4.
"Materially speaking, White is in a lost position. But through subtle, dynamic play he is able to level out".

K.K. Sukharev-90JT

The award was published in Shakhmatnaya Kompozitsia 43 (1xi2001)
The judge was K.Sukharev (Novosibirsk). 14 studies were published.

No 13060 Yu.Zemlyansky
1st prize Sukharev-90JT

b4c8 0353.20 5/4 Draw
No 13060
Yu.Zemlyansky. 1.Bh4
Kd7 2.Bf6 Bg6 3.Bxa1
Rb8+ 4.Ka3 Rd1 5.e8Q+
Kc6 8.Be4+ Kb5 9.Bd3+
Kc5 10.Bb1 Rxbl stalemate.
No 13061 Ivan Bondar
2nd prize Sukharev-90JT

f1h4 0471.22 6/6 Win

No 13061 Ivan Bondar (Belarus). 1.Rb6 Rg6
2.Rxc6 Rf6+ 3.Kg1 Bh2+
4.Kxe2 Rxh6 5.Sxe4 Rb6
6.g3+ Kg4 7.Bd1 Rxb4
8.e4 mate.

One hopes that 7.e4 is
adequately met by Kf3.
The wB is obtrusive.

No 13065 N.Argunov
2nd honourable mention
Sukharev-90JT

b3c8 0074.41 7/5 Win

No 13066 Vitaly Kovalenko. 
1.c7 d5+
2.Kc5 Bxc7+ 3.Bxc7+ Kb8
4.Kd6 Bxb3 5.Sa6+ Ka8
(Kc8;Bf5+) 6.Kc7 Bc4
7.Ba2, with:
- Bxa2 8.Kc8 and 9.Sc7
mate, or
- Bxa6 8.Bxd5+ Bb7
No 13066 V.Kovalenko
3rd honourable mention
Sukharev-90JT

No 13067 A.Kuryantikov,
E.Markov
1st comm Sukharev-90JT

c3a3 0043.53 7/6 Draw.

No 13068 Ya.Prizant
2nd comm Sukharev-90JT
g5c3 0410.33 6/5 Win.

No 13069 V.Razumenko
3rd/5th comm Sukharev-90JT
g2g8 3303.33 4/7 Win

No 13070 B.Olimpiev
3rd/5th comm Sukharev-90JT
c5g4 0031.12 3/4 Win
No 13071 V.Kirillov, A.Manyakhin, E.Fomichev
39/50th comm Sukharev-90JT

h7g5 4146.11 5/6 Draw.

No 13071 V.Kirillov, A.Manyakhin, E.Fomichev
special prize Sukharev-90JT dedicated to the memory of
F.Bondarenko

No 13072 F.Bondarenko and B.Sidorov

No 13073 A.Kalinin special honourable mention
Sukharev-90JT

StrateGems 1998-1999

The award of this informal international tourney was published in Strategems S9 supplement x-xii2000.
The tourney was judged by John Roycroft.
Confirmation period: by 1IV2001.
Judge's report: For enjoyment a study need be neither original nor sound.
This applies to composer and audience alike. But a judge's duty to exercise scholarship and argued discernment makes him on an occasion a kill-joy. So, do not let a mere judge mar your enjoyment - your award is perfectly valid, for you. (End of quotation from an imaginary Ralph Waldo Emerson essay.)
This judge's (abridged) criteria: charm; originality; depth. All should be present in an honoured study, with at least one desideratum prominent. The three terms are to be taken broadly: disguise may well contribute to charm; originality can be in the setting as well as in the idea; struggle contributes to depth. Mind you, a fourth, unexpected, ingredient is always welcome. StrateGems can celebrate the excellent standard of this its first tourney for studies: 23 published cosmopolitan entries ranging widely in style and content. A feast for
everyone. If the award is in some respects harsh—due to scrutiny for both soundness and anticipations by Harold van der Heijden (Deventer, The Netherlands), whose sophisticated computer-based consultation service is now de rigueur for both composers and judges—this too should be taken as a compliment.

No 13074 J.Rusinek
1st pr StrateGems 1998-1999

f1h2 3442.21 7/5 Draw
"There is compensation in plenty for the initial heavy material, and the climax is spectacular. No close anticipations." Hew Dundas expresses surprise at the top placing.

No 13075 M.R.Vukcevich
2nd pr StrateGems 1998-1999

a2h7 0877.57 10/14 Draw
"The Romanian Emilian Dobrescu (1998, so not an anticipation, though indeed a correction of his prize in Shakhmaty v SSSR in 1982 - see diagram 84 in his 1999 book Chess Study Composition showed the same theme of alternating Nowotny interference defences to a double threat of (mating) +. It is interesting for composers and classifiers that Dobrescu gives Black the mating threats so the interference moves are made by Black, whereas in the Vukcevich the mating threats are by White who therefore also plays the countering interference moves. Dobrescu shows the theme with greater economy, but his supporting variations are less readily comprehended."

No 13076 M.Campioli
3rd pr StrateGems 1998-1999

e4g5 0070.56 7/9 Win
"Despite the absence of a climax, and rather too many pawns, the supporting lines (such as
10. Kf4 Bb4) are fresh and the originality sufficient.

**No 13077** P. Benko
1st honourable mention
StrateGems 1998-1999

---

**No 13078 I.N. Aliev**
2nd honourable mention
StrateGems 1998-1999

---

**No 13079** M.R. Vukcevich
3rd honourable mention
StrateGems 1998-1999

---

- d4 a5 4400.00 3/3 Win
- No 13077 Pal Benko (USA/Hungary). 1. Qa1+ Kb6/i 2. Qb1+, with:
  - Ka5/ii 3. Qe1+ Kb6
  - 4. Rh6+ Rf6 5. Qf2, and the same trick, repeated in two other places on two other squares, or
  - Kc6 3. Rh6+ Rf6
  - 4. Qe4+ Kb6 5. Qf5, with no check by bQ on a7.
  i) Qa2 2. Qc3+ Ka6
  - 3. Rh6+, and interposition by bR is not on.
  ii) Ka6 3. Rh6+ Rf6
  - 4. Qf1+.

  "The accuracy of the extraordinary content (for this pawnless heavy material) is borne out by the computer."

---

**No 13078** Ilham Nuruoglu
Azerbaijan.

- I: l. Be3+ Qxe3 2. g7 Qe5
- 3. e8Q+ Qxe8+ 4. g8S+ Kf7
- 5. Bd3+ Kf6 6. Bg6+ Kxg6, when White is stalemated after two under-promotions.

- II: l. Se6 Qxe6 2. g7 Qe5
- 3. Be3+ Qxe3 4. g8S+ Kg6
- 5. e8Q+ Qxe8, the same stalemate, but the order of the promotions is switched.

"The judge is uncomfortable placing twins in an award, but finds himself impressed, despite the twinning being irregular in that it involves a switch of both piece type and square. There are partial anticipations - especially a magnificent Bron (1970, see No.1593 in EG29)."

---

- h8h6 3020.31 6/3 Draw
- I: diagram
- II: remove wBf1, add wSd4

**No 13079** M.R. Vukcevich.

- e7h8 0371.41 7/5 Win
- No 13077 M.R. Vukcevich.
- 1. Sd3/i Bxd3 2. Bxd3 Be1

- 5. Bf1 Ke6 6. Bh3 h5
- 7. f8Q+ Bxf8 8. Kxf8 h4
- 9. Ke8(Kg8) wins - the stalemate is disrupted.

  i) Sc2? Bxc2 2. Bxc2
- Kg7 5. Bd1 Kf6 6. Bg4 h5
- 7. Bh3 h4 8. Bf8+ Bxf8
- 9. Kxf8 stalemate. We read: wB has to hold wPf5 before capturing the light bB, but he must also keep an eye on Black's hP. This is possible only by placing wB on g4 or h3. In the try Black has time to create a stalemate, while in the solution White gains a tempo. Clear now?!

"The undeniable charm of the finale conflicts with the introduction's discordant - and head-scratching - thematic complexity."
No 13080 Mike Prcic
1st commendation
StrateGems 1998-1999

h7a3 0040.20 4/2 Win

No 13080 Mike Prcic
(USA). 1.a5 Ka4/1 2.a6 Bd4 3.Bb8 Kb4/ii 4.c3+
Kxe3 5.Be5 Bxe5 6.a7, winning.
"Charm again predominates. A computer-identified dual
(4.Kg2) can be cured, HvdH proposes, by placing the non-
participating wK (originally, ie in 1999, on
hl) on h7."

No 13081 Michael Roxlau
(Berlin, Germany). 1.Rh8/i Bxe7 2.Re8 Bxb4 3.Rb8
Bd6/ii 4.Rb6 Bc5 5.Kg3 Bxb6 6.BQe2 7.Qg7
(Qg8? Kf1;) e1Q+ 8.KB3+ wins.

No 13080 Robert Brieger
(USA). 1.h6/i Kg8 2.g6 hxg6 3.f6 g5 4.Kf1 g2+
5.Kg1 f4 6.Kf2 g3+ 7.Kg1 wins.
i) 1.f6? Kg8 2.g6 h6 draw.
"Every move sets up a reciprocal zugzwang. A dual
(4.Kh1) seems avoided (HvdH again) by
initially placing wK on e1, instead of g1, where it was
in 1998."

No 13083 D.Meinking,
P.Benko
StrateGems, x-xii1998

h3gl 0134.22 5/5 Win

No 13081 D.Meinking,
P.Benko
3rd commendation
StrateGems 1998-1999

a1c3 0003.13 2/5 Win

No 13083 Daniel
Meinking, Pal Benko
(USA). 1.e6 b5/i 2.c7 b4
3.e8Q b3/ii 4.Qe1+/iii
Kc2/iv 5.Qf2+/v Kd3
6.Qf1+/vi Kd2
7.Qf4+/vii Ke2/viii
8.Qc4+/ix Kf3 9.Qc6+/x
wins.
i) Sh3+?? 2.Kxa2 Sc1+
(b5; transposes)
3.Kxa3/xi b5 4.c7 b4+
5.Ka4 b3 6.BQe2
7.Qg6!!/xii Sd3 8.Qb6!!
Kc2 (Kd2; Ka3) 9. Qb3+

wins.

ii) In this "static" position, the play is governed by four 'rules', two for White and two for Black:

White has two ways to win:
1) by capturing bPa3 via continuous checks; the exception being if White can pin the b3P with wQa4 and bKc2/d1 (thus winning bPa3).

2) by capturing bSc1 with check.

Black's two roads to draw are to reach:
3) the square h3 safely (ie. without immediate loss of bPa3), or
4) the square h3 (!) safely (ie. without immediate loss of bPa3).

iii) Other checks allow
4...Kb4! drawing (Rule 3).
iv) This is now Meinking's EG79.5498. If 4...Kd3 5.Qf1+ transposes.
v) If 5...Qe4+? Ka3, White must again play 6.Qe1+ to prevent 6...Kb4! (Rule 3).
vi) White checks while eyeing the bSc1, to prevent the bK escaping via the c-file (Rule 2) to the b-file box (Rule 3).

vii) Still eyeing the bSc1 (Rule 2).
viii) As a side note, 7...Kd1 allows 8.Qa4! (Rule 1b), although White can still win by checking.
ix) The only move! And... still watching the bSc1.

All other checks allow Black to reach h3 (Rule 4), and thereby drawing.
Example: 8.Qe4+? Kb1! and White will not be able to force bPa3 nor bSc1 capture (Rules 1a and 2) before Black reaches h3 (Rule 4).

x) Game over! White will either win the bSc1 (Rule 2) or bPa3 (Rule 1a) with check.


xii) Not 7.Qe4? Sd3 8.Qc6+(8.Qb7? Sc5+!) Kd2 9.Qb5 Kc1! not Kc2? 10.Qb3+ wins) 10.Qc4+ Kd2 11.Qb5, draw, not 11.Qb3? Sc5+! The difference between 7.Qg6+ and Qe4? is that White can force Qb3 with check, so that Black will not then be able to play the ...Sc5+ fork.

The judge did not have the above exposition - which is largely due to composer Daniel Meinkin - at his elbow and considered the play too analytical and unstudy-like for inclusion in the award.

ROCHADE EUROPA
1996-1997

Informal tourney for original studies.
Report by judge: A study by Pal Benko (2/96) and three attributed to an unknown 'Mikhailo Prusikhin' (3/96) were not among the 23 studies presented for consideration to the judge. Skilled and experienced composers provided a wide range of style and content, much enjoyed and appreciated in the judging process.

If the successor judge (for the current tourney) derives as much pleasure from his work as the present one has had, then the enduring high quality of this international column will be an established fact. The judge thanks the editor Manfred Seidel for his unfailing help and guidance.

John Roycroft
London
b1h1 0432.02 4/5 Win
No 13084 G.Slepian


Judge: Startling!

f1h1 4342.12 6/6 Draw
No 13085 J.Fleck


iv) wQ is for the high jump. If now 4.Kf2, there is Bb6+, in reply.

v) Qd5 5.Bf3+. Or Qe6+ 5.Kf1. Or Qd8 5.Kf2. In none of these cases has Black any winning chances. One may observe that with aPP removed there is a win for Black by 4...Qa2 5.Kf1 Qg2+.

vi) The wQ-sac is explained. Now there is no win for Black by 6...Qc1+.

Judge: A lovely position with 'misprint' wR-sacrifice, repeated - although it is the same manoeuvre, repeated - there is no great variety in the repetition.

No 13086 E.Iriarte
1st honourable mention ROCHADE EUROPA 96-97

Judge: Startling!
No 13086 E.Iriarte
(Mendoza, Argentina) 1.c6, with:
- dxc6 2.a6 Se6 (or Sd7;)
  3.a7 Sc7 (or Sb6;)
  4.Kc4(Kd4) Kxg6 5.Kc5
  wins, or
- Se6 2.cxd7 Sc5+ 3.Kc4
  Sxd7 4.Kb8 Sb6 5.Kxa4
  Kxg6 6.Kb5 Kf6 7.a6
  wins, or
- Sxg6! 2.Kc2!! (for a6)

No wonder the Rochade Europa solvers were confused! Consider: 2.a6?
2.cxd7? Se5+ 3.Kd4 Sxd7
4.a6 Kf7 5.a7 Sb6 6.Kc5
Sa8 7.Kc6 Ke7 8.Kb7
Sxc6. 2.Kc7? d5+
  3.Kxd5 Kf4 4.a6 Se7+
  3.Kd5 Kf7 4.a6 Se7+
  5.Kxd6 Ke8, with 6.c7
  Sc8+ 7.Kc5 Ke7, or 6.Kc7
  Sd5+ 7.Kc8 Ke7 8.a7 Kd6
  3.a6 Se7 4.a7 Sd5+ 5.Kd4
  Sc7. 2.Ke7? Sc6 3.c7
  Sc4+ 4.Kd4 Sd6 5.Kc5
  Se8. 6.Kb5 d5, and 7.Kc5
  Kf7. 8.Kxd5 Ke7 9.Kc6 a3,
  or 7.Ka6 d4 8.Kb7 Sd6+
  3.a6 Sb4+ 4.Kc3 Sd5+
  5.Kd4 Sc7. Or (finally?)
  2.Kd2? Se5 3.c7 Sc4+

Judge: The unique reply to Sg6, when wK has the maximum of all 8 moves available 'as in a mirror', is extraordinary, rather than any variation in its own right.

No 13087 Em.Melnichenko
2nd honourable mention
ROCHADE EUROPA 96-97

No 13088 Em.Melnichenko
(New Zealand) 1.Bd5+ Kg4
  2.Ra6(Rg6+? Kh5;) Ba7/i
  3.Rg6+ Kh5 4.Rg8 Bb8/ii
  5.Rh8+ Kg4 6.Rg8+ Kh4
  7.Rh8+ Kg3 8.Rg8+ Kh2
  9.Rh8+ Kg1 10.Rh1+ Kf2
  11.Rh2+ Kg3 12.Ra2
  13.Rg2+ Kh3 14.Rg8
  15.Rh8+ Kg3
  16.Rg8+ Kf2 17.Rg2+ Kf1
  18.Ra2 Ba7 19.Ra1+ Kf2
  20.Ra2+ Kg1 21.Ra1+
  22.Rh1+ Kg3 23.Rg1+ Kf2
  24.Rg8 draw.

i) Qxa6 3.bxa6 Bxd5
  4.Kd4 Bd4 5.Kc5 Ba7+
  8.a7 Bd5+ 9.Kb8 Bxf4
  10.a8Q Bxe5+ 11.Ka7
  12.Kb8 draw.

ii) Bxd5 5.Rxa8 Bxa8 6.e6
  Bd5 7.e4 Ba2 8.e7 Bf7
  9.e5 Bc5 10.b6 Bxb6
  11.e6 Be8 12.Kc4 Kh6
  13.f6 Kg6 14.f7 draw.

iii) Not 9.Rg2+? Kh3

Judge: Mechanical, maybe - but not too mechanical.

No 13088 Ju.Randviir
1st commendation
ROCHADE EUROPA 96-97

No 13088 Ju.Randviir
(Tallinn, Estonia) 1.Sc3?
  Kc2, and 2.g7 Kxc3 3.g8Q
  d1Q+, or 2.Sd1 Kxd1 3.g7
  Kc2 both lead to W being mated. So 1.Sb2 Sxb2
  2.g7 d1Q 3.g8Q, and the oracle databases,
unsatisfactorily founded (as they have so far been) on 'game theory', declare a draw without giving any moves! So, 3...Kc2?
  4.Ka2 Qb1+ 5.Ka3 and
  3...Sc3 4.Qb3, or 3...Sa4
  4.Qc4+, or 3...Qd4
  4.Qg5+, all OK, but the author's line goes:
  3...Qa4+ 4.Qa2 Qc2
5.Qc4, when Qxc4 and Sxc4 both leave stalemate. Judge: A mini-delight.

No 13089 V.V. Nikitin
2nd commendation
ROCHADE EUROPA 96-97

562
No 13092 Gregor Werner
5th commendation
ROCHADE EUROPA 96-97

52c2 4001.03 3/5 Win

No 13092 Gregor Werner
(Worms, Germany)
1. Qe5+ Kd2 2. Se4+ Kd1
3. Se3+ Kc1 4. Qa1+ Kd2
5. Sl+ Ke2 6. Sxg3+ Kd2
7. Sl+ Ke2 8. Qe5+ Kd1
9. Se3+ Kc1 10. Qa1+ Kd2
11. Sc4+ Ke2 12. Qe5+
Kd1 13. Sb2+ Kd2
14. Qa5+ Ke2 15. Qb5+
Ke3 16. Qc5+ Ke2
17. Qe7+ Kd2 18. Qb4+
Ke2 19. Qf4 for 20. Qf2
mate.
Judge: The fresh handling
of this hackneyed material
is very welcome.
HvdH remarks that this
correction has been
cooked by Campioli with
15. Qxf5

No 13093 Pekka Massinen
(Warnecka, Germany)
1. Bg6+/i, with:
- hxg6/ii 2. f7+ Kf8
3. Sxg6+ Kxf7 4. Sxh4 Kg6
5. Kc6 Bd4 (e2; Sg2) 6. Kb7
Ke5 7. Sg2 Kd5 a7 Bxa7
wins, or
- Kf8 2. Sd7+ Kg8 3. f7+
Kg7 4. RQ+ Kxg6 5. Se5+
Kh5 (Kg5; Qe7+) 6. Qf7+
Kg5 (Kb6; Sg4+) 7. Qe7+
Kh5 8. Qxh7+ Kg5 9. Sf7+,
White wins.
i) 1. Ke6? Qh6 2. Sf7 Qh3+
3. Bf5 Qxf5+ draws.
mate.
iii) Kd4 12. Kc6 Ke5
Judge: It's the win after the
swap-off introduction that
really grabs us.
[Demoted from initially
awarded 2nd prize: the
many transposition duals
were identified by Marco
Campioli *C*.

Israel Ring Tourney
1995-96

Ofer Comay judged this
ring tourney. Uri Blass
(Israel) computer-checked
the studies and Alex
Ettinger provided an
English translation of the
award for publication in
Variantim no. 29 (ix/2000).
There seems to be no
confirmation period.
Judges report: "28 correct
studies were received for
adjudication. I should like
to thank Hillel Aloni for
the great job he did,
without which the award
would never have been
completed: collecting the
problems and meticulously
writing down all the
variations after each had
been thoroughly checked. I
should also like to thank
Uri Blass for computer-
checking, and thanks to
whose assistance the
honoured studies may be
assumed correct. ..."
"A considerable number of
entries were composed for
the 'As long as possible
1 tourney run in
Shahmat
1996, where composers
were asked to afford the
longest introductory-play
possible to a given
concluding position. Long
studies lacking in artistic
value are of course not included in this award, while others, with high artistic value, suffer from an inevitable weakness in originality.

In general, I enjoyed most of the entries: some would have made it in another tourney, but not here.

"And now to the award. I hesitated between the first two studies, and have decided to hesitate permanently."

No 13094 Yochanan Afek
1/2nd Prize IRT 1995-96

No 13095 Noam Elkes
1/2nd Prize IRT 1995-96
later) Ke7 10.Re8+ Kd6
11.Rd8+ Ke6 12.Rd3 Be4
13.Rc3 Bd5 14.Re3+ Kd6
15.Rd3 Rb2+ 16.Ka1 Rb3
wins.
Hillel Aloni's suggestion
(Variantim xi/1995): dlb6
0563.00 e3d2b1f8d3 3/5
BTM, Draw: 1...Bc2+
4.Rxb3+ Bxb3+ reaching
Elkies' position.
"The mutual zugzwang
position is surprising, and
is accentuated by the try
7.Ra7. On the other hand,
the play is technical and
wearisome. I find the
version offered by Hillel
Aloni more interesting, but
I don't think it can be
forced on the composer".

No 13097 Hillel Aloni
4th Prize IRT 1995-96

e8e4 0725.00 6/4 BTM, Win
No 13097 Hillel Aloni
(Israel), Shahmat vi/96:
1...Sd6+/i 2.Ke7 Sf5+
Kf4 (Kxf3; Se5+)
Rc3/vii 7.Rh1/viii Rxf3
(Kxf3; Rh3+) 8.Rh4 mate.
i) Rxb3 2.R(e)fl Rb8+
5.Kc5 Se6+ 6.Kc4 Rc7+
7.Kb5 Rb7+ 8.Ka6 Rf7
(Sf4; Bh1) 11.Sh2 wins.
ii) Sh4+ 4.Bxf3+ Kxf3
5.Sce5+; Rd6+ 4.Kg5.
iii) 5.Sce5? Rd6+ 6.Ke7
Sf5+ and Kxf3.
iv) Kxf3 6.Sc4(f1), or
v) 6.Sf1? Rc3 7.Rxc3
stalemate.
vii) Rxf3 7.Rc4 mate, Kxf3
7.Sd4+; Rb6+ 7.R(B)c6
wins.
"A beautiful pawnless
study, which culminates in
a stalemate trap
transformed into a mid-
board mate trap. All men
reach their final place
through natural play. The
weak point of the study lies
with the 'sitting ducks',
wBe3 and wSb3, which are
captured on their diagram
squares (though they take
part in side-variations)".

No 13098 Hillel Aloni
1st HM IRT 1995-96

h4b2 0242.05 6/7 Win
No 13098 Hillel Aloni
(Israel), Shahmat xi/96:
1.Sxd2/i exd1Q 2.Sxd1+
(Sc4+; Kxa2) Kxe2
3.Bb1+ Kxd1/ii 4.Sf3+
Kc2 (Kc1; Rxe3) 5.Sg1+/iv
Bxg1/v 6.Kg3/ii h4+/vii
h2+/ix 9.Kxh2/ x Kf2

No 13096 Shuki Nahshoni
3rd Prize IRT 1995-96

E8e4 0141.04 4/6 Draw
No 13096 Shuki Nahshoni
(Israel), Shahmat ii/96:
1...Sd6+/i 2.Ke7 Sf5+
Kf4 (Kxf3; Se5+)
Rc3/vii 7.Rh1/viii Rxf3
(Kxf3; Rh3+) 8.Rh4 mate.
i) Rxb3 2.R(e)fl Rb8+
5.Kc5 Se6+ 6.Kc4 Rc7+
7.Kb5 Rb7+ 8.Ka6 Rf7
(Sf4; Bh1) 11.Sh2 wins.
ii) Sh4+ 4.Bxf3+ Kxf3
5.Sce5+; Rd6+ 4.Kg5.
iii) 5.Sce5? Rd6+ 6.Ke7
Sf5+ and Kxf3.
iv) Kxf3 6.Sc4(f1), or
10.Bc2 e2 11.Bd1 e1Q
12.Rf3 mate.

"Rich and interesting play, terminating in a variation on a Réti-position".

h5c6 0052.12 6/4 Draw

No 13100 Hillel Aloni
3rd HMIRT 1995-96

4.Sxb3+i Bxb3 5.Bc1 stalemate,
vi) 1.Sd4+ Kb7 2.Bg2+ Ka6 3.Sxb3 Bxb3 4.Bf1+ Kb7 5.Bg2+ Kc8
v) Not Kc8? 3.Bh3+ Kd8
vi) Not Kb6? 2.Sxb3 Bxb3

"White sacrifices all his pieces to obtain a stalemate."

No 13101 Yochanan Afek
4th HM IRT 1995-96

No 13102 David Gurgenidze
1st comm IRT 1995-96

No 13103 Leonard Katsnelson
2nd comm IRT 1995-96
The move 4.Rh8! is the only one because of the precise timing required for the wK and wR progression. Only this moves enables 5.Kg6! Then White will choose his continuation according to black's choice of moves.

No 13104 Genrikh Kasparyan 3rd comm IRT 1995-96

64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

This tourney was judged by Oleg Pervakov. 34 studies by 23 composers entered. Judge's report/AJR remarks: ...

No 13105 A.Visokosov 1st prize 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

b8g8 0087.11 5/6 Draw

No 13106. S.N. Tkachenko
2nd prize 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

No 13107. A. Visokosov
3rd prize 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

"The tourney's sublest - but not most analytical - study. Highly original and with top class technique."

No 13108. V. Smyslov
special pr 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

---

No 13106. N. Tkachenko
2. Sf4+ Kf7/2. Rb7+ Kg8
3. Rb8+ Kh7 4. Rb7+ Kh6
5. Rb6+ Kg5 6. Rg6+/i
Kxf4 7. Rg4+ Kxf3 8. Rh4
Sf2 9. Rxh2, and it's a draw.

and 5. Sf2.

No 13106. e6 0104.12 4/4 Draw

ii) 6. Rb5+? Kxf4 7. Rh5
Sf2 8. Rh4+ Kg3 9. Rxb2
Kxf3, and White falls prey

i) 1. g7? shuts in wBh8, but
moving the latter instead
doesn't work: 1. Bb2? Kb5
2. Bf7 Bc4 3. g7 Se7. Try
something else: 1. Bf7?
Ka4 (for Ka3) 2. Bb2 Bb3,
and White is in zugzwang,
the demonstration being:
3. Kg5 Sc7 4. Bxb3+ Kxb3
5. Bb6 Se8, or 3. g7 Se7
4. Be8+ Ka5 5. Bf6 Sg8+
6. Kg6 Be2+ 7. Kg5 Kb6
8. Bf7 Bh7, or 3. Kh7 Se7
6. Be8+ Ka5 5. Bf6 Bg8+
6. Kg7 b3, or 3. Bb6 Se7
4. Bd7+ Ka5 5. Bf6 Sg8+
6. Kg7 Sx6 7. Kxf6 Bc4
Draws everywhere one
turns. And all because it's
not Black's move....

No 13107. h6a5 0053.13 4/6 Win

No 13107. A. Visokosov.
1. Be6/i Ka4 2. Bb2 Bb3
3. Bf7 Se7 4. Be8+ Ka5
5. Bf6 Sg8+ (Sxg6; Bd8
mate) 6. Kg7 (Kg5) Sxf6
7. Kxf6 Bc8 8. g7 Bh7
9. Bg6 Bg8 10. Bf7 Bh7
11. Kg5 wins.

i) 1. g7? shuts in wBh8, but
moving the latter instead
doesn't work: 1. Bb2? Kb5
2. Bf7 Bc4 3. g7 Se7. Try
something else: 1. Bf7?
Ka4 (for Ka3) 2. Bb2 Bb3,
and White is in zugzwang,
the demonstration being:
3. Kg5 Sc7 4. Bxb3+ Kxb3
5. Bb6 Se8, or 3. g7 Se7
4. Be8+ Ka5 5. Bf6 Sg8+
6. Kg6 Be2+ 7. Kg5 Kb6
8. Bf7 Bh7, or 3. Kh7 Se7
6. Be8+ Ka5 5. Bf6 Bg8+
6. Kg7 b3, or 3. Bb6 Se7
4. Bd7+ Ka5 5. Bf6 Sg8+
6. Kg7 Sx6 7. Kxf6 Bc4
Draws everywhere one
turns. And all because it's
not Black's move....

No 13108. V. Smyslov
(Moscow).

No 13108. Vassily Smyslov
(Moscow).

---

No 13108. e2b7 0101.46 7/7 Win

No 13108. Vassily Smyslov
(Moscow).

---
The 80-year-old sometime world champion continues to regale us with his output.

No 13109 A.Stavrietsky
special pr 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

No 13110 N.Kralin
special pr 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

No 13111 A.Visokosov
1st HM 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

No 13112 A.Roslyakov,
A.Serebryakov
2nd HM 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

A fresh look at an idea that is as old as the hills.

A frenzied affray in which both sides sacrifice in stalemate-based play.
No 13113 A. Roslyakov, A. Serebryakov
3rd HM 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

"Figaro here! Figaro there! Another variation on the Réti theme."

No 13114 V. Smyslov
sp HM 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

"wK plays with precision in this pawn ending."

No 13116 V. Neishtadt
comm 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

"Curious reci-zug."

No 13117 P. Arestov
comm 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

b2b5 0404.32 6/5 Draw

No 13118 N. Chupeev
comm 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

g8a5 0041.22 5/4 Draw

No 13118 N. Chupeev
(Moscow). 1.Sc3 d1Q 2.Sxd1 e2 3.Bd2+ Bxd2 4.d7 Bg3 5.Se3 draw, e1Q 6.hxg5. “... a 'shortie' to which both sides contribute.”

No 13119 V. Pomogalov
sp comm 64-Shakhmatnoe obozrenie 1999

d7h6 0003.11 2/3 Draw

No 13119 V. Pomogalov

"... figure-of-8 by Wk ..."

Krivoi Rog - 225AT

This formal international tourney celebrating 225 years of the Ukrainian mining town had as theme a paradoxical move.

The closing date was 14x2000, the award was published in Mistetsky shakh (Ukraine), editor Anatoly Svetil'sky, planned (per Infoblatt 27) for 14xii2000 [sic!]. Viktor Sizonenko judged this tourney of which only 5 prize-winners known to have been published.

Judge's report/AJR remarks: no technical report, but a prize fund of 90 US dollars is mentioned, split 1, 2, 3: $22.50, 13.50 and 9. This could be a Ukrainian 'first'!

No 13120 M. Roxlau
1st pr Krivoi Rog - 225AT

hlg8 3144.45 8/9 Win

No 13120 Michael Roxlau
(Germany). White is threatened not just with b1Q+, and Qa1+, but Qg1++; 1.Be5+/i Bg7 2.Rxg7+ Kh8 3.Rxf7+ Kg8 4.Rg7+ Kh8 5.Bxb2 Sd4 6.Rg2 d5 7.Rg6 (Rg7? Qa4+) hxg6 8.fxg6 Kg8 9.h7+/ii Kg7 10.h5/iii Kh8 11.Sc7 Qb6 12.Sb5(Se6) wins.

i) Why just this square? So that, later on, if bK plays to f8, the reply Bd6+ wins at once, seeing that the d7 flight is blocked.


572
Qf3+ 17.Kh2 Qe2+, drawn.


No 13121 I. Bondar
2nd pr Krivoi Rog - 225AT

d4h8 1402.04 5/6 BTW, Win
No 13121 Ivan Bondar (Belarus). 1...Rd8+ 2.Kc4 e1Q 3.Rh5+ Kg8 4.Qe7+ Qxe7 5.Qxe7 Rc8+ 6.Sc6 a1Q 7.Qf8+, with:
- Kxf8 8.Rh8 mate, or
- Rxf8 8.Qe7 mate.

No 13122 L. Topko
3rd/4th prize Krivoi Rog - 225AT

ii) 3.Sg7? Rxc5 4.e8Q Rxh8 5.Sxe8 Rc8 6.Sg7 Rg8 wins.
iii) Rh6 4.Ka5 Rxh7 5.Sf5 draw.

No 13124 P. Rossi
5th pr Krivoi Rog - 225AT

b1g8 1662.10 5/5 Win

Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000

The award of this informal international was published in Shakhmatnaya poezia, no.19 vii-ix 2001.
A. Maksimovskikh acted as judge. 22 studies were entered by 16 composers. Judge's report/AJR remarks: some promising entries proved to have flaws.

No 13125
N. Rezvov, S. Tkachenko
1st prize Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000

h2g5 0103.24 4/6 Draw
No 13125 Nikolai Rezvov, Sergei N. Tkachenko (Ukraine). 1.Rc1/e1Q 2.Rxe1 Sf3+ 3.Kh3 Sxe1 4.e7 a2 5.c8Q a1Q 6.Qxc5+/ii, with:
- e5 7.Qxe5+/iii Qxe5 stalemate, or
- Kh6 7.Qf2+/iv Kg7/v 8.Qg3+ Kf8 9.Qb8+ Ke7 10.Qf4+ Qf6 11.e5 Qxf4 12.e6+, a second stalemate, and another pure one, wp this time blocked on e6.

i) 1.Rxc5+ Kh4 2.Re1 e1Q 3.Rxe1 Sf3+ wins - see White's 3rd in the main line.

ii) 6.Qf5+? Kh6 7.Qf4+ Kg7 8.Qg3+ Kf7 9.Qf4+ Qf6 10.e5 Sd3(Sg2) 11.Qxf6+ exf6 12.exf6, when bp cannot be held up.


iv) 7.Qf5+? Kg7 8.Qg5+ Kf8 9.Qf4+ Qf6 wins.


"The winning study is in the highest traditions of Troitzky and Kubbel."

No 13126
G. Amiryan
2nd prize Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000

e2h1 4400.10 4/3 Win.

i) 1.Ra1+? Kxg2 2.Qg7+ Kh3+ draw.

ii) 2.Qxg1+? Kxg1 3.Kf3 Rf5+ 4.Kg4 Rf8 5.g3 Rg8+ draw.

iii) Qxa1 3.Rxa1+ Kh2 4.g4 Rh8 5.g5 wins.

iv) Rh5+ 5.Kg4 Rh7 6.g3 Qxa1 7.Rxa1+ Kg2 8.Ra2+ Kg1 9.Kf5 wins.

"A highly personal lead-in to a well-known beautiful checkmate."

No 13127 P. Rossi
1st honourable mention Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000

a5c8 0174.00 4/4 Win.


"Good play leads to a beautiful finale, well known as it is."
No 13128 B.Sidorov
2nd honourable mention
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000

e²g1 0000.33 4/4 BTM, Win
No 13128 Boris Sidorov
(Krasnodarsk province).
1...h2 2.h8Q h1Q 3.Qd4+ Kh2/i 4.Qd6+ Kg1 5.Qb6+ Kh2 6.Qh6+ Kg1 7.Qe3+ Kh2 8.Qf4+ Kg1 9.Qf2+ Kh2 10.g4+ Kh3 11.gxf5 Kg4 12.f6 wins.
i) Kxg2 4.Qf2+ Kh3 5.Qxf5+ Kg3 6.Qg3+ Kh3 7.Qh5+ wins.
"The creation of a P-battery on the second rank allows White not only to win bPf5 but also to set up his own passed pawn."

No 13129 Viktor Kalyagin
(Ekaterinburg).

No 13130 E.Kudelich
commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000
e³b3 0140.13 4/5 Draw
No 13130 E.Kudelich
(Tyumen region).
1.Bd5+ Ka3 2.Bxa2 ICxa2 3.0-0
iv) AJR, who has worked with this material, is tickled by the possibilities of: Bh6 8.Rf7/vi Bh3 9.Rxf5 Bd4+ 10.Kf4 Be3+ 11.Ke5.

No 13131 M.Campioli
commendation
Shakhmatnaya poezia, 2000

c³g3 0331.31 5/4 Win
No 13131 Marco Campioli
(Italy).
Kf4 9.a6 Be5 10.d6 Ke5 11.d7 wins.
"Black, having succeeded in neutralising the advanced passed pawn, finds himself unable to carry out the two-birds-with-one-stone drawing idea."

No 13132 E.Kudelich commendation
Shakhrmatnaya poezia, 2000

No 13133 V.Vinichenko and V.Kazantsev (East)
1st place Match West Russia vs. East Russia

This match was judged by Vazha Neidze (Georgia). The provisional award was published in Shakhrmatnaya kompozitisa No.20 magazine. The confirmation period: comments to the team captains (Barsukov in St Petersburg, Zholtunozhko in Ekaterinburg) by 31iii98.

Remarks: The geographical watershed was the Urals mountain range. The Western contingent suffered almost total wipe-out in the section for studies - only one study surviving the hatchet job done on the others by V.Vinichenko, while a corresponding counter-attack from the West has not materialised.

No 13134 V.Vinichenko 2nd place Match West Russia vs. East Russia

Black's task is to neutralise the pair of white pawns on

No 13135 P.Arestov (West) 1/4 place Match West Russia vs. East Russia

b5e4 0341.12 4/5 Win

No 13136 Yu.Zemlyansky (East) 1/4 place Match West Russia vs. East Russia


No 13137 S.Rumyantsev 5th place Match Russia vs. East Russia


No 13136 Yu.Zemlyansky 3/4 place Match West Russia vs. East Russia


   iii) Try: 5.Qd3+? Kxe1
No 13138 V. Kalashnikov  
6th place Match West Russia vs. East Russia

d6a8 0033.64 7/7 Draw

No 13138 V. Kalashnikov  
(East) 1.c7 Kb7 2.Kd7  
Ba4+ 3.e6+ Bxc6+ 4.Kd8  
Bd7 (Se7;c8Q+) 5.Kxd7  
Kd7 8.Kg7(Kg8) Ke7  
11.h7 f4 12.h6 f3 13.h5 f2  
14.h4 f1Q stalemate, or  
14...Ke7 15.Kg8 f1Q  
16.h8Q, the f7 square being  
blocked by the pawn there. 
8.Kg7 Ke7 9.Kxh7 Kf8  
10.Kh8 f5 11.h7 f4 12.h6  
f3 13.h5 f2 14.h4 Ke7  
15.Kg7 f1Q 16.h8Q Qf7  
mate. And not merely  
checkmate but an epaulette  
mate with a pair of active  
selfblocks. +10 pts

II All-Russian East-West  
match

This tourney was restricted  
to Russian composers and  
depending on which side
of the Urals they live. Set  
theme: In a study to win or  
draw the white king takes  
a prominent part in the  
construction of a position  
of domination.

The award was published  
in Shakhmatnaya  
kompozitsia 37 (on sale  
8x2000)

Judge Vazha Neidze strictly followed the  
'Georgian' interpretation of  
'domination',  
distinguishing it from  
'capture'. A number of  
submissions - some by  
leading composers - were  
excluded on this basis.

No 13139 N. Ryabinin  
1st place II All-Russian  
East-West match

h1h8 0326.20 5/4 Win

No 13139 Nikolai  
Ryabinin (West). 1.c7  
Rb1+ 2.Kg2 Rb2+ 3.Kf3  
Rc2 4.Bf5+ Kg8/i 5.Bd5  
wins.
i) Kh7 5.e7 Sxe7 6.Be4+,  
ii) Se6 8.Bc7. Rc8 8.e7  
"Fully dynamic. Unexpected dash by wK.  
All in all, astounding. A  
domination in the full and  
real sense of the term, in  
which bR is denied the full  
14-square range of his  
cross, and always for just  
one reason. No question,  
the match's best. 14  
points."

No 13140 Yu. Zemlyansky  
2nd place II All-Russian  
East-West match

b1h1 0350.22 5/5 Draw

No 13140 Yu. Zemlyansky  
Be4 3.Bxa3 Rx a3  
(Bxd5;Kb2) 4.Bd3, and:  
- Bxd3 5.Kb2,  
donomination, or  
- Bxd5 5.Kb2  
donomination - Ra2+ 6.Kb1  
Ra3 7.Kb2 Ra2+ 8.Kb1  
Kg1 9.Be4 Be6 10.Bf5  
Bf7 11.Bg6 Bg8 12.Bh7,  
drawing, for if a3 13.Bxg8  
Rb2+ 14.Ka1, a position  
that Averbakh tells us is a  
draw. "Both parallel and
serial domination are combined here, woven in with positional and theoretical draws. Interesting and original. An enrichment of the fund of rook-ensnaring studies.

No 13141 V.Vinichenko
=3rd/4th place II All-Russian East-West match

No 13142 N.Ryabinin
=3rd/4th place II All-Russian East-West match

No 13143 V.Kovalenko
5th place II All-Russian East-West match

No 13143 V. Kovalenko
5th place II All-Russian East-West match

g4e5 0130.13 3/5 Win

ii) 5.Rh1?Bg8 6.Rh8 Kf8 7.Kg5 Kg7, and White has landed himself in zugzwang pickle.
iii) "Domination in a position of reciprocal zugzwang."

"Sparkling cameo showing a deep treatment of a simple domination where wK plays an important role - without 7.Kg5 and its blocking function the system would collapse.
10.5 points."

"Midboard symmetry allows BR to be dominated twice by the trio of wB, wS and an aggressive wK. 11.5 points."
No 13144 Yu.Bazlov, V.Vinichenko, V.Kovalenko
6th place II All-Russian East-West match

No 13145 A.Malyshev
7th place II All-Russian East-West match

In the studies section the score was: East - 42.5, West - 41.

ARTICLES
editor: John Roycroft

63 studies by Albert van Tets, part II
T22 Albert van Tets Pretoria News 14iv1981

No 13144 Yu.Bazlov, V.Vinichenko, V.Kovalenko (East).

"There is less dynamism here, with pawns f5 and h5 already in place mining certain squares and lessening the impression. 8.5 points"


"The forcing play in a limited section of the chessboard gives place to a 'little' domination of b8. 8 points."

No 13146 A.Stepanov
8th place II All-Russian East-West match

In the studies section the score was: East - 42.5, West - 41.

ARTICLES
editor: John Roycroft

63 studies by Albert van Tets, part II
T22 Albert van Tets Pretoria News 14iv1981

i) Kg7 5.h6+ Kg8 6.h7+ Kg7 7.h8Q+ Rhx8 8.Kd7 and 9.Bc8.

"Not much originality here, either in the finale or the play. 7.5 points."

ARTICLES
editor: John Roycroft

63 studies by Albert van Tets, part II
T22 Albert van Tets Pretoria News 14iv1981

i) Kg7 5.h6+ Kg8 6.h7+ Kg7 7.h8Q+ Rhx8 8.Kd7 and 9.Bc8.

"Not much originality here, either in the finale or the play. 7.5 points."

ARTICLES
editor: John Roycroft

63 studies by Albert van Tets, part II
T22 Albert van Tets Pretoria News 14iv1981

i) Kg7 5.h6+ Kg8 6.h7+ Kg7 7.h8Q+ Rhx8 8.Kd7 and 9.Bc8.

"Not much originality here, either in the finale or the play. 7.5 points."
v) 3.e8Q? Qh5 4.Qd8 Qc5+ 5.Qc7 Qf8+ draw.
The newspaper's column editor was Peter Billingham.

T23 Albert van Tets
Ndaba 'Chessnuts' 29v1981

g2b8 0000.23 3/4 WTM?
BTM?
I: diagram
II: remove bPh5, add bPh6
III: remove bPh5, add bPh7.
I: White wins. WTM: 1.Kh2 (also Kf2) h4 2.Kg1 wins. BTM: 1...f3+ 2.Kg3.
II: WTM wins. 1.Kf1 or 1.Kg1. BTM wins: 1...g3.
III: Black wins. BTM, any p-move, even 1...f3 2.Kf2 2.h6.

T24 Albert van Tets
Ndaba 'Skaakpite' 10vii1981

e8d5 0044.23 5/6 Draw.
1.f6/f h2 (g5;Sf3) 2.g5 h1Q 3.Bh6, and Kxd4 4.Kf8! draw, or Qxh6 4.gxh6 g5 5.Kf8.
The composer draws attention to this being a variation of a 1933 position due to Kazantsev.
i) 1.Sf3? gxf5 2.gxf5 Kg4 2...Qxh6
ii) 2.Kc1 (Ke3) Kd6 3.e7 Rxf7 4.e8Q (e8S+,Ke6,)
Rf+ and 5...RxQ.

T25 Albert van Tets
Ndaba 'Chessnuts' 6xi 1981
A.Kastrikis vs. A.van Tets, Northern Transvaal 'Open' 1981

h1g5 0000.21 3/2 Win

Karl Weck, a Swiss friend of van Tets', had come up with:
a1c5 0000.20 .b2b3 3/1+.

T26 Albert van Tets
26iii1982

d2c6 0700.21 4/4 BTM Win
"How did Black, to move, force a win?"
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T27 Albert van Tets
25v1982

b4g6 0045.11 5/4 Win
1. Kg4 Bxg8 2. Se5+ Kh7
3. g6+ Kh8 4. Sf7+ Bxf7
5. gxf7 Sf5, and now what?
survives, but 6. Kg5! b2
7. Bh6 b1Q 8.f8Q+ Kh7
9. Qf7+ Kh8 10. Qf6+ K-
11. Qg6+ Kh8 12. Bg7+
Kg8 (Sxg7; Qxb1), and
White wins with 13. Bd4+
(also Bd2+) Kf8 14. Bc5+
Se7, and 15. Qxb1 or
15. Bxe7+. This solution
may not have been
published heretofore.

T28 Albert van Tets
17ix1982

b3g6 0000.23 3/4 Win
1. Kc2 (a4? g4; Kh5
(h5; Kd2) 2. d5 g4 3. d6 g3
4. d7 g2 5. d8Q g1Q
6. Qd1+ Qg4 7. Qxg4+ (a4?
f5; Kxg4 8.a4 f5 9.a5 f4
10. a6 f3 11. Kd2 Kg3 12. a7
f2 13. Ke2 Kg2 14.a8Q+
wins.

T29 Albert van Tets
3xii1982

5. Be6 Bb3 6. Bd7(Be8) B-
7. b4 mate.

T30 Albert van Tets
20xii1982

1. Rc1+ Rc7 2. b6, with
Rxcl 3. bxa7, or axb6 3.a7
winning.

T31 Albert van Tets
22iv1983

e26 0103.00 2/2 Win
1. Rb5 Sc2 2. Kd3 Se1+
3. Ke4 Sg2 4. Rh5 Se1
5. Rh2 wins.

T32 Albert van Tets
6v1983

e8c8 0400.21 4/3 Win
1. Rc1+ Rc7 2. b6, with
Rxcl 3. bxa7, or axb6 3.a7
winning.
h4f4 0410.20 5/2 Win

T34 Albert van Tets
23ix1983

T37 Albert van Tets
15vi1984

g2f4 0400.12 3/4 Draw
1.Rh1, with:
- Rxe6 2.Rf1+ Kg4
3.Re1 Rxel stalemate, or
- Kf5 2.Re1 Rxel
3.Rf1+ Kg4 4.Re1 draw.

T35 Albert van Tets
27iv1984

f1h8 1601.10 4/3 Win
1.Sg6+? Kg8 2.Sf4 Rxf4
3.Qxf4 Rf7 draws.
So 1.Sf5, with:
- Rb5 2.Qh5+ Kg8
3.Qxf7+ Kxf7 4.Sd6+ and
5.Sxb5, or
- Rxf5 2.Qxf5 Rf7
3.Qf2 Kg7 4.a4 Rxf2+
5.Kxf2 and the aP cannot be caught.

T36 Albert van Tets
24v1984

e7b8 0010.12 3/3 Win
1.Ba6 (Bg2? Ke7;) Ke7
(d5;Kd6) 2.b8Q+ wins as first shown by Troitzky in
1895: Kxb8 3.Kd6 Ka8
4.Kc7 and 5.Bb7 mate.

T38 Albert van Tets
unpublished correction
(19xii2000) of 27vii1984

l.Ba6 (Bg2? Ke7;) Ke7
(d5;Kd6) 2.b8Q+ wins as first shown by Troitzky in
1895: Kxb8 3.Kd6 Ka8
4.Kc7 and 5.Bb7 mate.
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T39 Albert van Tets 10i1984

T40 Albert van Tets 18i1985 - correction (first publication)

1.b6 axb6 2.a7 (Kb5? Ba7;) Bxa7 3.Kb5 Ke7 4.Ka6 Bb8 (or Kb8) 5.b5 draw.
Composing date: 23xii2000.
[There was no solution with wPP a6,b2,b5, which was the position published 18i1985. There is similarity to the study of 6xi1985.]

T41 Albert van Tets 15i1985

T42 Albert van Tets Ndaba, 21vi1985

c4d7 0030.31 4/3 Draw
1.b6 axb6 2.a7 (Kb5? Ba7;) Bxa7 3.Kb5 Ke7 4.Ka6 Bb8 (or Kb8) 5.b5 draw.

T43 Albert van Tets 18i1985

b8a6 0433.20 4/4 Draw
1.Rf8 Rb6 2.e8Q/i Bxc8 (Sxc8;Rxf5) 3.Rxc8 Sxc8

SNIPPET(S)

*C* GBR class 1006

Evaluation of this classic 5-man pawnless ending (queen against two knights) continues to elude - and to tantalise. There are many wins and many draws, but how can the
two be distinguished? No
rule-of-thumb is without
its exceptions. Suppose we
aver that with bKbSS in a
corner-based compact
bunch, and wK on the
opposite side of the board,
and Black to move not in
check, it's going to be a
draw. We put this to the
computer and, no problem
- it supplies a counter-
example.

*C* R1

Your editor-in-chief is
working on GBR class
1006 from time to time.
This space may be worth
watching.

AJR

Edmar John Mednis
b.1937 d.2002. The
American otb IGM was a
prolific
writer on all phases of the
game. Despite his many
endgame articles,
including several on the
class 4000.10, he never
subscribed to EG.

h7b1 1006.00 a8a2b2 2/3+.
WTM: win
BTM: draw
This is the same result as
R1, except that BTM
draws only by Sa2-c3*.
Starting wK on h7 instead
of a8 allows a refutation of
Sa2-b4. Let's make a
further minor adjustment -
R3.

*C* R3

h8b1 1006.00 a8a2b2 2/3+.
WTM: win
BTM: draw
White not only wins R1
WTM but has several
adequate moves to choose
from. BTM draws by
playing his a2 knight to b4
or to c3. So - we make a
minor adjustment - R2.

h6b1 1006.00 a8a2b2 2/3+.
WTM/BTM: White wins
And in R3 BTM doesn't
draw at all: now wKh6
rules out Sa2-c3; too!
This time Spotlight’s contributors were Mario Garcia (Argentina), Guy Haworth (England), Alain Pallier (France), Alberto Rodriguez (Argentina), Michael Roxlau (Germany) and Timothy Whitworth (England).

140.B8 p320. The diagram erroneously duplicates B7. The correct position is a2b7 0083.21 a6.b5c2c3 3/3=/.
140.p324. Z8.2 is no reciprocal zugzwang, as the Black king can oscillate between g5 and h4. Note that this does not affect the soundness of B11, whose notes refer to Z8.2.
142.M7 p456, A. and S. Manyakhin (also 108.8768). Spotlight in EG 143 mentioned a complete anticipation, but failed to correctly identify the origin of that idea. AP submitted a long list of studies that anticipate each other, and at the very beginning we find G. Nadareishvili, Etyudeby 1965, b57 0303.52 a1a6.a7c3e6f5c5e6 6/5+, 1.Kb6 Sc7 2.Kxc7 Rxa7+ (the study is cooked here by 2... exf5 3.Kb7 Rb1+ 4.Kc8 Ra1 draws) 3.Kb8 Re7 4.fxe6+ Kxe6 5.c7 and now 5... Kb6 6.c8S+! and 5... Re8+ 6.c8R!.

Even earlier there is Peckover (Szachy 1957, 1st prize), which, however, has no rook promotion. A sound setting with a very natural initial position is Van Wijgerden’s 102.8193.

143.12082, Sh. Tsurtsumia, R. Tsurtsumia. No solution: 3...Qf2 4.c8Q (4.c8R Ka3) Qd4+ and now 5.Kc1 Qe3+ 6.Qxe3 stalemate or 5.Kc2 Qc5+ 6.Qxc5 stalemate.
143.12083, V. Kalandadze. A dual: 2.Ka7 h1Q 3.g8Q+ Qg2 4.Qd8 with a winning attack, eg. 4... Qe4 5.Rg7+ Kf2 6.Qf8+ or 4... Rf1 5.Qd4+ Rf2 6.Rg7.
143.12090, M. Gogberashvili. The intended solution fails: 11... Rd6 12.Sg5+ (12.Sf8 Ra6) Kg6 13.Sf7 Re6 wins for Black. However, while draws by 4.e7+ Kf7 5.g6+ Kxg6 6.e8Q Qh7 7.Qf8+ Kxg6 (so far given in the notes) 8.Qf7+. Furthermore, it seems that 8.Qf7+ also draws. There are the immediate threats Qf7+ and Qg7+, so the Black queen must retreat to b6 or d3, but then White starts checking with 9.Qg7+. As soon as he has driven the black king out of the area d8/d4/h4/h8 White can safely capture the rook and draw with the h-pawn.
143.12092, V. Neidze. No solution: 3...Rf1+ 4.Kxb2 Rb1+ 5.Kxb1 Qxc3 with a technical win for Black.
143.12096, V. Gavashelashvili. No solution, Black wins by 2... Bb2+ 3.Kd3 (3.Kxb2 Sc4+ and ... Sd6) Le4+ 4.Kxe4 Sc4. It seems to me that even 2... c5 should win for Black.
143.13006, E. Dvizov, A. Foguelman. No solution, 7... c1Q wins for Black. The attempt to save this by, say, adding a black Ph6 would permit the dual 5.Rxd2 c1Q 6.Sxc5 Qf1 7.Rb8.
143.13008, E. Dvizov. Unsound, White even wins by 5.Be5.
143.13011, V. Zhuk, V. Tupik. A dual: 1.Kb2+ Kb5 2.c4+ Kc6 (2... Kb6 3.Ra4) 3.Ra5 and White is not worse.
143.13023, R. Caputa. A dual: 12.Rf5+ Qxf5 13.Qg4+ and stalemate.

GBR code (after Guy/Blandford/Roycroft) concisely denotes chessboard force in at most 6 digits. Examples: two white knights and one black pawn codes into 0002.01; wQ bQ wR codes as 4100; wBB vs bN codes as 0023; the full complement of 32 chessmen codes as 4888.88. The key to encoding is to compute the sum '1-for-W-and-3-for-B' for each piece type in QRBN sequence, with white pawns and black pawns uncoded following the 'decimal point'. The key for decoding is to divide each QRBN digit by 3, when the quotient and remainder are in each of the 4 cases the numbers of Bl and W pieces respectively.
The GBR code permits unique sequencing, which, together with the fact that a computer sort of several thousand codes and the reference attached to each is a matter of a second or two, enormously facilitates the construction of look-up directories.
A consequence of the foregoing is the code's greatest overall advantage: its user-friendliness. The GBR code has the unique characteristic of equally suiting humans and computers. No special skill or translation process is required whether the code is encountered on a computer printout or whether it is to be created (for any purpose, including input to a computer) from a chess diagram.
A natural extension of the GBR code is to use it to represent a complete position. A good convention is to precede the GBR code with the squares of the kings, and follow the code with the squares of the pieces, in W-before-Bl within code digit sequence, preserving the 'decimal point' to separate the pieces from the pawns, if any (where all W pawns precede all Bl).
The 223-move optimal play solution position in the endgame wR wB bN bN would be represented: a7d3 0116.00 b2b3c6d6 3/3+. The '3/3' is a control indicating 3 W and 3 Bl men, with '=' meaning W wins, while 'w' would mean White draws. The win/draw indicators are optional. Note that although in this example there are no pawns the GBR code decimal point and immediately following pair of zeroes are obligatory (enabling a scan of a text file searching for encoded chess positions) but the absence of a decimal point in the list of squares confirms that there are no pawns. A position with pawns but no pieces would be coded in this manner: a2c4 0000.32 .d4e3f2e4f3 4/3 WTM. To indicate Black to move (but still with the implied win or draw for White) it is suggested that '-' and '=' be employed. Where the position result is unknown or undecided or unknowable it is suggested that the computer chess convention 'WTM' (White to move) and 'BTM' be followed. The redundancy check piece-count (including the '=' separator) and terminating full stop are both obligatory.
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