You might have received this issue of EG a little later than usual. The reason for this is that a new treasurer was elected in the ARVES meeting of 5 October.
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The reader will have to sort out which items in this report are PCCC (FIDE Permanent Commission for Chess Composition) and which are WCCC (World Congress of Chess Composition) matters. Not that the distinction mattered to the over 200 participants.

After eight eventful years as president (and many more as delegate and vice-president) Bedrich Formánek (Slovakia) was no longer eligible for re-election. During his term of office membership rose healthily from 31 to 38 countries, though recurrent absences were worrying. Developments in computers and on the studies front (ie the Guidelines for organisers of formal international tourneys, and the Study of the Year innovation) he counted among his strongest memories. The new president, elected for four years, is John Rice (GB) who has appointed Paul Valois as secretary. Both are linguists. The three elected vice-presidents: Hannu Harkola (Finland), Uri Avner (Israel), Kjell Widlert (Sweden).

The results of the (first) World Championship in Composing for Individuals -- WCCI 1998-2000 -- were not only announced, but were distributed in booklet form, just one among a number of achievements by Marko Klasing (Slovenia) who acted as host and organiser (leading a great team of helpers) throughout the entire week. The WCCI was for published material, the competing composers (56 in the studies section) being allowed no more than six submissions, the best four of which would count. In the outcome Gurgenidze pipped Kralin to the studies post by a single point, Visokosov by a bare further half-point, and Pervakov just another half-point behind him. Wow!

The Open Solving was won by Murdzia (Poland), the 26th WCSC by Germany, the Individual by Murdzia again ('Solvenia' suited him), and an exciting Solving Show by Dragoun (Czech Republic), Murdzia this time being eliminated (by the young outsider Švic) in the first round.

No composing titles were awarded. Harold van der Heijden now has the title of International Judge (endgames).

Production of the 1995-7 FIDE Album is fairly well advanced, though with one section still in an uncertain state delay in publication cannot be ruled out. In the current Album, covering 1998-2000, studies section director Harold van der Heijden has offered to supply the judges with images (on CD) of all entries. Due to ill health Virgil Nestorescu has withdrawn from the judging and has been replaced by Gady Costeff (USA and Israel).

There were no quick composing tourneys for studies.

The offer to hold a meeting in Truskavets (Ukraine) in 2003 was withdrawn, so next year's will be held in Moscow from 26th July -- in the Ukraina Hotel. No invitations for 2004 were heard.

Nine of the PCCC's ten standing sub-committees functioned. Here is a hotch-potch. A timetable for WCCT.7 was established, and guidelines for judges awarding points from 0 to 4 were promulgated. Comments to WCCT.7 submissions awarded 2.5 points or more by any judge will be requested. Proposals for WCSC events included a fairy
round and re-scheduling to put studies into day 1, but no decision was taken. For the first time, solving norms were allowed for a non-FIDE, ie national, solving event, but with a cautionary note: adequate monitoring calls not only for the organisers to report the results to Klasinc’s ‘working party’ but to copy the set compositions as well, so the task will never be straightforward. The computer sub-committee is still beavering away at an all-embracing (ie to include fairy types) set of standards for position and solution presentation.

Relations with ‘big’ FIDE were discussed, it being agreed that closer contacts would become more important. There was no detail.

There is more information posted on the internet.

Turning to more personal matters, AJR can report: giving a mini-lecture using classic material supplied by British problemist David Shire; being photographed with other survivors (Newman Guttman, Zvonimir Hernitz and Zdravko Maslar) from the 1958 Congress at Piran (situated just a mile or so along the coast); receiving this year’s ‘Finlandia’ prize (made during a WCCC to a significant contributor to the composing scene who is not primarily a composer); stumbling on the dark and slippery narrow roller-coaster ridge-path in the subterranean and vertiginous Wagnerian vistas out of ‘Lord of the Rings’ called the Skocjan caves; and discovering, after mishearing ‘White Christmas series’ as ‘Rice Crispies cereal’, that at least one of his ears could do with a syringe.

Informal report of studies sub-committee (2002)

Two meetings were held, to discuss one topic, proposed by Israel, namely the published award in the sixth WCCT. Critical attacks had appeared in Suomen Tekstienkaiat, The Problemist, and the Ukrainian Year Book (‘Letopis’) for 2001. Neither the judge (Kalandadze of Georgia) nor the overall organiser (Hemmo Axt, Germany) was able to be present, so it was decided not to discuss specifics in detail but to concentrate on listing headings that would provide useful guidelines to organisers of similar events in the future.

However, some detail did emerge: an extenuating circumstance for a strong anticipation being overlooked in the WCCT.6 award was that no objection submitted through the team captains drew attention to it; in a second instance the clear self-anticipation was in an unsound version, and the Codex specifically states that an unsound composition is not to be considered an anticipation; in a third case the thematicity was in dispute because the set theme of ‘loss or win of a tempo’ was unclear with respect to interpreting ‘win’ of a tempo.

There was general agreement that the WCCT.6 award was unsatisfactory -- disagreement was confined to the degree of unsatisfactoriness. Even the judge was reported as stating that his award would have been different had he been in possession of all the facts. However, the main factor affecting the quality of his award was something else -- the severe shortage of time: all 73 studies were judged in the period of not more than two months preceding the Pula PCCC in 2000. The reasons for this haste were severe practical communication difficulties -- in particular, packages not arriving (Vazha Neidze was the Georgian team captain), failure to know or discover
the judge's postal address, and not knowing whether a package sent had been received. However, it seems that Pula 2000 was not an imposed ultimatum deadline but rather a practical way to guarantee safe handover. (E-mail seems not to have been attempted by either party. See EG142 pp401-403, noting that the words 'who had function' on p403 should read 'who had no function'.)

The sub-committee's list of potential risk factors:
- assured efficient inter-communication
- access to past publications and sources (eg the van der Heijden 2000 CD)
- suspicion of national bias
- the status of unsound anticipations
- the special case of an unsound study made sound by the stripping of one or more moves from the start of the solution (this device is not available to a problemist)
- the special case of an unsound 'win' being sound as a 'draw'
- the proper evaluation of an alleged partial anticipation
- the availability of computer-assistance in analysing/testing
- access to *C* oracle databases for 4-, 5- and 6-man endgames
- differences of opinion in the interpretation of a set theme
- the overriding requirement that the judge should explicitly justify each major placing.
This time Spotlight’s contributors were Ilham Aliyev (Azerbaijan), John Beasley (England), Marco Campioli (Italy), Axel Ornstein (Sweden), Alain Pallier (France) and Michael Roxlau (Germany).

132.11249, D.Gurgenidze, V.Kalandadze. The finale is marred by duals in both lines: After 7... Kc2 White can draw by 8.Ka3, while 7... b5+ can simply be met by 8.Rxb5. This was discovered by Axel Ornstein, who then sat down and produced a sound setting with an additional stalemate (see 145.13216). For more details see the latest issue of the British Endgame Study News.

140.11827, D.Gurgenidze. According to Ilham Aliyev this was jointly composed with Araz Almammedov.


145.13147, H. van der Heijden. Some readers claimed a dual by 4.Kb1, but to me it just looks like a waste of time after 4... Ke5 5.Ka2, which leads back to the solution.


145.13150, M.Roxlau. The try 4.a7? b1Q 5.Rxb7+ Qb7 6.Rxb7 Qh5+ 7.Kg3 Qg5+ 8.Kc2 stalemate (else perpetual check) is missing.

145.13151, V.Neidze. A reader wondered how White draws after 1... Kg2. If now 2.Kg1+? Kh2 then after both 3.Rd1+ Kg2 and 3.Rd1+ Kg1 the stalemate is relieved. Correct is 2.Rd6+ Kg2 3.Kd5+ Kh3 4.Kd6+ Kg4 5.Kc7 stalemate (else perpetual check) is missing.


145.13168, S.Tkachenko. No solution: Black draws by 1... e4, e.g. 2.Rxc5 Bd4; or 2.Kb6 c4; or 2.Rf7 Bd4; or 2.Rd5 e3 3.Rxc5 Bd4; or 2.Rf2 Be5+ 3.Kb6 e3. The black
king is already in the right coloured corner, and as soon as the bishop comes to his
defence Black is completely safe.

145.13173, A.roslyakov, L.serebryakov. No solution: in the line 1... bSxc4 Black
wins by 6... Kf2. This position is famous for its deceptiveness: legions of strong
grandmasters (not to mention study composers) have considered it as dead drawn and
consequently blundered heavily in tournament play. However, the win has been
pointed out by Horwitz as early as 1885 and can be found in any decent book on the
endgame.

145.13174, D.gurgenidze. Not only is this heavily anticipated by Herbstman («64»
1934, not Gurvich, as quoted in the notes!) and Matous (EG 119.10112), there is also a
cook by 4... Kd3 5.Rxc1 Sac3+ 6.Kb2 Rb8+ 7.Kc1 Sa2+ 8.Kd1 Sbc3+ 9.Bxc3 Rb1
mate.

145.13175, M.gogberashvili. Unsound. How does Black win after 2.Sf5?

145.13180, O.rabinovich. No solution: 1... Kf4 2.h4 d5 3.Kxd5 c5 draws. A sound
and more economic expression of this idea is A.Wotawa, Deutsche Schachzeitung

145.13182, V.kalyagin, B.olympiev. White cannot hope to survive with his
miserably placed knight. A particularly simple win for Black is 1... Bc7.

145.13183, B.sidorov. Is the final position really won for White? Michael Roxlau
continues with 8... Sf1 9.g8Q g3 10.Qh8+ Kg2 11.Ke2 Kg1, which looks like an
unassailable fortress.

145.13188, Z.libis. This just repeats the play of a very famous Mitrofanov (1st prize
Rustaveli-MT, EG 9.383). See EG 23.1216 for another shameless paraphrase of this
study by the two judges of the Rustaveli-MT.

145.13205, N.mironenko. Some readers have claimed a draw by 2... Sc3.

145.13216, A.orustein. The first line should read 2... Rc5 (not Rc8). See also the
remarks to 132.11249.


145.T62 p621, A. van tets. The line 1... g6 is significantly shortened by 2.Sf3 g5
3.Sf2 mate.

On 13ix2002 Aleksandr P.Kazantsev died in Moscow, just days after his 96th
birthday. A composer of spectacular studies in perfect harmony with his science
fiction writings, he was in at the start of the FIDE PCCC and present at Piran in 1958,
but never President. A revered legend has left us.
Zadachy i etudy 1999

This informal international tourney was judged by Yochanan Afek (Israel). The award was published in Zadachy i etudy no.26.

No 13219 Gherman Umnov
1st prize Zadachy i etudy 1999


“The tourney’s most original entry, with play that is both precise and dynamic, esp. the point 4.d8Q!! and the play by br.”

No 13220 Ya.Petrishin
2nd prize Zadachy i etudy 1999

a5a7 0086.20 5/5 Draw

No 13221 Nikolai Kralin

Draw.


iii) Again not 3.Bxd4?

"Subtle minor piece play by means of which Black wriggles to maintain his material plus - but with no winning chances."

No 13222 G.Amiryan
2nd honourable mention
Zadachy i etyudy 1999

Pleasing and imaginative, forestalling promotion.

No 13223 P.Arestov
3rd honourable mention
Zadachy i etyudy 1999

e4e2 0110.55 8/6 Win
No 13223 Pavel Arestov
g1Q 4.Bh4+ g3 5.Bxg3+ Kg2 6.Re1 f5+ 7.Kd3/iii
Kf3 8.c4 Qg2 9.Re3 mate.

i) 1.Sc2+? Kc4 2.Ra4+
Kb5 3.Rxg4 c2 4.Sc7+ Ka5 wins.

ii) 1.Sc6+? Ke4 2.Ra4+
Kb5 3.Rxg4 c2 4.Sc7+ Ka5 wins.

iii) 1.Sc6+? Ke4 2.Ra4+
Kb5 3.Rxg4 c2 4.Sc7+ Ka5 wins.

"Anti-stalemate play climaxes in checkmate due to the self-block as a consequence of zugzwang. OK, but Costeff has shown this in a lighter setting (1st prize, Israel 1986 ‘ring’ tourney)."

No 13224 V.Vlasenko
1st commendation Zadachy
i etyudy 1999

645
No 13225 Boris Sidorov
(Apsheronsk). 1.Sg4 Se4
2.Rh3 Sd5 3.Rh7+ Kb8
4.Rh8+ Kb7 5.Rh7+ Sc7
6.Rh3 Sd5 7.Rh7+ Kc8
8.Rh8+ Kc7 9.Rh7+ Kd6
10.Rh6+ (Rd7?? Ke6;) Kc7
(Kc7,Rxh6) 11.Rh7+
(Rc6+?? Kd7;) Ke8
12.Rh8+ (Rd7+?? Kc8;) Kc7
13.Rh7+ Kf8
14.Rh8+ Kg7 15.Rh7+
Kxh7 16.Sf6+ draws, Kh8
17.Sxd5, not 17.Sxe4?
Kg7??.

Uralsky Problemist 2001

The award of this informal international tourney was published in Uralsky Problemist 31 (3/2002)
It was judged by D.Gurgenidze (Georgia)
Report: “The entries were chiefly of the same medium quality. Those awarded prizes do not stand out from the
honourable mentions. Tourneys where nothing is prominent are difficult to judge.”

No 13226 Harold van der Heijden
(Netherlands). 1.g8Q? Bd5+ 2.Kf8 Sg6+.
So: 1.g8Q+ Kg5 2.Kg7
Bg6 3.Sh6 Sg2 4.f7 Sf4
5.f8S Sh5+ 6.Kh8 Kxh6
7.Sxh7 Sf6 8.Sf6, with:
- Kg5 9.Sh7+ Kh6
10.Sf6, or
- Bf7 9.Sg8+ Kg6
10.Se7+ Kf6 11.Sg8+ Kg6
12.Se7+ Kh6 13.Sg8+
positional draw.
“A miniature with two S-promotions - and excellent technique.”

No 13227 Vitaly Kovalenko
(Maritime Province, Russian Federation). 1.g5+ Kh5
2.Kh3 Be7 3.Bh7 Bd8
4.Bg8, with:
- Ba5 5.Bf7+ g6 6.Be6
Be1 7.Bg4 mate, or
- Kg6 5.Kg4 Bxg5
(Ba5,h5 mate) 6.Bh7+
(hxg5? stalemate) Kxh7
7.Kxg5 Kg8 8.Kg6 Kf8
9.Kh7 Kf7 10.h5 Kf8
11.h6 g5/i 12.Kg6 g4
13.h7 wins.
i) gxh6 12.Kxh6 Kf7
“Opposite B’s combining mate and stalemate - certainly impresses.”

No 13226 H. van der Heijden
1st prize Uralsky Problemist 2001

No 13227 V. Kovalenko
2nd prize Uralsky Problemist 2001
No 13228  S.Borodavkin
3rd prize Uralsky Problemist 2001

No 13229  A.Stavrietsky
(Russia).  1.Rh5+ Kg1 2.Rxh1+ Kxh1 3.Kd2 Rf2
4.Ke1 Rg2 5.Rc2 Bxe3 6.Rxe2 Kg1 mate. So:
Rg2 5.Rd2 Bxe3 6.Rc2z Kh2 7.Rxe2 with a
'drawing-pin'. “A known tie-up embellished with a subtle
themetic try.”

No 13230  A.Golubev
1st honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

No 13231  A.Golubev
2nd honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

c7e6 3011.34 6/6 Win
No 13230  A.Golubev.
1.g5, with:
- Qh8 2.Sf4+ Kf7 3.Sg6
Qa8 4.Bf3 Qxf3 5.Sg5+, or
- Qh7 2.Sf4+ Ke7
3.Sg6+ Ke8 4.Bd1 a5
5.Ba4+ Kf7 6.Bb3+ Ke8
7.Bd1 a6 8.Ba4+ Kf7
9.Bb3+ Ke8 10.Bd1 a4
Ke8 13.Bd1 a5 14.Ba4+
Kf7 15.Bb3+ Ke8 16.Bd1
a4 17.Bxa4+ Kf7 18.Bb3+
Ke8 19.Bd1 f4 20.exf4
Qg8 21.Ba4+ Kf7 22.Bc6

wins bQ.
“Classic force. White does
nothing but manoeuvre
with his bishop to place
Black in zugzwang.”

c3h2 0560.11 4/5 Draw
No 13229  A.Stavrietsky
special prize Uralsky
Problemist 2001

No 13230  A.Golubev
1st honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

No 13228  Sergei
Borodavkin (Ukraine).
1...Be5+ 2.Kb3 Ba4+
3.Ka2 Re1 4.Qg6+ Ke7
5.Qh7+ Kd6 6.Qg6+ Kc5
7.d4+ Bxd4 8.Qf5+/i Kb6
9.Qg6+ Ka5 10.Qg5+
hxg5 stalemate,
i) 8.Qg5+? Kc4 9.Qg8+
Kc3 10.Qc8+ Kd2.
“An interesting subject
with precise choice of
checking squares.”

No 13230  A.Golubev
1st honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

No 13231  A.Golubev.
1.Rd3+ Ke4 2.Bc6+ Ke5
3.Re3+ Kf4 4.Re8, with:
- Qa6 5.Be4+ Kg5
6.Rg8+ Kh6 7.Rg6+ Kh7
8.Rxf6+ K- 9.Rxa6 wins,
or
- h4+ 5.Kxh4 Qa6
6.Be4+ Kf4 7.e3+ Kxe3
“In the good old style.”

c3e8 1360.31 5/5 BTM Win
No 13228  Sergei
Borodavkin (Ukraine).
1...Be5+ 2.Kb3 Ba4+
3.Ka2 Re1 4.Qg6+ Ke7
5.Qh7+ Kd6 6.Qg6+ Kc5
7.d4+ Bxd4 8.Qf5+/i Kb6
9.Qg6+ Ka5 10.Qg5+
hxg5 stalemate,
No 13232 Yo.Afek
3rd honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

1. Sf7 Rxf7 2 b7
Rxb7 3 d7 Sd5 4 Rh6+/i
Sb6+ 5 Rxb6+ Rxb6
6 d8R Ri6 7 Kg6
Rf6 8 Kg6 wins.

a8a6 0404.41 7/4 Win
No 13232 Yochanan Afek
(Israel). 1.Sf7 Rxf7 2 b7
Rxb7 3 d7 Sd5 4 Rh6+/i
Sb6+ 5 Rxb6+ Rxb6
6 d8R Ri6 7 Kg6
Rf6 8 Kg6 wins.

No 13233 Pietro Rossi
(Italy). 1.Bh5+ Kxh5 2.h7
Bb3+ 3 Kxb3 d1 Q+ 4.Kb4
Ba3+ 5.Ka5 Bb4+ 6.Kb6
Ba5+ 7.Ka7 Bb6+ 8.cxb6
Qa4+ 9.Kb8 Qe8+ 10 Ka7
Qe7+ 11 Kb7 Qxb7 12.c4
Ka5 13.c5 Kf6 14.Ka8
Qe4 15 Ka7 Qh7 16.Ka8
Qh1 17 Ka7 Qa1+ 18.Kb6
Qb2+ 19 Ka7 Qh2+ 20 Kc8
Qh8+ 21 Ka7
Qg7+ 22 Ka8 Qf8+ 23 Ka7
Qc7+ 24 Ka8 Ke6
25.d5+ draw.

The pieces movement is original, but the extended second phase upsets the balance.”

No 13233 P.Rossi
4th honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

1. Bh5+ Kxh5 2 h7
Bb3+ 3 Kxb3 d1 Q+ 4 Kb4
Ba3+ 5 Ka5 Bb4+ 6 Kb6
Ba5+ 7 Ka7 Bb6+ 8 cxb6
Qa4+ 9 Kc8 Qe8+ 10 Kc7
Qe7+ 11 Kb7 Qxb7 12 c4
Ka5 13 c5 Kf6 14 Ka8
Qe4 15 Ka7 Qh7 16 Ka8
Qh1 17 Ka7 Qa1+ 18 Kb6
Qb2+ 19 Ka7 Qh2+ 20 Kc8
Qh8+ 21 Ka7
Qg7+ 22 Ka8 Qf8+ 23 Ka7
Qc7+ 24 Ka8 Ke6
25 d5+ draw.

No 13233 Pietro Rossi
(Italy). 1 Bh5+ Kxh5 2 h7
Bb3+ 3 Kxb3 d1 Q+ 4 Kb4
Ba3+ 5 Ka5 Bb4+ 6 Kb6
Ba5+ 7 Ka7 Bb6+ 8 cxb6
Qa4+ 9 Kc8 Qe8+ 10 Kc7
Qe7+ 11 Kb7 Qxb7 12 c4
Ka5 13 c5 Kf6 14 Ka8
Qe4 15 Ka7 Qh7 16 Ka8
Qh1 17 Ka7 Qa1+ 18 Kb6
Qb2+ 19 Ka7 Qh2+ 20 Kc8
Qh8+ 21 Ka7
Qg7+ 22 Ka8 Qf8+ 23 Ka7
Qc7+ 24 Ka8 Ke6
25 d5+ draw.

No 13235 The late F.Bondarenko
(Dnepropetrovsk),
B.Sidorov (Apsheronsk).

No 13235 The late F.Bondarenko
(Dnepropetrovsk),
B.Sidorov (Apsheronsk).

No 13234 A.Visokosov
5th honourable mention
Uralsky Problemist 2001

2. Bh4 Rg6 5 g3
Kb8 6 Kb6
Kc8 7 Kb7
Ke8 8 Kb6
Ke7 9 Kg7 wins.

“Tastefully done, but spoilt by the final sketch.”

No 13234 Andrei
Visokosov (Moscow).

1. Bc4+ Kb7 2 Bxb6 S3b2
3 Bd4 Sxc4+ 4 Kc5 Slb2
5 Kb4 Sd2 6 Ka3 bSc4+
7 Ka2 Bxd4 stalemate.

No 13236 S.Borodavkin
commendation Uralsky
Problemist 2001

e7a8 3100.21 4/3 Win
No 13236 S.Borodavkin.

1. c7 Qa7 2. Kf8 Qf2++
3. Kg8 Qg1+ 4. Kh7 Qa7
5.Rc4 h3 6.Kh8 Qa1+ 7.e3 wins.

No 13237 V.Kondratev
commendation Uralsky Problemist 2001


No 13239 A.Amiryan
commendation Uralsky Problemist 2001

Olimpiev-64JT

The award of this formal international tourney was published in Uralsky Problemist 31 (3/2002) v12002. B.O.Olimpiev (Ekaterinburg) acted as judge.

No 13241 Yo.Afek
1st-3rd prize Olimpiev-64JT
No 13242 Viktor Kalyagin (Ekaterinburg). If 1...Kh7
2.Sf4, or if 1...Qxe8+ 2.Kxf5, drawing, so:
1...Sd4+ 2.Kf7 (Ke5? Qxe8++;) Qd7+ 3.Kf8
(Kf8? Qf5++;) Qh7/i 4.Rf6/ii Qxh5 5.Sd6
9.Rf6/ii Kh7 10.Rf7/v+ with:
- Kh6 11.Rf6+ Kg5/i 12.Se4+ Kg4 13.Rf4+ Kh3
14.Rh4++ draw, or
- Kg6 11.Rg7+ Kf6
12.Sf4+ Ke6 (Ke5? Rg5++;) 13.Re7/v+ Kf5
14.g4+i Qxg4 15.Sd6+ Kf4 (Kg5? Rg7++;) 16.Re4++
draw.
i) Qf5+ 4.Rf6 Qxh5 5.Sd6. Or Se6+ 4.Rxe6 Qxe6
5.Sf6, blockading bk.
iii) Otherwise: 6.Sf7+ Kh7
7.Rh6+...
iv) Side-stepping the
original positional draw.
vii) 14.Sd6+? Kg4 (Kg5? Re5++;) 15.Re4+ Kf3
16.Rxd4 Qh8++ wins.
"Originality in the chosen
material, way-out instructive play and a
filigree forking finish."

No 13243 Emil Melnichenko (New
Ke7. Nor 1.Re4++? Kd7
better is 1.Kf5? Sc4 2.Rh4
draw.
i) Be6+ 2.Kg5 Be5 3.Re4
ii) 2.Kf5? Bc3 3.Rb7 Sc4
4.Ra7 Sd6+ 5.Kf4 Be6
6.Rh7 Sf7++. Or 2.Rb5?
Sc4 3.Rb7 Se3+ 4.Kg5
Be6 5.Ra7 Sd5 6.Rh7 Se7
7.Rh4 Ke7, and Black will
win.
iii) 3.Re2? Bb1 4.Re1 Bd3
5.Kf3 Ke7 6.Rd1 Bf5.
Ba7. 5.Rg4? Kf8 6.Rg1
Bh7 7.Rf1+ Ke8 8.Rg1
Se3 9.Rg7 Bf5/+ 10.Kf6
Bd6 11.Ra7 Be8 12.Ra8
Kd7. 5.Re2? Bd3 6.Ra2
Sb6 7.Ra1 Bc4/+ 5.Rd4?
Bg6 6.Rb4 Bf7/+ 7.Kf6
Be5+ 8.Kf5 Bd6 9.Rh7
Ke7.
"The author has graced the
jubilee with his surprise
use of GBR 0163
material."
Hew Dundas: Surely this
is a product of the
computer and as such does
not deserve a prize.

No 13244 A.Sadykov (4th prize Olimpiev-64JT)

No 13245 A.Sadykov (5th prize Olimpiev-64JT)
7. Ka4/iii Re4+ 8. Ka3, and it's perpetual check by the promoted rook.
   i) Kb1 2. Rc3 e2 3. Re3 draw
   ii) e1Q 4. Rd1+ Qxd1 stalemate
   "This amalgam succeeds - an unqualified achievement by the Asbest composer."

No 13245 V. Kalashnikov, A. Pankratev
5th prize Olimpiev-64JT

No 13246 V. Kalyagin
honourable mention
Olimpiev-64JT

No 13247 E. Melnichenko
honourable mention
Olimpiev-64JT

No 13248 N. Argunov
commendation Olimpiev-64JT

---

d4c1 0312.13 5/5 Win
No 13245 V. Kalashnikov, A. Pankratev
   "Three active sacrifices of white pieces on b1."

No 13246 V. Kalyagin
honourable mention
Olimpiev-64JT

No 13247 E. Melnichenko
honourable mention
Olimpiev-64JT

---

e7h5 3501.12 5/5 Win
No 13246 V. Kalyagin

---

e7h5 3501.12 5/5 Win
No 13246 V. Kalyagin
1. Sb6 Re6+ 2. Kf7 Qe5 3. Se4 Rf6+ 4. Kg7, with:
   - Qxa5 5. Rxa5+ Rf5 6. h4+ Kf4 7. Se3+ Kg5 8. Sxf5, or
   - Qf5 5. h4+ Kf4 6. Sxe3+ Kg5 7. Sxf5, or
   - Qg5 5. Rxf5+ Kg5 6. h4+ winning.
   "A not entirely run-of-the-mill intro to a popular synthesis."

No 13248 N. Argunov
commendation Olimpiev-64JT

---

a4d8 3531.01 4/5 Win
No 13248  N.Argunov
(Russia). 1.Rf8+  Kc7
2.Sd5+/i  Kb7/ii  3.Rb2+
Kb7/iii 4.R2xb8  Ra1+i
5.Kb5  Rb1+  6.Kc6  Rxb8
7.Rf7+  K-  8.Sc7+  Ka7
9.Sb5+  K-  10.Ra7+  Bxa7
11.Sc7 mate.
i)  2.Se6+?  Kb7  3.Rb2+
Bb6 draw
ii)  Kd6  3.Rxb8  Kxd5
4.Rxf2  Ra1+  5.Kb3  Rb1+i
6.Rb2 wins.
iii)  Kc6  4.R2xb8  Ra1+i
5.Kb3  Rb1+  6.Kc4  Rxb8
7.Rxb8 wins.

No 13249  V.Kalashnikov,
 A.Pankratev
commendation Olimpiev-64JT

a3b1 0210.07 4/8 Draw
No 13249  V.Kalashnikov,
 A.Pankratev () 1.Rb8+
Kd1 2.Rxa4  c1Q+  3.Kb4+
Kd2  4.Kc5+  Kc2  5.Rxc4+
Kd2  6.Rxe1  Kc1  7.Bf5
h1Q  8.Rb1+  Kxb1

No 13250  B.Sidorov
commendation Olimpiev-
64JT

f1d3  4314.06  4/10 Draw
No 13250  B.Sidorov.
1.Sf4+?  Kxd2  2.Qd4+/i
Kc2  3.Qf2+  Kc1  4.Qe1+
Kc2  5.Qf2+  Kb1  6.Qe1+
Kc2  7.Qf2+ positional
draw - Kc3  8.Sd5+  Kd3
9.Sb4+  Kc3  10.Sd5+
perpetual check.
i)  1.Qf2+?  Kxd2  2.Qxb2+
Ke3  3.Qc3+  Kf4 wins.
Alternative checks by wQ
also allow bK to emerge
unscathed.
ii)  2.Qxb2+?  Kdl  3.Qe2+
Kcl  4.Qel+  Kb2  5.Qf2+
Ka3.

No 13251  V.Kalyagin.
1...Ke3  2.Sd5+  Kd4  3.Sc7
Kc5/i  4.Ke7, with:
-  Kb6  5.Sd5+  Kc5  6.Sf6
wins, or
-  Kf7  5.Sc6+  Kd5
6.Bg6 wins.
i)  Sh7+  4.Kg6  Sf8+i  5.Kg7
wins.
"With reduced material
something new: each of
White’s pieces has his turn
at lassoing the stray
mustang. Special honour -
for a malyutka."
No 13251  V.Kalyagin
special prize Olimpiev-64JT

d5f1  0114.02  4/4 Win
No 13252  A.Sadikov
special prize Olimpiev-64JT

d5f1  0114.02  4/4 Win
No 13252  A.Sadikov ()
1.Ba7  f2  2.Se2  g1Q
3.Sxg1  fxg1S/i  4.Bxg1
Sd3  5.Re3  Sf4+i  6.Ke4  Sg2
7.Rg3  Kxg1  8.Kf3  Kh1
i)  fxg1Q  4.Rf5+  Kg2
5.Rg5+  K-  6.Bxg1 wins.
"Something to please the
player.
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No 13253 A. Stavrietsky
special prize Olimpiev-64JT

1. Bf4+ Kh4 2. b7+i Sf3
3. Bg2, with:
- Rb5 4. Bxf3 Kg3 5. Be4
8. Be4 Rb5 9. Bd5, or
- Rg8 4. Bxf3 Kg3 5. Bxd5
Re8 6. Be6 Rd8 7. Bd7 Kg2
8. Bh3, and Black has to
take the draw by Kg3, and
Kf2;
i) 2. Bg2? Se2 3. b7 Rb5
4. a4 Rb2 5. Kh2 Sf4 6. a5
Rxg2+ 7. Kh1 Rb2 8. a6
Kg3.
ii) "With two aims: threat
4. Bh3 mate; and entering
the stalemate zone."
"A double-systematic to
the judge's taste."

No 13254 Gherman
Umnov (Moscow region).
1. Bf4+ Kg1/i
2. Bxe3+ Kf1 3. Kd1/ii Sg5
4. Bxg5 c5 5. Bh6 Be7
6. Bg5 Bd6 7. Bf4 Bxf4
8. Bxe4 Bc8 9. Bf5 Bb7
10. Be4 positional draw.
i) Kh1 2. Bxe4+ Bxh7
draw.
ii) "With two aims: threat
4. Bh3 mate; and entering
the stalemate zone."
"A double-systematic to
the judge’s taste."

No 13255 V. Kalyagin
special honourable mention
Olimpiev-64JT

1. Sf2+ Kg1 2. Ke2 h2/i
3. Bb7 h1S 4. Sg4+ Sf2
i) d1Q+ 3. Sxd1 h2 4. Bb7+
Khl 5. Sf2+ Kg1 6. Se4+
Khl 7. Sg3 mate.
"Pleasing, especially both
sides’ third move."

No 13256 D. Pikhurov
special honourable mention
Olimpiev-64JT

b7d6 0040.12 3/4 Draw

No 13257 A. Foguelman
special commendation
Olimpiev-64JT

d3h1 0011.03 3/4 Win

h1h3 0313.20 4/3 Draw
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A.Foguelman (Argentina).
l.Rg7 Sxe4 2.b7 Sxc5 3.Kd5 Sxb7
4.Rxe7 Rd8 5.Re8 Rxe8
stalemate.

"All good wishes to our
Argentinian colleague on
his 75th birthday."

"Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

Atilla Schneider (Hungary)
organized the first
endgame study tourney on
the internet. It was an
informal tourney, and the
studies were published
with extensive comments
of the composers,
immediately after
submission (usually within
one day!). Judging was
done by the participants
themselves, who had to
award all entries with 1-20
points. As to be expected,
there were some
participants giving
maximum points to each
other studies, and
comparable childish
behaviour. It does seems
feasible, however, to
implement rules based on
several suggestions of
participants for future
tourney.
The tourney was being held
between Christmas 2000
After a slow start (well, the
first prize winner was the
first study that was
published...) towards the
deadline some well-known
composers entered some
fine pieces. Altogether 19
studies were submitted.
HvdH was consulted for
anticipation checking.

No 13258 Pal Benko
1st Prize "Chess Clinic"
2000-2001

1.Qe5+ Kc1
2.Rb8/ii Rb4+ 3.Kd3 Rb4+
Rd2 6.Rb4 ifs 7.Ra4
Qc6+ 8.Rc4 Qd5 9.Rc8/vi
Qd7 10.Qc7 Qd6/vii
11.Kb3+ Kd1 12.Qc1+
Kc1 13.Qc1+ Rd1
14.Qc3+ Kb1 15.Qb2
mate.
i) Kc2 2.Qd6 wins.
ii) 2.Qd6? Qb1+ 3.Ke3
Qb3+ Black wins.
iii) 4.Qxd4? Qxb8 5.Qa1+
Qb1+ 6.Qxb1+ Kxb1
draws.
iv) Re4 5.Qxe4 Qc7+
6.Qc4 wins.
v) 5.Qxd4? Qxg3+ 6.Qd3
Qe5+ 7.Qd4 Qg3+ draw.
vi) Qd7 7.Qg1+ Rd1
8.Rb1+ Kxb1 9.Qb6+ wins,
f6 7.Ra4 Qc6+ 8.Rc4
Qd5 9.Qe1+ Rd1 10.Qe2
Rd2 11.Kb3+ Kb1
12.Qe1+ Rd1 13.Qb4
Qd3+ 14.Qc3 Qd6
15.Rc1+, not 9.Rc8f5 Z2.
vi) 9.Re5? Qxe5+ 10.Qxe5
Rc2+ draws.

No 13259 Andrej Vysokosov
2nd Prize "Chess Clinic"
2000-2001

1.Rd3+/i Kg5 2.Rxd2
Re7/ii 3.Sd7/iii Rxd7+
Sf5 6.Rxf5+ Kxf5 7.Bc8
Ke6 8.Bh8/vi Ba3/vii
(Bc3?; Ke7) Rg7 11.Bf4/ix
ZZ Rf7 12.Bg5/x Bb4
(Bb2; b4) 13.Be3/c1/xii
positional draw.

No 13260 Yochanan Afek
3rd Prize "Chess Clinic"
2000-2001

No 13261 Oleg Pervakov & Boris Gusev
1st Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic"
2000-2001
No 13262 Péter Gyarmati
2nd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

f4h2 0131.01 3/3 Win

No 13263 Michael Roxlau
3rd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

Bb3 5.Rg7 Bd5.

vii) Be2 5.Rh6 g1Q
6.Sxg1+ Kh1 7.Kg3 wins.

viii) Bb5 3.Rf6 see main line; Bd7 3.Sg5 g1Q
4.Sf3+ Kh1 5.Rh6+ Kg2
6.Rg6+ wins.

Rd2 6.Kc6/ix Kg5 7.Sf3+
Kxf6 8.Sd4+ Kg5.

No 13263 Michael Roxlau
3rd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

Bb3 5.Rg7 Bd5.

vii) Be2 5.Rh6 g1Q
6.Sxg1+ Kh1 7.Kg3 wins.

viii) Bb5 3.Rf6 see main line; Bd7 3.Sg5 g1Q
4.Sf3+ Kh1 5.Rh6+ Kg2
6.Rg6+ wins.

Rd2 6.Kc6/ix Kg5 7.Sf3+
Kxf6 8.Sd4+ Kg5.

No 13262 Péter Gyarmati
2nd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

f4h2 0131.01 3/3 Win

No 13263 Michael Roxlau
3rd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

Bb3 5.Rg7 Bd5.

vii) Be2 5.Rh6 g1Q
6.Sxg1+ Kh1 7.Kg3 wins.

viii) Bb5 3.Rf6 see main line; Bd7 3.Sg5 g1Q
4.Sf3+ Kh1 5.Rh6+ Kg2
6.Rg6+ wins.

Rd2 6.Kc6/ix Kg5 7.Sf3+
Kxf6 8.Sd4+ Kg5.

No 13262 Péter Gyarmati
2nd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

f4h2 0131.01 3/3 Win

No 13263 Michael Roxlau
3rd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

Bb3 5.Rg7 Bd5.

vii) Be2 5.Rh6 g1Q
6.Sxg1+ Kh1 7.Kg3 wins.

viii) Bb5 3.Rf6 see main line; Bd7 3.Sg5 g1Q
4.Sf3+ Kh1 5.Rh6+ Kg2
6.Rg6+ wins.

Rd2 6.Kc6/ix Kg5 7.Sf3+
Kxf6 8.Sd4+ Kg5.

No 13262 Péter Gyarmati
2nd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

f4h2 0131.01 3/3 Win

No 13263 Michael Roxlau
3rd Hon. Mention "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

Bb3 5.Rg7 Bd5.
Sd2 7.Bf5/iii Sb7 (g2; Be6)  
8.h4/iv Sc4/v 9.Be4 Sd6  
10.Bc6 g2 11.Bxg2 Se8+  
12.Kd7 Sf6+ 13.Kc8 Se4  
(Sd5; h5) 14.Kc7/vi wins.  
i) 1.b6+? Ka6; 1.Sd8? Sxd8  
2.b6+ Ka8 3.Bg4 Sd2,  
Sd3 6.Bxh3 Sd2 7.Ba6 g2  
8.b7+ Sxb7 9.Bxb7+ Ka7  
iii) 7.Bg6? Sb7 8.Be8 Sc4  
11.Bxb7 g2 12.Bxg2 Kc8  
draws.  
iv) Bishop moves are not  
fast enough: 8.Bc8? Sc5  
9.h4 Sc4 10.b7+ Sxb7  
11.Bxb7+ Ka7 12.h5 Sd6;  
10.Bc6 g2 11.Bxg2 Sb5+  
12.Kd7 Kb8 13.h4 Sd4  
14.h5 Sf5 draws.  
v) g2 9.Be8 Sc5 10.b7+  
Sxb7 11.Bxb7+ Ka7  

 vi) Precision is needed  
until the end: 14.h5? Sbd6+  
15.Kc7 Se8+ 16.Kd8 Kb8  
17.Kxe8 Sf6+ 18.Ks7  
Sxb5; 14.Bf3? Sd6+  
17.Kc7 Sbd6 18.h5 Sf5+  
published January 30th,  
2001, 12.2 points.

No 13264 Michael Roxlau  
1st Commendation "Chess  
Clinic" 2000-2001

Kg8 and White has to  
deliver perpetual check.  
vi) b1Q 12.Rd7+ Kc8  
13.Rc7+ Kd8 14.Kb7 and  
15.Rd7 mate.  

Kd8 15.Rc6+ Qb1+ 16.Kb7  
Qa7+ 17.Kxa7 Ke7  
18.Sd8+ Kd7 19.Rd6+  
Kxe8 20.Rxd2 Kf7 draws.  
vii) Not Rxg5? 2.Sxd5 Ka7  
3.Rxb3 f5 4.Kc7 b4 5.Rxb4  
Ka6 6.Sc3 wins.

No 13265 Emil Vlasak &  
Michal Hlinka  
2nd Commendation "Chess  
Clinic" 2000-2001

b6e3 0831.31 7/5 Draw

No 13265 Emil Vlasak  
(Czech Republic) &  
Michal Hlinka (Slovakia)  
1.Re2/iv Kxd4 2.Rxe8  
Rc6+ 3.Kg5/ii Re5+ 4.Sf5+  
Rxf5+ 5.Kxh5 Bxe8  
6.Kg5/iii Bxb5/iv 7.a4 Be2  
(a5; Kxb5) 8.a5 draws.  
i) 1.a4? Kxd4 2.axb5 axb5  
and this b-pawn is very  
quick.


iv) Bb5 7.a4 Bxd3 8.a5.

published September 19th, 2001, 10.9 points.

No 13266 Harold van der Heijden
3rd Commendation "Chess Clinic" 2000-2001

c2hl 0303.20 3/3 Draw


iii) Rh3 8.a6 Rb3+ 9.Ka4; Rxe7 8.a6; Rh1 8.a6 Rb1+ 9.Ka4 Kc4?? 10.h8Q and a1 is protected; Rh6 8.a6 Rxh7 9.Kb6 Kd4 10.a7.

published January 4th, 2001, 10.7 points.

Vecherny Leningrad 1971-72

This informal tourney was judged by the columnist Yu.Fokin

No 13267 Viktor Kichigin prize Vecherny Leningrad 1971-72

f2h5 0044.34 6/7 Win

No 13267 Viktor Kichigin (Perm) 1.Kg3 Se4+ (g4,Bg6++) 2.Bxe4 g4 3.f4 Bh4+ 4.Kg2/ Bf6 5.Bg6+ Kh4 6.Bf7 a1Q (Bxh8;Bxa2) 7.Sg6+ Kh5 8.Se7+ Kh4 9.St5 mate.


No 13268 Leopold Mitrofanov (Leningrad) honourable mention Vecherny Leningrad 1971-72

d7b4 0001.22 4/3 Win

No 13268 Leopold Mitrofanov (Leningrad) 1.Sd3+ Kxb5 2.cxb7 f1Q 3.b8Q+, with:

- Kc4 4.Qb4+ Kd5 5.Sf4+ Ke5 6.Sg6+ Kd5 7.Se7+ Ke5 8.Sc6+ Kd5 (Kf5;Qf8) 9.Qd4 mate, or

No 13269 L.Mitrofanov commendation Vecherny Leningrad 1971-72

c8h8 0000.33 4/4 Win
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No 13269  L. Mitrofanov
1.Kf8 2.f6 exf6 3.g6 f2 4.h5 f1Q 5.h6, and wP is stronger than the bQ, for if
gxh6 6.g7+ and mates! Had
White played 1.Kf7? then
Black would save himself
by checking: 5...Qe4+.
David Blundell draws
attention to
EG720.10182/10183.

No 13270  Viktor Razumenko
commendation Vecherny
Leningrad 1971-72

No 13270  Viktor Razumenko
Vecherny  Leningrad 1973-74
This informal tourney was
judged by the columnist
Yu. Fokin

No 13271  V. Razumenko
prize Vecherny Leningrad
1973-74

No 13272  Nikolai Kralin
honourable mention
Vecherny Leningrad 1973-74

No 13273  L. Mitrofanov
honourable mention
Vecherny Leningrad 1973-74
No 13273 Leopold Mitrofanov (Leningrad) 1.Kg5+ g3 2.f6 g2 3.f7 g1Q+ 4.Kh6/ii Qc5 5.Kg7 Qg5+ 6.Kh7 Qf6 7.Kg8 Qg6+ 8.Kh8, and if the pawn is captured the consequence is stalemate.
"A sympathetic malyutka with an effective introduction."

No 13274 A.Gerkhen-Gubanov commendation Vecherny Leningrad 1973-74

d1e3 3025.14 6/7 Win
No 13274 A.Gerkhen-Gubanov (Leningrad) 1.Sg4+ Kd3 2.Se5+ Ke3 3.Kc1, with:
- Qb1+ 4.Bd1 Qxd1+ 5.Kxd1 Sh4 6.Bd2+ Kf2

"One of the author's first productions."

No 13275 L.Mitrofanov commendation Vecherny Leningrad 1973-74

g8h5 0000.22 3/3 Win
No 13275 L.Mitrofanov (Leningrad) 1.g4+ Kh6 2.d7 a2 3.d8Q a1Q 4.Qh4+ Kg6 5.Qh5+ Kf6 6.Qh8+, winning the black queen.
"A pleasing pawn study winding up unexpectedly."

Vecherny Leningrad 1975-76
This informal tourney was judged by the columnist Yu.Fokin

No 13276 M.Gorbman 1st prize Vecherny Leningrad 1975-76

b1a7 0103.33 5/5 Win
"A little treasure - and the intro is subtle!"

No 13277 O.Mazur and Viktor Razumenko 2nd prize Vecherny Leningrad 1975-76

c7d4 0032.11 4/3 Win
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No 13277 O. Mazur (Krasnoyarsk) and Viktor Razumenko (Leningrad)
1.f7 g2 2.Sg3 Bxc4 (g1Q; Se2+) 3.Qf6+ g1Q 4.Qf6+ Kd2 6.Sg2 and 7.Qxg1, winning.
i) 4.Qg7+? Ke3, and the check from a7 is not possible, while if 5.Sf5+ Kf2 draws.

"The white queen in ambush behind his knight is appealing, leading as it does to the win of the opposing queen."

No 13278 Sergei Zakharov
3rd prize Vechemy Leningrad 1975-76
b6f4 0015.12 5/4 Draw

i) Kg5 2.Bc1+ Kf6 3.S2xd4 a1Q 4.Bf4 draw. Or Ke3(Kf3/Kf5) 2.Sxd4

No 13279 Leonard Katsnelson (Leningrad)
i) exf1S 2.Bd5+ Kf6 3.Rf3+ wins.
"It looks as if White can win the black queen either way by discovered check with a bishop move, but in reality only one of them will work."

No 13280 L. Mitrofanov
honourable mention Vechemy Leningrad 1975-76
h7a6 0003.21 3/3 Win

No 13280 Leopold Mitrofanov (Leningrad)
"The confrontation between the white king and Black's king and knight yields a full point for the first player."

No 13281 Aleksandr Bor
commendation Vechemy Leningrad 1975-76
e5h7 0401.03 3/5 Win

"The confrontation between the white king and Black's king and knight yields a full point for the first player."

No 13281 Aleksandr Bor
commendation Vechemy Leningrad 1975-76
e5h7 0401.03 3/5 Win

No 13281 Aleksandr Bor
No 13281 Aleksandr Bor
(Leningrad)
1.Rg7+ Kh8 2.Ra7+ Rd5+
3.Kf6 Rxh5 4.Kg6 Rg5+
5.Kxh6 Kg8 6.Rh7 mate.
i) 2.Rb7? Rd5+ 3.Kf6
Rhx5 4.Kg6 Rb5, and
Black saves himself, or
4.Kg6 Rg5+ 5.Kxh6 g3
6.Kxg5 g2 7.Kh6 g1Q
draws.
"The study's point lies in
the precise choice on
White's move 2."

No 13282 Revaz Tavariani
commendation Vecherny
Leningrad 1975-76

No 13283 Nikolai Kralin and
An. Kuznetsov
1st prize Vecherny Leningrad
1977-78

No 13284 Aleksandr Bor
2nd prize Vecherny
Leningrad 1977-78

No 13285 Leonard
Katsnelson (Leningrad)
1.f6 Bb3 2.Sb5 c2 3.Sd4
c1S 4.Sxb3 Sxb3 5.f7 Sc5
6.f8S draws.
"A miniature showing [echoed] underpromotion [to knight]."

No 13286 Sergei Zakharov
honourable mention
Vechemy Leningrad 1977-78

No 13287 Vitaly Kovalenko
honourable mention
Vechemy Leningrad 1977-78

No 13288 Aleksei Sochnev
commendation Vechemy
Leningrad 1977-78

No 13289 I.Shulman
commendation Vechemy
Leningrad 1977-78

d8b8 0100.57 7/8 Win

No 13287 Vitaly Kovalenko (Maritime Province) 1.Ra1 e4 2.Ra8+ Kxa8 3.dxc6 d1Q+ 4.Kc8 Qxc6+ 5.Kc7 wins.
"The point is White's sacrifice of a rook to create a mating position."

h7f5 0011.03 3/4 Draw

Reviews

Ukrainian ‘Shorichnik 2000’; Ukrainian ‘Letopis 2001’. Published in Mikolaiv in 2001 and 2002 respectively, these two year books have 476 and 424 pages (and edition sizes 150 and 100). Overall editor is Stanislav Kirilichenko, of the ‘Problemist pribuzhya’ club. There is no ISBN. They are crammed with composition information (awards, articles, biographical data, photos) in a mixture of Ukrainian and Russian. Finding one’s way is confusing until one notices: first, a clue -- ‘chapter headings’ are indicated in the bottom corner of the page; second, a distraction -- tourney announcements are interspersed ad hoc to take up incidental space.


Encyclopedia Etyudov-Malyutok, part IV. Dnepropetrovsk 2001. 188 pages. In Russian except for Western composers’ names. This fourth volume, probably Nikolai Griva’s last in his comprehensive anthology of the study malyutka sub-genre, takes the serial diagram numbering forward from 3534 to 4820. Diagrams, figurine notation, sources and index (separate for non-Cyrillic) are of admirable quality. [Index entry Roycroft 3981 should be 3971.]

Štúdia - Kráľovná koncoviek, by Michal Hlinka. Bratislava 2002. 112 pages, in Slovak. No ISBN. The bulk of this attractive volume consists of 111 richly commented studies by the leading, indeed, world class, Slovak study composer. There appears to be a loose narrative link, which one would dearly like to be able to follow, but the language defeats us.

‘The study and endgame theory’, by David Gurgenidze. Tbilisi 2002. 96 pages. In Russian. 169 diagrams. No ISBN. The intimate relationship between corners of endgame theory and studies is discussed with numerous examples, many of them by the author.


‘Study Mosaic’ series by David Gurgenidze and Iuri Akobia. Nos 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Tbilisi 2000 to 2002. Figurines. No.14 -- the only one with any problems, all the others being restricted to studies -- doesn’t have an ISBN, the others do. All are in Russian. Generally 22 pages each. Some content (consisting of awards, articles, excerpts and illustrations) is original, some not. [The source ‘Amelung-Erler 1987’in No.11 should presumably be 1897.]

45th World Congress of Chess Composition. Five quick composing awards and one internet award (none for studies) are included in the looseleaf clipped binder distributed at the Portoroz concluding banquet.


‘Kompozitsia - maya privilegia’ by Vladimir Chernous. ‘Problemist pribuzhya’
Odessa/Nikolaev 2000. 96 small pages. In Russian. No studies, but interesting biographical detail.

'Albom Moldovy' 1899-1999. 'Problemist priznya' Kishinyov/Nikolaev 2000. 96 small pages. In Russian. 45 of the 360 compositions are studies. [The solution to 048 is a nonsense.]


'My Miniatures', by A Selivanov. Moscow 2002. 112 pages. Hard cover. In Russian. ISBN 5-94693-013-3. Edition size: 2050. Diagrams 24-65 (out of 108) are studies. One diagram per page. The enviably energetic, talented and ambitious chess politician has brought together the favourites among his not-more-than-seven-men compositions, from which one can easily see his fascination with a pawn struggle against bishop and knight. If this fascination is not already also the reader's it soon will be! But there is much else besides.

SNIPPETS
1. No entries were received - not even from Tim Krabbe - for the 'game concoction' challenge arising out of the Porterfield Rynd Affair. See EG143 p527.
2. The Azerbaijan site ZERKALO (see EG145 p633) in fact only occasionally contains chess matter.
3. Boris Stilman, programmer who in the 1970s and 1980s assisted Botvinnik on the incomplete PIONEER project, is now well ensconced in the University of Colorado at Denver (USA), where his developing 'Linguistic Geometry', which might be nicknamed 'son of Pioneer', flourishes with DARPA and other funding. Try a search (on the internet): cudenver stilman
5. Continuing the Chapais Canada Conjecture (see EG145 p591). In 1930 Thomas Chapais, while representing Canada at the League of Nations, took time off to visit the township of Brécey in Normandy (near St Malo). Brécey was the reputed ancestral seat of (a branch of) the emigrated Chapais clan, to which 'our' Chapais may or may not have belonged. Watch this space research.
6. *C* http://chess.jaet.org/cgi-bin/mzugs is a wonderful site put together by Guy Haworth from a number of expert sources, all listed. It allows 3-man, 4-man, 5-man and 6-man reci-zugs to be displayed, and many of them to be played out with optimal moves. It includes positions (but not in every possible class) with more than one pawn and, for example, all distinct 8997 reci-zugs for GBR class 0107. Full-point zugzwangs are identified, there is much additional data besides, and where there are still gaps in our knowledge these are marked. The list for GBR class 1601, which has 905 positions, was not included on the floppy disk distributed with EG138 but we hope print them in EG later.
*C*  GBR class 0107 - rook and knight against two knights

The 6-man pawnless ending GBR class 0107 is obdurately obscure. The publication (in EG121 in 1996) of a forced DTC win in 243 moves ensured its notoriety, even to the extent of prompting a rumour that this endgame is a general win. This mistaken opinion has even taken root in Moscow, as the Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia award for 2001 by Oleg Pervakov and the long and outspoken article by Andrei Visokosov categorising tries (thematic and non-thematic) in the same issue (Shakhmatnaya kompozitsia no.46, iv2002) show. To scotch the rumour and to set the record straight we have prepared and now publish a lengthy 0107 solution with every unique winning move asterisked. This means, very simply stated, that whenever a white move carries an asterisk [ie *, appended to a solution text line ending in a full stop – see below], every alternative move fails to win. While we may not understand what is going on - no one does - if we believe the database generated by Ken Thompson and donated by him to the web-enabled chess world, we have to conclude that, unlike 0116 the ending 0107 is not a general win.

The layout of the following 207 moves of optimal play is experimental. With odb ('oracle' database) data solution depth is more informative than conventional move numbering, which we have therefore abandoned; and by retaining the computer search argument source format we give the reader the option to set up a position at any point.

1. The position after every ply is set out consistently and in full.
2. A move is identified by highlighting in bold (and underlining) both departure and arrival (men and) squares of the position (see 1 above), so that the relevant data will align one above the other on two consecutive lines of the 'solution'. In other words, this ‘mini-block’ four alphanumeric characters underlined in bold stand directly above four similar characters of which the first two (identifying the chessman) repeat and the second two identify the departure and arrival squares respectively. We have added + for check, absent in the computer source. There will be instances of black knight moves where the bS is separated from the relevant square (always in bold) by the square of the knight that is not moved.
3. Helpful hint. Except for the very first and very last position, every line of text highlights both a white piece and a black. One of these is the departure, the other is an arrival. A concluding full stop alternates with no punctuation and signifies a white arrival and a black departure on that line, the ‘no punctuation’ signifying the converse.
4. 16 diagrams, always with associated DTC (solution depth to conversion, not to checkmate) is supplied. The appendage ‘+2’ to a move designated DTC means that this moves adds 2 to the DTC depth, and is generally the ‘only’ such (presumably minimal ‘waste-of-time’) move in the position. An asterisk signifies uniqueness, either to win or to draw, according to the context. A few alternative lines, always brief, are
given in more standard **EG** algebraic notation. Every move was extracted from the website set up by Ken Thompson, starting from the White to move (WTM) position: 
http://plan9.bell-labs.com/magic/eg/wke5wra3wbd2bse3e2

"C" 0107 with selected annotations

wke5 wra3 wbd4 bkf2 bse3 e2

WTM - DTC 207

Ke5e4? Se2g3*;  
Ke4d3 Se3g4/Se3g2/Sg3f5/Kf2f3.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  

Ke5e4? Se2g3*;  
Ke4d3 Se3g4/Se3g2/Sg3f5/Kf2f3.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  

Ke5e4? Se2g3*;  
Ke4d3 Se3g4/Se3g2/Sg3f5/Kf2f3.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  

Ke5e4? Se2g3*;  
Ke4d3 Se3g4/Se3g2/Sg3f5/Kf2f3.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  
wke5 wra3 wbd3 bkf2 bse3 e2.  

52f3+ DTC+2 (only). When a "DTC+2" move (especially when no other move retains the win - denoted by our use of 'only' between parentheses) occurs in, and apparently disrupts, an otherwise unbroken sequence of (asterisked) unique white moves, it should be interpreted as no more than an insignificant "dual". In other words, the already long sequence is even longer and, taken as a whole, is, we confidently think, a critical forcing combination **linking two phases**. Of course, no one is yet able to describe either the combinations or the phases, but this will be done, just as it was done with the 5-man GBR class 0023 and its five phases. We note that in such sequences sub-optimal black moves tend significantly to lessen the depth, ie shorten White's task by advancing one phase (or more than one), while after such a sequence sub-optimal white moves will increase it significantly, ie retard a phase. As an article of faith we believe that 'phases' will eventually unlock all these endgames. The clues are all there, and the odb is Sherlock Holmes' magnifying glass! What prevents you being Sherlock Holmes?


wkd4 wrb2 wsc7 bxf7 bsf5+d2
wkd3 wrb2 wsc7 bxf7 bsf5 d2.
wkd3 wrb2 wsc7 bxf7 bsf5 f1
Rb2f2? Sflg3*
Kd3c4 Kf7e7/Kf7f6/Kf7g6.
wkd3 wrb6 wsc7 bxf7 bsf5 f1.*
wkd3 wrb6 wsc7 bxf7 bse7 f1.
wkd3 wrb6 wsc7 bxf7 bse7 f1.*
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bxf7 bse7 g3
Kd3d7 Sg3e2+.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 g3.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 e2+.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 e2.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
wkd3 wra6 wsc7 bke7 bse7 f4.
Confined to the main line pieces. No other moves retain the win.

Alternative DTC+2 moves: Kg7g6 and Rb5b4, showing that DTC+2 moves are not confined to the main line pieces. No other moves retain the win.

Alternative DTC+2 moves: Kg7g6 and Rb5b4, showing that DTC+2 moves are not
Hereon in we drop logging DTC+ instances. These long (near-)unique sequences seem (this is our tentative surmise) to denote a tense mid-solution phase during which some kind of bind on Black is established by White. In the phase that follows this unique moves are no longer prominent though making progress is another matter.
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Hereon in we drop logging DTC+ instances. These long (near-)unique sequences seem (this is our tentative surmise) to denote a tense mid-solution phase during which some kind of bind on Black is established by White. In the phase that follows this unique moves are no longer prominent though making progress is another matter.

Hereon in we drop logging DTC+ instances. These long (near-)unique sequences seem (this is our tentative surmise) to denote a tense mid-solution phase during which some kind of bind on Black is established by White. In the phase that follows this unique moves are no longer prominent though making progress is another matter.

Hereon in we drop logging DTC+ instances. These long (near-)unique sequences seem (this is our tentative surmise) to denote a tense mid-solution phase during which some kind of bind on Black is established by White. In the phase that follows this unique moves are no longer prominent though making progress is another matter.

Hereon in we drop logging DTC+ instances. These long (near-)unique sequences seem (this is our tentative surmise) to denote a tense mid-solution phase during which some kind of bind on Black is established by White. In the phase that follows this unique moves are no longer prominent though making progress is another matter.

Hereon in we drop logging DTC+ instances. These long (near-)unique sequences seem (this is our tentative surmise) to denote a tense mid-solution phase during which some kind of bind on Black is established by White. In the phase that follows this unique moves are no longer prominent though making progress is another matter.
Among many comparisons that may be made is with the 5-man endgame 1006 where the knight pair build assorted barriers to hinder wK’s approach. Does the queen’s fluid power find it easier to dislocate the barrier than the cumulative pressure associated with having to move two pieces instead of one?

A weak conjecture might be that such a bKbSS ‘sandwich’ is a sign of positional weakness.

This is the first of a series of visits to h8 by wR. One thinks of the Monopoly board and throwing dice.

Against moves by bK many moves win - a fact which by itself hardly helps our understanding. Think ‘two-steps’ for S-maneuvers. Se5-g6 with Sg6f4 in mind.
Miraculously the ‘barrier’ of six moves earlier is no more.

**W_4** wrh3 wsg6 bkd2 bsa5 b1

**W_5** wrh3 wsg6 bkd2 bsa5 b1

**W_6** wrh8 wsg6 bkd2 bsa5 b1.

wR to h8 again. Would White benefit from a larger, 8x8 board? Or would Black?

**W_7** wrh8 wsg6 bkc2 bsa5 b1.

**wK_3** wrh8 wsg6 bkc2 bsa5 b1.

**wK_4** wrc8+wsg6 bkc2 bsa5 b3.

Is it sensible to speak of a ‘hole’ at d3c3? In any event there is no defensive fortress. Perhaps it **never** makes sense to speak of a fortress when the aggressor possesses a knight?!!

**wK_5** wrc8 wsg6 bkb2 bsa3 b3.

**wK_6** wrc8 wse5 bkb2 bsa3 b3.

**wK_7** wrc8 wse5 bkb2 bsa3 c1.

**wK_8** wrc8 wse5 bkb2 bsa3 c1.

bK in front of the wire, facing wK, is a strong, generally drawing, defence in 1006. Is it as effective here?

**wK_9** wrh8 wse5 bkb2 bsa3 a2.

**wK_10** wrh8 wse5 bkb2 bsa3 a1.

This manoeuvre succeeds in undermining the defence, if only we could follow what is going on!

**wK_11** wrh8 wsf3 bkb2 bsa3 c1.

wR leaves another calling card on h8. Is it as effective here?
But now bK is behind the knights! How has this deterioration in Black's defence been brought about?

We shall see wS checking on b5.

On the way to h4.

This asterisk is far from mysterious!

A Zwischenschach is at least as useful in the endgame as in the middlegame.

Nimble knights!
wkd5 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsa6 d3
wkc4 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsa6 d3.

wkc4 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsa6 b2+.  

wkd4 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsa6 b2.

wkd4 wrh4 wsb5 bkd2 bsb4 b2.

wkd4 wrh4 wsb5 bkd2 bsb2 c2+

WTM - DTC 38

The black knights also think in double-jumps.

wkc4 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsa4 c2.

There are no further "asterisk" moves (white uniques), so the inference has to be that White has a strong bind. How might this bind be characterised? We wish we had a medal to confer on the author of the most illuminating answer!

wkd4 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsb2 c2.*  

bSS have no check, and the white pieces now visibly dominate.

wkd4 wrk4 wsb5 bkd2 bsa4 c2.*

The end seems nigh.

wkd3 wrh2 wsc7 bkc1 bsb4 b1.

wkb4 wrd4 wsc7 bkc1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

The only other moves to offer resistance are: Sc2e1 (DTC26) and Sh1d2+ (DTC13).

wkb4 wrd4 wsc7 bkb1 bsc2 b1.

The end seems nigh.

wkd3 wrh2 wsc7 bkc1 bsc2 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkb4 wrd4 wsc7 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

The end seems nigh.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.

wkd3 wrk2 wse3 bkb1 bsb4 b1.
When wRxbS is met by a fork, perhaps the right man to move is wK.

wkc4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bse4 d3.

When wRxbS is met by a fork, perhaps the right man to move is wK.

wkc4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bse4 b2+.

wkd4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bse4 b2.

wkd4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bse4 b2.

wcb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4+ g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsc5+ g3.

wkc4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsc5 g3.

wkc4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkc4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkc4 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

wkb3 wre7 wse3 bkb1 bsa4 g3.

Not a tempo-move but switching the pressure-direction again.

wkc4 wrg7 wse3 bkb2 bsa4 e4.

wkc4 wrg4 wse3 bkb2 bsa4 e4.

Se4c3; Kc4b4 (DTC4).

wkc4 wrg4 wse3 bkb2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrg2+wse3 bkb2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrg2 wse3 bkb3 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrg2 wse3 bkb3 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrg2 wsc2 bkb2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrg2 wsc2 bkb2 bse4 c3.

wkd4 wsb4+bka2 bse4 c3.

wkd4 wsb4+bka3 bse4 c3.

wkd4 wsb4+bka3 bse4 c3.

wkd4 wrh2 wsb4 bka3 bse4 c3.

wkd4 wrh2 wsb4 bka4 bse4 c3.

Rh2c2? Se4d6+/Sc3b1;

wkc4 wrh6 wsb4 bka4 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsb4 bka3 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsb3 bka3 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsb3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsb3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka3 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkc4 wrh6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 c3.

wkb4 wra6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 a3+.

WTC - DTC1

Kd4d5 (DTC1191): Se4c3+;

Kd5c5*,Ka2b3;Ra6b6+*,Kb5c2;

Sd3b4+*,Kc2c1;Rh6h6*,Sa3c2;

Kc5c4*,Sc3e2;Sb4d5*,Kc1d2;

Rh6h3*,Sc2c1;Rh3f3/Rh3b2 (DTC111).

wkb4 wra6 wsd3 bka2 bse4 a3.

Finis. [AJR, August 2002]
TWINS
by Ilham Aliyev

Maybe it was in 1995 while working on a particular schema that I came up with the A1 pair of twins. The notion of twins tickled my fancy. Riffling through the 50-odd titles on my bookshelves I found little on twins. The entries in encyclopedias and dictionaries were skimpy. (A Moscow 1996 book by Ivunin - Bliznetsy (Twins) - may have something, but I haven’t seen it.) From that time on I started to examine studies really closely, especially studies where the same idea was expressed by different pieces. What follows is the result.

I: 1.Be3+ Qxe3 (Kxg6;Bd3) 2.g7 Qe5 3.e8S Qxe8+ 4.g8Q? Qe5+;) Kg6 5.Bd3+ Kf7 6.Bg6+ Kxg6 stalemate.
II: 1.Se6 Qxe6 (Qa8+;Bd8) 2.g7 Qe5/i 3.Be3+ Qxe3/ii 4.g8Q+/iii Kg6 5.e8Q+ Qxe8 stalemate.
i) Kg6 4.e8Q+ Qxe8+ 5.g8Q+.
iii) 4.e8Q? Qxe8+ 5.g8Q+ Qxg8+ 6.Kxg8 Kg6 7.Kf8 Kf5, and Black wins..

It was later that I learned from the tourney award that the first part leads to Bron (1970, EG29.1593). So - a partial anticipation.

Next, a classic K&H (A2a), which reinvigorated their productivity.

A2a: J.Kling, B.Horwitz 1851

The same combination is familiar with a bishop, as A2b shows.

A2b: J.Schwers Rigoer Tageblatt, 1900
1.Ra5+ Ke4 2.Rf5 wins, or I...b5 2.Rxb5+ Qxb5 3.c4+ wins.

I set myself the task of combining A2a and A2b, which was achieved by working a P-ending.

A2:
I: 1.Rf4+ Kb5 2.Rf5 d5 (Qxf5;e4+) 3.Rxd5 Qxd5 4.c4+ Qxc4 (Kxc4;Bc2+) 5.Bd3
II: 1.Rf4+ Kb5 2.Rf5 d5 (Qxf5;Sd6+) 3.Rxd5 Qxd5 4.c4+ Qxc4 (Kxc4;Sb6+) 5.Sd6+
Ke5 6.Sxc4 Kxc4, and so on as in I.

676
A3a is over 500 years old.

A3a:
1.Rh5 Rxh5 2.Ra6+ Ke5 3.Ra5+ and 4.Rxh5.

By wQ replacing wR J.Kling arrived at A3b.

A3b: J.Kling Chess Weekly, 1849
1.Ra4 Qc8 (Qxa4,Rh3+) 2.Rh3+ Qxh3 3.Ra3+ wins.

With due application it is possible to combine A3a and A3b.

A3: I.Aliev first publication
1: as A3a.
II: 1.Rh5 Qe2 (Qxh5;Ra6+) 2.Ra6+ Qxa6 3.Rh6+ and 4.Rxa6 wins.

Bianchetti’s A4a is a classic.

A4a: R.Bianchetti, 1925
1.Bb2, with:
- Rf8/1 2.Rc7+ Kg8 3.Rg7+ Kh8 4.Ka2 Ra8+ 5.Ra7+, or, symmetrically
- Rh6 2.Rg3+ Kh7 3.Rg7+ Kh8 4.Kb1 Rh1+ 5.Rg1+ wins.
i) Rf7 2.Rh3+ Kg8 3.Rh8 mate, or, symmetrically, Rg6 2.Rc8+ Kh7 3.Rh8 mate.

By shifting wK L.Topko created a new study (A4b).

A4b: L.Topko special prize, Bulletin Problemistic 1973

Almost trivially, it is possible to combine A4a and A4b in twin form (A4), for whose originality I of course stake no claim!

A4 (I.Aliev - first publication)
after Bianchetti, Topko

Then I stumbled on A5a.

A5a: F.Simkhovich Pravda, 1927

It didn’t take long to call up A5b.

A5b: A.Herbstman Magyar Sakkvilág, 1936
1.Bf5+ Kxe3 2.Kc1 a1Q+ 3.Bb1 Kf4 4.g6 Kg5 5.g7 Kh6 6.g8S+ wins.

A5 linking these two studies not only enriches them but improves the intro to A5b.

A5: I.Aliev (after Simkhovich and Herbstman) first publication
II: 1.Kd1 Ra2 2.Sxa2 bxa2 3.Kc1 Kf4 4.Bb1 a1Q 5.g6 Kg5 6.g7 Kh6 7.g8S+ wins.
Next there are the studies where the simple adding of a man creates the twin.
*A6a* F.S. Bondarenko *Put' k kommunizmu, 1977*

By the addition of bPe7 we have a change in the solution - and a twin.
*A6: I. Aliev first publication (after Bondarenko)*
i) 4. Be8? e5 5. h5 Ke7 6. h6 Kf8 draw.

*A7a: E. Pogosyants Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1983*

If we add bPa4 there is a second stalemate.
*A7: I. Aliev first publication (after Pogosyants) as A7a, with 5...a3 stalemate also.*

*A8a: J. Ulrichsen 1st commendation, Springaren 1996*

A similar study, A8, shifts all men one file to the right.
*A8: I. Aliev first publication (after Ulrichsen)*
A win? No, after 1. b7 Se5, and so on it leads to the final, but shifted, position of A8a - A7 with colours reversed.

In exactly the same way one can treat a much earlier anticipation of A8a.

*A9a: C.J. de Feijter Deventer Dagblad, 1960*
1. g7+ Kxg7 2. e7 Sc4 3. Kd7 Sd6, and now as A8a.

*A9: I. Aliev first publication (after de Feijter) - is this a win?!*

*A10a: V. Kalandadze, R. Tavariani 1st prize, Prokesh MT 1968*
1. h8Q+ Qxh8 2. Kf5+ Kh7 3. Rh6+ Kxh6 4. g5+ Kh7 5. g6+ Kg8 6. Be5 Qh6 7. Be3 Qh8 8. Ke6 Kf8 9. Kd7 Qg8 (Kg8; Ke7) 10. Bc5 mate.

With tweaking a twin emerges.

*A10: I. Aliev first publication (after Kalandadze, Tavariani)*
I: 1. Kf5+ Kh7 2. Rh6+ Kxh6 3. g5+ Kh7 4. g6+ Kg8 5. Be5 Qh6 6. Be3 Qxe3 stalemate.

Before we come to the concluding offering, A11a, A11b and A11 provide another 'observation'.
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\textbf{A11}: I. Aliev after Mouterde, Kuryatnikov (first publication)
I: 1. 0-0-0+ Kg2 2. Rd2+ as Mouterde.
II: As Kuryatnikov. bQ must not be on g6 because of 1. Kf2+ Kh2 2. Rh1+.

The final offering is a malyutka - \textbf{A12}.

\textbf{A12}: I. Aliev first publication
i) Réti.
ii) Declining to capture a piece.

The tale of the twins has a sequel. On 17ii1999 there was a double addition to the Aliev clan: Orhan is a baby boy and Tyurkan is a baby girl.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\textbf{A1} \& Aliev & \textbf{A2a} \& J. Kling, B. Horwitz & \textbf{A2b} \& J. Sehwers \\
2nd honourable mention, & 1851 & \textit{Rigaer Tageblatt, 1900} \\
\textit{StrateGems} 1998-99 & & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
  &  & \\
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture} & \begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture} & \begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

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

e2d4 3101.21 5/3 Win

d2d5 3110.43 7/5 Win

679
A5a F. Simkhovich
Pravda, 1927

I: diagram
II: add wPg5 7/4 Win

A6a F.S. Bondarenko
Put' k kommunizmu, 1977

A7a E. Pogosyants
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1983

A5b A. Herbstman
Magyar Sakkvilág, 1936

d1d7 0311.34 6/6 Draw

A5 I. Aliev (after Simkhovich and Herbstman)
first publication

d1d3 0010.52 7/3 Win

A6 I. Aliev
first publication (after Bondarenko)

d5a8 3010.10 3/2 Win

A7 I. Aliev
first publication (after Pogosyants)

d3a8 3010.11 c6h7.h2e7 3/3 Win

e1e3 0311.43 7/5 Draw
A8a J. Ulrichsen
1st commendation, Springaren 1996

A9a C.J. de Feijter
Deventer Dagblad, 1960

A10a
V. Kalandadze, R. Tavariani
1st prize, Prokeš MT 1968

A8 I. Aliev
first publication (after Ulrichsen)

e8g8 0036.30 4/4 Win

A9 I. Aliev
first publication (after C.J. de Feijter)

c8f8 0033.30 4/3 Win

e6h6 3110.43 7/5 Win

A10 I. Aliev
first publication (after Kalandadze, Tavariani)

d8g8 0033.30 4/3 Draw

e6h6 3110.24 5/6 Draw

I: diagram  
II: add wPd2 6/6 Win

f8h8 0036.30 4/4 Draw
Alia A. Mouterde
4th prize, La Stratégie 1916

A11a A. Mouterde
after Mouterde, Kuryatnikov
(first publication)

e1h3 3200.00 3/2 Win

A11b A. Kuryatnikov
3rd prize, Shakhmaty v SSSR 1979

elh1 3200.00 3/2 Win
I: diagram
II: remove bQf5, add bQh7

A12 I. Aliev
first publication

elh1 3200.00 3/2 Win

h6h1 0030.11 2/3 Draw
I: diagram
II: remove wPg6; add wPf6
The Aliev Twins