GBR class 0011: a 33-move endgame
by S.T. Dekker and H.J. van den Herik, Delft University of Technology

A research project in computer chess began in 1978-9 at Delft as a part of Artificial Intelligence (AI) research. A principal aim was to formalise chess endgame knowledge. To achieve this the idea was to formulate rules in terms of patterns in such a manner that a chess program could mimic grandmaster play (in certain specific endgames) by means of a combination of (a) applying 'knowledge', and (b) searching a game 'tree'.

One of the chosen sub-domains was GBR class 0011 - wB plus wS against bK alone. All the 'books' correctly state that mate can be forced from any position - with only a few bizarre exceptions - but there is no consensus as to the number of moves necessary and sufficient for this purpose from any arbitrary position with W to move and assuming optimal defence. Indeed, estimates diverge:

Pachman - 32; Rabinovich - 33; Euwe (initially, 'between 31 and 37') and Donner - 34; Fine - 34; Golombek - 'about 34'; Averbakh - 'about 35'. Bijl, Chéron, Keres and Withuis give no estimate.

Prompted by the prevailing uncertainty the authors decided to build a data base for the GBR class 0011 in May/June 1982. The program is written in Pascal and runs on the Delft University of Technology Computing Centre's Amdahl machine, Technical assistance was kindly given by C.A. Nolet. This led to a running time of 28 min. 58 seconds for constructing the complete data base. On 9th June our principal result appeared: it is a 33-move game.

Some of the most important results are set out below.

1. 33 moves are necessary and sufficient to mate bK alone.
2. No chess authority (not even Rabinovich) had published "error-free" analysis in the 'optimal' sense.
3. Not a single 'mate in 33' position had been published before, let alone a 'mate in 33' solution.
4. BI's best defence often involves his taking refuge in a corner whose extreme square is not controllable by wB. (Well known, of course).
5. But playing into such a corner is not always necessary for optimal (maximum solution length) play.
6. The Délétang method (given pride of place by Chéron) of forcing bK from a larger 'B triangle' to a middle 'B triangle' is not necessarily optimal.
7. There are 1104 distinct 'mate in 33' positions.
8. The list of 'mate in n' positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Example of optimal play from 'mate in 33' position **DH1**. All optimal alternatives are indicated.

**Correctness**
Our claim simply runs as follows: the GBR class **0011** is a 33-move game. We made this claim for the first time in an article (1982) in the Dutch bi-monthly **COMPUTERSCHAAK**, a publication of CSVN (Computer Schaak Vereniging Nederland); we have no proof of the correctness of our program. Our claim may be falsifiable.

Ken Thompson formerly held the opinion that this is a 32-move game, but our data corrected this. He had obtained his result many years before but had not published it. We should like to point out that it is somewhat fortunate that Ken Thompson did not publish, as we should not in that event have tried to find our own solution. Starting from **DH1** Thompson's solution diverged at move 3: 3. Bg2/i Ke8/ii 4. Sg4/iii Ke7(iv) 5. Ka6(iv) Ke7(v) 6. Be4(v) Kb3(vi) 7. Kc5(vii) Kf6(viii) 8. Kg8/ix 9. Kg7(x) Kg8(xi) 10. Bh7 Kh8.

This Bl move is not optimal. The position changes from a mate in 21 to a mate in 20. The only optimal move is 12. ..., Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner. 13. Kg8, forcing W to play a tempo move at move 15 before expelling bK from the 'safe' corner.

---


---

vi) Sh4, g5 +. Bd3, c2, b1, f5.

---

vii) Sb2, f4, c5. Bc4, b3.

---

viii) Se5, d6, a5.
vi) Ke7, f7, d8, f8.

vii) Kd6, e6, c7, e7, d8.

viii) Kd4, d5, d6.

ix) Kh6, f8, g8, h8.

x) Be2, c4, a6.

xi) Sb6, c5, f6.

xii) Bd3, e2, f1.

If the optimal move 12. ..., Kg8 is played the winning procedure is unaffected (see points 4 and 5 above).

Two corrected analyses

The data base enables us to improve on the published analyses in the end-game theory book. DH2 is from Reuben Fine’s ‘Basic Chess Endings’ (pp. 4-5).


Even when playing from the 'safe' corner one has to be cautious, as can be seen from DH3 taken from Golumbek’s 'Encyclopedia of Chess' (p. 94).


AI implications

Also at our disposal is a pattern-driven program divorced from the data base. With this program we can carry out the mating procedure in a successful, though non-optimal manner. The data base provides us with the optimal moves, but no strategy. One of our students (Jan Korst) is now constructing a pattern-driven optimally playing program, checking his program against the data base. The underlying idea is to discover (new?) chess rules from a body of knowledge which contains nothing but raw data (individual positions and specific, optimal, moves). One of the next research steps should be to formulate rules for the GBR class 0023 (see EG 74). This task may be performed in conjunction with Ken Thompson using his data base for this specific endgame. The computer chess world, the world of chess, and the world of AI research would profit from such a project.
REVIEWS


With this volume the English reader has for the first time access to the complete* work of one of the founder composers of the modern study art. In Kubbel form and content meld in classic harmony - the ideal choice of composer, for such a book as this, a choice made even more suitable because Kubbel produced nothing obscurely esoteric, nor was he tediously prolific. The volume is for the specialist too, since Kubbel's own works, published in 1925 and 1938, are rare and, by reason of their dates, incomplete, while the results of soviet research have been appearing sporadically right up to 1983 since the recent discovery of most of Kubbel's notebooks. With the exception of the notebooks themselves Timothy Whitworth has sifted every available source in a careful and unhurried manner. Finally as regards content, the introduction by Herbstman lends a rare human dimension by mixing personal reminiscence with critical examination. The introduction was written specially for Whitworth's book.

* The punctilious Whitworth makes no claim to completeness, but all of value is included.

Whatever their ramifications, Kubbel's, and all other, analyses have themselves been double-checked for accuracy. Two unsound studies are deliberately omitted*.

Whichever way one tests it, against whatever criteria, this book is, like a Kubbel First Prize Winner, a flawless masterpiece.

Why then did the author-editor have to publish it himself, shouldering the financial risk personally? Because no British publisher, and, worse still, no chess adviser to a publisher, could discern this book for what it is. Hold it in your hand and you have physical evidence of the worst and the best of the 'western' system: worst - the blindness of chess publishers; best - the freedom of individuals. When the imminent soviet book on Kubbel appears it will provide evidence of the corresponding 'worst' and 'best' of the 'eastern' system: worst - poor quality paper and diagrams, behind-the-scenes censorship and insidious state paternalism; best - high quality chess content, and an edition of maybe 50,000 copies. For all these reasons Timothy Whitworth's volume will instantly become a treasured rarity in the USSR. In Britain it merits a better fate.

STUDIUM SZACHOWE W POLSCE 1890-1980, by Gregor Grzeban and Jan Rusinek, published by 'Sport i Turystyka', Warsaw, 1983 in an edition of 20,000 copies. With an errata slip. 152 pages, 186 diagrams. Non-readers of Polish will nevertheless guess that the title refers to the chess study in Poland. It appears to be the very first such book, so it is an event to celebrate, especially since the contents include Przepiorka (7), Szaja Kozlowski (22), Grzeban (30, the more recent studies being collaborations), Wlodzimierz Proskurowski (10), and, naturally, Rusinek (27). These separate chapters are pre-
ceded by an introductory chapter about studies, their history and principal names, a chapter on pre-First-World-War studies (Zabinski, Wagner, Hauke and Kleindienst are the only names - Zytogorski is not there, was he not Polish?), and followed by a chapter on other Polish study composers of recent years (Z. Boleslawski, T. Czarnecki, J. Dankiewicz, M. Halski, T. Horak, E. Iwanow, L. Korsi, M. Kroso, I. Lesnik, A. Lewandowski, S. Limbach, Helmut Odasnik, E. Pallasz, T. Regendzinski, J. Rusek, P. Ruszczynski, I. Sojka, K. Strzala, A. Trzesowski, E. Wolanski, S. Wojciech, M. Wrobel and a pseudonym 'W. Jaskolka' for M. Wrobel and David Przepiorka), with a terminal chapter on tourneys conducted in Poland from 1955 onwards. The diagrams are clear, the annotations extensive and the paper passable, with only the cover being disappointing.


ENDBLÖNN-THORIE UND PRAXIS, by the late Max Euwe, de Gruyter, 1983 (title page has '1984'), 222 pages, 214 diagrams.

The English work waves the banner vigorously for all sides of chess and includes 14 well-selected, though less well researched, studies. The German work I found a disappointing mixture of the excruciatingly old (ie, a scissors-and-paste job) with occasional flashes of the new (mention of computers here and there, and updating of the FIDE 50-move Law): the verdict has to be 'thumbs-down'. It is also expensive. Both books are very attractive to the eye.

"Finales de Torre", by Rey Ardid, Madrid (Fundamentos/Aguilera), 1984. This is the fifth and final volume of Dr. R. Rey Ardid's life's work on the endgame. It is devoted to R-endings, with at least one P, but included in this definition are positions with the exchange ahead (or behind!), positions where two minor pieces oppose the R, and double-R endings. It is intended as a practical volume, with studies as examples. There are 446 pages, and no fewer than 935 diagrams. One might suppose that that with this quantity of examples, often complex examples, there would be no room for explanatory material, but this is not so. Almost every position is accompanied by comment and/or annotations. With the abbreviated algebraic notation employed throughout, and with bold type distinguishing the main line, the effect is one of easy and spacious presentation, enhanced by practically every page sporting at least one attractive diagram. Let us hope that this opus in the Spanish language receives the wide acclaim it deserves, outside as well as inside the borders of Spain.

AJR

(Rey Ardid's volume on minor pieces, reviewed on p.318 of EG77, has 1159 diagrams).

Tourney

V.A. Bron Jubilee formal (closed) international, in honour of the FIDE Composition GM's 75th birthday. Closing date: 14.ix.84. Maximum 2 entries per composer. Each entry in 2 copies (with name/address on 1 only) to: Yuri Konstantinovich LYAL-YUSHKIN, Sverdlovsk L-63, A-Ya 17, 620063 USSR. 3 prizes, 5 other awards. (A tourney of the Sverdlovsk Regional Committee for chess composition, in conjunction with "'Na Smyenu!' regional newspaper).
DIAGRAMS AND SOLUTIONS

No. 5310: G.M. Kasparyan (USSR).
Judge: Pauli Perkonoja (Finland).
1. Qb2+ (Kg6? Qg1; 1. ..., Kg8 (Kh7; Qb1+)) 2. Qb8+ Kg7/i 3. Qe5 + Bf6/ii 4. Sxf6 d1Q + 5. Sg4 + Kg8 6. Qg5 + Kf8 (7). Qf6 + (also Qg6 + first) Qxf6 stalemate.

i) 2. ..., Bd8 ^ Qxd8 + Kg7 3. Qg5 + Kf7 4. Qd5+ Ke7 5. Kd5 + Kg6 6. Se5 Qh2 + 7. Kg6 Qg1 + 8. Kh7 draw.


iii) 7. ..., Ke7 8. Qe5 + Kf7 9. Qd5 + Kg7 10. Qxg5 + Kf7 11. Qf4 + Qxf4 stalemate.

No. 5311: G.M. Kasparyan (USSR).


ii) Or 2. ..., Ke6 3. Sd4(e5) +. Or 2. ..., Kb6 4. Sd4 +

iii) 5. ... Ke4 6. dSc2 Bis8 7. Sc3+


No. 5312: V. Nestorescu (vii.81)
2nd Prize, Revista Romana de Sah, 1981
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No. 5313: Y. Makhtsov (ii.81)

Draw
5 + 6

No. 5315: M. N. Klinkov (ii.81)

Win
5 + 4

No. 5314: A. P. Maksimovskikh (ix.81)

Draw
5 + 6

No. 5316: I. Garayazly (iv.81)
Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1981

Win
5 + 9

No. 5317: A. and C. Socaciu (v.81)
Commended, Revista Romana de Sah, 1981

Win
4 + 3

No. 5314: A. Maksimovskikh. 1. 0-0+/i Ke2 2. Rf2 + Kxd1 3. Rxa2 de
4. Rxa3 e2 5. Rf3 (Re3? Bd4; or Rd3 + ? Kc2;) 5. ..., Bxh2 + 6. Kg2
i) 1. Rf1 + ? Ke4 2. Kd2 a1Q 3. Sf2 +
Kf3 4. Rxa1 de + and 5...Bxa1, or, in
this, 2. Ke2 d3 + 3. Kd2 a1Q 4. Sf2 +
Kf3 5. Rxa1 Bxa1 6. Sxd3 Bf6 7. Sc1
Bxe3 +, or again, 2. Sf2 + Kxe3 3.
Rxa1 d3 + 7. Sxd3 Bxa1 8. Sb4 + Kb3
9. Sd3 Bh2, is given but 4. Rf3 +
here is strong, with 5. Rxa3, as Peter
Poland observes.

No. 5315: M. N. Klinkov. 1. b4 Be5
2. Ka5/i Bsc7 3. b5 + Kb6 4. Sc3 and
mate follows – one of 3.

No. 5316: I. Garayazly. 1. f7 Rd8 2.
f8Q (Rg8? Rh8;) 2. ..., Rx8 3. Rd6
(for Rd2) 3. ..., f4 (Kc2; Rh3) 4. Rd2

Kd7/i Kg5 (else e7) 5. e5 wins.
No. 5318: G. Amiryan. 1. g3 + Ke4 2. Rxc6 Kxf5 3. g4 +/i Ke6 4. Rxc7 Kxh6 5. g5 + Ke6 6. Rc8 Kxf7 7. g6 + and the solution stops as "draw", though W clearly has winning chances after 7. Ke7 (Kxg6? Re8;) 8. gh elQ 9. Ke8 + (h8Q? Qb4 mate) 9. ..., Kxe8 10. h8Q +.


No. 5320 : Gh. Telbis. 1.Sf4+ Kc5 2.Sxg6 Kxb6 3.ba/i hg 4.e4/ii g5 5.e5 (Kb8? Kxa6;) 5...g4 6.Kb8 Kxa6 7.e6 g3 8.e7 g2 9.e8Q g1Q 10.Qa4 + Kb6 11. Qa7 +, a manoeuvre given by Cozio in 1766 (see C13 on p.4 of EG33). i) 3.e4? ab 4.Sf4 b4 5.e5 b3 6.e6 b2 7.Sd5 + Ke6 8.Sc3 Kd6, while if in this, 5.Kd7 Kc5 6.e5 b3 7.e6 Kc4 draws. Another W try here is 4.Kd7 b4 5.Sb4 Kc5 6.e5, when 6...Kc4 is given as the only move to draw. ii) 4.Kb8? Kxa6 5.e4 Kb6 -- and Bl wins!

No. 5321 A. Sochniev. Prize, Biuletyn (Czestochowa), 1976-82 Award: No. 31/34, x .82-v .83 6 + 6
No. 5321: A. Sochniev (USSR). This occasional bulletin identifies itself as: "BIULETYN okręgowego związku szachowego WFS w Częstochowie". The editor: Eugeniusz Iwanow is the same as that of "Problemista", whose issue EG71 quoted on p.142 is properly dated, so I learn, xi-xii.19-82. Al's address: Kilinskiego 57m. 53, Częstochowa, Poland. He is a FIDE International Judge (though not for studies) and judged this tourney. 19 entries came from 7 composers in Yugoslavia, USSR, Sweden and Poland. Covering 1976 to 1982, this must be the most protracted tourney ever -- there cannot be many correspondence games that last this long! But, this tourney was completed...

(Canadian Chess Chat, please note).


No. 5322: A. Lewandowski.

No. 5323: N. Krailin. 1. f8Q/i e2 2. Qe8 Se7 3. Qxe7 Ka1 4. Qa7 (Qxe2? b1Q; Qd2, Qd3 +;) 4. ..., e1Q 5. Kb3 + Kb1 6. Qa2 + Kc1 7. Qxb2 + Kd1 8. Qc2 mate.

i) No notes were supplied in the source, and it took a little while to discover what is wrong with 1. fgQ? Well, it is a distant stalemate, that also lies behind the 4. Qxe2? try in the main line. 1. ..., e2 2. Qe8(e6) Ka1 and now either 3. Qxe2 b1Q 4. Qd2 Qd3 + 5. Qxd3 stalemate, or 3. Qe3(e4) e1Q (b1Q? Qc3(d4) +) 4.Qxe1 + b1S + and it is stalemate after 5.Kb3, and "just" a draw after 5.Qxb1 +. It seems a pity that the actual winning move, 4.Qa7, leads only to a standard mate (AJR)

No. 5324: V. Kichigin.

No. 5325: V. Kichigin. 1.Sc5 + Kb5 2.Sc4 f1Q 3.Rb6 + Ka5 4.Ra6 + Kb4 5. Rb6 + Ka3 6. Rb3 + Ka4 (or Ka2;) 7. Rb1, and it is a kind of domination to draw, as if Bl saves bQ there is a perpetual check by wS on c3 and b3.

No. 5325: O. Mazur (Krasnoyarsk) and G. A. Umnov (Podolsk). Judge: A. Kopnin, who appears to have judged all 4 sections of this journal's first set of tourneys. (The other sections were for problems.) The magazine began in 1980, and currently there are 6 issues per annum. "1. Sc4 Rxb3 + 2. Ka2. The reason for 2. Kc2? failing will become clear only at the end. 2. ..., Bxa7 3. d7 Rb8 4. Se5+ Kf4. B1 counters W's unsubtle plan of transferring wS to c6 with tempo and a double threat of capture of bRb8 and of promotion on d8. The counterplay involves sacrifice of bR. 5. Sc6 Sd7 6. Se7. What a surprise! W does not capture bR, but moves wS out of danger, this seeming senseless as bR can play to any square at will. 6. ..., Rb7 7. Sd8 Rb8 8. Sc6 Rb8 9. Se7 Rb8 10. Se6. Positional draw. An outstanding example of the contemporary study."


No. 5330: E. Dvizov. 1. b7 Qb1 2. h7 a1Q 3. Sb2, with the lines: 3. ... Qa2+ 4. c4 Qxb2 5. b8Q + Qxb8 6. h8Q mate, or 3. ... Qa2 + 4. c4 Qxb2 5. h8Q + Qxb8 6. b8Q mate.


No. 5333: Albert van Tets (Verwoerdburg, South Africa). Judge: Pauli
Perkonoja (Turku, Finland). The present (provisional) award is from the 25 studies entered. The studies by Forsberg and Gurgenidze are reserves.


No. 5335: Em. Dobrescu (Romania). 1. g7 + Kh7 2. g8Q + Kxg8 3. Rb8 + Kg7 4. Rb7 + Kg6 5. Rb6 + Kg5 6. Rb5 + Kh4 7. Bxg3 + Kxg3 8. Rxb1 de 9. Bf1, and now either 9. ..., d1Q 10. Rxd1 edQ stalemate, or 9. ..., e1Q 10. Rxe1 deQ stalemate. Interpolation of Sf2 +; Kg1 still leads to stalemates!
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No. 5337: F.S. Bondarevsko and A.L. Kuznetsov (ii.82)
2 Hon. Mem.,
Tidskrift for Schack 1982

+ 10

Win 8 + 10

No. 5338: Y. Akobiya and V. Neidze (vii.82)
Commended,
Tidskrift for Schack 1982

4 + 3

No. 5338: Y. Akobiya and V. Neidze (both Tbilisi). 1. Rd8 Ke2 2. Re8 +
Kc1 8. Rc8 + Kd1 9. Rd8 + (Ra8?
Rc7?) 9. ..., Ke2 10. Re8 + Kf1/i 11.
Re8 Re7 12. Rd1 + (Kg4? Ke2;)
12. ..., Re7 13. Rd2 g1Q 14. Sg4 (zug-
zwang) 14. ..., Re7 15. Rd1 + Re1 16.
Rd2 Qh1 17. Sh2 + Kg1 18. Sf3 + Kf1

No. 5339: R. Forsberg (vi-vii.82)
Tidskrift for Schack 1982

4 + 6

No. 5339: R. Forsberg (Stockholm).
Kxc1 4. Bd3 fg 5. Bxe2 g2 6. Bf1 g1Q
stalemate, or 6.g1R 7.Kf2.

No. 5340: D. Gurgenidze (ii.82)
Commended,
Tidskrift for Schack 1982

4 + 4

No. 5340: D. Gurgenidze (Georgian
Ke5 4.Kf7 Kf5 5.Kg7 Kg4 6.Kxh7
Rx7 13.Kb6 + wins.

No. 5341: G.A. Umnov (v-xii.82)
1st Prize,
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982
Award: iv-vi.
1983

No. 5341: G.A. Umnov (Podolsk,
USSR). Judge: Mario Camorani. 1.
Sc7 + /i Kb8 2. Sa6 + Ka8 3. Be6
a1Q/i 4. Bd5 + Sb7 5. Kc8 Qxa6 6. c5
g3 7. h6 gh 8. gh g2 9. h7 g1Q 10. h8Q
Qg3 11. Kd7 + Qb8 12. Qe8.

No. 5341: G.A. Umnov (Podolsk,
USSR). Judge: Mario Camorani. 1.
Sc7 + /i Kb8 2. Sa6 + Ka8 3. Be6
a1Q/i 4. Bd5 + Sb7 5. Kc8 Qxa6 6. c5
g3 7. h6 gh 8. gh g2 9. h7 g1Q 10. h8Q
Qg3 11. Kd7 + Qb8 12. Qe8.

i) 1.c5? Sxc8 2.Kxc8 a6.


ii) 1...g2 2.d5 Sf3 3.d6.

iii) 2.e5? g2 3.e6 Sg5 + 4. Kf6 Sxe6 and 5...Sf3.

No. 5343: A. Sochniev (Leningrad). 1. d4/i ed/ii 2. Rh1/iii Sg5 + 3. Kf6 gSf3 4. e5 g2 5. e6 ghQ 6. c7 Qe1 7. e&Q+ stalemate, is given, but Peter Poland busts with an underpromotion 5...ghR 6.e7 Re1 wins.

i) 1.Rh1? Sg5 + 2.Kf6 gSf3.

ii) 1...g2 2.d5 Sf3 3.d6.

iii) 2.e5? g2 3.e6 Sg5 + 4. Kf6 Sxe6 and 5...Sf3.
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No. 5346

P. Angelini (i-iii.82)
3 Hon. Men.
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

Win 4 + 3

i) 1. ..., Kc8 2. Be6 + Kb7 3. Rb2 + . ii) 1f 5. ..., Qxb3 6. Rxf4 + (Rf8 + ? Qg8) 6. ..., Kg8 7. Rh8 + .

No. 5347

Ruth Cardoso (iv-vi.82)
4 Hon. Men.
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

Win 4 + 3


No. 5348

S. Gallitto (i-iii.82)
1 Comm.
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

Draw 5 + 5

i) 1. ..., Kc8 2. Be6 + Kb7 3. Rb2 + . ii) 1f 5. ..., Qxb3 6. Rxf4 + (Rf8 + ? Qg8) 6. ..., Kg8 7. Rh8 + .

No. 5349

V. Archakov and A. Zinchuk (vii-ix.82)
2 Comm.
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

Draw 3 + 5

iii) 7. Bg6? Bf3 8. Be4 Bg4 wins.
No. 5350 V. Kirillov (v-xii.82)
3 Comm.
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

Win I: Diagram
II: wKg2

No. 5350: V. Kirillov (USSR).
1. Kd3 + Ka7
2. Qg1 + Ka8
3. Qg2 + Ka7
4. Qf2 + Ka8
5. Qf3 + Ka7
6. Qe3 + Ka8
7. Qe4 + Ka7
8. Qd4 + Ka8
9. Qd5 + Ka7
10. Qc5 + Ka8
11. Qc6 + Ka7
12. Kd2 wins,


No. 5351 E. Iriarte (iv-vi.82)
4 Comm.,
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

No. 5351: W. Iriarte (Argentina).
1. Bd7 + Ka3
2. f6 Rxa7
3. f7 Rc7 +
4. Kb1 Rb7 +
5. Ka1 Rb8
6. Be8 Rb4
7. f8R Rf4

No. 5352 O. Comay (vii.-ix.81)
5 Comm.,
Sinfonie Scacchistiche, 1981-1982

No. 5352: O. Comay (Israel).
1. e7 Qb1 +
2. Kh2 Qb8 +
3. Kg2 Qxc8
4. f4 + Kg7
5. e8S + /i Kxg6
6. f8S + Kh5
7. Sf6 + Kh4
8. Sg6 mate.

i) 5. e8Q? Qg4 +
6. Kf1 Qd1 +
7. Qe1 Qd3 +
8. Kg1 Qxg6.

No. 5353 I. Krikheli (vii.82)
Prize, Szachy, 1982
Award: vi.83

No. 5353: I. Krikheli (Georgian SSR).
Judge: A. Koranyi of Budapest.
1. Sb3 c1Q/i
2. Sxc1 d2
3. Sd3 Sxd3
4. Rbl/ii Kh3
5. Ra1 Sc1
6. Ra3 + Kg4
7. Ra4 + and 8. Rd4, draws.

i) 1...d2 2.Sxd2 c1Q

ii) W is in zugzwang after 4.Ra1?
Kh3.

No. 5354 G.M. Kasparyan (vii.82)
1 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1982

No. 5354: G.M. Kasparyan (vii.82)
1 Hon. Men., Szachy, 1982

Draw 5 + 5


i) Threatening to blockade with Bh5.


i) 1...c1S 2.Sc6 Bb6 3.Rc2 +.
(This also meets other moves of bR)

(aQ) 1. ..., Rf8 2. h8Q/xiv Rgl + 3. Kh7
(i) 1. ..., Rf8 2. h8Q/xiv Rgl + 3. Kh7
1. ..., Rf8 2. h8Q/xiv Rgl + 3. Kh7
ii) 2. ..., Kxf6 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.

2. ..., Rb8 3. f8Q + Rxf8 stalemate.
xv) 5. Rd8 + Rxd8 6. f8Q a1Q + 7. Qg7 Rxd7 8. hg Rd7.
xvi) 6. Rc8 + Rxc8 7. f8Q a1Q 8. Qg7 Rxf7 9. hg Rg7.
xvii) 6. ..., a1Q stalemate. 6. ..., a1R 7. Rc8 + Rxc8 8. f8Q Rxc1 9. Qf4 + Rc7 draw.
xxv) This threatens 12. Re6 Rxe6 (Rh4; Bf7 and Bg6) 13. Bxe6 Kc7 14. Bf7 Kd6 15. Bg6.

"The only correct entry which successfully mastered the difficult task of combining thematic multiplication with satisfying study content. So it is interesting to watch the 'staircase manoeuvre' of wR along the a1-h8 diagonal, force the advance of aP, and nothing else; the delicate and exhaustive dual-preventors after 4. Rd6 +? with 5. Rd4!? or 6. Rc5 +? with 7. Rc3!? add a special spice to the by-play by containing here and there a very exact 'endgame within an endgame' of GBR class 0010.02 (see notes (ix) and (xviii) for instance) with connected passed P's, but one could ask for these to be more univalent (sic)."

No. 5359: Attila Korányi (Hungary).


"Good introductory play 5. Rc2 + (Rd3 + !?) 5. ..., Kxd1 (Kc1); 6. Rcl + Kd2 (Kxc1), which leads to 2 original echo variations with nice pin stalemates. A polished execution."


"Again an impressive introductory play rich in substance leading to a piquant, if not new, pin-stalemate position. Especially worth mentioning are the 'play within the play' positions reached in 2. ..., Be3 after 6. Be3, and in 4. ..., Sf5 + after 6. Bd4, and in the dual avoidance 4. Kd1? after 6. ..., Se4!"


ii) 1. ..., Kd2 2. Rxd6 + Ke5 3. Rd3.


No. 5361: Draw

No. 5360: Y. Afek

Draw 3 + 6

No. 5361: V. Pachman

Draw 4 + 5
2...., Bg1 3. Kh2.


"Here the emphasis is on enrichment of the thematic content (5. Kxf2 h1Q) with another original stalemate (5...., h1B). The subtle try 2...., Sg3 + makes an interesting contribution to minor piece endings."

"A surprising countermanoeuvre by Bl (2...., Bc1) is answered by a no less startling W stalemate maneouvre (4. Rxf4). As a dessert we have a further stalemate after a minor promotion (4...., d1R 5. Rd4 +)."

Peter Poland, who assisted with preparing this material from the almost unbelievably condensed mass of the original, lets off a little humorous steam with: "Belgians, Germans and English have their desserts at different courses of the meal. When do Israelis get theirs?"


vi) 4...., d1Q or ...d1B drawn. 4...., e1E 5. Rd4 + Rxg4 stalemate.


ix) 4...., Ke7 (e6) 5. Sc1 e1Q 6. Rxe1 Bxe1 7. Sxd3.


viii) 6. ..., ef 7. Sxf5 Qxb4 + 8. Kc3 Qa5 + .


"One of the few win endings in the tourney, in which clever stalemate threats by Bl (4. ..., ef; and 6. ..., Kh6!) are successfully countered by no less sophisticated manoeuvres by W (7. Be7!). In this connection the critical wK move (3. Kg1!) is worthy of mention. The rather clumsy introductory play is a pity."

No. 5364: Piero Angelini (Italy).


No. 5365: Zoltan Fekete (Hungary).

1. Rg8/i Qc8 + 2. Rxc8 d1Q/ii 3. Kg8 Qd7 + 4. g4 + Qxg4 + 5. Rxc4 Draw
ef (e²; Bxf³) 6. Rg²/iv flR (flQ stalemate) 7. Rg⁴/vi Bc³/v 8. Rg³/vi Rxh₁ 9. Rg₁ Rxg₁ stalemate.
i) 1. Bxf³? dlQ. 1. Rg⁷? Qc⁸+ 2. g⁴+ Qxg⁴+ 3. Rxg⁴ dlQ.
iv) 7. Rg⁷? Bb⁴ 8. Rg² fg 9. Kxg² Bf³. 7. Rg⁷(g⁸)?, foiled by a clever antistalemate manoeuvre; and 9. Rxf³?, which is defeated by effective mating play.


i) 1. Rc⁵? Bc⁸ + 2. Kg⁵ c¹Q + 3. Rx¹ Rx¹ 4. b³ Rc⁵ + 5. Kh⁶ Bxb⁷ 6. e²Q + Kxe² 7. cb + Rx⁵.
ii) 2. b³ Qc³ 3. b³Q + Bc⁸ + 4. Kg⁶ Qh⁶ mate.

v) 4. ..., Rb1 5. b7 Bxb7 6. cb + Rxb5 7. Rxb5 c1Q 8. b8Q + .

"Another composition with a classical aroma... Well polished play, with hair's breadth risks by both sides. However, the finished product in the form of a stalemate position (8. b8Q) and even the supplementary underpromotion (8. b8R!) are not new -- see Rinck, Le Temps, 1930, or the theme example (1974, Ofer Comay)."

---

"A charming miniature combining well known stalemate motifs (A. Daniel, Chess Amateur, 1908) with known elements of endgame theory (GBR class 0430)."

---


i) 2. ..., Kf5 3. c4. 2. ..., Sc1 3. Rb1 Sb3 4. c4 a2 5. Kg1 + Kf5 6. cd.

ii) 7. Rh7? loses, as it is the Kling and Kuiper position, see Chéron I, No. 410.

"A charming miniature combining well known stalemate motifs (A. Daniel, Chess Amateur, 1908) with known elements of endgame theory (GBR class 0430)."


i) 1. d8Q? h1Q + 2. Kd2 Bxe3 +.


v) 4. Rf3 + ? Ke6 5. Rg6 + Ke5.

"The 'twin brother' of the 3rd Place study, but the play is forced and over-schematic".
No. 5370: Marek Halski and Jan Ru-
... Re3 + 4. Kxf4 Rf3 + 5. Rxh3 h2 6. Rh3 Sxh3 + 7. Kg3 h1Q stalemate, or 7. ...
h1R 8. Kg2.


"The final stalemate is not new (eg H. Aloni, Szachy, 1960, 2 Comm.)
but there is a valuable addition in the under-promotion h1R, which on one
occasion succeeds (in the dual-pre-
venting 2. Ke5? line), and once fails
Kg3 and Bh lacks a waiting move)."

No. 5371: Jerzy Konikowski and Piotr Ruszczynski (Poland). 1. Ba7 +
d1Q stalemate.


ii) 1. ... Kxb5 2. Rc5 + K- 3. Rxe5.


iv) 4. ..., Ka4 5. Ra6 + Kxb5 6. Ra5 +.

"Its only contribution: an original spicy stalemate position with self-pin
and self-block."

No. 5372: Nils G.G. van Dijk (Nor-
way). 1. Rb5 + Kc7 2. Rb7 + Qxb7 3.

i) 1. Sb5 + ? Sc7 + 2. B (or S)xc7(+)


iv) 4. ..., Ka4 5. Ra6 + Kxb5 6. Ra5 +.

"Here too we have a new stalemate
position, with a cosmetic (4. baB?)
addition, but the play is short and
colourless."

No. 5373: Romolo Ravarini (Italy).
1. h7+ Kh8/i 2. Ra8 + Kxb7 3.

i) 1. ..., Kxb7 2. Bxc2 + K- 3. Rxa3
g4 4. Bc4. 1. ..., Kf7 2. g6 + Ke6 3.

ii) 1. ..., Kxh7 2. Bxc2 + K- 3. Rxa3
g4 4. Bc4. 1. ..., Kf7 2. g6 + Ke6 3.


iv) 4. ..., Ka4 5. Ra6 + Kxb5 6. Ra5 +.

"An idea identical to that of the 13th
Place study, (q.v., as regards original-
ity), but the introductory play
lacks originality."
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No. 5374: Kosko Miloseski (Yugoslavia). 1. f7 Rxf7/i 2. ef Bg8 3. f8R (f8Q? is the thematic stalemate) 3. ..., Kg7 4. Re8/ii Kh6 (Bb3; Kg5) 5. Kg4 (Rxg8 draw) 5. ..., Bb3 6. Kf5 Bc2 + 7. Kf6.

i) 1. ..., Kg7 2. gh Rxf7 3. ef.

ii) 4. Rd8(a8)? Kh6 5. Rd6 Bb3 6. Kg4 Bc2, while, in this, 5. Kg4 Be6 + "The inclusion of this composition in the final award involved quite a heavy struggle, since it has a total anticipation (N. Kralin, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1977). The favourable decision is due to the miniature construction and the clean play by P's-only on the W side."

AJR comments on this tourney: I agree whole-heartedly with the comments of the judge in the preamble, but I remain worried by the use of the word "theme". It seems to me that the proper use of the word should be confined to cases where a successful solver will be able to name the theme or, themes of the study he has solved. This is certainly not the case here. It is yet another instance where studies differ from problems. But this is not to say that the WCCT studies section should have been set or organised differently -- I am simply suggesting that the set "theme" should in the case of studies have been called something else, such as a "motif". I believe that some composers will have been misled into thinking that very little was required of them. This will not have helped the future development of studies.

No. 5375: V. Neidze (Tbilisi). This fully international tourney was a worthy tribute to IGM Gia Antonovich Nadareishvili on the occasion of his 60th birthday - presumably spent in his native Tbilisi celebrating in true Georgian style, as his own 'tamada' (master of ceremonies and toastmaster combined). Judge: G.A. Nadareishvili.

It is of no avail to capture either Bl piece that is en prise. 1. baQ + ? Kxa8 2. cd + (c7 + is no better) 2. ..., Ka7 3. d8Q e1Q + 4. Kd7 Qb4. 1. cd? Bd6 + (also e1Q + ;) 2. Kxd6 Rb8. 1. Kxd7 Bc7 and either 2. Kxc7 Rb8, or 2. baQ + Kxa8 3. Kxc7 e1Q. So, only 1. c7 solves, setting up a position with the threat of baQ mate. Bl has only one defence. 1. ..., Sb6. 1. ..., e1Q + 2. Kxd7 Ka6 3. baQ + Kb5 4. cbQ +. But now Bl threatens 2. ..., Bxc7 or 2. ..., e1Q + or 2. ..., Sxd5 + 2. ab +. And not 2. c8Q? Sxc8 + 3. bcQ Bd6 +. 2. ..., Kxb6. Naturally, if 2. ..., Ka6 3. baQ + wins. 3. baS + Ka7 4. c8S + Ka6 5. Bc4 + Kb7 6. Bxe2. The finale: Bl can select from 6. ..., Kxa8 7. Bf3 mate, or 6. ..., Kxc8 7. Ba6 mate, or 6. ..., Bd6 + 7. Sxd6 +. "An effective study presen-
ting a synthesis of underpromotions and mates. The echo model mates with the help of the newly-born Ss make it unique."


No. 5377: A. Belyavsky and L. A. Mitrofanov (Leningrad): 1. Sd5 Re1. bR needs to give checks, as 1. ..., Re6 2. Rg8 wins, and if 1. ..., Rxe4 2. e8Q wins. 2. Rg1 Re2 3. Rg7 Sf6. Not just obstructing the rank, but decoying wS from protection of wPe7. 4. Sxe7 f5 5. Se6. Had Bl played 2. ..., Re4 then now W would win at once, but now Bl queens with check. 5. ..., b1Q + 6. Kg8. With the blistering threat of 7. e8Q+. Now there are two lines:


"The introduction is masterfully constructed using play that is far from evident. It leads to two winning variations, of which we must prefer the mating finale."

No. 5378: A. Maksimovskikh (Kurgan 371
  
"A witty miniature with symmetrical king-play and mutual avoidance of capturing.


4. ..., g1Q 5. a8Q+ Kg7 6. Qb7+ Kxg6 7. Qxb6 + Qxb6 stalemate.

5. ..., Rh4+ 5. Ka3 g1Q 6. a8Q+ Kg7 7. Qb7+ Kxg6 8. Qb1 + Qxb1 stalemate.

"Chameleon echo stalemates on a widely known theme that Prokop (Czechoslovakia) worked on in his time."


"An effective mastering of bQ by wSS."


"An effective mastering of bQ by wSS."

No. 5381: M. Gromov (Vladimir). 1. Bg3 + Kh1 2. Rc3 Qg5 3. Rc7 Qh6 4. Rb7 Qg6 5. Ra4 Qh7 6. Ra4 Qh8 7. Be5 Qxe5 8. Sg3 + Kh2 9. Rh4 mate.
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"A masterfully executed synthesis of horizontal and vertical 'Mkhedruli' theme."

No. 5383: V.N. Dolgov (Krasnodarsky Krai). 1. f6 Bd3 + 2. Kg7 Bd4 3. Kh6 Be3 + (Bxf6 is stalemate No. 1) 4. Kg7 Kg5 5. f7 Bd4 + 6. Kg8 Be4 7. Kh7 Bd3 + (Bx7 is stalemate No. 2) 8. Kg8 Kg6 9. f8S + Kf6 (sic!) 10. Sd7 + Ke7 11. Se5 Bxe5 (sic!) stalemate No. 3.

EG74 readers will know that 9. ..., Kf6 is weak, giving W a drawing chance, but that 11. ..., Bx5 throws away the win, to be had with 11. Bb5 or 11. Be4. Of course, the study can still be considered correct if endgame theory is considered valid at a given date.


i) 3. ..., f5 4. Bxf5 Ba8 5. Bc8 + Bb7 6. B7 (e.g.) Ba8 7. Bc8 + Rb7 stalemate.

The thematic point is that we have W staleminating Bl in the note, and Bl staleminating W in the main line. This study and the following 3 were all placed equal.

8. a8Q with the following alternatives:
8. ..., f1Q + 9. Kg3 + Kg1 10. Qa7 + Kh1 11. Qa8 + Kg1 12. Qa7 + Kh1 13. Qa8 + .

"The introduction is somewhat divorced from the final part, thus lowering the general evaluation of the study."

No. 5387: A. Zinchuk

No. 5388: D. Pikhurov (Stavropol).

No. 5389: M. Bordenyuk and An.G. Kuznetsov

No. 5389: M. Bordenyuk (Moldavia) and An.G. Kuznetsov (Moscow).

No. 5390: M. Zinar

No. 5390: M. Zinar (Feodosia).
1. a8R Rxa8 2. b7 Rh8 3. b8R Rxb8 4. c7 Rh8 5. c8R Rxc8 6. d7 Rh8 7. d8R
If W at any point makes a Q, then .... Kg5 + ;Qxh8, fgS + ;Rxg1 stalemate.
"A happy working of the theme of multiple underpromotion." (Is promotion sequence unique? AJR)

"A model mate with two active self-blocks."


"Play against the advanced pawn ends in an original manner."

"A piquant and witty miniature."

"A nice systematic manoeuvre."


"Play against the advanced pawn ends in an original manner."

"A piquant and witty miniature."

"A nice systematic manoeuvre."

No. 5395: N. Pandzhakidze (Georgia) and A. Svetilsky (Krivoi Rog). 1. Bd5 Ba6 2. Be6+ f5 3. Bxf5 + g4 4. Be4 g3 5. Bf5 + Rg4 6. c8Q Bxc8 7. Bxc8 g2+ (gh;B—) 8. Kg1 and Bl is stalemated, or 7. ..., gf 8. Bxg4+ hg and this time W is stalemated.


"A deeply devised study difficult of solution, on the theme of the struggle of Q vs. two Ss."

"A subtle study that is a development from known studies of Bondarenko and Selman."
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No. 5399: V.I. Kalandadze (Tbilisi). 1. Rb3 + Ka2 2. Rb2 + Kxa1 3. Rxd2 with 3 lines:
   3. ..., e1Q 4. Rd1 + Qxd1 5. Rc1 + Qxc1 stalemate the first, or
   3. ..., Bh2+ 4. Kc8 e1Q 5. Ra6 + Kbl 6. Ra1 + Kxa1 7. Rd1 + Qxd1
   stalemate the second, or
   Ra2 + Kbl 9. Ra1 + Kxa1 stalemate the third.

"A successful rework of an earlier study by the composer."

No. 5400: A.P. Kazantsev (Moscow). 1. Sc3 + Kc1 2. c7 Kf2 3. Sdl +
   Kg3 4. Sf5 + Kh3 5. Sf2 mate. This study and the next 5 were all
   placed equal.

"There is a partial anticipation by Neidze."


No. 5402: CM. Bent. 1. c7 Se7 2. c8Q + Sxe8 3. Sxc8 Kb7 4. Sd6 + Kc6
No. 5403: C.M. Bent
Commended, Nadareishvili Jubilee, 1983

No. 5404: V. Yakhontov
Commended, Nadareishvili Jubilee, 1983

No. 5405: E.L. Pogosyants
Commended, Nadareishvili Jubilee, 1983

No. 5406: L. Shilkov
Commended, Nadareishvili Jubilee, 1983

No. 5407: E.L. Pogosyants
Hon.Mem., Ryazan Komsomoltsy, 1980-81
Award: 28. viii.82

"A dancing duet of opposing Bs presented in miniature form, based on an attractive stalemate position."

"A manoeuvring style struggle of 6 pieces in a miniature form."

"And a familiar 'triangular merry-go-round' draw, rather resembling (AJR opines) a Möbius strip."

stalemate. It is a 'mirror' mate or stalemate when the suffering K can 'see himself' in all 8 adjacent squares, because they are unoccupied.


No. 5409: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Bd7 + Bxd7 2. b7 + Kb8 3. c7 + Kxb7 4. c8Q + Bxc8, a mirror model stalemate, or 4. ..., Kxc8, only a 'pure'

Win 3 + 6

ii) 1. ..., Rh3 2. Rc5 wins, but not 2. a3? Rc3. W threatens Rb2 or Rc5.

No. 5411: E.L. Pogosyants. 3 Hon.Men., Ryazan Komsomolets, 1980-81

Win 4 + 4

No. 5410: E.L. Pogosyants 1/3 Comm., Ryazan Komsomolets, 1980-81

Draw 4 + 3

No. 5411: E.L. Pogosyants 1/3 Comm., Ryazan Komsomolets, 1980-81

Draw 3 + 4

   i) 1. ..., Bxg2 or 1. ..., fg or 1. ..., hg are all stalemate.


   v) 2. Sd5 g4 3. Sxf6 g3 4. Sd5 g2.
   vi) 4. Sd5 Sxd5 5. cd g2 6. d6 Qg1Q + .


"Imaginative and creative play. An interesting study, alive from first move to last."


iii) 4. ..., Kd4 5. a3 Kc4 6. f4.


"With very little material this is a pleasant study having a surprising degree of difficulty and good tries."

For analysis of a similar position see pp. 40-41 of Euwe and Hooper's "A Guide to Chess Endings": wKc2 wPa3, f3 bKd4 bPa4.


ii) 2. ..., Kb7 3. Rf2 h5 (Ba1;Rf1) 4. Rf7 + Ka6 5. Rf8.

iii) 7. ..., Bb7 8. Sa5 or Ad6.

"Precise, interesting domination manœuvre."


i) 1. Ra4 Kxe2, or 1. Rgl + ? Kxe2.
ii) 2. ..., Kb3 Sb4 Ra8 + 4. Sa6 wins.

No. 5420: Y. Averbakh, who showed AJR this one-move extension of No. 4834 during the o-t-b World Championship semi-final candidate matches in London in xi.83. The same setting was independently indicated by IGM Pal Benko in a letter. 1. Ke6 e4 and now the solution as before, 2. Rg5 with echoes 2. ..., Kf2 3. Rf5 + and 2. ..., Kd2 3. Rd5 +.

Benko published his version in Chess Life (USA), vi.84.
No. 5422: D. Gurgenidze (Chailuri, Georgian SSR). Judge: Jan Rusinek (Warsaw), who sadly states that almost 50% of the 84 published studies were unsound. 1. Rh7 + Kg3 2. g7 Bc6 + (Ra8;Rh8) 3. Kd6/i Bd5 4. Kxd5 Ra5 + 5. Kd4 Rg5 6. Kxe4 and it is a zugzwang curtain for Bl -- 6. ..., Kg4 7. Rh1 wins.


"An excellent position with zugzwang operating against both sides, presented in two thematic variations, occupying the centre of this fine miniature of masterly construction. W has to choose his moves most carefully in order to place Bl in his quandary. The theme is already known (Nadarashvili, 64, 1979, Special Prize), but that was not with mutual zugzwang."

"An elegant study, also showing positional draw in two variations. Masterly construction. The play is without a capture."


"A very hard study with precise play by both sides. W several times chooses the one correct continuation when confronted with two or three apparently equivalent choices."


i) 1. e8Q? e1Q+ wins, so W plays an introductory move.
ii) 2. Se3? e1R 3. Kf4 Bc6(h5), or if here 3. e8QR Rx e3 + .
iv) 4. ..., Qxe8 stalemate, or 4. ..., Qd4 + 5. Ke7.
v) 5. Kd7? Bc6 + or 5. ..., Bg4 + .
vi) 5. ..., Bd5 + (g4 + ) 6. Kf6 draws, or 5. ..., Qd5 + 6. Kf6(e7) drawing.

"Sacrificing wSS leads either to an elegant stalemate or to a positional draw."


v) 5. Kd7? Bc6 + or 5. ... Bg4 + .

vi) 5. ..., Bd5 + (g4 + ) 6. Kf6 draws, or 5. ..., Qd5 + 6. Kf6(e7) drawing.

"The play has no especial strategy, but is nevertheless sharp and interesting."

No. 5425: Y.M. Makletsov (vi.81)
1 Hon. Men., SCHACH, 1981-2

No. 5427: Y.M. Belyakin (Sverdlovsk, Ukrainian SSR) and A.G. Kopnin (Chelyabinsk, Russian FSR).


"Interesting final stalemate combination, but weak introductory play."

   4. ..., Ke7(f6) 5. Sd5 + K- 6. Sc3. 4. ...,
   "Propagated checks well put together."

No. 5428: G.M. Kasparyan (xi.81)
Commended, SCHACH, 1981-2

No. 5429: Y.M. Makletsov (ix.81)
Commended, SCHACH, 1981-2

No. 5430: Günther Scheffler (Borstendorf, East Germany). 1. Bd2 (Rxe2 3)
   Kg5 c1Q/iv 6. Rc6 + , and either 6. ...
   Qxc6 stalemate, or 6. ..., Kg7 7. 
   Rxc1 Sxcl 8. Kg5 drawn.
   1. ..., c1Q 2. Bxcl Sxcl 3. Rc3 
   Rxc1 Sxcl and Bl wins.
   3. ..., Kg7(h7) 4. Rxc3 Sd3 + 5. 
   Kg5 c1Q 6. Rxc1 Sxcl 7. Kg5 drawn.
   iv) Bl is unable to win the R-endgame 
   after 5. ..., c1R 6. Rxd3, for example, 
   6. ..., Rf1 + 7. Ke4 h4 8. Rd6 + Kg5 
   9. Rd8 h3 10. Rg8 + Kh4 11. Rh8 + 
   Kg3 12. Rg8 + Kh2 13. Ke3.
   "Pretty play, with a stalemate at the end."
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i) To prevent wK crossing to the K-wing, when the W passed Ps are irresistible.


"The very good 3. Kc2! helped this study to its place of honour."


i) 1. Sf3? Bc3 2. Kc2 Ba1 3. Sd4 e4 4. Sb5 + Kb7(d7) 5. Sc3 e3 6. h7 e2 7. h8Q e1Q and Qc8+ is not mate.

ii) 2. Sc3? Kb7, but not 2. ... Bd4?

iii) 3. ..., Ba1 4. Sb1 e4 5. Sc3 e3 6. h7 e2 7. h8Q e1Q 8. Qc8 mate.

No. 5434: E.L. Pogosyants (Znamya, Kaluga), 30.V.81

1. Sh6+ Kg5/i 2. Kg8 h1Q 3. Sh7+ and 4. Se5, the
fortress draw known since the beginning of this century.

i) 1. ..., Ke4 2. Sg4. 1. ..., Kf4 2. Be5 +.

No. 5435: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Bc6 + Ka5/i 2. Sc7 a1Q 3. Sd3 and if Bl wishes to stop W assuming the Karstedt draw he has nothing better than to deliver perpetual check.

i) 1. ..., Kxc6 2. Sb4+.


No. 5437: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Rf7 + Kg3 2. Rg7 + Kh3 3. h7 Bd1+ 4. Kh6 Bg4 5. Rxg4 Kxg4 6. h8Q g1Q 7. Qg7(g8)+ wins.


No. 5439: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Kf4, with either 1. ..., Rxg1 2. Sf3 and the lone knight delivers the checkmate, or 1. ..., Rh2 2. Bd4 Rg2 3. Bf6 + Rg5 4. Bxg5 and the lone bishop delivers the checkmate. Can anymore improve on this theme: last piece left mates?


No. 5445: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Bb2 + c3 2. Bxc3 + Kxc3. Now what? Bh threatens not only Rh1 mate, but Bh7 + and Bxa2 + as well, while 3. Bd5? is suicide. 3. a8Q. Covers h1, so 3. ... Bh7 + 4. Ka1 Rx a8 stalemate. Hooray, but what about 3. ... Bxa2 + 4. Qxa2 Rh1 mate? Bust! No! 4. Kxa2? is no good of course, but 4. Ka1 Rx a8 is stalemate again. Nevertheless the attractive little study is flawed: 1. Ka2 also draws.


   i) 1. Bxd4 +? Kh2, and eP is strong enough to draw.


No. 5453; E.L. Pogosyants

Tourney for studies with 10 men in the diagram: closing date 31.III.85.
Address: "Magadansky Komsomol'stvi", Ul. Proletarskaya 14, 685000 MAGADAN, USSR.
Mark the envelope: "SHAKHMATY /CHESS". Judge: D. Gurgenidze.
Send 2 copies of each entry.

-- 0000.10 (ie, just a single wP, somewhere). Here's a little challenge for readers. The computer tells us that the longest endgame to win, with best play on both sides, takes 19 moves -- that is, 19 W moves, the 19th being the promotion move. Find the starting position.

No. 5453: E.L. Pogosyants. 1. Rf8 + ? Kxd7 2. Rxa8 Bb5 is a known positional draw, with wRc1 holding wPc6, but bKc6 and bB have sufficient mobility to prevent wK approaching wP. 1. Rf7, and if 1. ..., 0-0-0 2. Sb6+ Kb8 3. c6 wins, so 1. ..., Kd8 2. Sb6 Rb8 3. Kf6 Rb7 (else wKe5-d6) 4. Rf8 + Kc7 5. Rc8 mate. Or here, 3. ..., Bc8 4. Ke5 Ke8 5. Rh7 wins.

*C* Solution:

There are several points that one may note:
1 The win involves repetitive manoeuvres. These are not difficult, showing yet again that length and difficulty are far from synonyms.
2 The classic winning manoeuvre with (for instance) wPb2 wKb4 bKb6, where with W to play the win requires use of the spare tempo move of wP (b2-b3), does not occur.
3 The difficult move, the only difficult move, is Bl's 11th. Its point, which can only occur with bP or gP, is the continuation 12. b4 Kb8 13. b5? Ka7! 14. Kc7 Ka8. Now, since 15. b6?? gives stalemate, W must play 15. Kb6 (if the wishes to win!), promoting only on move 20. The main line move 12. Kb6! puts a stop to all this nonsense, as indeed, would the move 13. Kb6 instead of 13. b5?

-- Axel Fridolf Ericsson (9.viii.01 - 12.ii.84). Yet another sad loss to the Swedish studies world, after (Herbstmann and) Runquist.

391
Alexander Rueb Foundation announces two cash prizes of 1,000 and 500 Dutch guilders for the best chess studies "from (chess) developing countries" (in Dutch: "schaakontwikkelingslanden"). The studies must not have been previously published, and there is a maximum of 3 per composer. Closing date: 31.xii.84. Address: Alexander Rueb Stichting, A.K.P. Jongsma, Lucas van Leydenlaan 7, 2102 AZ Heemstede, NETHERLANDS. (The competition has been funded by the INTERPOLIS insurance company of Tilburg. No explanation of the phrase "chess developing countries" is given in our source, namely Schakend Nederland of iv.84. AJR's advice in such cases is to give an optimistic interpretation. It's a practical rule-of-thumb to follow when encountering ambiguous questions in questionnaires).

FIDE ALBUM Tourney: 1980-1982
High quality studies published during the above 3-year period may be entered by sending by 31.vii.84 to the Section Director for Studies: Yehuda HOCH, 17 Shapira St., 49491 Petakh-Tikvah, ISRAEL. Each diagrammed entry must be in 5 copies, on paper not less than 155x210 mm. Mandatory conditions: 1 entry per sheet; solution may continue on further sheets (not on the reverse); position of the kings to be written as well as diagrammed; stipulation, full solution, full name and address of composer(s), place of original publication, and (if any) award and dedication.

Judges: Nestorescu (Romania), Perkonoha (Finland), Gurgenidze (USSR).

It is stated that entries not complying with the foregoing requirements will be rejected. One-and-two-thirds points are awarded each study selected for publication, the points counting towards FIDE Master and Grandmaster Composition titles. (The closing date is as learned by AJR in vi.84 from the v.84 issue (actually an inserted slip) of THE PROBLEMIST. Let us trust that it will be extended).

Shatrin Bodlovo, Etyudiin Onol is a small book of 176 pages, published in 1975 in Ulan-Bator (Mongolia) and in Mongolian-in-Cyrillic. The author is Sonomon Chimedtseren and the content is chess composition, with 330 diagrams. Studies are mixed in with other genres, and the treatment is international. The apparent size of the edition: 3200.

*C* denotes, in EG, either an article relating to electronic computers or, when above a diagram, a position generated by computer.

The Chess Endgame Study Circle and EG 4 issues p.a. EG75-78 for 1984 £ 4.00 or $ 10.00 and EG79-82 for 1985, also £ 4.00. Calendar year.

How to subscribe:
1. Send money (cheques, dollar bills, International Money Orders) direct to A.J. Roycroft.
Or
Or
3. If you heard about EG through an agent in your country you may, if you prefer, pay direct to him.

New subscribers, donations, changes of address, ideas, special subscription arrangements (if your country's Exchange Control regulations prevent you subscribing directly): A.J. Roycroft, 17 New Way Road, London England, NW9 6PL. THE CHESS ENDGAME STUDY CIRCLE

Editor: A.J. Roycroft

Next Meeting: Friday 12th October 1984 at 6 p.m.
Venue: Batsford Books, 4 Fitzhardinge St, London W1