

14th INTERNATIONAL INTERNET TOURNAMENT-UAPA-2021

## AWARD FINAL

Section A: Theme : (white builds Fortress - Draw ) or (white ruins Black's Fortress- Win ). If the number of studies is significant, there will be two sections: A.1. Win and A.2. Draw - Examples : Look here Fortress (chess)

Judge : A. GM (chess) Petr Kiryakov (Russia)
Section B: No set theme.
B.1. Studies Win - Judge: IM ( composition) Michal Hlinka (Slovakia)
B.2. Studies Draw- Judge: FM ( chess) Poul Rewitz (Denmark)

On behalf of the "Union Argentina de Problemistas de Ajedrez", we thank composers and judges for their participation in the tournament organized to celebrate the $14^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the Tournaments of the UAPA.

After the deadline (30-4-2021), the Director sent the studies with diagrams and solutions to the judges for their evaluation.

Participants: Michal Hlinka (Slovakia); Luboš Kekely (Slovakia); Valery Kalashnikov (Russia); Andrzej Jasik (Poland); Mario G. García (Argentina); Pavel Arestov (Russia); Marc Gelly (France); Peter S. Krug (Austria); Daniele Gatti (Italy); Poul Rewitz (Denmark); Vladislav Tarasiuk (Ukraine); Amatzia Avni (Israel); Alexey Gasparyan (Armenia); Michael Pasman (Israel); Jan Timman (Netherlands); Itay Richardson (Israel); Jarl H. Ulrichsen (Norway); Luis Gómez Palazón (Spain); David Gurgenidze (Georgia); Luis Miguel González (Spain); Vladimir Neistadt (Russia); Yehuda Hoch (Israel); Paul Muljadi (USA); Sergey Osintsev (Russia); Alexander Zhukov (Russia); Oleg Pervakov (Russia); Can Aydinoglu (Turkey); Antonio Misericordia (Italy); Alexander Avedisian (Uruguay); Sergey Kasparyan (Armenia); Vazha Neidze † (Georgia); Bizya Buyannemekh (Mongolia); Valery Shanshin (Russia); Vladimir Samilo (Ukraine).

We have received 84 studies from 34 composers from 19 countries.

Sebastián A. Palomo<br>Coordinator of Tournaments (UAPA)

## Section A

## REPORT

I have recieved 29 studies from 19 composers (including a few $\mathbf{G M s} / \mathbf{I M s}$ in chess composition and in chess) from 13 countries.
(Slovakia, Russia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukraine, Argentina,Italy, Israel, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Georgia, Turkey)

Hlinka (3*), Kekely (2*), Kalashnikov (2), Jasik (1), Timman (1+1*),Garcia (1*), Gurgenidze (2), Tarasiuk (1), Ulrichsen (2), Osinsev(1),Afek(1), Pasman(2), Arestov (2+1*), Gatti (1), Pervakov (1), Krug (2), Rewitz(2), Aydinogly (1), Richardson (1)

It is my second experience as a judge in UAPA tourneys.
The theme of "Fortress" is a very special for me.
My journey to the chess composing world started in 1997 with a fortress study (i got commendation in "Moscow-850"!) and it remains my favorite topic since then.

As a practical player, $i$ do like new findings, new unexpected positional draws (or fortresses)

Here is my award. It contains one prize and a few honourable mentions and commendations.

I want to thanks all authors for their works and passion to the chess composition! I'm open to answer all question by e-mail kiriakov_petr@mail.ru, please write me)




## Sergey Osintsev (Russia)

1...Rb1+ 2.Kb4! [2.Ka4? b2! 3.Qxf5+ g6 4.Qd7+ Bf7! 5.Qxf7+ Kh6 6.Kb3 Ra1! 7.Qf4+ Kh7 8.Qc7+ Kh6=] 2...Ba3+! [2...Bd2+ 3.Ka4 b2 4.Qxf5+ g6 5.Qxc2+-] 3.Ka4!! [3.Ka5? b2! 4.Qxf5+ g6 5.Qd7+ Be7! 6.Qxe7+ Bf7! 7.Qxf7+ Kh6 8.Qf4+ Kh7 9.Qc7+ Kh6= Having sacrificed the Bishops, Black freed the a-file. Black has two fortresses: the Black King with pawns successfully opposes the white Queen and Knight, the Rook and pawns mutually defend each other, it is impossible 10.Qxc2?? Ra1+ 11.Kb6 b1Q++] 3...b2! [3...c1Q 4.Qxf5+ g6 5.Qf7+ Kh6 6.b8Q Qc6+ 7.Kxa3 Qc5+ 8.Qb4 Qc1+ 9.Ka4 Qc6+ 10.Qb5 Qxb5+ 11.Kxb5 b2! 12.Qf8+! Kh7 13.Ne4!+-] 4.Qxf5+ [4.b8Q?? Be6! 5.Q5e8 Bf8!! 6.Qxe6 Ra1+-+] 4...g6 5.Qd7+ [5.Qxc2? Bd6! 6.Ne4 Rf1 7.Qxb2 Rf4 8.Qh2+ Kg7 9.Qb2+ Kh7!=] 5...Be7! 6.Qxe7+ [6.b8Q? Bf7!! 7.Qxb2 Rxb2 8.Qxe7=] 6...Bf7! 7.Qxf7+ Kh6 8.Qf8+! [Thematic try : 8.Qf4+?! Kh7 9.Kb3? c1Q 10.b8Q Qd1+ 11.Kb4 Qd2+! 12.Kb3=] 8...Kh7 9.Qe7+ Kh6 10.Qxe3+ Kh7 11.Qe7+ [11.Kb3? c1Q 12.Qe7+ Kh6=] 11...Kh6 12.Qf8+ [Try to destroy the fortress with the help of Knight sacrifices are ineffective 12.Nf5+?! gxf5 13.Qf6+ Kh5= (13...Kh7) ; 12.Qh4+?! Kg7 13.Nh5+?! gxh5 14.Qg5+ Kf7!=] 12...Kh7 13.Qf7+ Kh6 14.Qf4+! Kh7 Having elimin ated the pawn, the Queen came back, and White carries out the main plan, prepared 12 moves back by the move $3 . \mathrm{Ka} 4$ ! 15.Kb3! [15.Qc7+?! Kh6 16.Kb3? c1Q 17.b8Q Qe3+ (17...Qd1+) 18.Qc3 Qe6+! 19.Kb4 Qe7+! 20.Kb5 Qd7+! 21.Qc6 Qxc6+ 22.Kxc6 Rc1+ 23.Kd5! b1Q 24.Qh8+ Kg5 25.Ne4+ Qxe4+! 26.Kxe4=] 15...c1Q 16.b8Q Qd1+ 17.Kb4 Qa4+! [17...Qe1+ 18.Kb5 Qa5+ 19.Kxa5+-] 18.Kxa4 Ra1+ 19.Kb5! b1Q+ 20.Kc6! Qc2+ 21.Kd7! Rd1+ 22.Ke7! Qc5+ 23.Kf6! Qc6+ 24.Kg5 Rd5+ 25.Kxg4 Qe6+ 26.Kf3+-
Picturesque modern study with a long sharp fight. In the logical try 3.Ka5 White cant overcome Black's defence.In the solution to break Black's fortress (situated on both sides of the board!) -White King "jumps in the fire" $15 . \mathrm{Kb} 3$ ! and escapes from the check, providing the win. You will definitely have fun analysing all lines of that study. Put the pieces on the wooden board and enjoy..)

## Yochanan Afek (Israel)

Black's promotion is unavoidable. How should White meet the new-born Queen? 1.Rb3! [1.Rf1+? Kb2 2.Rf2+ Kc3 3.Rf3+ Kd2 4.Rf2+ Kel-+] 1...Rc4! 2.Kf3! [2.Kf2? Rc2+ 3.Kf3 Rb2 4.Re3 Rb4!-+] 2...Rc3+! [Non thematic main line 2...Rc1 3.Rb4!! (3.Rb8? Rb1 4.Ra8 Rb4! 5.g4 Kb2! 6.Kg3 Rb3+ 7.Kf4 Ra3-+; Likewise 3.g4? Rb1 4.Ra3 Rb4!-+) 3...Rb1 4.Ra4 Kb2 5.g4 a1Q 6.Rxa1 Rxal 7.Ke4! shouldering 7...Kc3 8.g5 Ra5 9.Kf4=] 3.Rxc3 Kb2 4.Rc7!! [4.Rc4? a1Q 5.Kf2 Qa7+!-+] 4...a1Q 5.Kf2! Qa6! [main 5...Qd1 6.Rf7 Kc3 7.Rf3+ Kd2 8.g4 Qh1 (8...Qe1+ 9.Kg2 Ke2 10.g5 Qh4 11.Rg3 Qe4+ 12.Kg1 Qh4 $13 . \mathrm{Kg} 2=$ ) $9 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \div$ Followed, when needed, by 10 . Rf5 with a third echo fortress.] 6.Rf7! Qb6+ 7.Kf1! Alternatives are met by an immediate fork. 7...Kc1 8.Rf3! Completeing a cool blooded Rook Rundlauf! 8...Kd1 ...And a Chameleon echo fortress A 9.Rd3+ Kc1 10.Rf3 [10.Rh3? Kd2! 11.Rf3 Qb1+ 12.Kf2 Qe1\# Chameleon echo mate A1] 10...Qd4 [Or 10...Kd2 11.Rf2+ Kd1 12.g3!=] 11.g3! Qe4 12.Kf2 Qh7 13.Kg2 [13.Kg1? Qh3-+] 13...Qe4 14.Kf2 Kd2 15.Rf4! Chameleon echo fortress B! 15...Qe1+ 16.Kg2= Positional draw.[16.Kf3? Qe2\# Chameleon echo mate B1. Both fortress positions, known from theory, appear as Chameleon echo pictures along a single main line (with a third one in another main line).]
Judge: Nice ultra-miniature ( 6 pieces) on the given topic of fortress. By precise play white reaches wellknown fortresses $-\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{g} 2$ vs Q . I like to work with that material, and this study will be good adding to my collection)

## Oleg Pervakov (Russia)

1.Nh4! Bh7 Main A (thematic) [Main B 1...g5 2.Nf5+ Kh5 3.Ng3+! Kh4! (3...Kg4 4.Ne4=) 4.Nf5+ Kg4! 5.Nh6+ Kf4 6.Nxg8 g4 (6...d5 7.Ne7 d4 8.Ng6+! Ke4 9.Ne5!) 7.Ne7 g3 8.Ng6+! Ke4 9.Nh4 d5 10.Kg5 d4 11.Kg4 g2! 12.Nf3! (12.Nxg2? d3-+) 12...d3 13.Kg3 g1Q+ 14.Nxg1 d2 15.Nh3! (15.Ne2? Kd3-+) 15...d1Q 16.Nf2+=] 2.Nf3! d5 3.Ke6! [3.Ke5? Bg8-+ zz 4.Kf6 Kh5! zz 5.Ng5 d4 6.Nf3 d3-+] 3...Bg8+ 4.Ke5 zz 4...Kg7 [4...g5 5.Kf5 Bh7+ 6.Kg4=] 5.Ng5! zz [5.Nd4? Kh7! 6.Kf6 Kh6 7.Nf3 Kh5 8.Nd4 g5+; 5.Nh4? Kh7! 6.Kf6 d4-+] 5...Bf7 6.Nf3! zz 6...Kh7 7.Ng5+! [7.Kf6? Bg8! zz 8.Ke5 Kh6 9.Kf6 Kh5!$+\mathrm{zz}]$ 7...Kg7 [7...Kg8 8.Kf6! d4 9.Nxf7 d3 10.Nh6+ Kh7 11.Ng4=] 8.Nf3 Kh6 9.Kf6 Bg8 [9...Be8 10.Nd4! Bd7 11.Ke5=] 10.Ke5 Kh5 11.Kf6 zz. New fortress, based on mutual zugzwangs

Fresh positional draw N against $\mathrm{B}+2 \mathrm{p}$. No added pieces, -just a pure fortress with nice sideline where Knight holds 2 passed pawns.

## Jan Timman (Netherlands)

1.Nb5! [1.Ke3? Bh4 2.Bxd7 Bf2+ 3.Kd3 e5 4.c5 Nf4+ 5.Kc4 Bxd4 6.a6 Nd3 7.a7 Nxc5 8.a8Q Nxd7 9.Qd5+ Ke7 10.Qc6 Nf6 11.Qxc7+ Ke6=] 1...c6 [1...Bh4 2.Nxc7+-] 2.a6! cxb5 3.Bb3! bxc4 4.Bxc4+ d5! 5.Bxd5+ e6 6.Bxe6+! Kg6! [6...Kxe6 7.a7 Nf4+ (7...Bg5 8.a8Q Nf4+ 9.Kf3+-) 8.Kf3 Bg5 9.a8Q+-] 7.Bf5+! [7.a7? Nf4+ 8.Kf3 Nxe6 9.a8Q Ng7 10.Qe4+ Kf7 11.Kg4 Bg5= (or 11...Kg8= )] 7...Kxf5 8.a7 Nf4+ 9.Kf3 Ne6 10.a8Q Bg5 11.Qa6!+- Breaking the fortress
In the try Black reaches the fortress $\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{p}$ vs Q , in the solution White ruins Black's defence.

## Poul Rewitz (Denmark)

1.Be5+ [1.Bg3? Qc3+ (1...Qc2-+ is slower; 1...Kf7? 2.Kb2!=; 1...Kg6? 2.Kb2!=; 1...Kh7? 2.Kb2=; 1...Kg8? 2.Kb2!=) 2.Ka2 Kg6 (2...Qc2+-+ is slower) 3.Kb1 Kf5! 4.Bf2 Ke4! 5.Ng3+ Kd3-+] 1...Kf7 [1...Kg6 2.Bh8! (2.Bb2? Kh7! mZZ 3.Ba1 - see 3.Bb2?-line (position "Y")) 2...Kh7 (2...Kf7 3.Kb2! Qh4 4. $\mathrm{Bc} 3=$ ) 3.Bb2! (3.Ba1? - see 3.Bb2?-line (position "Y")) 3...Kg8 4.Ba1! - main; 1...Kg8 2.Ba1!= - main; 1...Kh7 2.Bb2! Kg8 3.Ba1!= - main] 2.Bh8! [2.Ba1? Qd3+ 3.Kb2 Kg6! - see 3.Bb2?-line (position "Z"); 2.Bb2? Ke6!-+ mZZ e.g. 3.Nf3 Qd3+ (3...Qxf1? 4.Nd4+=) 4.Ka2 Qxf3-+] 2...Kg8 [2...Kg6 3.Kb2! (3.Bb2? Kh7! - see 3. Bb2?-line (position "X")) 3...Qh4 4.Bc3=] 3.Ba1! [3.Bb2? Kh7! mZZ (position "X") 4.Ba1 (position "Y") 4...Qd3+ 5.Kb2 (5.Ka2 Kg6!-+) 5...Kg6! (position "Z") 6.Kc1 Qc4+ 7.Kd1 (7.Kb1 Qe4+! 8.Ka2 Qe6+! 9.Ka3 Qa6+ 10.Kb2 Qa5! 11.Kb1 Qe1+ 12.Ka2 Kf5!-+) 7...Qa4+ 8.Ke2 Qa6+!-+ (8...Qxa1? 9.Nf3! Kf5 10.Ne1! fortress (10.Ne3+? Kf4!-+) 10...Ke4 11.Nd2+=) 9.Kf2 Qa2+! 10.Kf3 Qxa1 11.Ne3 (11.Ng3 Kg5 12.Ne4+ Kh4! (12...Kf5? 13.Nf2 Qg1 14.Nhg4=) 13.Ng4 Qd1+-+) 11...Qf6+ 12.Kg2 Qb2+-+] 3...Qc2 prevent 5.Kb2. [3...Qa6+4.Kb2 Qa5 5.Kb1=; 3...Qd3+4.Kb2= (or 4.Ka2= ) ] 4.Bb2 Qc4 prevent 5.Ka2. [4...Kh7 5.Ka2!=] 5.Ba1 Qc2 6.Bb2= a kind of fortress. Black may try to use the king, but it doesn't help. E.g.: 6...Kf7 7.Ka2 [7.Bh8 Ke6 8.Kb4! also holds.] 7...Ke6 8.Ka1 Kd7 9.Ka2 Kc6 10.Ne3! Qxh2 11.Nf5 Kc5 12.Nd4= fortress
A Good pawnless study.- By interesting Bishop moves to the corners white finally reaches $\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{N}$ vs Q fortress.


## Pavel Arestov (Russia)

1.Be6+! [1.Nd2? Kf7 /Qg6-+] 1...Kh7! [1...Kf8 2.Nd2 main line] 2.Nd2! Qxg2 3.Bc4! [Try: 3.Bb3? Qc6! 4.Bc2+ Kg8!! (4...Kh6? 5.Kc1! Qh1+ 6.Kb2 Qg2 7.Nb1=) 5.Kc1 Qh1+! 6.Kb2 Qh8+! 7.Kc1 Qa1+! 8.Nb1 Qxa2-+; 3.Kc1? Qg1+! 4.Kc2 Qg6+-+] 3...Kg6 [3...Qg7 4.Kc2! Kh6 5.Bb3 Qg2 6.Kc1! Kg5 7.Nb1 - main line] 4.Kc1! [4.Kc2? Kf5 5.Bb3 Kf4-+] 4...Kf5 5.Bb3! [5.Nb1? Qc6-+] 5...Kf4 6.Nb1! [6.Bc2? Qg1+ 7.Bd1 Ke3-+] 6...Ke3 7.Bc2 Qc6 8.Kb2 Qb5+ 9.Kc1! [9.Bb3? Kd3!-+] 9...Kd4 10.Bb3 Kd3 11.Bc2+ Ke3 12.Bb3 Qf1+ 13.Kb2! [13.Kc2? Qg2+-+] 13...Qg2+ 14.Bc2=
Quite complex study where Kingside fortress doesnt work and White reaches fortress on the Queenside. For "true fans" of positional draws)

## Michael Pasman (Israel)

1.Rb2+! [1.Bd7? Nxe7 2.Bxg4 Rh2+-+] 1...Kc7 [1...Kc8 2.Rc2+ Kb8 3.Rb2+=] 2.Rb7+!! [2.Rc2+ Kd6 3.Rc6+ Kxe7-+] 2...Kd6! [2...Kxb7 3.Bc6+=] 3.Rd7+! [3.Bd7? Rh2+ 4.Kf3 Rf4+ 5.Kg3 Nxe7 6.Kxh2 Nxg6 With theoreticall y won endgame (thematic with addition of knight and bishop), for example : 7.Be8 Rh4+ 8.Kg3 Nf4 9.Rh7 Ke5 10.Re7+ Kf6 11.Rf7+ Ke6 12.Rb7 h5 etc.] 3...Ke5 4.Bf7! [Thematic try : 4.g7? Rh2+ 5.Kf1 Ra4 6.Bh5 Ra1+ 7.Bd1 Ra8 8.Rd8 Rh1+9.Kg2 Nxe7! 10.Rxa8 Rxd1 11.Re8 Kf6 12.Rxe7 Rd8-+ and after capturing g-pawn we receive the thematic won endgame with $g$ and h-pawns] 4...Nxe7 5.Rxe7+ Kf6 6.g7!! Rh2+! [6...Kxg7 7.Be6+/h5 7...Kf6 8.Bxg4=] 7.Kf3 Rf4+ 8.Kg3 Kxg7 9.Bh5+! [9.Kxh2?-+ leading to thematic endgame without fortress] 9...Kf6 10.Rf7+ Ke6 11.Rxf4 Rxh5 12.Re4+!! [Thematic/Logical try : 12.Ra4? Rh1! 13.Ra6+ Kf7 14.Kg2 Rh4-+ and no fortress - black is winning by Kg 7, Rf4-f6 etc.] 12...Kf5 [12...Kf6 13.Kg2! = fortress - rook can't go out; $12 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 713 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ ! $=$ fortress - rook can't go out] 13.Ra4! Fortress. White needed intermediate move Re4+, because Black king must stand on f5 [Thematic try : 13.Rb4? Rh1 14.Rb6 h5 15.Rb5+ Kf6 16.Rb6+ Ke7 17.Rb7+ Kd6 and on $18 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 1-+$ ] 13...Rh1 [13...Kf6 14.Kg2= fortress, the rook is catched] 14.Ra6! Now black has no a time for Rh4 and defending the h-pawn by the king from 7-th rank, so he has to play h5 to try to go out offortress 14...h5 [14...Rh4 15.Rb6 /c6 - just waiting] 15.Ra5+ Kf6 16.Ra6+ Kg7 Black king has no way to escape from checks 17.Ra7+ Kh6 18.Ra6+ Kh7 19.Ra7+ Kg6 20.Ra6+ Kf7 21.Ra7+ Ke6 22.Ra6+ Ke7 23.Ra7+ Kd6 24.Ra6+! Kc7 25.Kg2! Rc1 26.Ra5=
An example how to survive with Rook against $\mathrm{R}+$ " g "+" h " pawns. Good for practical players.

Vladislav Tarasiuk (Ukraine) (v)
1.Bf1! [1.Qf3? Qxd2 2.Be2+ Nc3+-+] 1...Nc3+! [1...Qe5 2.Qf3+ Nc3+ 3.Qxc3+! Qxc3 4.dxc3=] 2.dxc3 Qe3 3.Qa4+! [3.Qg2?? Qe1\#] 3...Kxa4 4.Kb2! Fortress. [4.Bd3? Ka3!-+] 4...Qf3 5.Bd3 Qf4! 6.Bg6! [6.Be2? Qb8+ 7.Ka2 Qe5! 8.Bd3 Qxc3-+] 6...Qb8+ [6...Qxc4 7.Be8+ Qb5+ 8.Bxb5+=] 7.Ka2 Qg8 8.Bd3 Qg3 9.Kb2 Qe5! 10.Bg6! [10.Bf1? Qb8+ 11.Ka2 Qf4! 12.Bd3 Qc1 13.Be4 Qa3+ 14.Kb1 Qxc3-+] 10...Qb8+ 11.Ka2 Qg8 12.Bd3 draw

## Peter Krug (Austria)

1.Nxe4! [1.Rg4? a3 2.Rxg6+ Kf7 3.Rd6 a2 4.Rd7+ Ke6 5.Ra7 Rb1+] 1...Rxe4 2.Rg4 Kg7 3.f5 ! [3.fxe5 Rxg4 4.hxg4 Kf7 -+ no fortress] 3...Rxg4 4.hxg4 h5 5.e4 [5.fxg6 ? 5...h4 -+ no fortress] 5...hxg4 6.f6+! 6...Kxf6 7.g3 != fortress

Initial position looks like from the blitz-game. White builds the fortress in the pawn endgame.

## Jarl Henning Ulrichsen (Norway)

1.Kb5 Bd2 2.Kc4 Be1 3.Kd3 [3.f3? loses; e.g. 3...Kg5 4.Kd3 Kf4 5.Ke2 Bb4 6.Kf1 Bc5-+] 3...Bxf2 4.Ke2 Bg3 [4...Bc5 5.Kf3 Kg5 6.g4= draws.] 5.Kf1 Bh2 6.g4+ hxg3 7.Kg2= with a fortress.

## Jarl Henning Ulrichsen (Norway)

1.Kc6 Bh2 2.Kd5 Ke7 3.Ke4 Kf6 4.f4 Bg3 5.Ke3! [5.Kf3? Kf5 6.Ke2 Kxf4 7.Kf1 Bh2 8.g4 h3-+ and Black wins.] 5...Kf5 6.Kf3 Bxf4 7.Kf2 Bh2 8.g4+ hxg3+= with a theoretical draw.
Ulrichsen for the sending of 2 studies $\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{o}} 28$ and $\mathrm{N}^{\circ} 29$-Pleasant findings in a well-known material "pawns against the Bishop "are suitable for the endgame textbooks.

Petr Kiryakov Judge

## Section B.1.: Studies - Win

## REPORT

For evaluation I received 27 studies (including one version) from the director in a text file and also in a pgn file.

I would like to thank my friend Luboš Kekely for checking the anticipations.
The authors also devoted themselves to a relatively large number of corrections, improvements and development of the idea of older compositions.

I did not evaluate the study of A. Kasparyan and S. Kasparyan Kg3/Kd4, as this was already published in Zadachy i Etyudy in 2016, but I accepted its version from the same authors and the new co-author Pavel Arestov. I also did not evaluate the study A. Avedisián Ke4/Kg5, which is only a version of the study from 11th UAPA 2020.

My result I lined up as follows:



#### Abstract

Alexander Zhukov \& Pavel Arestov (Russia) 1.g3 Rc2! [1...Kb6 2.Kc3+!+-] 2.Rc3! Rd2! [2...Rxc3 3.Kxc3+-] 3.Kc4! [3.Kc5? Kb7!=] 3...Kb6 4.Rd3! Re2 5.Kd4! [5.Kd5? Kc7! - ] 5...Kc6 6.Re3 Rf2 7.Ke4! [7.Ke5? Kd7!=] 7...Kd6 8.Rf3 Ra2 [8...Rxf3 9.Kxf3 Ke5 10.Kg4!+-] 9.Kf5! Ra8 [9...Ke7 10.Kg6 Ra6+ 11.Kg7+-] 10.Kg6! [10.Rd3+? Ke7=] 10...Rg8+ 11.Kf7! [11.Kh7? Rg4=] 11...Rg4 12.Kf6! Kd5 13.Kf5 Rg8 14.Rd3+! [14.Ra3 Rf8+ 15.Kg6 Rg8+ 16.Kf7 Rg4!=] 14...Kc4 15.Ra3! [15.Re3? Rf8+ 16.Kg6 Rg8+ 17.Kf7 Rg4!=] 15...Kd5 16.Ra5+ Kd6 17.Ra6++- A very elegant super miniature instructive even for a practical player reminded me of the study of D. Gurgenidze, Chess in the USSR 1981, 1st prize. It is possible that the approach of the white king to the g3 pawn was inspired by this study.


## Itay Richardson \& Yehuda Hoch (Israel)

1.b6! [1.Nc4+? Ke6 2.f7 Ke7 (2...Kxf7? 3.Kc3 Rxb5 4.Nd6++-) 3.b6 axb6 4.Kc3 Rb5=; 1.f7? Rf4=; 1.Nf5+? Ke6 2.f7 Kxf7 3.e3 Ke6 4.Nd4+ Kd5 5.Kc3 a5 6.bxa6 Rb6 7.a7 Ra6=] 1...axb6 [1...Rh4 2.Nf5++-; 1...Rxb6 2.Nc4++-; 1...Rb5 2.bxa7 Ra5 /c5+ 3.Nc4++-; 1...Kc6 2.Nc4 Rb5 3.bxa7 Kb7 4.Nd6++-; 1...a5 (a6) 2.f7 Rf4 (2...Ke7 3.Nd5++-) 3.b7 Kc7 4.Nd5++-; 1...Re4 2.f7 Ke7 /Rf4 3.bxa7+-] 2.Nf5+ [2.Nc4+? Ke6 3.f7 Ke7 (3...Kxf7? 4.Kc3 Rb5 5.Nd6++-) 4.Kc3 Rb5=] 2...Ke6 or else just 3.f7 and Black can't stop promotion 3.f7! [3.e3? Rg4 4.f7 Rg2+ 5.Kc3 Kxf7=] 3...Kxf7 4.e3! Ke6 [4...Rb5 /e4 5.Nd6++-; 4...Rg4 5.Nh6++-] 5.Nd4+ Kd6! [5...Kd5 would lead to the same continuation] 6.Kd2! [6.Kd3? Kd5 7.Kc3 Kc5 8.Ne6+ (8.Kd2 /c2 8...Rxd4+=) 8...Kb5 9.Nd4+ (9.Nc7+ Ka5= (9...Kc5? 10.Na6++-) ) 9...Kc5 (9...Ka5? 10.Nc6++-) 10.Kd3 Kd5=] 6...Kd5 [6...Kd7 /c7 7.Kc3+-; 6...Kc5 7.Kc3 b5 8.Ne6++-] 7.Kd3 [7.Kc3 Kc5= as was seen before] 7...Kd6 [7...Kc5 8.Kc3 b5 9.Ne6++-] 8.Ke4! a: 8...Kc5 [another main line b: 8...Ke7 (d7, c7) 9.Kd5 Ke8 (9...Kf6 10.e4 Kg5 11.e5 Kf4 12.e6 Ke3 13.Nc2++-) 10.e4 White can play back and forth in the 6-8th rank, but Black would just move their king back and forth in the squares: e8, f8, f7 and when the White king goes back to c3 to capture the trapped rook, the Black king would always be in time to defend the rook in c5. For example: (10.Ke6 Kf8 11.Kd7 Kf7 12.Kc6 Ke7 13.Kd5 Ke8 14.Ke4 Kd7 15.Kd3 Kd6 16.Kc3 Kc5= as was seen before) 10...Kd7 11.e5 Kc7 12.Ke4 (12.e6? Kc8 13.Ke4 (13.e7 Kd7 14.Ke4 /e5 14...Rxb3 15.Nxb3 Kxe7=) 13...Kc7 14.Kd3 Kd6 15.Kc3 Rxd4 16.Kxd4 Kxe6=) 12...Kd7 a) 12...b5 13.Kd3 Kb6 14.Kc3 Kc5 (14...Ka5 15.Nc6++-) 15.Ne6++-; b) 12...Kb7 13.Kd3 Ka6 14.Kc3 Ka5 15.Nc6++-; 13.Kd3 Kc7 14.Kc3+-] 9.Ke5! mutual zugzwang 9...b5 [If it was White to move again, they wouldn't win: 9...-- $10 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 6$ 11.Kd3 Kd5 12.Kc3 Kc5= as was seen before] 10.Ke4 Kd6 11.Kd3 Kd5 12.Kc3 Kc5 13.Ne6++-

The capture of the rook takes place here in a quite interesting way, in which the mutual zugzwang is prepared. Works well after defense $7 \ldots$ Kd6 move 8 .Ke4!, which will prepare the decisive zz and after $9 . K e 5$ ! he forces a move $9 \ldots \mathrm{~b} 5$ and so the white king returns and picks up the rook. It's just a pity that this rook didn't get on the b4 square during the play.

## Michael Pasman (Israel)

1.f5+! [Try : 1.Re3+? Kf5 2.Re5+ Qxe5 3.fxe5 Ra8+ 4.Kh7 Rxc1 5.Ne3+ Ke6 6.Kxh6 Rxc6=; 1.d8Q!? Nf7+-+] 1...Ke7 [1...Kf7 2.d8Q Ra8 3.Bb8+-; 1...Qxf5 2.Re3+ Kf7 3.d8Q+-] 2.Re3+! [2.g8Q Nxg8= Rg7+ Kd8 Rxg8+ Ke7] 2...Qxe3! [2...Kf6 3.c7! Nf7+ 4.Kh7 f1Q 5.d8Q+! Nxd8 6.Be5+! Kxf5 7.c8Q+!+Qe6 Qc2+ Kg4 Nf2+ Kh5 Bf6 Rxg7+ Bxg7] 3.Bd6+!! [Thematic try : 3.Nxe3? Ra8+! 4.Kh7 Rxc1 5.f6+ (5.Kxh6 Rxc6+ 6.Kh7 Kf7=; 5.c7? Kxd7; 5.Bd6+? Kxd6) 5...Ke6! 6.Kxh6 Rxc6! 7.Kg6 Rc4! 8.Bc7! Rg4+! (8...Rxc7 9.f7) 9.Kh5 Re4! 10.d8Q (10.d8N+) 10...Rxd8 11.Bxd8 Kf7!=] 3...Kf7! [3...Kd8 4.Nxe3+-; 3...Kxd6 4.d8Q+ Kxc6 5.Qf6+! Kc7 6.Nxe3+-] 4.Nxe3! [4.g8Q+? Nxg8 5.Nxe3 R1a4! 6.d8Q Ra8! 7.Bb8! Ne7! 8.h5! Rh4! 9.Qd1! Rxb8+ 10.Kh7 Rg8=] 4...Ra8+ 5.Kh7 f1Q! Removing white knight from e3 to include the black knight in the defense [5...Ng8 6.Nd3 Nf6+ 7.Kh6 $\mathrm{Ng} 8+8 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Rg} 1+9 . \mathrm{Kf} 4$ f1Q+ 10.Nxf1 Rxf1+ 11.Ke5 Nf6 12.Bc7 Ne8 13.d8Q Rxd8 14.Bxd8 Rd1 15.Kd4 Nxg7 16.c7 Nxf5+ 17.Ke5+-; 5...Rxc1 6.c7+-] 6.Nxf1 Ng4! [6...Ng8 7.Nd3! Rxf1 8.Ne5++-] 7.Nd3!! Rxf1 [7...Nf6+ 8.Kh6 Rxf1 9.Ne5++-] 8.Ne5+! [8.Bb8? Nf6+!] 8...Nxe5 9.Bb8!! [9.Bxe5? Rxf5-+; 9.Bf8 Rg1-+] 9...Rxb8 10.c7 Rxf5! 11.d8N+!! Rxd8 12.cxd8N+! Kf6 13.g8N\#!

White sacrificed all his army including 2 knights and then promotes 2 new knights (Double Phenix) with ideal mate. The idea of a mate after the promotion to one or two knights with blocking the fields to the black king has been worked in the past, quite often. A. Sochnev, Bulletin Problemistic 1983 has already worked with a very similar end to this author. He later tried to develop the idea in 1987 and 2004, but both studies are unsound. The new author processed the idea in a rather interesting way, but the solution is demanding and required a complex construction, which nevertheless reduces the overall impression. It would be worthwhile to save the figures in the intro and focus on the final position.

## Pavel Arestov (Russia)

1.Rh2+! [1.a8Q? Ra6+ /Qe6=; 1.Rb2+? Kd3 2.Rb3+Kc2 3.Rh2+ Kc1=] 1...Ke3 2.Rh3+! [2.Rb3+? Kd4! 3.Rh4+ Kc5 4.Rc3+ Kb5! 5.a8Q Ra6+=] 2...Kf2 3.Rb2+ Kg1 4.Rh1+! [4.Rb1+? Kf2 5.Rb2+ Kg1 loss of time] 4...Kxh1 5.a8Q+ Kg1 [5...Rc6 6.Qh8+ Qh6 7.Rb1+ Kg2 8.Qb2++-] 6.Qa7+ [6.Rb1+? Kf2 7.Rb2+ Kg 1 loss of time] 6...Kh1 7.Qb7+ [7.Rb1+ Kh2 8.Qf2+ (8.Rb2+) 8...Qg2=] 7...Rc6! selfin [7...Kg1 8.Rb1+ Kf2 9.Qb2++-] 8.Ka1!! point [8.Rb1+? Kg2=] 8...Qe4 unpin [8...Qh6 9.Rb1+Kg2 10.Qb2++-; 8...Kg1 9.Qa7+ Kh1 10.Rb1+ Kh2 11.Qf2+ Qg2 12.Qh4++-] 9.Rb1+ Kg2 10.Qb5! [10.Qg7+? Qg6! 11.Qb2+ Rc2=] 10...Qd4+ [10...Rg6 11.Qb2+ Kh3 12.Qh8+! Kg3 13.Qc3+ Kh2 14.Rb2+ Rg2 15.Qh8+! Kg1 16.Rb1++-] 11.Rb2+! selfin [11.Ka2?? Qa7+-+] 11...Rc2! selfin 12.Qc6+! [12.Qg5+? Kf1! 13.Qf5+ Rf2! selfin 14.Qb1+Kg2=] 12...Kf2 13.Qxc2++-
Miniature and the struggle of heavy figures in it, where we also involve pin and unpin of the pieces. After a pleasant foreplay, white sacrifices the rook and promotes a queen. Then he will show the point $8 . \mathrm{Ka} 1!!$, at the same time this move puts black in front of the unsolvable mutual zugzwang - he has to move and therefore loses. If white was on the move again, it would just be a draw.

## Amatzia Avni \& Sergey Osintsev (Israel-Russia)

1.Rg8!! Threatens mate in two and prepares to meet ... Qd1+ with Rg1 [1.Rf8? Qd1+ 2.Kh2 Qe2+ 3.Kxh3 $\mathrm{Qg} 4+=$; 1.Nf6+? $\mathrm{Kg} 6=$; 1.Be8+? $\mathrm{Kg} 42 . \mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 4=]$ 1...Bf5 Best: defends against the mate threat and evacuates h3 for his queen. [1...Qxg8 2.Nf6++-] 2.Nf6+ [2.Bg2? Kh6!=] 2...Kh6 3.Rh7+! Deflecting the black bishop from covering square g4 [3.Re7? to protect square e3 from eventual checks 3...Qa3 (or 3...Qh3+ 4.Kg1 Qa3= the exposed position of WK does not enable white to exploit his material advantage) ; 3.Rag7? Qh3+ 4.Kg1 Qe3+=] 3...Bxh7 4.Ng4+ Kh5 5.Be8+ Bg6 6.Bxg6+ [6.Nf6+? Kg5 7.Rxg6+ Kf5=] 6...Kxg4 7.Bf7+ [7.Bc2+?? Qxg8-+] 7...Kh3! [\#] 8.Rg3+! the second rook is also being sacrificed on an empty square; this time deflecting the black queen from covering square e6 [8.Bxb3?= stalemate] 8...Qxg3 [8...Kxg3 9.Bxb3+-] 9.Be6+ Qg4 10.d5+-
After 1.Rg8!! the black king finds himself trapped and the white king is safe. White attacks and creates a battery with the intention of gaining an opponent's queen, but black creatively defends himself $7 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 3$ ! and he would like to heal with a stalemate. In the end, however, he will enjoy white - he will show a pleasing finish to the eye.


## Luis Miguel González (Spain)

1.Re8+! [Thematic try: 1.Re1+? Kd4! 2.Rf4+ Kd5! 3.Rd1+! Ke5 4.Rxc4 Rxc4 5.Ra1 Rc3+ 6.Kg4 Kd5! 7.Nd8 Kc4 8.Ne6 Kb3=] 1...Kd5! [1...Kd4 2.Rf4+ Kd5 3.Rd8+! Ke5 4.Rxc4 Rxc4 5.Ra8 Rc3+ 6.Kg4 Kd5 7.Nd8! Re3 (7...Kc4 8.Nc6! Re3 9.Kf4 Rc3 10.Kg5! Rh3 11.Kxg6 Kb3 12.h5 Rxh2 13.Nd4+ Kb2 14.Rb8++-) 8.Nf7 Kc4 9.Nh8 Re4+ 10.Kg5 Kb3 11.Rxa3+ Kxa3 12.Nxg6+-] 2.Rd1+ Kc6 3.Na5+! [3.Nxc5? a2! 4.Ree1 Qc3+ 5.Kg4 Kxc5! 6.Rc1 a1Q 7.Rxa1 Qd4+= perpetual check] 3...Rxa5 4.Rc8+ Kb5 5.Rb1+ Qb4! 6.Rb8+ Kc5! 7.Rc1+! Qc4! 8.Rc8+ Kd5! 9.Rd1+! [9.R8xc4? a2! 10.Rg4 a1Q 11.Rxa1 Rxa1 12.Rxg6 Ke5=] 9...Qd4! 10.Rd8+ Ke5! 11.Re1+! Qe4! 12.Re8+ Kf5! 13.R8xe4! [13.Rf1+? Qf4 14.Rf8+ Ke5 15.Re1+ Qe4 16.Re8+ Kf5 17.R8xe4 loss of time] 13...a2 14.R4e3! Kf4! 15.Re7! [15.Re8? Ra3+! 16.Kg2 a1Q 17.Rf8+ Kg4=] 15...Ra3+! 16.Kg2 a1Q 17.Rf7+ Kg4 18.Re4+ Kh5 19.Rh7\# After V. Kalandadze, Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1977 (HHdbVI\#44238)
The study was created according to V. Kalandadze, Shakhmaty SSSR (Kh1/Kh4), 1977, in which the author worked a systematic movement of three heavy pieces (with movement from right to left). The new author added an intro, removed the shortcoming with a non-playing black rook, and with a systematic movement of three heavy figures (from left to right) ended the study with a checkmate.

## David Gurgenidze \& Vazha Neidze $\dagger$ (Georgia)

1.Bc8+ [1.axb4? Nxf2=; 1.Be2+? Kb6 2.Nxh1 Rh4 3.Bf3 Rh3 4.Be4 Rh4=] 1...Kb5 2.Nxh1 [2.Bd7+? Kb6 3.Nxh1 Rd4=] 2...Rd4 3.Ng3 Rd2+ 4.Ka1 Rd3 5.Nf5 Rxb3 6.Nd4+ Ka4 7.Bd7+ Kxa3 8.Nc2\#
Elegant correction of V. Neidze's study from LItalia Scacchistica (Ka3/Kb6) 1963. K. Husák also tried unsuccessfully to repair it in Pat-Mat (Kb1/Kd4) 1993.

## Paul Rewitz (Denmark)

1.Ra5+! [Try: 1.Re4+? Ka3 2.Re3+ Ka4 3.Ne2 (3.Na2 Bxb7+ 4.Kxc7 (4.Kc5 Bc8! (4...b1N? 5.Re2! Kb3 6.Kd4 c5+ 7.Kxc5 Nc3 8.Nc1++-) 5.Nc3+ Kb3 6.Nb1+ Ka2 (6...Kc2? 7.Na3++-) 7.Nc3+ Kb3 8.Nd1+ $\mathrm{Kc} 2=$ ) 4...Be4! (4...Bg2? 5.Kd6+-) 5.Nc3+ Kb4=) 3...Bxb7+ 4.Kxc7 Kb4! 5.Nc3 Be4!!= (5...Ba8? 6.Na2+ Ka4 7.Kd6! Be4 8.Kc5 b1Q 9.Nc3+ Ka5 10.Nxb1+-) ; 1.Ne2? Bxb7+=; 1.Na2? Bxb7+=] 1...Kxa5 2.Nb3+ Ka4 3.Nc5+! [3.b8Q? Bb7+! 4.Qxb7 b1Q 5.Nc5+ Ka3 6.Qxb1 stalemate; Try: 3.b8R? Bb7+! (3...b1Q? 4.Nc5++-) 4.Rxb7 b1Q (or 4...b1R ) 5.Nc5+ Ka5 6.Rxb1 stalemate] 3...Ka3 4.b8R! [4.b8Q? Bb7+! (4...Bb5+? 5.Qxb5 b1Q 6.Qa4+ Kb2 7.Qb3+ Ka1 (7...Kc1 8.Nd3+ Kd2 9.Qxb1) 8.Qa3+ Qa2 9.Nb3+ Kb1 10.Qc1\#) 5.Qxb7 b1Q 6.Qxb1 stalemate] 4...Be2! [4...Ka2 5.Na4!+- (5.Ne4? Kb1!=) ] 5.Kxc7! [5.Ne4? Bf3=; 5.Kd5? Ka2 6.Na4 b1N! 7.Kd4 (7.Rb2+ Ka3 8.Rxe2 Kxa4 9.Kc4 Na3+=) 7...c6!=] 5...Ka2 6.Na4 [6.Ne4? Kb1! 7.Nc3+ Kc2=] 6...b1N! 7.Kd6!+- [or 7.Kc6!+- ; 7.Rb2+? Ka3=]

A short but interesting solution with a logical minor promotion. It's a pity that the end of the study did not turn out best.



Win


Win


Win

## Michael Pasman (Israel)

1.a6! [Thematic try : 1.d6? c2 2.d7 Nc6! 3.Bxc6 Ke7-+] 1...c2 [1...Kf7 2.d6 c2 3.dxe7 c1Q 4.Bd5+ Kxe7 5.a7 Qxc5 6.a8Q+-] 2.a7 Kg8!! Preparing mate trap [not 2...Kf7 3.a8Q c1Q 4.Bc6 Nxc6 5.Qxc6 Qxf4 6.Qe6+ Kf8 7.Kg6+-] 3.d6!! [3.a8Q+? Kh7 4.f5 c1Q=] 3...Kh7! Continuing the plan 4.f5! [4.dxe7?? g6\#] 4...cxd6 [4...Nxf5 5.gxf5 c1Q 6.a8Q+-; 4...g6+ 5.fxg6+ Nxg6 6.Be4! c1Q 7.Bxg6+ Kg7 8.a8Q Qxc5+ 9.Bf5+-] 5.cxd6! [Thematic try : 5.a8Q? c1Q 6.Qe8 Qe3! /e1 7.cxd6 Nxf5! 8.Qg6+ (8.Be4 Qxe4!) 8...Kh8 9.gxf5 (9.Qxf5 Qe8+ 10.Qg6 Qe5+ 11.Qf5 Qe8+=) 9...Qe2+ 10.Qg4 Qe8+= with perpetual check] 5...c1Q [5...Nxf5 6.gxf5 c1Q 7.a8Q Qb1 (7...Qd1+ 8.Bf3+-) 8.Be4 (8.Kg4 h5+ 9.Kf4 Qc1+ 10.Kf3 Qd1+ 11.Ke3 Qxd6) 8...Qd1+ 9.Bf3+-] 6.dxe7 [6.a8Q?? Qc5!!-+ 7.g5 Qxf5-+] 6...Qb1! 7.e8Q! 5 moves white could promote a-pawn and didn't do it and finally promotes e-pawn [still 7.a8Q?? g6+ 8.fxg6+ Qxg6\#] 7...Qxb7 8.a8B!!+- a-pawn can' t still be promoted to Queen! Phenix - White square bishop sacrificed and new white square bishop promoted[8.a8Q? Qf7+! 9.Qxf7 Stalemate; 8.a8N? Qa7! 9.g5 hxg5 10.hxg5 fxg5 11.Qg6+ Kh8 12.Qc6 Kh7! 13.Qe4 Qf7+ 14.Kxg5 Qf6+= Draw The final bishop promotion is known before from the game Reshko - Kaminsky, Leningrad ch. 1972]
The construction of this study reminded me of the study from G. Costeff, Hlinka JT (Kh5/Kd8) 2004, which I awarded the special prize. In that study, the bishop is promoted to defend white with a stalemate. In this new study, the promotion to a bishop is in order to avoid a stalemate.

## Mario G. Garcia (Argentina)

1.Qf8+! [Try : 1.Qd8+? Kf7! (no 1...Ke6? 2.Qc7 Kf5 (2...Qe8 3.Bc8+ Kf6 4.Qg7\#) 3.Qc5+ Ke6 4.Bc8+ Kf7 5.Qc7+ Ke8 6.Bf5 Qc6+ 7.Bg6+) 2.Be4 Qa6+!=] 1...Ke6 2.c5! [Try : 2.Bc8+? Ke5 3.Qe7+ Kf4 4.Bb7 (4.Qxg5+ Kf3 5.Bg4+ Kf2 6.Qf4+ Ke1 7.Qxd4 Qc6+ 8.Kg5 Kf1=) 4...Nc6!= positional draw] 2...Qd7 3.Bf3! [Try : 3.Bc8? Qxc8 4.Qxc8+ Kd5 5.c6 Nxc6 6.Qd7+ Kc5 7.Kxg5 Nb4!= positional draw; or 3.Bg2? g4! 4.Kg6 Nd5!=] 3...Qc7 [3...Qf7 4.Bg4+ Kf6 5.Qd6++-; 3...Ke5 4.Kxg5 Nd5 5.Qh8+ Ke6 (5...Nf6 6.Qxf6\#) 6.Bg4++- pin] 4.Kg6! [4.Qe8+? Kf6 5.Qg6+ Ke7 6.Qg7+ Kd8 7.Qxd4+ Qd7=] 4...Kd7 [4...Qf4 5.Qe8\# mate; 4...Qe7 5.Qf5\#; 4...c2 5.Qf6++-] 5.c6+ Nxc6 [5...Ke6 6.Qf6\# mate] 6.Bg4\# mate Themes: Domination and culmination in mate.
After a precise foreplay, all the figures are played and a short but effective solution ends with a checkmate with active blocking of two squares.

## Vladislav Tarasiuk (Ukraine)

1.b5 [1.Ka5? Rxa6+! 2.Kxa6 Kc2=] 1...Ne6 2.Rb4! [Try: 2.Rh4? Nc7 3.Rh1+ Ka2 4.Bd8 Rxb5 5.Bxc7 Rb3! 6.Bd6 Rb6=; 2.a7? Nxd4 3.a8Q Nxb5 4.Ka5 Nc3=] 2...Nc7 [2...Kc2 3.Ka5!+-] 3.Bd8 Rxa6+! [3...Nxa6 4.Rxb2+! Kxb2 5.Bxb6 Nb8 6.Bd4+ Kc2 7.b6+-; 3...Rxb5 4.Rxb5 Nxb5 5.Bf6! Nc7 6.a7 Kc2 7.Bxb2+-] 4.bxa6 Nxa6 5.Rh4! [Thematic try: 5.Rg4? Ka2 6.Rg2 Nc5+ 7.Kb4 Nd3+ 8.Kc4 Nf4 9.Rd2 Nd5! 10.Kxd5 Ka3 (b3)=] 5...Ka2! [5...Nc5+ 6.Ka3!+-] 6.Rh2 Nc5+ 7.Kb4 Nd3+ 8.Kc4! [8.Kc3? Ka1! 9.Bf6 b1Q 10.Kc4+ Nb2+=] 8...Ka3 9.Be7+ Ka4 10.Rh1! [10.Rh8? Ne5+ 11.Kc3 Nc6! 12.Ra8+ Kb5=] 10...Nc1 11.Rh3 [11.Rh8? Nb3!=] 11...b1Q 12.Ra3\#

After the precise move $2 . \mathrm{Rb} 4$ ! the position of black is unsustainable. He must sacrifice the rook ( $3 . .$. Rxa6 + ) and the hope of an active knight fails cause the weak black king finds himself in a mate trap.

## Peter S. Krug (Austria)

1.Rd7! Kg8 2.Rg7+ Kh8 3.e7 Nc3 [3...Nd2 4.Rg4 Kh7 5.Rd4 Nf3 6.Rd8 +-] 4.Rg4 Kh7 [4...Nb5 5.Re4 Kh7 6.e8Q Rxe8 7.Rxe8 +-] 5.Rd4 Nb5 main [5...Re8 6.Rh4+ Kg8 7.Rg4+ Kh7 8.Rd4! Zugzwang 8...Rxe7 9.Rh4+! and win according Tablebasis] 6.Rd7 Kh6 7.Rb7! Rxb7 8.e8Q Rb6+ 9.Ke5! [9.Ke7? Re6+ =] 9...Rg6 10.Kf4 Rf6+ 11.Kg4 Rg6+ [11...Nd6 12.Qh8+ Kg6 13.Qg8+ Kh6 14.Qg5++-] 12.Kh4 Nd6 13.Qh8\# 1-0
In the superminiature, black fails to solve the stray knight. The moment the black rider approaches the white pawn, it turns out that the cause of the loss is also the king in the corner of the board.

Košice, May 2021
Michal Hlinka, international judge of FIDE

## Section B.2.: Studies - Draw

## REPORT

28 studies, 7 of them where joint-compositions, overall 23 composers from 14 countries (Argentina, Armenia, Austria, France, Georgia, Israel, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russia, Slovakia, Ukraine, USA) participated in section B. 2 (draw).

This is my debut as a judge. Not an easy task to judge and make a ranking list out of the many interesting studies, but it has been a great pleasure.

I have simplicity and originality relatively high as judging criteria.
In six of the studies, I have found similar points or nearly or exact the same positions in other studies.
In $\mathrm{N}^{0}$. 6, black wins with: 4 ... $\mathrm{Bc} 4+5 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Qd} 4+6 . \mathrm{Nc} 3 \mathrm{Ba} 3+$ !.
In $\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{o}}$. 16 , there is unfortunately another solution in the first move: 1.Rc6+ Kb5 2.Rxf4 e.g. 2...b2 (2...Kxc6 3.Rxd4=) 3.Rc8 Ka6 4.Rc6+=.


## Sergey Osintsev \& Valery Shanshin (Russia)

1.Be8! [1.Qh8? Nd6+! 2.Kb3 Nxf7 3.Qa8+ Kb6! (3...Kb5? 4.Qa4+ Kb6 5.Qxd7 h2 6.Qe6+=) 4.Kb2 Nfe5 5.Qh8 Nd3+ 6.Ka1 Nb4-+; 1.Bd5? Nb6+! 2.Kxc5 Nxd5 3.Kxd5 h2 4.Qh8 h1Q+! 5.Qxh1 a1Q-+] 1...Nb6+! [1...Nd6+ 2.Kb3! h2 3.Qxd7 c4+ 4.Kb2 a1Q+ 5.Kxa1 h1Q 6.Qc7+=; 1...Na3+ 2.Kb3! h2 3.Qxd7! c4+ 4.Kb2 c3+5.Kb3 (5.Ka1? Nc2\#) 5...Bc2+6.Kxa2 h1Q 7.Qc7+=] 2.Kxc5 [2.Kb3? Nd4+-+] 2...Na4+ [2...h2? 3.Bxb5 Na4+ 4.Bxa4 h1Q 5.Qa7\#] 3.Kc4! [3.Kd5? Nac3+-+] 3...Nd6+! [3...h2 4.Qe5 Nac3 5.Bxb5 Bd3+ 6.Kxd3 h1Q=] 4.Kd5! [4.Kb3? Nc5+! 5.Kb2 (5.Ka3 Nc4\#) 5...Nc4+! 6.Ka1 Nb3\#!] 4...Nxe8 [4...Nb5 5.Bxb5! h2 6.Qc7+ (6.Qa7+) 6...Kxb5=] 5.Qe5! [5.Qa7+? Kb5! 6.Qd7+ Kb4! 7.Qe7+ Kb3!-+] 5...a1Q! 6.Qxa1 h2 7.Qh8! [7.Qxb1? Nc3+-+] 7...Bh7! 8.Qa1! [8.Qxh7? Nf6+-+] 8...Bb1 9.Qh8=

The final idea with the long queen- and bishop moves is very impressive and new to me. The whole board is used and all the minor pieces makes a good impression. All in all, a high class study.

## Oleg Pervakov (Russia)

1.Qb4! Creating the battery [Not 1.Rd8+? Kb7! 2.Qb1 (2.Qb4 e1Q!-+) 2...Kc7! (2...e1Q? 3.Qh7+!+-) 3.Rd5 Qg8! 4.Qc2+ Kb8-+] 1...Rb3! [1...e1Q? 2.Qd6+!+-; 1...Kc8 2.Rc7+ Kxc7 3.Qe7+=; 1...Rf5+ 2.Kc4+ Kc8 3.Rc7+ Kxc7 4.Qe7+ Kb6 5.Qe3+!=] 2.Qxb3 e1Q 3.Rf7! [3.Ka6+? Kc8-+; 3.Rd5? Qe7-+] 3...Qe8+! 4.Kb4!! zz Mutual zugzwang. Again battery K+Q did not play! [4.Ka6+? Kc8-+] 4...Qge4+ Main A [Main B 4...Qgc6 5.Qg3+! (5.Ka5+? Ka8-+) 5...Ka8 6.Qa3+ Kb8 7.Qg3+ Kc8 8.Qh3+ Qee6 9.Qh8+ Qce8 10.Qc3+ Q6c6 11.Qh3+= Perpetual check; Or 4...Kc8 5.Qc3+ Qgc6 6.Qh3+…; 4...Qc8 5.Ka3+!=] 5.Kc5+! Kc8 6.Rc7+! Kxc7 7.Qb6+ Kd7 8.Qd6+ Kc8 9.Qc7+! Kxc7= Stalemate

On many parameters a high class study: Two Q-K batteries and an unbelievably mutual zugzwang with four heavy pieces. But in creativity, I don't give it a high score because the mutual zugzwang position with exactly this material can be found along with few other positions in a database over mutual zugzwang.

## Vladimir Neistadt (Russia)

1.Nb5+! [1.Nc1? Bxc1 2.Nb5+ axb5 3.Ra7+ Kb4! 4.Kxc1 Nc6-+] 1...axb5 2.Ra7+ Ra4 3.Rxa4+ bxa4 4.Nc1! [4.Nb4? Kxb4 5.Kxb2 a3+-+] 4...Bxe1 5.d7 Nc6 [5...Nxd7 6.c6=] 6.d8Q Nxd8 7.c6 Nxc6 [7...Bf4 8.Bxf4 Nxc6 9.Bd6+= similar to solution] 8.Bd6+ Nb4 9.Be5! =
A bit clumsy starting position, but the play is very fine. The final position where black is a piece and two pawns up is a very nice positional draw, with a stalemate if black tries $9 . . . b 2$ 10.Bxb2+ Bxb2.
I have received the following claim on this study: "... was published by the same author in UAPA-10, 2019 with another introduction". Therefore, I can not give the study more than a special prize.


## Pavel Arestov (Russia)

1.Be4+! [1.Nf2+? Kg1!-+] 1...Rxe4 [B) 1...Qxe4 2.Nf2+! Rxf2 (2...Kg1 3.Nxe4 d1Q 4.Qg7+ /b6=) 3.Qa1+ Qe1 4.Qa8+ Kg1 5.Qg2+! (5.Qg8+? Kf1 6.Qg2+ Rxg2 loss of time) 5...Rxg2= stalemate 2] 2.Nf2+ [2.Qxd2? Qh8+ /c8-+] 2...Kg1 3.Nxe4 Qc8+! [3...d1Q?? 4.Qg2\#; 3...Qxe4 4.Qxd2=] 4.Kh4! [4.Kg3? Qc7+! 5.Kf3 d1Q+-+] 4...Qd8+! [4...d1Q?? 5.Qf2+ Kh1 6.Ng3\#] 5.Ng5! [5.Kg3? Qc7+! 6.Kf3 d1Q+-+] 5...d1Q 6.Qg2+! [6.Qh2+? Kf1! 7.Qg2+ Ke1!-+] 6...Kxg2 stalemate 1
Nice play and two very fine stalemates.

## Bizya Buyannemekh \& Mario García (Mongolia-Argentina)

1.b5+ Kxa5 2.b7 [2.Rxd6? Nf5-+] 2...Bxc4 [2...Rh8+ 3.Kd7 Bxc4 4.Rxd6 Bxb5+ (4...Nf5 5.Ra6+ see solution) 5.Kc7 Rh7+ 6.Kc8 Nf5 7.b8Q=; 2...Rh7 3.Rxd6 Rxb7 4.Ra6+ Kb4 5.Rxa2=] 3.Rxd6 Rh8+ [main 3...Rxb5 4.Kd8 Rxb7 5.Rd4!= fork; or 3...Bxb5+ 4.Kd8 Rh8+ 5.Kc7=] 4.Kd7 Nf5 [4...Bxb5+ 5.Kc7 Rh7+ 6.Kc8=] 5.Ra6+! [Try: 5.Rb6? Bxb5+! 6.Rxb5+ (6.Kc7 Rh7+ 7.Kd8 Rd7+ 8.Kc8 Ne7+-+) 6...Kxb5 7.Kc7 Rh7+-+] 5...Kxb5 6.Rb6+! Kxb6 7.b8Q+ Rxb8 - stalemate

A model stalemate, after all the pieces have been moved. Very nice, but not too surprising.

## Michael Pasman (Israel)

1.Ra2! [Logical try $1: 1 . R b 3$ ? a2! 2.Ra3 Nxc7 3.Rxa2 h2 Position X1 with rook on a2 instead of a3 4.Ra1 h1Q 5.Rxh1 Bxh1-+] 1...h2 [Important logical line : 1...Nxc7 2.Rxa3 h2 Position X1 with rook on a3, white has : 3.Rxf3+! exf3 4.Rh5 Kg2 5.Rg5+ Kf1 6.Rh5= Positional draw] 2.Rh5! Bxh5 3.Bxh2 e3+ 4.Kc1 e2 [4...Nc3 5.Ra1! Ne2+ 6.Kb1 Nc3+7.Kc1 e2 8.Kd2 Nd1 9.Bg3+! Kxg3 10.Ke1! Ne3 11.Rxa3 Pin on 3-rd rank 11...Kf4 12.Ra4+ Kf3 13.Ra3! positional draw, can't escape from pin] 5.c3!! Pin on 2-nd rank [Logical try 2 : 5.c4? Nc3 6.Rc2 Bg6 7.Bg3+ Kxg3 8.Rxc3+ Kf2 9.Re3 Kxe3 Position X2, white has additional pawn on c4 and no stalemate] 5...Nxc3 6.Rc2! Main A 6...Nb5 [Main B 6...Bg6 7.Bg3+! Kxg3 8.Rxc3+ Kf2 9.Re3! Kxe3 Ideal Stalemate (this stalemate shown also by Zalkind in 1913 ). Position X2 see Logical try 2(9...e1Q+ 10.Rxe1 Kxe1 Ideal stalemate) ] 7.Be5! against Nd4 7...Bg6 8.Bg3+! [after 8.Rd2 simplest is $8 \ldots \mathrm{Bd} 3$ 9.Bg3+ Kxg3-+] 8...Kf3 [8...Kxg3 9.Rxe2=] 9.Rd2 Nc3 [Another important line : 9...Nd4!? 10.Rxd4 Kxg3 11.Kd2 a2 12.Ra4 Kf2 13.Rf4+ Kg3 14.Ra4 With positional draw] 10.Bh4! [10.Be1 Ke3! 11.Rc2 Bxc2 12.Kxc2 (12.Bxc3 Bg6) 12...Nb5!-+] 10...Ke3 [10...Be4 11.Rd6 /d7=; 10...Bf5 Rd6/d8=; 10...a2 11.Kb2=] 11.Bg5+! [11.Rd6? Na2\#] 11...Ke4 [11...Kf3 12.Bh4=] 12.Bh4 Ke3 13.Bg5+ Kf2 14.Bh4+ Positional draw
A rich study with many ideas. Nice stalemates in the 'Main B'-line.

## Jarl Henning Ulrichsen (Norway)

White a- and b-pawn draw versus black knight and a-pawn. This draw is not mentioned in books on endgames. 1.Kf6 f3 2.Bc4 f2 3.Ke5 Nf3+ 4.Kd5 [4.Ke4? Nd2+-+] 4...Nd2 5.Bxa6 f1Q 6.Bxf1 Nxf1 7.b3!! Festina lente. [The try (and natural move) 7.b4? loses to 7...Ng3 8.b5 (8.Kc5 Ne4+ 9.Kb5 Kc7 10.Ka6 Kb8 11.b5 Nc5\#) 8...Nf5 9.Kc5 Ne7 (Now White to move loses; (9...Nd6? 10.b6 a6 11.b7=) $10 . \mathrm{b} 6$ a6 11.b7 Nc6 12.Kb6 Nb8 13.Ka7 Kc7 14.Ka8 Nc6-+] 7...Ng3 8.b4 Nf5 9.b5 Nd6 (After 9--RNe7+ $10 . \mathrm{Kc} 5$ we have the same position as in the try after Black s 9 th move, but now it is Black to move!) [9...Ne7+ 10.Kc5] 10.Kc5 Nb7+ 11.Kb4 Kc8 12.Ka4! [Not 12.a6? Nd6 13.Kc5 Kc7-+] 12...Nd6 Black can make no progress. 13.Kb4 Kd8 14.Kc5 Kd7 15.b6 [Not 15.Kb4? Ne4 16.Kc4 Kd6-+] 15...a6 16.b7 Nxb7+ 17.Kb6=

A very fine mutual zugzwang in the position after b3. This and many similar position can be find in the database over mutual zugzwangs with up to 6 pieces, but still there is a lot of work to make it to a study.


## Andrzej Jasik (Poland)

1.c7 Ng6+ [1...f2 2.c8Q f1Q 3.Qxc3 Qh3+ 4.Kg5 Qe3+ 5.Kf5 Qf2+ 6.Kg5=] 2.Kg3! [2.Kg5? Ne7 $\mu$; 2.Kxg4? f2+ $\mu$ ] 2...f2 [2...Ne7 3.Bd5 $\pm$ ] 3.Rh1+! [3.c8Q? f1N\#] 3...Kxh1 4.Kxf2 g3+! 5.Kxg3 Bg4! 6.Bd5+! [6.Rxd3? c2 $\mu$ ] 6...Kg1 7.Bb3! c2 [7...Bd7 8.c8Q Bxc8 9.Rxd3=] 8.Bxc2 dxc2 9.Rxd2! [9.c8Q? Bxc8 10.Rxd2 c1R $\mu$ ] 9...c1Q 10.c8Q! Qxc8 [10...Bxc8 11.Rd1+ Qxd1 Stalemate] 11.Rd1+! Bxd1 Stalemate
Two nice stalemates at the end, where the bishop and the queen swap places.

## David Gurgenidze \& Vazha Neidze $\dagger$ (Georgia) <br> 1.c8Q Qh6+ 2.Kg8 Qxg6+ 3.Kf8 [3.Kh8? Qh6+ 4.Kg8 g1Q+-+] 3...Qf6+ 4.Ke8 [4.Kg8? g1Q+ 5.Rg4 Qxa7-+] 4...Qh8+ 5.Kd7 Qxc8+ 6.Kxc8 g1Q 7.cxb3 I) [7.a8Q? Qg8+ 8.Kb7 Qxa8+ 9.Kxa8 bxc2-+] 7...Qxa7 [II) 7...Kb6 8.Rb4+ Kxa7 9.Rb7+ Ka8 10.Rb8+ Ka7 11.Rb7+ positional draw N 2] 8.Ra4+ Kb5 9.Rb4+ Kc5 10.Rb7 Qa8+ 11.Rb8 Qa7 12.Rb7 positional draw N 1 <br> A pretty idea with two perpetuals, first with the king on a7-a8 and then with the queen on the same squares.

Michal Hlinka \& Luboš Kekely (Slovakia)
1.c4 [1.Kf6? Ne3 2.c3 Nd5+-+] 1...Kg8 2.c5 [2.Kf6? Kf8 3.c5 Ke8 4.c6 b6-+] 2...Kf8 3.c6! [3.Kf6? Ke8 4.Ke6 Kd8-+] 3...bxc6 4.Kf6! [4.bxc6? Ke7-+] 4...Ne3 [4...Ke8 5.Ke6 Kd8 6.Kd6 cxb5 7.axb5 Ne3 8.Kc6 Kc8 9.b6 a6 10.b7+ Kb8 11.Kb6=] 5.Ke6 [5.bxc6? Ke8-+] 5...c5 [5...cxb5 6.axb5 Nc4 7.Kd5 Na5 8.Kd6=] 6.Ke5 [6.a5? Nc4 7.b6 Nxb6!-+] 6...Ke7 7.Ke4 Nc4 8.Kd5 Na5! [8...Nd6 9.Kxc5 Kd7 10.a5=; 8...Nb6+ 9.Kxc5 Kd7 10.a5=] 9.Kxc5 Kd7 10.Kb4 Nb7 11.a5 Kc8 [11...Nd6 12.Kc5 Ne8 13.Kd5=; 11...Kd6 12.a6 Nc5 13.b6 Nxa6+ 14.Kb5 axb6 15.Kxb6=] 12.Ka4! [12.a6? Nd6 13.Kc5 Kc7-+] 12...Nd8 [12...Nd6 13.Kb4 Kd7 14.Kc5 Ne8 15.Kd5 Nf6+ 16.Kc5=] 13.Kb4 Kd7 14.Kc5 zz 14...Ne6+ [14...Nb7+ 15.Kb4 Kd6 16.a6 Nd8 17.b6 Nc6+ 18.Kb5=] 15.Kd5=

The main pointe that white does not recapture on c6, is very nice. The zugzwang position is also nice, but not surprising.

## Peter Krug (Austria)

1.Bh6+! [1.h8Q? Rg1+ 2.Kxg1 Nf3+ 3.Kg2 Ne1+ 4.Kh1 g2+5.Kh2 Qc7+ -+] 1...Kf5 2.e8Q Qxh7 3.Nd3 exd3 4.Rxh4 Rg1+ 5.Kxg1 Nf3+! ! 6.exf3 gxf2+ 7.Kh2 Bc7+ 8.d6!! [try . 8.f4? Qxh6! 9.Rxh6 Bxf4+ 10.Kg2 f1Q+ 11.Kxf1 b1Q+ 12.Kf2 Qa2+ 13.Kf1 Qa1+ 14.Kf2 Qd4+ 15.Kf3 Qxd5+ -+] 8...Bxd6+ 9.f4 A) 9...f1Q [B) 9...b1Q 10.Rh5+ Kf6 11.Bg5+ Kf5 12.Bh6+ Kg4 13.Qe6+ Kxh5 14.Qh3+ Kg6 15.Qe6+=] 10.Rh5+ Kg4 11.Rg5+ [11.Qe6+? Kf3 12.Rh3+ Qxh3+!-+] 11...Kxf4 12.Qe3+ Kxe3+ 13.Rg3+ [13.Re5+? Kd4!-+] 13...Ke2= stalemate Patt

A very messy study, but a nice stalemate at the end, with pins and a discovered check.

## Pavel Arestov (Russia)

1.e6! [1.Rh3+? Kf2! 2.e6 Qf4+ 3.Ke8 Qg4 4.Rh6 Qg7 /g7-+] 1...Qf4+ 2.Ke8! [2.Ke7? Qg5+ 3.Kd7 Qd5+-+] 2...Qa4+ 3.Kf7 [3.Kf8? Qa8+ 4.Kf7 Qxh1-+] 3...Qa2! 4.Rh6! [4.Kf6? Qf2+-+; 4.Rh5? Kf4! 5.Kf8 Qa3+6.Kf7 Qb3 7.Kf6 Qc3+ 8.Kf7 Qf3! 9.Rc5 Kg4+ 10.Ke8 Qa8+! 11.Kf7 Qa2! 12.Rb5 Qc4 13.Ra5 Qf4+ 14.Ke8 Qc7!-+] 4...Kd4! [4...Kf4 5.Kf6! Qb2+6.Kf7 Qa2 7.Kf6= positional draw; 4...Ke4 5.Kf8 /g7=] 5.Rh5! [5.Kf6? Qf2+! 6.Kg7 Qe3 /e2-+] 5...Ke4! [5...Qf2+ 6.Ke8 /e7=] 6.Rb5! [6.Kf6? Qf2+ 7.Kg6 Qf8-+] 6...Qc4 [6...Qf2+ 7.Ke8!=; 6...Kf4 7.Kf6! Qa1+8.Kf7 Qa2 9.Kf6= positional draw] 7.Rh5! [7.Rg5? Kf4-+] 7...Qb3 8.Rc5! Qa2 9.Rb5! Qc4 10.Rh5! Kf3 [10...Qa2 11.Rb5= positional draw] 11.Rh7! [11.Rh6? Kg4!-+] 11...Kg4! 12.Kf8!! [12.Rg7+? Kf5-+; 12.Kf6? Qf4+-+] 12...Qf4+ [12...Qxe6 13.Rg7+ Kf5 14.Rf7+ Kg6 15.Rg7+ Kh6 (15...Kf6 16.Rg6+ Kxg6= stalemate 1) 16.Rh7+ Kxh7= stalemate 2] 13.Kg8! [13.Kg7? Qd4+-+; 13.Rf7? Qb8+-+] 13...Qc4 [13...Qe5 14.e7=] 14.Kf8! [14.Kf7? Kg5-+] 14...Qc8+ 15.Kf7 Qc4 16.Kf8=
A very pleasant study, but the idea of 12. Kf8 is not new. In Ostmoe, Geir Sune, comm. Problemblaad 2019-20 is the position identical except that the black queen is at d 5 instead of c 4 .

Denmark, October 2021

Poul Rewitz, Judge

