# XIV CONFERENCE OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSION OF THE F.I.D.E. FOR CHESS COMPOSITIONS <br> The Hague, 25.ix-2.x. 1971 

A number of interesting and important items were on the agenda for this meeting, which was attended by only two Commission Members with a strong attachment to studies: Prof. Dr. Boris A. Sakharov (USSR) and Alexander Hildebrand (Sweden).

1. Comins Mansfield, who recently celebrated his 75th birthday, retired from the position of President and was elected Honorary President and Life Member. Mansfield's handling of the sometimes awkward deliberations during his long term of office could not have been bettered by U Thant.
2. G. W. Jensch (West Germany) was elected President, with Prof Sakharov as 1st Vice-President. Herr Jensch is a vigorous personality and well known as a champion of all branches of chess composition.
3. The application for membership by the Rumanian Chess Federation was unanimously approved.
4. The 1914-1944 FIDE Album will be published in three volumes to accommodate the 2500 selections. The volume including studies should appear some time during 1972.
5. It is hoped that the 1965-1967 FIDE Album will appear soon, the chief cause of delay being illness.
6. The procedure for the 1968-1970 FIDE Album will include some changes. Composers will not be subject to a limit, but will be encouraged to submit only their best work. The total in the Album will be not more than 850 compositions. Judges A and B will independently mark entries which in their opinion ought not to have been submitted, and those which both so mark will not be considered further. The necessary panel of 9 Directors, 27 Judges and 9 reserve Judges was chosen. Various plans for checking entries for anticipations and other faults were considered, but no final decisions were taken.
7. The title of "International Master of the F.I.D.E. for Chess Compositions" was awarded to the Soviet study composer Vitaly Tjavlovsky. Also to Yosif Kriheli (USSR).
8. The title of "International Judge of the F.I.D.E. for Chess Compositions" was awarded to Leopold Mitrofanov (U.S.S.R.).
9. "Statutes" for the Commission were circulated, but decisions concerning them were deferred until the following meeting.
10. It was decided to seek the F.I.D.E.'s approval for the institution of a "Grandmaster" title. This title would be awarded by honour, sparingly, and there would be a permanent Qualifications Committee set up" of five experienced and highly respected Members".
11. Finland was authorised to conduct the first official international team composing tournament, to be known as the "World Chess-Compositions Tournament of the F.I.D.E." The two previous competitions (sometimes known as "Friendship" matches) were unofficial. The two study themes will be set by Spain and the U.S.S.R. and these latter countries must decide on and send their statements and examples of the set themes to the Commission President by 1.iv.72. The minute says that "limitations on pieces, and constructional tasks should be avoided".
12. A sub-committee suggested replies to certain points raised by Finland respecting "the composer's right to his work". The four points, and the replies, read verbatim:

## APPENDIX

Point 12 - "The composer's right to his work" (Finland). Herewith are the suggested answers of the Tampere sub-committee (Messrs. O. Kaila, Dr. K. Fabel, Ing. B. Formanek and B. P. Barnes) to the following four questions:
(a) "What kind of notes should be added to a reprinted problem when other people besides the composer have found one or more 'cook' solutions?"
It was agreed that where a related idea and perfectly good second/ third etc. solution to a problem - overlooked by the original composer - is found by a solver, the problem is published on future occasions with suitably amended conditions (e.g. $2 / 3$ solutions) and still with the name of the original composer only over the diagram. Whenever possible and practical, credit is given to the finder(s) of the second/third solution when the printed solutions appear.
(b) "What is the right of the composer if it is shown that his solution was not correct and that another correct solution is present in (1) the original position, and (2) a changed position?"
(1) It was thought desirable that where the original composer's intended solution does not work but a second perfectly good solution found by another person does work, the other person deserves some credit. It was suggested that the diagram is headed to show the name of the original composer as well as (Solution by A. N. Other).
(2) In the case of a changed position, it was agreed that where a new composer modifies the position and/or the solution of an earlier problem, the new composer can take credit according to
the rules of 'fair play' (e.g. Version) by A. N. Other or After A. N. Other), but in no case is reference to the original composer deleted. In all cases, all original sources (from actual games, analysis, etc.) should be accredited.
(c) "Which date in a tournament is valid as the date of publication?" It was agreed that the closing date of a formal tourney must count as the date of first publication of a problem, and that this practice would obviate the so-called 'anticipation' by another identical problem published after the closing date of the formal tourney but before the award is made.
It was also agreed that it should become standard practice for the closing date of the formal tourney to be added to the source details of the problem when it is printed on future occasions. For example, in addition to the usual heading details, C.31.8.67 would indicate the closing date of the tourney.
(d) "How long is the validity of a composer's right after the publication of a 'cooked' problem?"
It was agreed that the answer to this question is the answer given in (b) (2) above when in no case is reference to the original composer deleted.

Review. '2e Internationale Landenteamstrijd voor Schaakcomposities', Netherlands Society of Problem Friends, dated 1970 on front cover, but published in September 1971.
This is the official record of the Second Team Composing Match, organised by the country, Holland, which came second in the first 'Friendship' match. The coordination involved in undertaking such a task can hardly be guessed at by an outsider, but a few facts are suggestive. There were 588 entries for the 9 sections (only one was for studies, Section I). 27 countries entered, making a theoretical maximum of 81 for any section. This figure of 81 was used for the official ranking of teams, irrespective of how many entries there were in a particular section. That is, the first placed composition scored invariably 81, the second 80 and so on. Naturally, only valid entries scored, and this meant that 173 were eliminated, 17 of them after printing of the preliminary report, from which EG's Nos. 1392-1422 were taken. Some of the disqualifications were due to anticipation or being unthematic. This caused hardship in the studies section, where the judge, Dr Zlatic standing in for Z. Hernitz, felt obliged to base his approach on the 1958 Yugoslav 'Codex' compiled during the 'First World Congress of Chess Problemists' at Piran, a document which he nevertheless found unsatisfactory - as the report states, composers will agree with him. Thus the Codex does not envisage a proof that Black is to move; likewise, partial or alternative analyses had to be excluded, in the judge's opinion. In all, 22 of the 52 studies were eliminated.
One study was eliminated after the distribution in the autumn of 1970 of the preliminary award. Unfortunately, this was No. 1392, so all the EG-published rankings are one too high. See 'Spotlight' for further details.
As many facts as possible are compressed into the attached table of the results. The report is magnificently printed by EG's printers, Van Spijk, and the fact that all participants were sent free copies is due to the assistance accorded by the "Prins Bernhard Foundation".


No. 1433: G. V. Afanasiev and E. J. Dvizov. 1. e3 Sd3†/i 2. Bxd3 d1Q 3. Bc4/ii Qh5 $\dagger$ 4. Bd5 wins. i) 1. . Sxc4 2. Kxc4 wins, or 1. .. d1Q 2. Rxb2 Qh5 $\dagger$ 3. Bd5. ii) Avoidance of the 'obvious' double attack 3. Bc2†? Ka3 4. Bxd1 stalemate.

No. 1434: V. Cuciuc. 1. Ra4 Rc2 2. Bxg4 Bg7 3. Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 7$ 4. Be6 a1Q 5.Bg8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 8$ 6. Ba2 $\dagger \mathrm{Bf} 8$ 7. Rxf8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 8. Rf7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 9. Bd5 Qd4 10. Rf5 $\dagger$ Kh7 11. Rf7 $\dagger \mathrm{Qg} 7$ 12. $\mathrm{Rxg} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Kxg} 7$ 13. Be4 draw. The composer is a young Roumanian engineer.

No. 1435: D. A. Gurgenidze. 1. Ra4 Rxa4 2. b4/i Rxb4 3. c4 Rxc4/ii 4. d4 Rxd4 5. e4 Rxe4 6. f4 Rxf4/iii 7. Rf1 Rxf1 8. b8Q wins.
i) 2. f4? Ra5 (Rxf4? Rf1) 3. f5 Ra4 wins for Black. 2. e4? Ra5 (. . Rxe4; f4, Re5?? fe†) 3. e5 Rxe5 wins. ii) 3... Rb6 4. Kh7 wins. iii) 6... Rb4 7. Rg1.
The composer is a student at Tbilisi Polytechnic. JRH: "Korolkov (Magyar Sakkelet, 1957) used a similar series of P-offers with mate threatened by bR. See p. 184 of his collection. Not an anticipation."

No. 1436: D. A. Gurgenidze. 1. g7 Rc8 2. Bf8 Kf3 3. Ke1/i Rc1†/ii 4. Kd2 Rg1 5. Kd3 Rd1 $\dagger$ 6. Kc3 (c4) Rg1 7. Kd4 Rd1 $\dagger$ /iii 8. Ke5 Rg1 9. e4 Rg5 $\dagger$

10. Kd4/iv Rg4 11. Kd5/v Rg5 $\dagger$ 12. e5 Kf4 13. Kd6 Rg6 $\dagger$ 14. e6 Kf5 15. Kd7 wins. i) 3 . Kg1? Rel $\dagger$ 4. Kh2 Rc2 $\dagger$ and 5. . . Rg2 draw. ii) 3. .. Kxe3 4. Kd1. iii) 7. .. Rg4 $\dagger$ 8. Kd3/vi Rg1 9. e4 Kf4 10. Kd4 Rd1 $\dagger$ 11. Kc4 (c5) Rg1 12. Kd5 Rg5 $\dagger$ 13. Kd4 Rg1 14. e5 Kf5 15. Kd5 Rd1 $\dagger$ 16. Kc5 (c6) Rg1 17. Kd6 Rg6 $\dagger$ 18. Kd5 Rg1 19. e6 Kf6 20.Kd 2 Rd1† 21. Kc6 (c7) Rg1 22. Kd7 Rd1 $\dagger$ 23. Ke8 Rg1 24. e7. iv) 10. Kf6? Rxg7. v) 11.Kd3? Kf4 12. Bd6† Kf3 13. Be5 Rg1 14. Bf6 Kf4 15. Kd4 Rd1 $\dagger$ 16. Kc5/vii Rc1 $\dagger$ 17. Kd6 Rc8 18. e5 Kf5 19. Ke7 Kg6 20.Bb2 Ra8 21. Kd7 Rb8 22. e7 Kf7. vi) 8. e4? Rxe4† 9. . Rg4. vii) $16 . \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Rc} \dagger \dagger$ 17. K- Rg1 18. Kd5 Rg5 $\dagger$ draw.

JRH: "No anticipation, but Bron (1952, No. 88 in his collection) has a similar sequence."

No. 1437: M. Gorbman. 1. e8S Qa7 2. Sg7† Qxg7 3. fg a2 4. g8S a1Q 5. Sgf6 $\dagger$ Qxf6 6. gf c3 7. f7 c2 8. f8Q c1Q 9. Sf6 $\dagger$ Kg5 10. Se4 $\dagger$ Kh5 11. Qh8 $\dagger$ Qh6 12. Qe5 $\dagger$ g5 13.Qe8 $\dagger$ Qg6 14.Sf6 $\dagger$ Kh6 15. Qh8 $\dagger$ wins. The composer is from Krivoi Rog in the U.S.S.R.

No. 1438: M. Gorbman. 1. d7 Se4† 2. Kf4 g5 $\dagger$ 3. Kf5 Be6 $\dagger$ 4. Kxe6 Sxc5 $\dagger$ 5. Kf5 Sxd7 6. Kxg4 draw.


No. 1448: N. Kondratyuk and V. Yakovenko. 1. Sa1 Kf6 2. Be8 Bd6 $\dagger$ 3. Ke3 Bxh2 4. Kd2 Sb2 5. Kc3 Ea4 6. Bh5 Sd1† 7. Kb4 Sb2 8. Kc3 Kg5 9. Bf3 Kf4 10. Eh5 Kg5 11. Bf3 Bd1 12. Bc6 Sa4† 13. Kd2 Sb2 14. Kc3 Ba4 15. Bf3 Kf4 16. Bh5 Sd1 $\dagger$ 17. Kd2 Kh5 18. Bf3 draw. The socond set theme was alternate attack on 2 men by K.

No. 1449: I. Kriheli. 1. h7 Be5 2. e3 Sf3 3. b6 $\dagger$ Kxb6 4. Be2 Sg1 5. Bf1 Sf3 6. Be2 Sg1 7. Bf1 Sd1/i 8. h8Q Bxh8 9. Kxh2 Sf3† 10. Kg3 Sd2 11. Be2 Be5 $\dagger 12$. Kg2 Sxe3† 13. Kf2 Bd4 14. Ke1 Ec3 15. Kf2 Bd4 16. Ke1 draw. i) Bl threatens 8... Sf $2 \dagger$, as otherwise W draws by moving wsa1, promoting on h8 and taking bPh2.
No. 1450: V. A. Bron. 1. h7 Sg5 $\dagger$ 2. Kf5 Sxh7 3. Sxa4 Bxa4 4. Bg7 $\dagger$ Kb1 (or Ka2) 5. Kg6 Bc2† 6. Kf7 Bb3† 7. Kg6 Ec2 $\dagger$ 8. Kf7 draw.

No. 1451: A. Kashnin. 1. Sxa6 Kxa6 2. Bg2 Bd7 3. Bf1 Be6 4. Kf6 Sf4 5. Kg5 Sh3† 6. Kf6 Sf4 7. Kg5 Sh3† 8. Kf6 draw.

No. 1452: G. Afanasiev and E. Dvizov. 1. Sa4 Bd8† 2. Kf5 Sf7 3. Ke 3 Sg5 $\dagger$ 4. Kd7 Sb7 5. Kc6 Sa5 $\dagger$ 6. Kd7 Sf7 7. Ke6 draw.

No. 1453 6th A. Popandopulo 6th Place,
2nd Theme, VI U.S.S.R. Team Championship. 1968-9

No. 1455
8th Place
P. Babich

2nd Theme, VI U.S.S.R Team Championship. 1968-9


No. 1454 E. Pogosjants
7th Place,
2nd Theme, VI U.S.S.R.
Team Championship. 1968-9


No. 1456 Vth Place,
V. Evreinov

2nd Theme, VI U.S.S.R
Team Championship, 1968-9


No. 1453: A. Popandopulo. 1. b4 Bxb4 2. cb Bxf8 3. b7 Bd6 4. Kd5 Sf5 5. Ke4 Sg3† 6. Kd5 draw.

No. 1454: E. Pogosjants. 1. d7 Sc7 2. d8S Se6† 3. Sxe6 Kxe6 4. Sa3 Ba4 5. Kb4 Sb2 6. Kc3 Sd1† 7. Kb4 Sb2 8. Kc3 draw.

No. 1455: P. Babich. 1. Kd7 Ba6 2. Bf4 Bb7 3. Kc7 Ba6 4. Kd7 Kh7 5. Ke6 Sd8 $\dagger$ 6. Kd7 Sf7 7. Ke6 Kg8 draw.

No. 1456: V. Evreinov. 1. Sd6 Bg6 2. f8Q Sxf8 3. Kg7 Bc5 4. Sb7 Be7 5. h7 Exh7 6. Kf7 Sg6 7. Kg7 Sf8 8. Kf7 Sg6 9. Kg7 draw.

No. 1457: A. V. Alekseev. 1. Qb1 Sc6 $\dagger$ 2. Rxc6 Ra8 $\dagger$ 3. Kxa8 Qb7 $\dagger$
 9. Re7 Rxc7 $\dagger$ 10. Ka8 Ra7 $\dagger$ 11. Kb8 Rb7 $\dagger$ 12. Kc8 Rc7 $\dagger$ 13. Kd8 Rd7 $\dagger$ 14. Ke8 Re7 $\dagger$ 15. Kf8 Rf7 $\dagger$ 16. Kg8 Rg7 $\dagger$ 17. Kh8 Rg8 $\dagger / i 18$. Kh7 Rg7 $\dagger$ 19. Kh6 Rg6 $\dagger$ 20. Kh5 Rg5 $\dagger$ 21. Kh4 Rg4 $\dagger$ 22. Kh3 Rg3 $\dagger$ 23. Kh2 Rg2 $\dagger$ 24. Kh1 Rh2 $\dagger$ 25. Kg1 Rg2 $\dagger$ /ii 26. Kf1 Rf2 $\dagger$ 27. Ke1 Re2 $\dagger$ 28. Kd1 Rd2 $\dagger$ 29. Kc1 Rd1 $\dagger$ 30. Kb2 wins. i) 17. . Rh7 $\dagger 18$. Qxh7 and no stalemate any more. ii) 25 . . Rh1 $\dagger$ and wK still marches to b2 to lift the stalemate.

No. 1457 A. V. Alekseev Karseladze Memer
Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70
Award in "Lelo", 1970 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. 1459 (st Hon M. Kalinin
Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. 1458 E. L. Pogosjants
Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. $1460{ }_{2 \text { nd }} \underset{\text { Hon. A. Bron }}{ }$ Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


The tourney was organised by the Sports Committee of the Georgian town of Gori. Judge: V. A. Korolkov.
No. 1458: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. Rg3 $\dagger$ Kxf4 2. Kh5 Rf5 $\dagger$ /i 3. Kh4 Be7 $\dagger$ 4. Qg5 $\dagger$ Bxg5 $\dagger$ ii 5. Kh3 Be2 6. Rf3 $\dagger$ Bxf3 7. g3 mate. i) 2. .. Be $2 \dagger$ 3. Rg4 $\dagger \mathrm{Bxg} 4 \dagger$ 4. Qxg4 mate. ii) 4. . . Rxg5 5. Rf3 mate.

No. 1459: A. K. Kalinin. 1. Sc3 d1Q 2. Sxd1 e2 3. Sc3 e1Q 4. Sb5 Qf1/i 5. Bg2 Qe2 6. Bf3 Qd3 7. Be4 Qc4 8. Bd5 Qe2 9. Bf3 Qh2 10. Bg1 Qg3 11. Bf2 Qf4 12. Be3 Qe5 13. Bd4 Qf4 14. Be3 Qc4 15. Bd5 draw. i) If 4. . Qg3 at once then 5. Pf2.

No. 1460: V. A. Bron. 1. h8Q $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 2. Qg8 Ka1/i 3. Qg7 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 4. Qf7 Ka1 5. Qf6 $\dagger$ Ka2 6. Qe6 Ka1 7. Qe5 $\dagger$ Ka2 8. Qd5 Qxd5 9. c8Q Qb3 10. Qg8 Ka1 11. Qg7 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 12. Qf7 Ka1 13. Qf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 14. Qe6 Ka1 15. $\mathrm{Qe} 5 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 16. Qd5 Qxd5 17. d8Q Qb3 18. Qa5 $\dagger$ wins. i) Capturing merely short-circuits: 2. . Qxg8 3. c8Q Qb3 4. Qg8 etc.

No. 1461: A. G. Kopnin. 1. e7 Sf6 2. Sg4 Sexg4 3. e8Q Sxe8 4. Bxe8 Re5 5. Bh5 Rc4 6. Bf7 Ra4 7. Be8 Ra6 8. Bh5 Ra4 9. Be8 Re4 10. Bf7 Re5 11. Bh5 Rc4 12. Bf7 draw.

No. 1461
A. G. Kopnin 3rd Hon. Men. rseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970
 Karseladze Commend,
Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. 1462 I. V. Chuiko Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. 1464 S. Rumyantsev 2nd Commend,
Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in 'LLelo",' 1970


No. 1462: I. V. Chuiko. 1. Qa7 Sa3† 2. Qxa3 e1Q 3. Qxc5 $\dagger$ dc 4. Sd3 $\dagger$ Ke2 5. Sxe1 bc 6. Sg2 Kf3 7. Sh4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 8. §g6 Kf5 9. Sf8 Kf6 10. Sd8 Ke7 11. Sfe6 Kd7 12. Kxc3 Ke7 13. Kxc4 Kd7 14. Kxc5 Ke7 15. Kxc6 Ke8 16. Sb7 with a book win.

No. 1463: S. G. Pelokon. 1. Sf2 f5 2. Kb8 Kb6 3. Kc8 Kc6 4. Kd8 Kd6 5. Ke8 Ke6 6. Kf8 Kf6 7. Kg8 Kg6 8. Sd3 ghQ 9. Bd4 Qxh2 10. Se5 $\dagger$ Kh6 11. Sf7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 6$ 12. Sh8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 613$. Bg7 mate.

No. 1464: S. Rumyantsev. 1. Sd6 $\dagger$ Kd7 2. f7 Ke7 3. f6 $\dagger$ Kf8 4. Sc4 g1Q 5. Se5 Qd4† 6. Kb5 Qc3 7. Kb6 Qc8 8. Kb5 Qc7 9. Kb4 draw.

No. 1465: E. L. Pogosjants. 1. e3 Kf7 2. Bc4 $\dagger$ Se6 3. Bxe6 $\dagger$ Kxe6 4. e4 Kf7 5. e6 $\dagger$ Kxe6 6. e5 Kf7 7. e6 $\dagger$ Kxe6 8. Sf $8 \dagger$ Sxf8 9. f7 Rh6 $\dagger$ 10. Kg8 Rh5 11. Kxf8 Rxg5 12. Ke8 Ra5 13. f8S $\dagger$ draw.
No. 1466: V. V. Yakimchik. 1. Rc7 $\dagger$ Khis 2. Rc8 Kh7 3. Bg3 Bf4 $\dagger$ 4. Ke7 Bxg3 5. Rh8 $\dagger$ Kxh8 6. hg elQ $\dagger$ 7. Kf7 Qe4 8. g7 $\dagger$ Kh7 9. g8Q $\dagger$ Kh6 10. Qh8 $\dagger$ Qh7 $\dagger$ 11. Qg7 $\dagger$ Qxg7 $\dagger$ 12. fg wins.

Presumably (AJR) 2. . Kxh5 is met by 3 . Re8 Bb4 $\dagger 4$. Kd5, or 3. . . e1Q 4. Rxe1 Bxe1 5. Ke6.

No. 1465 E. L. Pogosjants Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. $1467 \quad$ L. I. Katsnelson 1st Prize "Ajedrez" 1970 Provisional Award vii. 71


No. 1466 V. V. Yakimchik
Karseladze Memorial, 1969-70 Award in "Lelo", 1970


No. 1468 O. J. Carlsson 2nd Prize "Ajedrez" 1970 Provisional Award vii.71


No. 1467: L. I. Katsnelson. There were 114 entries for this formal tourney. Judges: B. Soukup-Bardon (Prague) and F. Benkö (Argentina). On the First Prize there is the comment "... unusual . . . highly interesting". JRH has found no anticipations except for the concluding tactical E-check/S-fork in No. 1469.

1. Re6 Sc4 ${ }^{2}$ 2. Kb5/i Se5 3. RxS Rg5 4. Ef5 RxB 5. RxR e1(Q) 6. RxB $\dagger$ Kh7 7. Rf7† Kh6 8. Rf6† Kg5 9. Rf3 Qc1 10. Kb4/ii Qc2 11.Kb5 Qc7 12. Kb4 Qc6 13. Kb3 Qc5 14. Kb2 Qc4 15. Kb1 Kg6/iii 16. Kb2 Kh7 17. $\mathrm{Rh} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 6$ 18. $\mathrm{Rf} 3=$. i) 2. Kc 7 ? $\mathrm{Rg} 7 \dagger$ 3. K any $\operatorname{Re7}$ wins.
ii) 10. Kb6? Qc4 etc. or 10. Ka4? Qb1 11. Ka3 Qb5 12. Ka2 Qb4 13. Ka1 Qd2 14. Kb1 Kg4 wins. iii) 15. . Qe2 16. Rg3 $\dagger$ etc.
No. 1468: O. J. Carlsson. "... no new basic idea, but an optimum presentation" (S-B).
2. c7 Sa4 2. $\mathrm{Be} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Sf} 3$ 3. $\mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{Rc} 1 / \mathrm{i} 4$. $\mathrm{Bc} 6 \mathrm{Rc} 5 \dagger$ 5. $\mathrm{Ka} 6 \mathrm{RxB} \dagger$ 6. $\mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 6 \dagger$ 7. Ka7 Rc6 8. Kb7 Se5 9. c8(Q) Sc5 $\dagger$ 10. Kb8 Sed7 $\dagger$ 11. Ka7 Rh6 12. $\mathrm{Qg} 8 \dagger=$. e.g. 12. . Kh3 13. Qh8 RxQ stalemate.
i) $3 . . . \mathrm{Sc} 3 \dagger 4$. $\mathrm{Kb} 6 \mathrm{Sa} 4 \dagger 5 . \mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Sc} 5 \dagger 6 . \mathrm{Kb} 6=$.

No. 1469: V. A. Asmolov. "The clever combination is very impressive" (S-B). 1. Kg5/i b2/ii 2. Se7 (Kh6? Kxg8) 2. .. b1Q 3. Kh6 Qb6 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii}$ 4. Bc6/iv Qc5 5. Sg6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 6. Bd5 $\dagger$ Qxd5 7. Se $7 \dagger$ wins.

i) 1. Se7? c3 2. Kg5 Kh7 3. Eh3 c2 4. Bxf5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$. Or 1. Bh3? c3 2. Bxf5 c2 wins. ( r 1. Kxf5? c3 2. Be4 c2 wins. ii) 1. . Kg7 2. Se7 c3 3. Sxf5 $\dagger$ K- 4. Sd4 c2 5. Sxb3 wins. 1. . Kxg8 2. Bd5† K- 3. Bxc4 b2 4. Ba2 wins. 1. . c c3 2. Kh6 c2 3. Se7 c1Q 4. Sg6† Kg8 5. Bd5 mate.
iii) 3. . f 4 4. $\mathrm{Sg} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Qxg} 6 \dagger$ 5. Kxg6 c3 6. Be4 wins.
iv) 4. Sg6 $\dagger$ ? Qxg6 $\dagger$ 5. Kxg6 c3 万. Kxf5 c 2 wins.

No. 1470: J. Vandiest. "... unexpected struggle showing distinct variations" (S-B).

1. e4/i e6/A, B 2. d6 e5† 3. KxP Kd7 4. Kf6/ii c4 5. e5 c3 6. e6 $\dagger \mathrm{KxP}$ 7. e7 c2 8. e8(Q) c1(Q) 9. Qd8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 610 . \mathrm{Qc} 8 \dagger$ wins. i) 1. Ke5? e6 2. d6 Kd 7 3. e4 c4 4. Kd4 KxP =, or 1. Kf5? e6 $\dagger$, or $1 . \mathrm{Ke} 4$ ? e6 2. d6 Kd7 3. Ke5 c4. ii) 4. Kd5? c4 5. KxP KxP.
A) 1. . Kf7 2. e5/iii Kg7/iv 3. € 3 Kf8 4. Ke4 Ke8 5. Kd3 Kd8 6. Kc4 Kc8 7. KxP Kc7 8. Kb5 Kb7 9. d6 wins. iii) 2. Kf5? e6 $\dagger$, or 2. Ke3? e6 3. d6 e5 4. Kd3 Ke6 5. Kc4 KxP 6. Kb5 c4 7. KxP Kc6 =. iv) 2... e6 3. d6 Ke8 4. Ke3 Kd8 5. Kd3 Kd7 6. Kc3 Kc6 7. Kc4 Kb6 8. d7 Kc7 9. Kxp KxP 10. Kb6 wins, or 2. . . Kg6 3. Kc4 c4 4. Kd4 Kf5 5. e6 Kf6 6. KxP Ke5 7. Kc5 wins.
B) 1. . . Kd7 2. e5/v e6 3. d6 Kc6 4. Ke4 Kb6 5. Kd3 Kb7 6. Kc3 Kb6/vi 7. Kb2/vii Kb 7 8. Kb3/viii $\mathrm{Kb} 6 / \mathrm{ix} 9$. Ka4 Kc6 10. Ka5 c4 11. Kb4 c3 12. KxP wins. v) 2. Ke5? e6 3. d6 c4 4. Kd4 Kxd6. Or 2. Ke3? e6. vi) 6. . . Kc6 7. Kc4 Kb6 8. d7 wins. vii) 7. Kc4? Kc6, or 7. Kb3? Kb7 8. Ka3 Kc6 9. Ka4 Kb6 draw. viii) 8. Ka3? Kc6 9. Ka4 Kb6, or 8. Kc2? Kc6. ix) 8. .. Kc6 9. Kc4 Kb6 10. d7 wins.

No. 1471: R. Brieger. "An epic struggle over the length and breadth of the board" (S-B).

1. Sc3 Sd2/i 2. Rc2 Qa8† 3. S6d5 Qa1 4. SxP Qa8† 5. S7d5 Qa1/ii 6. KxP Kf1/iii 7. Se3† Ke1/iv 8. Kg2 Qa8 $\dagger$ 9. Sed5 Qa1 10. Sf6 Qa8 $\dagger$ 11. S6e4 QxS $\dagger$ 12. SxQ SxS 13. Kf3 SxP† 14. Ke3 Kd1/v 15. Rc6 Sf7/vi 16. Rc5 h6/vii 17. Rf5 Sg4 18. Rf6 Kc2 19. RxP Kc3 20. Kf4 Sf7 21. Rc6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 4$ 22. Rf6 Sd8 23. Rd6 Sf7 24. Rd7 Sh6 25. Rg7 wins. i) 1. . Qa8† 2. S6e4 Sd2 3. RxS wins. ii) 5. .. Qa3 6. RxS QxS 7. SxQ KxR 8. Sd5 Kd3 9. KxP Ke4 10. Se7 Ke5 11. Kg4 wins. iii) 6. .. Se4 $\dagger$ 7. SxS Qe5 $\dagger$ 8. Kf3 Qf5 $\dagger$ 9. Sf4 Kd1 10. Rc5 Qf7 11. Ke3 Qa2 12. Sd3 wins.
iv) 7. . . Kg1 8. Se2† (or 8. Rcl†) Kh1 9. Rc1 $\dagger$ QxR 10. SxQ Se4 $\dagger$ 11. Kf4 SxP 12. KxS h5 13. Kh4 Kg1 14. Sd3 Kh2 15. Sf4 Kg1 16. Kg3 h4 $\dagger$ 17. Kf3 wins (h3 18. Se2 $\dagger$ Kh1 19. Sf1 h2 20. Sig3 mate).



No. 1473: V. Kalandadze. 1. Sb4 a1(Q) 2. Sc2 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 2$ 3. SxQ RxS $\dagger$ 4. Kg2 RxS 5. Re8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd1}$ 6. Rd8 Ra2 $\dagger$ 7. Kf1 Rd2 8. Ra8 Ra2 9. Rd8 Rd2 10. $\mathrm{Ra} 8=$.

No. 1474: T. G. Gorgiev. ". .. some of the manoeuvres are inevitably familiar" (S-B). 1. Sg6 Bf7/i 2. Sf4 BxB 3. Sf6 $\dagger$ Kh8 4. S6xB Sc7 5. Kc6/ii Se8/iii 6. Kd7 Sg7 7. Sf6 Sf5 8. Ke6 Sh4 9. Kf7 h5 10. Kf8 wins. i) 1. . . Bd3 2. $\mathrm{Sf} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 3. Se8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 4. Se7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf} 8$ 5. Sd5 Be4 6. S8f6 Bd3 7. Kc6 Pa6 8. Kd6 Be8 9. Sd7† Kg7 10. Ke7 Eb7 11. S7f6 Ea6 12. Se8† Kg8 13. Bf7 $\dagger$ Kh8 14. Kf8 wins. ii) 5. Kb6? Se8 draw. iii) 5. . Sa6 6. Sd3 Kh7 7. S5f4 h5 8. Kb7 Kh6 9. KxS Kg5 10. Sh3 $\dagger$ Kg4 11. Sdf2 $\dagger$ wins "AJR welcomes comments on the system of numbering notes used in the following two complex studies by Pospisil.
No. 1475: J. Pospisil. 1. Kd6/i h4/iii 2. Kd5/vi Kg6 3. Ke5 Kh5/vii 4. Kf5 g4 5. Ke4/viii Kg5/x 6. Ke3 g3 7. Kf3/xi Kf5 8. Ke2 Kg4 9. Kf1 h3 10. Kg1 draw. i) 1. Ke6? Kg6 2. Ke5 h4 3. Ke4 Kf6 4. Ke3 Ke5 5. Kf3 Kf5 6. Kf2/ii Kf4 or Kg4 wins. ii) Or 6. g3 g4† 7. K any h3 wins, or 6 . g4† Ke5 7. Ke3 Kd5 wins. iii) 1. . Kg6 2. Ke6/iv g4 3. Ke5 Kg5 4. Ke4 g3 5. Ke3/v h4 6. Kf3 Kf5 7. Ke2 draw. iv) 2. Ke5? h4 wins. v) 5 . Kf3? h4 6. Ke2 h3 7. gh Kh4 8. Kf1 Kxh3 9. Kg1 g2 wins. vi) 2. Ke5? Kg6 etc. vii) 3. . Kh6 4. Ke4 draw. viii) 5. Kf4? g3 6. Kf3/ix Kg5 7. Ke2 h3 wins. ix) Or 6. Ke3 h3 wins. x) 5. .. g3 6. Kf4 draw. xi) 7. Ke2? h3 wins.

No. 1476: J. Pospisil. 1. Rfg3/i e1Q/v 2. Rg5 $\dagger /$ viii Kh6 3. Rg6 $\dagger$ Kh7 4. Rg7 $\dagger$ Kxh8 5. Qa8 $\dagger / \mathrm{ix}$ Rf8 6. Rg8 $\dagger$ Kh7 7. Qxb7 $\dagger$ Rf7/x 8. R8g7 $\dagger$ Kh6 9. Qxc6 $\dagger$ Rf6 10. R7g6 $\dagger$ Kh5 11. Qc5 $\dagger$ Rf5/xi 12. R6g5 $\dagger$ Kh4 13. Qxb4 $\dagger$ Rf4 14. R5g4 $\dagger$ Kxh3 15. Qxf4 Qxf4 16. Rxf4 Qe2 17. Rf2 Qxf2 18. Rf3 $\dagger$ and draws by perpetual check or stalemate. i) 1. Re3? Rh4 2. Re5 $\dagger$ Rf5 wins; or 1. Rxf2? Qxh3 $\dagger$ 2. Rh2 Qxh2 $\dagger$ 3. Kxh2 Rh4 $\dagger$ 4. Kg2 Rg4 $\dagger$ 5. Kf3 Rxg1 6. Qe7 Rf1 $\dagger$ 7. Kg2 e1Q 8. Qh7 $\dagger$ Kg5 9. Qg6† Kf4 10. Qf6 $\dagger$ Ke4 11. Qxc6 $\dagger$ Kd4 12. Qc3 $\dagger$ Kd5 13. Qxd3 $\dagger$ Kc5 14. Qxf1/ii Qxd2 $\dagger$ 15. Qf2 $\dagger$ Qxf $2 \dagger$ 16. Kxf2 Kd4 17. Ke2 Sd6 18. Kd2/iii Sc4 $\dagger$ 19. Kc1 Se5 20. Kd2 b4 21. Kc1 or Ke1 Ke3 22. Kd1 Kd3 23. Kcl Ke2 24. Kb1 Kd2 25. Kal Ke3 26. Kb1 Ki4 27. Kc1 Kf5 or Kg5 28. Kd2 Kf6 29. Ke3 Sc4 $\dagger$ wins. ii) Or 14. Qc3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 615$. Qd4 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 6$ wins. iii) Or 18. Sg6 Sc4 19. Sf4 Sxb2 20. Kd2 Sa4 21. Kc1/iv Kc4 22. Kb1 Kb4 23. Sd3 $\dagger$ or Sd5 $\dagger$ Ka 3 wins. iv) Cr 21. Se $2 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 422$. Kc1 b2 $\dagger 23$. Kc2 b1Q $\dagger 24$. Kxb1 $\mathrm{Sc} 3 \dagger$ wins. v) 1. .. Rg4? 2. hg $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 63 . \mathrm{Qe} 7$ and White wins; or

No. 1477 G. Nadareishvili
Shakhmatnaya Moskva 1970


No. $1478 \quad$ V. V. Yakimchik 2nd Pr.,
Shakhmatnaya Moskva 1970


1. .. Ra4? 2. Rg5 $\dagger$ Kh6 3. Rg6 $\dagger$ Kh7 4. Qe7 $\dagger$ and White wins; or 1. .. Qxg1 $\dagger$ 2. Rxg1 Rh4 3. Rg5 $\dagger$ Kxg5 4. Qe7 $\dagger$ Kh5/vi 5. Qh7 $\dagger$ Kg5 6. Qe7t Rf6 7. Qe5t Rf5 8. Qg7t/vii Kf4 9. Qd4 $\dagger$ with perpetual check. vi) 4. . Kf5 5. Qf7† Ke4 6. Qxf2 draw. vii) 8. Ge7†? Kh6 9. Qxh4 $\dagger$ Kg 7 10. Qg4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 8$ 11. Qxf5 e1Q wins. viii) 2. Qxb4? Rh2 $\dagger$ 3. Kxh2 Qef2 $\dagger$ 4. Kh1 Q2xg1 $\dagger$ 5. Rxg1 Qxh3 mate. ix) 5. Rg8 $\dagger$ ? Kh7 6. R8g7 $\dagger$ Kh5 7. R7g6 $\dagger$ Kh5 8. R6g5 $\dagger$ Kh4 9. Qxb4 $\dagger$ Rf4 10. R5g4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 3$ 11. Qxf4 Qxf4 12. Rxf4 Qe2 13. Rf2 Qe $4 \dagger$ 14. Rgg2 Sd6 15. Kg1 Sf5 16. Rh2 $\dagger$ Kg4 wins. x) 7. . Qf7 8. R8g7† K any 9. Rxf7 draw. xi) 11. .. Qf5 12. R6g5 $\dagger$ Kh6/xii 13. Rxf5/xvi Qe4 $\dagger$ 14. Rg2/xvii Rxf5/xx 15. Qd6 $\dagger$ or Qb6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 5$ 16. Qg6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 4$ 17. Qg3 $\dagger$ with perpetual check. xii) 12. . . Kh4 13. Rxf5 Qe4 $\dagger$ 14. Kh2 Rxf5/xiii 15. Rg4 $\dagger$ Qxg4/xiv 16. Qe7† Qg5/xv 17. $\mathrm{Qh} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Qh} 5$ 18. Qe7 $\dagger$ with perpetual check (18. . Rf6 19. Qxf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Qg} 5$ 20. Qh8 $\dagger$ etc.). xiii) 14. . Qxf5 15. Qxb4 $\dagger$ Qf4 $\dagger$ 16. Qxf4 $\dagger$ Rxf4 draw. xiv) 15... Kh5 16. Rxe4 Rxc5 17. Rxb4 draw. xv) 16. . . Kh5 17. hg $\dagger$ Rxg4 18. Qh7 $\dagger$ draw. xvi) 13. Rxel? Qxh3 $\dagger$ 14. Kg1 Rg4 $\dagger$ 15. Rxg4 Qxg4 $\dagger$ 10. Kh1 or Kh2 Qh4 $\dagger$ wins. xvii) 14. Kh2? Qxf5 15. Qxb4 Qe5 $\dagger$ 16. Kh1/xviii Qd5 $\dagger$ 17. Kh2/xix Rf $2 \dagger$ 18. Kg3 Gf $3 \dagger$ 19. Kh4 Qh5 $\dagger 20$. Kg3 $\mathrm{Rf} 3 \dagger$ 21. Kg2 or Kh2 Qxh3 mate. xviii) 16. Kg2 Qd5 $\dagger$ 17. Kg3 Rf3 $\dagger$ wins. xix) 17. Rg2 Rf1 $\dagger$ 18. Kh2 Qe5 $\dagger$ 19. Rg3 Rf $2 \dagger$ 20. Kh1 Qxg3 wins. xx ) 14... Qxf5 15. Qxb4 Qf1 $\dagger / \mathrm{xxi} 16$. Kh2 Qf4 $\dagger$ 17. Qxf4 $\dagger$ Rxf4 18. Rg3 draw. xxi) 15. . Q Qxh3 $\dagger 16$. Kg1 draw.
No. 1477: G. Nadareishvili. 1. e4/i d4 2. e5 h4 3. e6/ii h3 4. e7 h2 5. e8R/iii h1Q $\dagger$ 6. Re4 Qxe4 $\dagger$ 7. de h5 8. e5 h4 9. e6 h3 10. e 7 h 2 11. e8S $\dagger$ Kc8 12. Sd6 $\dagger$ perpetual check draw. i) 1. d4? h4 2. e4 h3 3. ed h2 4. $\mathrm{d} 6 \dagger \mathrm{Kxd} 6$ 5. Kb8 hic. ii) 3. gh? g3 4. e6 g2 5. e7 g1Q 6. e8Q Qg2 $\dagger$ 7. Qe4 Qg8 $\dagger$ wins. iii) 5. e8S $\dagger$ ? Kd7 6. Kb8 h1Q 7. a8Q Qxa8 $\dagger$ 8. Kxa8 Kxe8. Cr 5. e8Q? h1Qt 6. Qe4 Qf3 and wins, this leading to stalemate against the main line R -promotion.
No. 1478: V. V. Yakimchik. 1. Kd6 f1Q/i 2. c3 $\dagger$ Ke4 3. Bc4 Kf5/ii 4. e4 $\dagger$ fe 5. Bxf1 ed 6. Ed3† Kf4 7. Ec2 Ke3 8. Kd5 Ke2 9. c4 Ke3 10. Ke5/iii Ke 2 11. Kd6 Ke3 12. Kd5 Ke2 13. Kc6 wins. i) 1. .. f3 2. e3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 4$ 3. Ke6 and mates, though 2. c3 $\dagger$ also wins. ii) 3. . Qb1 4. Bg8 f3 5. Bh7† Kf4 6. e3†. (r 3...f3 4. Ed3† Kf4 5. e3†. iii) 10. Kc6? Kd4 11. Kb5 Kc3 draws. AJR: A fine triangulation discovery in the main line; the attraction of studies where W has the material advantage but positional inferiority is subtler than that of its classic converse.


No. 1479: A. P. Maksimovskikh. 1. e5/i fe 2. Kxg5 Kg3 3. Kf5 d6 4. c4 Kf3 5. c5 dc 6. Kxe5 Ke3 7. Kd5 Kd3 8. a5 ba 9. Kxc5 draw. i) 1. c4? g4 2. c5 g3 3. cb g2 4. b7 g1Q 5. b8Q Qg5 mate.

No. 1480: G. M. Kasparyan. Judge of this informal tourney was L. Zoltan. Attempts to save both W pieces fail, while there is no theoretical draw with the $\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{P}$ in this configuration. The saving line is therefore very pointed. 1. Kg4 Qc8 $\dagger$ 2. Kf3 Qb7 $\dagger$ 3. Rd5! Now we see the light! 3. . Qxb1 4. Ra5 $\dagger$ and 5. Rb5 $\dagger$.
No. 1481: H. Lilja. 1. Kg7 Ra8 2. Ee7† Kxc4 3. Bf8 Ra1 4. h8Q Rh1 5. Qg8 $\dagger$ Bd5 6. e6 Rg1† 7. Kf6 Rxg8 8. e7 wins.

No. 1482: J. Lamoss. 1. Kxc2 h2 2. Bg8 h1Q 3. Bxd5 Qh7 $\dagger$. Seemingly avoiding the worst. 4. Be4! Cxe $4 \dagger$. Kb2 with the winning threat of Sc3. Note that wK can catch gP after 5... Qxb1 $\dagger$.

No. 1483: F. S. Bondarenko and V. Neidze. 1. d7 $\dagger /$ i Kxc4 2. b3 $\dagger$ Kxb5/ii 3. Sxa2 Qa5 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii} 4 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 6$ 5. Bb4 Qxa6 6. c4 mate. i) 1. Kxa2? Kxc4 2. $\mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{Ga} 5 \dagger$ 3. Kb1 Bb6. Or 1. Sxa2? Qa5 $\dagger$ 2. Kb3 cb 3. d7† Kc6 and .. Qa4 mate is a winning threat. ii) 2 . . Kd5 3. Sxa2 Qa5 $\dagger$ 4. Kb2 Bb6

5. $\mathrm{c} 4 \dagger$ Ke6 6. b4 Qa4 7. d8Q Bxd8 8. Sc3 wins! iii) 3. . Qa6† 4. Kb2 Bb6 5. c4 +Ka 5 6. Bb4 mate. - Problemist play with bQ and bP, though it does not seem correct to describe the theme as 'Loyd-Turton' (MS ii.70) since bQ does not cross, but already occupies, b6, and it is a defensive manoeuvre in any case. AJR.

No. 1484: E. Janosi. 1. Kd6/i g3 2. Bd4 g2 3. Ea6 glQ/ii 4. Bb7 $\dagger \mathrm{Qg} 2$ 5. a6 Qxb7 6. ab Kg2 7. b8Q and soon mates (7. . . h1Q 8. Qb7† or g8 $\dagger$ ). i) 1. Ba6? g3 2. Kd6 Kg2 ciraw. 1. Bb8? Kg1 2. Exh2† Kxh2 3. a6 g3 draw. ii) 3. . g g1R 4. Bb7† Rg2 5. Kd5 Rg5 $\ddagger$ 5. Ke4 Rb5 7. Bc6 Rg5 (. . Kg2 Kf4 $\dagger$ ) 8. Kf4 $\dagger$ Rg2 9. Kf3 Rg6 10. Bb7 Rg2 11. a6 wins (11... Ra2 12. Be4 Rd2 13. Fe3 and a7 follows.).
The composer has extracted a very interesting win out of the R-promotion variation - see AJR's 1958 study quoted by CMB ( F on p. 83 of EG4, iv.66).
JRH: See Sackmann (1923) on p. 43 of Rueb's 'Eronnen' IV, and Havasi (1923), No. 735 in '1234'.

No. $1487 \quad$ V. Kalandadze 3rd Pr., Magyar Sakkélet 1970 Award: iv. 71


No. 1488 T. B. Gorgiev (iii.70) 1 H.M.,
Magyar Sakkélet 1970 Award: iv. 71


No. 1485: P. Benko. Judge: A. Koranyi. 1. Kb6/i a3/ii 2. ba Sb4! 3. Rd8 b2 4. Rd1 Sa2 5. Rb1 Sc3! 6. Rh1 Kg2 7. Re1 Kf2 8. Rh1 Ke2 9. Rh2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxf} 3$ 10. Rh1 b1Q $\dagger$ /iii 11. Rxb1 Sxb1 12. a4 Sd2 13. Kb5 Sb3 14. Kb4 Sd4 75. Kc5 Ke4 16. Kc4 Sc6 17. Kc5/iv Sa5 18. Kb5 Sb3 19. Kb4 Sd2 20. Kc3 Sf3 21. Kc4 Ke5 22. a5 Kd6 23. a6 Kc6 24. a7 Kb7 25. Kd5 Sh2 26. g5 hg 27. Ke4! drawn. i) 1. Ka6? Sxb2 2. Ka5 a3 3. Kb4 a2 4. Ra8 Sa4 5. Rxa4 b2 wins. ii) 1. .. Sxb2 2. Kc5 draw. iii) 10. . Kf4 11. Kc6. Or 10. . Kxg4 11. Kc5 h5 12. a4 draw. iv) 17. Kb5? Kd5.
--Grandmasters can compose... sometimes! Or perhaps we should put it the other way round, namely that fine composers may also be Grandmasters. (AJR)

No. 1486: J. Koppelomäki. 1. Rh7 d2 2. Rh3/i Bd3† 3. Bc4 Bxc4† 4. Ka5 $\mathrm{Bb} 4 \dagger$ 5. Kb6 Ba5 $\dagger$ 6. Kc5/ii Bb6 $\dagger$ 7. Kc6 $\mathrm{Ed} 5 \dagger$ 8. Kd6 $\mathrm{Ec} 7 \dagger$ 9. Kd7 Be6 $\dagger$ 10. Ke7 Bd6 $\dagger$ 11. Kd8 Bc7 $\dagger$ 12. Ke7 Bd6 $\dagger$ 13. Kd8 draw.
i) 2. Rh5? $\mathrm{Bd} 3 \dagger$ 3. Ka 5 Bg 64 . $\mathrm{Rh} 3 \mathrm{Bb} 4 \dagger$ wins. ii) Other moves allow El to force an escape check from his $R$, or promotion with check. 6. Ka7? $\mathrm{Bb} 6 \dagger$ 7. Kb8 Ba7 $\dagger$ 8. Kc7 $\mathrm{Bb} 8 \dagger$ 9. Kc6 $\mathrm{Bd} 5 \dagger$ 10. Kd7 Rc6 $\dagger$ 11. Kc8 $\mathrm{Bd} 7 \dagger$ 12. Kd8 Bc7t. Or 6. Kc6? Bd5 $\dagger$ 7. Kd6 Bb4 $\dagger$ 8. Kd7 Be $6 \dagger$ 9. Ke8 Ef7 $\dagger$ 10. Kxf7 Rf1 $\dagger$ 11. Sxf1 $\dagger$ Kg1 12. Sxd2 Bxd2 wins.

No. 1487: V. Kalandadze. 1. Be4 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Rxe4 2. $\mathrm{Rh} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 2$ 3. $\mathrm{b} 8 \mathrm{Q} \dagger \mathrm{Rxb} 8$ 4. $\mathrm{Bxb} 8+\mathrm{Bc} 7$ (for stalemate) 5. Exc7† Kh1 6. f8R/ii Re8 7. Rf2/iii Rh8 8. Rf3 Rf8 9. Bf4 Rh8 10. Rg3 wins. i) 1. Bxb6? Rexf7† 2. Ke2 Re8 $\dagger$. ii) 6. f8Q? Rf4†. iii) 7. Rf3? Re3.

No. 1488: T. B. Gorgiev. 1. g6 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Kxg6 2. Se5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 7 / \mathrm{ii}$ 3. f7 a2 4. f8S $\dagger$ Kxh6/iii 5. Sf7 $\dagger$ Kh5 6. Sf6 $\dagger$ Kxh4 7. Sg6 $\dagger$ Kh3 8. Sg5 $\dagger$ Kg2/iv 9. Sf4 $\dagger$ Kf 2 10. $\mathrm{Sg} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Ke} 1$ 11. $\mathrm{Sxf} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kd} 1$ 12. K e3 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 1$ 13. $\mathrm{Sd} 3 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 1$ 14. $\mathrm{Sd} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 1$ 15. Sc 2 mate, only because a 2 is blocked! i) 1. Kxa3? g2
ii) 2. . Kf5 3. f7 e1Q 4. f8Q $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 4$ 5. Sf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf5}$ 6. Sfg4 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 6$ 7. Qf7 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 6$ 8. $\mathrm{Qd} 7 \dagger \mathrm{Kc} 5$ 9. Qc9 9 . iii) 4. . Kg8 5. h7 $\dagger$. 4. . . Kh8 5. Seg6† Kg8 6. h7 $\dagger$ Kf 7 7. $\mathrm{Sd} 6 \dagger$ and 8. h 8 Q . iv) 8. . Kh 2 9. $\mathrm{Sg} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 10. $\mathrm{Sf} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 211$. Sfh4 mate.


No. 1489: G. M. Kasparyan. The over-hasty solver should note that W is in check! 1. Ke3/i Sc2†/ii 2. Kd3 Sxal 3. g6/iii Qh6 $\dagger$ 4. Ke2 Kf8 5. Kd1 Qh8 6. Kc1 Qg8 7. Kb2 Qh8 8. Kc1 Qh6† 9. Kd1 b5 10. g4 Qh8/iv 11. Kc1 Qg8/v 12. Kb2 Qh8 13. Kc1, positional draw. i) 1. Kg4? g6! ii) 1. . Sf5 $\dagger$ 2. Kf4 g6 3. Re8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf7}$ 4. Rae1 Qxh5 5. Rd8 and 6. Rd7. iii) 3. Re8 $\dagger$ ? Kf7 4. g6 $\dagger$ Qxg6 5. hg $\dagger$ Kxe8 6. Kc1 Ke7 7. Kb2 Kf6 8. Kxal Kxg6 wins. iv) 10... Qf4 11. Rf5 $\dagger$. v) Threatening . . Sxb3.
No. 1490: J. Lamoss. 1. d7 Rd4 2. c6 be 3. b7 Rb1 4. Sb4 Rxb4 5. Rc5 $\dagger$ Kxc5 6. c3 wins. It is hard to believe! Given as a try is 1 . Rd5?! Rxa2 2. $\mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{Ra} 8 \dagger$ 3. d 8 Q Rxd8 $\dagger$ 4. Rxd8 Kxc5.

No. 1491: L. Zoltan. 1. b4 Kd6 2. Ke2 Kc7 3. Kd3 Kb7 4. Kd4 Kb6 5. Kc4 Kb7/i 6. Kc5 Kc7 7. b6 6 Kb7 8. Kb5/ii Kb8 9. Ka6/iii Ka8 10. b7† Kb8 11. b5. i) 5. . Kc7 6. Kc5 Kb7 7. b6 Ka6 8. b7 Kxb7 9. Kb5 wins, not of course 8. Kc6? stalemate. ii) 8. b5? Kb8 9. Kc6 Kc8 drawn. iii) As MS ix. 70 points out, also possible is 9 . Kc6 Kc8 10. b7† Kb8 11. b5 Ka7 12. b8Qt, but not 12 . Kc7? with another stalemate. JRH: Definitely preempted by Kovalenko (1967) and Kovalenko and Dvizov (1967), both in Problem.

## No. $1493 \quad$ V. A. Bron (iii.70)

Comm.,
Magyar Sakkélet 1970


No. $1495 \begin{gathered}\text { L. Mattei (vi.70) }\end{gathered}$ Magyar Sakkélet 1970 Award: iv. 71


No. 1494 J. Lazar (viii.70) Comm., Magyar Sakkélet 1970


No. 1496 G. M. Kasparyan
Hungarian Chess Fed. 1970 Award: Magyar Sakkélet x. 70


No. 1492: R. Brieger. 1. Bf4 $\dagger$ /i Kxh3 2. Kf3 Rd8 3. Bb5 Rd1 4. Ec4 Rel 5. Bd3/ii e6 6. Bc4 and a nice Zugzwang. i) 1. Sf2? Rxh6 2. Sg4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 3. Sxh6 h3 4. Bc6 h2 5. Bh1 c4 6. Sg4 c3 7. Sf2 c2 8. Sd3 e5! 9. Ke1 e4 10. Sc1 e3 11. Se2 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 1$ 12. Kf1 c1Q $\dagger$ 13. Sxc1 e2 $\dagger$, quite a remarkable variation. ii) 5 . Ba6? c4 6. Bxc4 e6 draw.
It is a pleasant coincidence that an American composer should appear just here, as 1492 was the year in which Columbus discovered the New World.

No. 1493: V. A. Bron. 1. Bf4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7 / \mathrm{i}$ 2. Be $5 \dagger \mathrm{Kf} 8 / \mathrm{ii}$ 3. Bd6 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 4. Be $6 \dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 5. Be $5 \dagger / \mathrm{iv}$ Kxg6 6. Bxg3 Bxg3 $\dagger$ 7. Kf1 Se2 8. Bf7† Kxf7 stalemate. i) 1. . . Rg5 2. Bxg5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxg} 5$ 3. g7 Bf7 4. Kf2 Kf4 5. g3† Ke4 6. Kg2 Sf3 7. Bc6†. 1... Kxg6 2. Bxg3 Exg3† 3. Kf1 Se2 4. Be8t draw. ii) 2. . Kg8 3. Be'5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf} 8$ 4. Bd6 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 8$ 5. Bxg3 $\mathrm{Bxg} 3 \dagger$ 6. Kf1 Se2 7. g7. iii) 3. g7†? Rxg7 4. Bxg7† Kxg7 5. Bb5 Bf7 6. Kf2 Bd5 wins. iv) 5. Bxg3? Bxg3† 6. Kf1 Se2 7. Bg4 Sf4 wins.

No. 1494: J. Lazar. 1. Rg5 Rxb5/i 2. c6 Rxb4 3. Rc5 bc 4. c7 wins. i) 1. . . be 2. Rxc5 with a book advantage enough to win. JRH: A prefix to Rinck (1906), No. 396 in Tattersall, or Prokes (1941), p. 97 of his Kniha.

No. 1497 A. Koranyi
3rd Pr.
Hungarian Chess Fed. 1970 Award: Magyar Sakkélet x. 70


No. 1498 G. M.
1 H.M.,

Hungarian Chess Fed. 1970
Hungarian Chess Fed. 1970
Award: Magyar Sakkélet x. 70


No. 1495: L. Mattei. 1. Sd3 Ke3 2. Bd1 Sf5/i 3. Kxf5 h2 4. Sf2/ii Kxf2 5. Bxf3 Kxf3 6. a7 wins. i) 2. . Sf7 3. Kxf7 h2 4. Bxf3 Kxf3 5. a7 wins. ii) 4. Bxf3? Kxf3 5. a7 h1Q 6. a8Q $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 3$ 7. Qxh1 stalemate. $J R H$ : The final B-sacrifice to promote with check and spear $b Q$ is known, e.g. D. Markov (1948), No. 133 in Bulgarian Problems and Studies; and Rinck (1917), No. 963 in '1414'.

No. 1496: G. M. Kasparyan. 1. . . b4 $\dagger$ 2. $\mathrm{Kb} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 5 \dagger$ 3. Ka4/i $\mathrm{Sc} 3 \dagger 4$. Kxb4 $\mathrm{Be} 7 \dagger$ 5. Ka5 ab $\dagger$ 6. Kxb6 Ed8 $\dagger$ 7. Kc5/ii Be7 $\dagger$ 8. Kd4 $\mathrm{Bf} 6 \dagger$ 9. Kd3/iii Be $4 \dagger$ 10. Ke3 Bg $5 \dagger$ /iv 11. Kf2 Bh4 $\dagger$ 12. Kg1 Se $2 \dagger$ 13. Kf1 Sf4/v 14. Qc3 $\dagger$ Kxh2 15. Qd2 $\dagger$ Kh1 16. a7 Bg3 17. Qc2! Bxc2 18. a8Q $\dagger$ wins!
i) 3. Kc2? $\mathrm{Be} 4 \dagger$ 4. Kd1? Sc3 $\dagger 5$. Ke1 Bh4 $\dagger$ 6. Kd2 Bg5 $\dagger . \quad$ ii) 7. Ka7? Sb5 $\dagger$ 8. Kb8 Bc7 $\dagger$ 9. Kc8 Be6 $\dagger$ 10. Kb7 Bd5 $\dagger$. iii) 9. Ke3? Bg5 $\dagger$ 10. Kf2? Se $4 \dagger$ 11. Kg1 Be3 $\dagger$. iv) 10... Sd5 $\dagger$ 11. Kxe4 wins. v) 13... Be3 14. Qa3! Sc3 $\dagger$ 15. Kg1 Se2 $\dagger$ 16. Kh1 wins.
--The 1st Prize was No. 1391. Judge: J. Ban.
No. 1497: A. Koranyi. 1. a7 Rh2†/i 2. Kf3 Ra5/ii 3. h7 Ra3†/iii 4. Kg4/iv Rg2†/v 5. Kf4/vi Rf2† 6. Ke4/vii Rf8 7. Kd5/viii Rh8 8. Kc6 is left as a draw, 8. . Rc3 $\dagger$ 9. Kb7 Rxc2 10. Rxd $6 \dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 7$, with an indication that aP can promote to S , though 11. Ra6 also works (AJR).
i) 1. . . Ra1 2. h7 Rf5 $\dagger$ 3. Kg2 Rf8 4. Rb7 Rh8 5. Rb8 Kxh7 6. Rb7† Kg6 7. Rb8. ii) 2...Rh3 $\dagger$ 3. Kf2 Rf5 $\dagger$ 4. Kg2 Ra3 5. h7 Rf8 6. Rb7 Re8 7. h8Q! Rxh8 8. Rb8. iii) 3. . . Rxh7 4. Rd6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 5. Rd7 $\dagger$, so aR moves from 5th rank. iv) 4. c3? Rxh7 wins. v) 4. .. Rxc2 5. h8S $\uparrow$ Kf6 6. Rxd6 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 7$ 7. Rb6. Or 4. .. Ra4 $\dagger$ 5. c4! vi) 5. Kh4? Rxc2 6. h8S $\dagger$ Kf5 wins. vii) 6. Kg4? Rf8 7. Rb7 Rh8 8. Rb8 Kxh7 9. Rb7† Kg6 10. Rb8 Rah3! viii) 7. Rb7? Rh8 8. Rb8 Kxh7 9. Rb7† Kg6 10. Rb8 Rh4 $\dagger$ 11. Kd5 Rha4 wins.

No. 1498: G. M. Kasparyan. 1. Rxa4! Rd5 $\dagger$ 2. Kg4 Sf2 $\dagger$ 3. Kg3 (Kf3? Rf5 $\dagger$ ) 3. .. Sh1 $\dagger$ 4. Kg2 Bxa4 5. Kxh1, and, although the result is a book draw very difficult to conduct, and there must be thousands of won positions, the solution continues: 5 . . . Bc $66 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Rd} 2 \dagger / \mathrm{ii} 7$. Kh3 Rf2 8. Sg4 Rg2 9. Se5. i) 6. Sgf3? Rg5, or 6. Shf3? Rd2. ii) Or the symmetrical play 6. . Rg5 $\dagger$ 7. Kf1 Rg3 8. Se2 Rg2 9. Sd4.
--This study is an interesting and rare addition to to the " $R+B$ v. $2 S$ " collection in EG13.


No. 1499: V. A. Bron. 1. c6 Sxd6/i 2. cd Kc4 3. Kxe3 Kxd5 4. Ke2/ii h6 5. Kd3 h5 6. Ke2 h4 7. Kf1 h3 8. Kg1 wins, for 8... Ke4 9. Se6 and $\mathrm{wS} \dagger$ follows bSb7 or bSf7, while 8. . . Kc4 9. Sc6 with echo variation. i) 1. . . Se5 $\dagger$ 2. Ke2 dc 3. dc $\operatorname{Sc} 4$ 4. d7 Se5 5. c7 wins. ii) 4. Kd3? h6 5. Ke2 Ke4! 6. Se6 Sf7! and .. Kd5 draw.

There must be an anticipation for the main idea (without hP), but JRH has not located it and I cannot find it. AJR.

No. 1500: J. Lamoss. 1. d7 Rg8 $\dagger$ 2. Kb7 h3 3. a8Q $\dagger$ Rxa8 4. Kxa8 h2 5. Ka7/i h1Q 6. d8S b5 7. Sb7 $\dagger \mathrm{Qxb} 7 \dagger$. Kxb7 wins. i) 5 . d8Q? h1Q $\dagger$ 6. Kb8 Qb7 $\dagger$.

JRH: A Very similar termination occurs in No. 178 in Prokop's '212' (1930).

No. 1501: D. Petrov. 1. Sf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 2. Rg8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kh} 6$ 3. Rh8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 4. Rxb2 Rd4 4 5. Kc2/i Kxh8 6. Kc3/ii Ra4/iii 7. Rg2/iv Ra3† 8. Kd4 Ra4† 9. Ke3 $\mathrm{Ra} 3 \dagger$ 10. Ke4 Ra4 $\dagger$ 11. Kf5 Ra5 $\dagger$ 12. Kg6 Ra2 13. Rg5 Ra5 14. Sd5 Kg8/v 15. Re5 Kf8 16. Rf5 $\dagger$ wins. i) 5 . Ke2? Kxh8 6. Ke3 Rd1 7. Rb7 Re1 $\dagger$ 8. Kf4 Re7 draw. ii) 6. Rb7? Rh4 7. Kd3 Rh6 8. Rf7 Rh3† 9. Kd4 Rd3 $\dagger$ 10. Kc5 Rc3 $\dagger$ 11. Kd6 $\mathrm{Rd} 3 \dagger$ 12. Ke7 $\mathrm{Re} 3 \dagger$ 13. Kf8 Re8 $\dagger$. iii) Or 6. . . Rd1 7. Rb7. iv) 7. Rb7? Ra7. v) 14. .. Ra7 15. Kf6 Ra6 $\dagger$ 16. Kf7 Ra7 $\dagger$ 17. Se7. JRH: For non-echo play see Hasek (1928), No. 618 in '1234', or even earlier Reichhelm (1901) in DSZ.


No. 1502: Y. Bazlov. 1. Bf1 $\dagger$ / Bd3 $\dagger$ 2. Kg3 Rg8 $\dagger$ 3. Kf2 Bxf1 4. Rf4 Se2 5. Rf3 Rg1 6. Rb3†/ii Kc4 7. Rb1 Rg2† 8. Ke3 Sg3 9. Kf3 Rg1 10. Kf2 $\mathrm{Rg} 2 \dagger$ 11. Kf3, positional draw. i) 1. Rf4? Bf5 $\dagger$ 2. Kg5 Se6 $\dagger$ 3. Kxf5 Sxf4 4. Bf1† Kc5 5. Kxf4 Rf8†. ii) 6. Rf5†? Kb4 7. Rd5 Rh1 8. Rd1 Rh2 $\dagger$ 9. Kxf1 Sg3 $\dagger$ and 10. Kg1 Rh1 $\dagger$, or 10. Kf1 Re2 mate.
No. 1503: V. Neidze. This is a correction of a xii. 67 study. 1. a3 $\dagger$ Ka5/i 2. b4 Ka6 3. Fe2† Bb5 4. Exb5 $\dagger$ Rxb5 5. e4 Kb7 6. e5 Kc8 7. e6 Kd8/ii 8. e7† Ke8 9. Ke6 and Bl loses his R through Zugzwang.
i) 1. . Kb3 2. Bd1† Kxb2 3. Kxe5 Re8 4. a4 Ka3 5. Kf6 Exa4 6. Bxa4 Kxa4 7. e4 wins. ii) 7. . Rf5 8. e7 Rf6 $\dagger$ 9. Ke5.
No. 1504: S. Stambuk. 1. Kd2/i Kf5 2. Ke3 Bf1 3. Sa3 Kg5 4. Sc2 Bg2/ii 5. Kd2 Kh5 6. Ke2 (for Sa 3 ) 6. . $\mathrm{Bf} 3 \dagger$ 7. Ke3 Bg2 8. Kf4 Pe4 9. Se3 Ef3 10. Sf5 ef 11. e6 Kg6 12. Ke5 f4 13. Kd6. i) 1. Sa3? Kf5 2. Sxb5 Ke4 3. Kd2 Bf1. Cr 1. Sd2? Re4 2. Sb3 Bg6 3. Sc5 Kf5 4. Kd2 Be8 5. Sb7 Bc6. ii) 4. . . Ec4 5. Se1 Bf1 6. Kf2 Bc4 7. Sg2 Kf5 8. Ke3 and 9. Sf4, after which wS reaches e8, with threat of Sg 7 , prevented cnly by . Kg6, but then Kf4 wins. No Shakhmaty solver unravelled this study. The composer of this and No. 1506 are Yugoslavs.
No. 1505: E. Pogosjants. 1. c8Q Be $3 \dagger$ 2. Bd2 Exd2 $\dagger / \mathrm{i} 3 . \mathrm{Kb} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 1 \uparrow$ 4. Kb2 Ec3 $\dagger$ 5. Qxc3 Rg2 $\dagger$ 6. Ka1 Rg1 $\dagger$ 7. Kb2 Rb1 $\dagger$. Kxb1 d2 $\dagger$ 9. Qc $2 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 3$ 10. Ka1 Bxc2 stalemate. i) 2. . Rxd2 3. Qc4† draws.

No. 1507 F. S. Bondarenko
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No. 1506: L. Ugren. 1. Rh4 Kd8 2. Kd6 Ke8 3. Ke6 Kf8 4. Kf6 Kg8 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kh} 7$ 6. Rh4 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 7. $\mathrm{Rg} 4 \dagger \mathrm{Kf} 8$ 8. Rh4 Ke8 9. Ke6 Kd8 10. Kd6 Kc 8 11. Kc6 Kb8 12. Rh8 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 7$ 13. Rh7 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka} 6$ 14. Rh8 Ka5 15. Ra8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 4$ 16. Rb8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kc} 4$ 17. Rh8 Kd4 18. Kd6 Ke4 19. Ke6 Kf4 20. Kf6 Kg4 21. Rg8 $\dagger$ Kh5 22. Rh8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 23. Rg8 $\dagger \mathrm{Kf} 4$ 24. Rh8, positional draw. A wellknown practical draw idea expanded by composer technique into a study with task characteristics. (AJR).

No. 1507: F. S. Bondarenko. W has a material plus, against which Bl tries to set up 'fortress' defences - 3 of them. The theme may therefore be called 'anti-fortress'. 1. Sf1/i Kd7 2. Kb3/ii Qh8/iii 3. Ra1 Qh1 4. Kel Qg2 5. Sd1 Ke7/iv 6. Sg3 Kf7 7. Rh1 Kg7/v 8. Kc2 (c3) Kg8 9. Kd2 Kg7 10. Ke1 Kg8 11. Sc3 Kg7 12. Sb1 Kg8 13. Sd2 Kg7 14. Sdf1 Kg8 15. Rh2 wins/vi. i) There is a Bl threat that forces W to proceed with precision. 1. Kb3? Qh2 2. Sd1 Qg1 3. Kc2 Qe1 4. Rb4 Qe2 5. Rb3 g5 and Bl will win with the further advance of this pawn. ii) 2. Sd1? Qh8 3. Sg3 Qh2 4. Kb2 Qg1 5. Kc2 Qe1 6. Kc1 Kc8 7. Kc2 Kd7 with a clear draw. iii) This is the start of the first fortress idea, to bring bQ to g 2 , bK to g 7 to stop wR entering via h -file. For 2 . . Ke7 see /vii, and for 2. .. Qg8 see /viii. These are the other two defences. iv) 5. . . Kc8 6. Sg3 Kd7 7. Rh1 Kc8 8. Kc2 Kd7 9. Kd2 Kc8 10. Rh8 $\dagger$ Kd 7 11. Rb8 demonstrates that the wR incursion is a real threat. v) The $w R$ invasion is stopped, so $W$ has to break the blockade admittedly not a difficult task. vi) 15. Sh2? Qh3 16. Sgf1 Qg2. After 15. Rh2 the continuation might be 15... Kg7 16. Rxg2 fg 17. Se2, or 15. . Qg1 16. Rh4 Qg2 17. Rg4 Kf7 18. Rg5 Qg1 19. Sxe4 Qh1 20. Sg3 and 21. Re5. This last line looks as if it needs further attention, the source giving only 18. . Kf6 19. Sxe4† (AJR). vii) Here bQ will keep on g4 and g5. 2. .. Ke7 3. Ra1 Kf7 4. Sg3 Kg8 5. Rh1 Qd8 6. Kc2 Qg5 7. Kd1 Qg4 8. Ke1 Qg5 9. Kf1 Qg4. Now a long wS manoeuvre wins. 10. Sa4-c3-a2-b4-c2-e1 15. .. Qg4 16. Sh5! Qe6 17. Sf4 Qf6 18. Rg1. viii) And thirdly, bQ guards h6-h8, with bK either staying put or in a role-reversal trying to cover h4. 2. . . Qg8 3. Sg3 Ke6/ix 4. Ra1 Kf6 5. Rh1 Kg5 6. Kc2 Qg7 7. Kd1 Qg8 8. Ke1 Qg7 9. Sd1 Qg8 10. Sc3 Qg7 11. Sb1 Qg8 12. Sd2 Qg7 13. Sdf1 Qg8 14. Sh5! Kf5 (14. . Qh7 15. Rg1 $\dagger$ wins) 15. Sf4 Kf6 16. Rg1 g5 17. Sh3 g4 18. Sf4 Kf5 19. Sh2.
ix) 3. . Qg7 4. Ra1 Qg8 5. Rh1 Qg7 6. Kc2 Kc8 7. Kd1 Kd7 8. Ke1 Kc8 9. Sd1-c3-b1-d2-f1-h2-g4-e5, and then Rh4 'etc' is given.


No. 1508: Y. Bazlov. 1. Sc5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 4$ 2. Sa6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 5$ 3. re7 $\dagger \dagger \mathrm{Kb} 6$ 4. Sa8 $\dagger$ Kb7/i 5. Kxe3 Kxa8/ii 6. Kf4 Bg6 7. Rh1 Kb7 8. Rh8 Kc7 9. Kg5 wins. i) Quite a common introductory mechanism, wS continuous checks, bK moves being forced else $W$ can check with $w R$ and protect $w S$ at the same time. For example 2. . Ka5 3. Ra1†. ii) 5. .. f4† 6. Kxf4 Kxa8 7. Re8 $\dagger$ and 8. Re7 $\dagger$.

No. 1509: L. Iskra. 1. d7 Rd5 2. f7 Ea3 3. Bd6 Rf5 $\dagger$ 4. Ke3/i Bc1 $\dagger$ 5. Ke4 Bd3† 6. Kxd3 Bg5 7. Be5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 78$. Bf 6 and it is not a win, as Novotny interferences normally are in studies, but a draw, for instance 8. . Rxf6 9. d8Q Rf3† 10. Ke2 Bxd8 11. Kxf3. i) 4. Ke1? Rf1† 5. Kd2 $\mathrm{Bc} 1+6$. Kc2 Eg5 7. Be5 $\dagger \mathrm{Kxh} 7$ 8. Bf6 Rxf6 wins.
JRH finds 20 Novotny interferences ending in a draw in his collection. The only one with two successive interferences is Kasparyan (1959), K17 in EG19.
The 3 H.M. was No. 1167 in EG22, by E. L. Pogosjants.
No. 1510: D. Curgenidze and G. Nadareishvili. 1. Rg3/i Bf6 $\dagger$ /ii 2. Bxf6 $\dagger / \mathrm{iii}$ ef $\dagger$ 3. Kh6 g1Q/iv 4. Rxg1 b1Q/v 5. Re1 Qcl $\dagger$ 6. Se3 Qxe1 7. $\mathrm{Sc} 2 \dagger$. i) 1. Re1? Bf $6 \dagger$ 2. Bxf6 ef $\dagger$. Kxf6 b1Q draw. ii) 1. .. blQ

2. $\mathrm{Bxc} 3 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 2$ 3. $\mathrm{Rxg} 2 \dagger \mathrm{Ka} 3$ 4. Se 3 will win. iii) 2. Kh 6 ? $\mathrm{Rxg} 7 \dagger$ 3. Kxg 7 g1Q 4. Rxg1 b1Q 5. Re1 Qb4 6. Sc3† Kb2 7. Rb1† Kxc3 8. Rxb4 Kxb4 is only a draw. iv) 3. .. b1Q 4. Ra3† Qa2 5. Rxa2† Kxa2 6. Sc3 $\dagger$ and 7. Se2. v) Not a position one would readily think of as won for W!

No. 1511: V. Shoshorin. 1. Bc5 c1Q 2. Sxc1 Bc3 $\dagger$ 3. Kf7 e1Q 4. Bd7 $\dagger$ Ka5 5. Sb3 $\dagger \mathrm{Ka6}$ 6. $\mathrm{Bc} 8 \dagger \mathrm{~Kb} 5$ 7. Pd7 $\dagger$ and it is easy to see that the checks are continuous. The economy of the setting and the cunning of the introductory play (every pawn and piece moves) render the overworked theme attractive yet again.

No. 1512: V. Tjavlovsky. 1. Be7/i Kd4 2. Ed8 Bd1†/ii 3. Kh4 g5 $\dagger$ 4. Kh3 $\mathrm{g} 1 \mathrm{~S} \dagger 5$. Kg3 Se2 $\dagger$ 6. Kg4 $\mathrm{Sf} 4 \dagger$ 7. Kf5 $\mathrm{Bc} 2 \dagger$. Kg 4 and draws.
i) 1. Bd8? Bd1 $\dagger$ 2. Kh4 g5 $\dagger$ 3. Kh3 g $1 \mathrm{~S} \dagger 4$. $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Se} 2 \dagger$ 5. $\mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Sd} 4 \dagger$ wins, as 6 . $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Sf} 5 \dagger$ and 7 . . . g4 keeps gP , and 6 . Kxg5 Se6 $\dagger$ wins wB.
ii) 2. . . Kc5 3. a5 Bd1 $\dagger$ 4. Kh4 g5 $\dagger$ (with bKe3 this is met by Bxg5 with check) 5. Kh3 g1S $\dagger$ 6. Kg2 Sf3 7. Re7† Kb5 8. Kg3 Kxa5 9. Kg4.

No. 1513: I. Kovalenko. 1. Kf6 $\dagger \mathrm{Kg} 4$ 2. Rh5/i Kxg3 3. Bc2 Kg2 4. Be4 $\dagger$ Kf1/ii 5. Rxh2 d1Q 6. Rh1 $\dagger \mathrm{Ke} 2$ 7. Ef3 $\dagger$. i) But a second solution is 2. Rc3 Kh3 3. Bd7† Kg2 4. Rd3 Kf1 5. Rxd2 h1Q 6. Rd1† Kg2 7. Bc6 $\dagger$.
ii) 4. . . Kg1 5. Rd5. It is not clear whether the solution in note (i) was intended by the composer, perhaps on the lines of 2 -solution helpmates, the lines being thematically related. However, the composer himself is not related to the better known V. Kovalenko of Vladivostok.

No. 1514: V. Kovalenko. 1. Rh7 Ra1 $\dagger$ 2. Kb4 Kxc1 3. Rh1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kb} 2$ 4. Rh2 $\dagger$ Kc1 5. Kb3 Ra5 6. Rh1 $\dagger \mathrm{Kd} 2$ 7. Kb4 Ra2 8. Rh2†. The vi. 70 original version had wKa6 and bRb 3 , with 1 . Ka5 Rb 1 to reach the diagram, but 2 other solutions were discovered: 1. Rh7 c5 2. Rc7 Kxc1 3. be Ra3 $\dagger$ 4. Kb7 a5 5. Kb6 a4 6. Kb5 Ra2 7. Kb4. And 1. Ef4 Ra3† 2. Kb7 Ra5 3. Rh5 a6 4. Rh2 $\dagger$.

No. 1515: V. Bron and B. Olympiev. 1. g7 Rg5 2. h4 Rg2 3. h5 Rg4 4. h3 Rg5 5. h4 Rg4 6. Sf6 Rxg7 7. Kf2 Kd8 8. c3/i Kc8 9. c4 Kb8 10. c5 Ka8 11. c6 Kb8 12. c7† Kc8 13. e4 with win of bR by Zugzwang. i) 8. c4? Kc8 9. c5 Kb8 10. c6 Ka8, and W has nothing better than 11. c7 Rg2 2 with a draw.
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No. 1516: V. Dolgov and Al. P. Kuznetsov. 1. Rb5† Kxa6 2. Rxb1 Se5† 3. Kf6/i Sd7† 4. Ke6/ii Sf8 $\dagger$ 5. Ke7 Sg6 $\dagger$ 6. Kf7 Se5 $\dagger$ 7. Kf6 Sg4 ${ }^{2}$ 8. Kf5 Sh6 $\dagger$ 9. Kg5 Sf7 $\dagger$ /iii 10. Kg6 Sh8 $\dagger$ 11. Kg7 Sxe2 12. Rb8 or 12. Rb6 $\dagger$ and Rh6. i) 3. Ke6? Rxe2 retains the 'book' winning advantage. ii) 4. Ke7? Rh7† 5. Kd8 Sxe2 6. Re1 Sd4. C r, an echo line, 5. Kd6 Sxe2 6. Re1 Sd4. iii) 9. . Sxe2 10. Rb6†.

No. 1517: V. Kovalenko. 1. Sc6 $\dagger / \mathrm{i}$ Ka8 2. Re7/ii Bh5 3. Rxb7 Be3 $\dagger$ 4. Kc7 Bf4 $\dagger$ 5. d6/iii Bxd6 $\dagger$ 6. Kb6 Bc5 $\dagger$ 7. Ka6 wins. i) 1. Pe7? Kc8 is given, but 1. Rxb7 $\dagger$ is not: 1. . . Kc8 2. Rc7 $\dagger$ Kd8 3. Sc6 $\dagger$ Ke8 4. Re7 $\dagger$ Kf8 5. Rxe2 looks like a win, 5. . . Sf4 6. Rd2. ii) 2. d6? Sf4 for . . Sd5 is nasty. iii) A decoy sacrifice (Roman theme) in order to deprive El of a specific later defence: after 6. . . Bc5 $\dagger$ the c5 square is no longer available for bS.

No. 1518: S. Tolstoy. 1. a6 Sg5† 2. Kxe7 Se6 3. a7 Sc7 4. Kd8/i Sa8 5. Kc8 Kc5 6. Kb7 Sb6 7. Ka6 Sd5 8. b4 $\dagger$ and 9 . Kb7 wins.
i) 4. Kxd7? Sa8 5. Kc8 Ke6! 6. Kb7 Kd7 7. Kxa8 Kc8.

## Death of two Czech composers

From Ceskoslovensky sach, xi.71, we learn of the death of Frantisek Richter (26.vi.13-19.viii.71).
By private communication we learn also, with great regret, of the death of Dr Arthur Mandler (5.i.91 - 20.x.71). We hope to publish a full appreciation in a later issue.

## Review

This collection, simply entitled "Studie", is a personally commented selection of Dr Mandler's studies. It is volume 9 of a series not previously known to us, "Edice Sachoveho Klubu Ustredniho Domu Armady". The date shown is 1970, but we think the work appeared only in mid-1971. A previous volume of 308 compositions covered the composer's problems, and here we find the studies, numbered 309-537. From the poor quality of the paper, print and diagrams, from the errata, and from the absence of any State imprint, one may surmise that the work was produced under conditions of some difficulty. It carries the Western circled ' C ' copyright symbol after the author's name in the colophon. We can only trust that the author, who survived the appearance of this book by only a few months, derived some satisfaction from it.
The book is a mine of delight for the meticulous analyst or the practical player intrigued by the fringes of rook endgame theory, with a strong dash of knight. There is, for instance, a large set of positions where wR plays, and sometimes wins, against $S+P$, where the Bl P is aP and bK is shut in ahead of his P (only 5 men on the board), which is either on the sixth or seventh rank.
There is a preface by Dr Mandler's close friend and admirer, Bretislav Soukup-Bardon.

## Magazine news

Shakhmatisti Rossii (see EG21, p. 153) has ceased to appear since 1970. Makedonski Shak is a new Yugoslav magazine, apparently incorporating 'Novy Temy'. Cf the 42 pages, 8 are devoted to composition, but we have not yet had the opportunity to examine the material.
Bulletin Problemistic is a new Rumanian publication, with a studies section by G. Teodoru, but again we have not seen it as yet.
To Mat, a new Greek magazine, has appeared to replace the magazine of the same name which disappeared in 1965. It is a monthly, and there are 2 of the total of 40 pages devoted to composition.
Another magazine of which we have heard but again not seen a copy, is the "Slovenian Problemists' Bulletin". There is said to be an endgame section.
Magazines which have lapsed are: Ajedrez Magico (Argentina, but help-mates only); and 1. P4R!!, which ceased publication in 1969 (Argentina).
Furthermore, we have not seen a copy of Ajedrez Artistico (once more Argentina) since the viii-ix. 1970 issue. Probleme (France) is also in abeyance through indisposition of its editor, we trust only temporarily.

## AJR Greetings!

It is one of the great pleasures of editing EG to receive so many greetings from so many countries. To reply personally to them all is quite impossible, which is really the only sad aspect! My very best wishes to all, whether they be composer, solver, or study-friend, for 1972.

AJR
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