## GBR CLASS 0103.11

This otb 6-man endgame could almost be what Martin Amis was describing in the excerpts from his novel Money quoted on pp. 326-7 of EG91.


To win W must somehow play wK to f5. To set up threats wR must exercise its power of squeezing, for which purpose f 2 is the key square. We follow the actual game. (Notes adapted from Oleg Stetzko's in Shakhmaty v SSSR i.88, p. 23.)
67. Ra7 + Kg6 68. Ra3 Kg7 69. Rb3 Kg6 70. Rb6 + Kg7 71. Rb3 Kg6 72. Re3 Kg7 73. Rc1 Kg6 74. Rf1 Sg2 75. Rf6 + Kg7 76. Rf3 Kg6 77. Ke4 Kg 7 78. Rf2.
After the hesitations we now see text-book material.
Sh4 79. Ke5 Kg6 80. Ke6 Kg7 81. Kd7 Kg6.
wK outflanks in the line Sg6; Rf5, Kh6; Ke8, Sh4; Ke7, and if then Sxf5; gf, when W is first to promote (with check), or if $\mathrm{Sg} 6+$; Kf6, wins bPg5.
82. Ke7 Kg7 83. Ke8 Sg6 84. Rf5 Sh4.
The drawing tendency of $\mathbf{0 1 0 3 . 1 0}$ (SP) when wR guards wP on the rank is well known from the draw-of-the-Laskers (New York, 1924). This could occur now after Rxg5 + , Kf6; Rg8, (Ra5, Sg6;) Sg6; g5, Kf5; Kf7, Se5 + .
85. Rf7 + Kg6 86. Kf8 Sg2 87. Re7 Kf6(Sh4; Re6 + , Kh7; Kf7) 88. Re4 Sfd4 89. Kg8 Kg6 90. Re1.
''Zugzwang'" - bS cannot move because of the Re6 threat. The position is more interesting than the $\mathbf{0 0 0 0 . 1 1}$ trébuchet described by Martin Amis.

Kf6 91. Kh7 Sd3 92. Rf1 + , resigns.

## *C* EXCEL 68000 AND THE ENDGAME

Kathe Spracklen, who with husband Dan form the renowned programmers from San Diego, California, responds below to EG's questions concerning the endgame capability of the commercially available EXCEL 68000 (MACH 2 version) chessplaying machine. (See EG90, p.288.)

Q: EXCEL will checkmate the lone $K$ with R, with BB, with BS, even at its fastest-playing speed. Are these three distinct checkmating algoririthms? If 'yes', is this proliferation 'inevitable' in your opinion? If 'no', how much do the algorithms have in common?

A: These checkmates are for the most part accomplished using the normal endgame 'mop-up' techniques of restricting the enemy king to the edge and bringing the attacking king over to the defending king. The single exception is the mate with bishop and knight. We accomplish this mate with a small amount of table data ( 64 bytes) and the normal search. As more and more complex endgames are handled by the program, proliferation of table data is, in my opinion, inevitable, but it should be possible, through data compaction and through supplementing tables with search, to keep the amount of data down to a resonable size.

Q: What other (specific) endgames have been 'algorithmed'?

A: Other endgames which have had special treatment are $K+P$ vs. $K$, $R+P$ vs. $R$, and the rook's $P$ with the 'wrong' $B$.

Q: EXCEL fails to win significantly deep positions in Q vs. R , a 4-man endgame. Why?
A: The actual solution of this endgame is quite complex, beyond the program's normal mop-up methods, and we have not addressed it as a domain-specific endgame.

Q: EXCEL can handle some specific $\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{P}$ vs. R positions well, though only at its longer response times. For example, EXCEL can correctly defend the Philidor 'barrier' position and finds (or 'knows') the winning bridge-building manoeuvre attributed (wrongly) to Lucena. Can you tell us more about this? Do you think that this is tantamount to the programming of domain-specific knowledge? How difficult is it?

A: When he worked with us Boris

Baczynskyj pointed out our program's failure to correctly handle some of the situations you describe in your question. He diagrammed several positions for us, pointing out the moves the program played in the situation and the moves it should have played.
When Danny Kopec worked with us over the summer of 1986, we asked him about these positions. He was able to present a description of the knowledge our program lacked in terms that were specific, programmable, and within the limits of computational complexity of our microprocessor, We coded up his suggestions and were delighted to see that we now played the moves that Boris had suggested for us, and we also performed correctly in several other test positions Danny Kopec provided for us. This is definitely a case of domain-specific knowledge. Danny Kopec made it seem easy. You would have to ask him how difficult it really is.

Q: There seems to be a very unhuman contrast between the 'skill', shown by EXCEL in $K+P$ vs. $K$ compared with its lack of skill in $K+P P$ vs. $K+P$. Would you care to comment?
A: Over that same summer of 1986, the other major area in which Danny Kopec assisted us was in $K+P$ vs. $K$. Again, the knowledge is domain-specific. We have not yet addressed the question of $K+P P$ vs. $K+P$.

Q: What further plans have you, and what scope is there, for expanding EXCEL's endgame repertoire? Are you open to suggestions?

A:The scope is definitely there. Our studies in data compaction and our work with Danny Kopec in domainspecific algorithms have shown us that there is tremendous potential in
programming specific endgames. The question is allocation of resources (ie our programming time). It used to be considered that the endgame was the area that was in most need of work; right now the feeling amongst program reviewers is that our midgame needs most attention. So currently, there are no further plans for endgame work.
(By the way, the hash tables really shine in the endgame, and some problems we can now solve are due to increased depth alone.)

Kathe Spracklen
San diego, California xi. 87

GBR class 0026??
Replace each letter with a (different) digit in this addition sum

BHSHOP

+ BISHOP
KNIGHTS

Solution: p372
(Acknowledgement to COMPUTER WEEKLY)

## REVIEW

The Chess Study Today, by Filipp Semyonovich Bondarenko. 197 pages, 378 diagrams. Kiev, 1987. In Russian. Printing: 45,000.
We proffer heary congratulations to the indomitable veteran composerauthor, our faithful correspondent for over twenty years, on the completion, with the appearance of this fourth volume in the series, of his self-appointed task of chronicling the endgame study from its hazy beginnings to its present-day flourishing. As the author states, the period since 1945 presents an embarras de richesse: selection for inclusion in his book must have caused the deepest heartsearching. He has tried, we read, to retain what is of greatest importance. We must therefore ask if the intent has succeeded. In the sense that no two people would make the same selection the subjective answer will be negative. But let us try to be objective. On consulting the list of contents (there is no index) we find that 35 countries are represented. Among them are Bolivia, Cyprus, Denmark, the Lebanon, Mexico,

Norway, Portugal and Turkey. Excellent! But Ireland (Robert Pye) and Israel (almost uncountable names) are missing.
Let us consider the implications of Israel's omission. In our evaluation we ought to be generous, remembering that although published in the time of glasnost this book was necessarily written for the most part before glasnost. So the lacuna is not just deplorable, it is in this context frustrating, for we have lost the opportunity of knowing for sure if 1988's putatively relaxed censorship would have passed Israel. Are we being invited to read between the lines when we see on p. 174 that "Unfortunately, for technical reasons studies prepared by the author from composers in Japan, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealnd are not in this publication'? The prognosis is provisionally pessimistic, but it is only fair to the author to state that in our ignorance of the relationships between a soviet author and his soviet publishing house we welcome any enlightenment.

+ Clifford G HILTON d.3.i.88, aged 58. Mancunian, six times British Championship contender and for six years President of the Lancashire (Chess) League, bulletin editor, one of the best solvers in the days of the late Assiac's New Statesman column, self-taught computer programmer, author of chess puzzles, well-informed and helpful subscriber to and supporter of EG, Clifford had not long retired to devote his great energies to planning, running, and acting as BCF Arbiter at, many week-end congresses, where his revised system of computerised pairings in jamboree events was widely adopted. He was at work programming to improve all-play-all pairings. One of his last activities was an extensive review of the three '5-man endgame' booklets in Bulle-

Tourney announcement - HILLEL ALONI (50) JUBILEE
Entries, with no limitations as to numbers or themes, to: Yochanan Afek, 72 La-Guardia Street, 67325 TEL-AVIV, Israel. Closing date: 31.xii.88.

## VARIANTIM

The first issue of VARIATIM, the bulletin of the Israel Chess Composition Association is dated i-iv.88. It is in Hebrew and English and therefore carries: a picture of Ofer Comay on the back/front; and tourney announcements on the front/back. Included is a major article by Yochanan Afek displaying 29 examples of 'stalepinned' promotions, 'stalepin' being a neologism for promotion with instant pinning stalemate. VARIANTIM replaces HAPROBLEMAI and is under the joint editorship of Uri Avner and Yoel Aloni.
tin No. 258 (i.88) of the Manchester and District Chess Association.
+Stanley N COLLINGS (1.xi.192.xi.87). Of leukaemia. Stanley was an EG stalwart from the start, an occasional correspondent, and a friendly voice on the telephone from Stratford-upon-Avon. He also supported the 5 -man endgames publication project with a sizeable donation. It would have pleased Stanley that all 24 of the Q -ending series (of which only three have been printed, in booklet form) may yet appear as a single volume in 1990 with an American publisher.

+ Aarne Armas Artturi DUNDER (9.vi.14-27.i.88). Finnish composer and co-author of the Finnish study anthologies 111 (1946) and 123 (1972).


## SNIPPETS

Anatoly Scharansky
re EG90, p292. The recent biography Scharansky, Hero of Our Time, by Martin Gilbert reports (p. 25) that S. began graduate work at the Moscow Physical-Technical Institute in the summer of 1972 on 'the application of chess endgames as examples of making decisions in situations of conflict". In iv. 73 S . applied for an exit visa. ... Presumably the thesis, if completed, was never published. It is also reported that S . could, and maybe still can, play 15 games of chess blindfold.

| Solution: | $\begin{array}{r} 796043 \\ +796043 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 1592086 |



No. 6797: A. Maksimovskikh and V. Shupletsov. Judge: P. Perkonoja (Finland). 1. Sf7 +Kg 8 2. Sh6 + Kh8 3. Rb6 Bxb6/i 4. Kf8 gh 5. Bc3 b1S 6. Bal/ii Ba5 7. d5 + Bc3/iii 8. Bxc3 + Sxc3 9. d6 Sb5 10. d7 Sd4 11. d8S Se6 + 12. Sxe6 h4 13. Sd8 h5 14. Sf7 mate.
i) 3...a3 4. Kf8 gh 5. Bc3 Bd6 6. Rxd6.
ii) 6. Bb2? a3 7. Bal Ba5 8. d5 + Вc3 9. Вxc3 Sxc3 10. d6 a2 11. d7 alQ.
iii) 7...Sc3 8. d6 e3 9. d7 e2 10. d8Q elQ 11. Qf6 mate.

No. 6798
A. Belyavsky
and L. Mitrofanov
2nd Prize, Mongolian Chess


No. 6798: A. Belyavsky and L. Mitrofanov. 1. Rh8 + Ka7 2. Bxb3

Rg7 + 3. Kh5 Rf7 4. Bxf7 f2 5. Rh7 Kb8 6. Rh8 + Kc7 7. Rh7 Kd8 8. $\mathrm{Rh} 8+\mathrm{Ke7} 9 . \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kd} 7$ 10. Rf8 Ke7 11. Re8 + Kxf7 12. Re4 f1R 13. Rxb4 Rf5 + 14. Kg4 Ke6 15. Re4+ Re5 16. Kf4, drawn.


No. 6799: the late A.V. Sarychev. 1. e8Q elQ + /i 2. Qxe1 Sf5 + 3. Kh3/ii $\mathrm{Qa} 3+$ 4. $\mathrm{Bf} 3+\mathrm{Qxf} 3+$ 5. Bg 3 Qh5 + (Sxe1 stalemate) 6. Bh4 Qf3 + (ditto) 7. Bg3 Qh5, positional draw.
i) $1 . . . \mathrm{Sf} 5+2 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Qa} 3+3 . \mathrm{Bg} 3+$.
ii) 3. $\mathrm{Kg} 5 ? \mathrm{Qg} 7+4 . \mathrm{Kxf} 5$ Sxel wins.

No. $6800 \quad \begin{array}{r}\text { A. Sochniev }\end{array}$ t Hon. Mention, Mongolia Chess Federation, 1984


No. 6800: A. Sochniev and L. Mitrofanov. 1. Rh1/i Bd2+ (Kg7; Rxh3) 2. Kb3 Rc3 + 3. Ka4 ba 4. $\mathrm{Rxh} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 3+\mathrm{Kf7}$ 6. Rf3 + Ke7 7. Rd3 (Re3 + ? Bxe3;), with Rxd3 stalemate, or 7...Rc2 8. Kb3, or 7...Be18. Re3 + .
i) 1. Rd3? Sf4 2. $\mathrm{Rxe} 3 \mathrm{Sd} 5+$.

1. $\mathrm{Rd} 8+$ ? Kg 7 2. $\mathrm{Rd} 7+(\mathrm{Kb} 3, \mathrm{Rc} 7$;)

Kf6 3. Rxb7 Ra2.


No. 6801: J. Vandiest. 1. d5 (Bf5? f2;) h4 2. d6 h3 3. d7 h2 4. d8Q h1Q 5. $\mathrm{Qd} 4 \mathrm{Kd} 2+6 . \mathrm{Bf} 1+\mathrm{Ke} 1$ 7. Bxb 5 $\mathrm{Qh} 7+8 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Qh} 2+9$. Kb3 Qf2 10. Qe4 $+\mathrm{Kd1}$ 11. Qb1 +Kd 212. Qc2 + Ke3 13. Qc5 + wins.


No. 6802: A. Vostroknutov (USSR). 1. $\mathrm{Qg} 7 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Qb} 2+$ 2. Kc6 Qxg7 3. Bb6 $+\mathrm{Ke7}$ 4. d8Q $+\mathrm{Kf7}$ 5. Qxd5 + Ke8 6. Qd8 + Kf7 7. Bd4 Qh6/ii 8.

Qf6 + Kg8 9. Kd7 Qh3 + 10. Kd8 Qh7 11. Ke8 Qh6 12. Qf7 mate.
i) 1. Qf8 + ? Kxd7 2. Qf7 + Kc8 3. $\mathrm{Qe} 8+\mathrm{Kc7} \mathrm{4}. \mathrm{Bb6+} \mathrm{Kb7} \mathrm{5}. \mathrm{Qd7+}$ Kb8.
ii) 7...Qf8 8. Qd5 +, or 7...Qg8 8. Qd7 + , or 7...Qh7 8. Qd7 + , mating next move in all cases.


No. 6803: F.S. Bondarenko and B. N. Sidorov. 1. $\mathrm{Bd} 4+/ \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Kg} 8$ 2. Ba 7 h2 3. Kg2 h3 + 4. Kh1 Kf8 5. Bc5 + Ke8 6. Ba7 Kd8 7. Bb6 + Kc8 8. Вa7 Kd8 9. Bb6 + Kc8 10. Ba7 Kf8 11. $\mathrm{Bc} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 8$ 12. Ba 7 Kh 8 13. $\mathrm{Bd} 4+$, drawn.
i) 1. Ba 7 ? Kg 8 2. $\mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{~h} 2+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 2$ h3 + 4. Kh1 Kf8 5. Bc5 + Ke8 6. Ba 7 Kd 8 7. $\mathrm{Bb} 6+\mathrm{Kc} 8$ wins.

No. 6804 G.G. Amiryan
3rd Commendation,


No. 6804: G. Amiryan. 1. Rb8+ Kc 2 2. Rc8 $+\mathrm{Kd1}$ 3. Rd8 +Ke 24. Re8 + Kf1 5. Rf8 + Kel/i 6. Re8 + Kd1 7. Rd8 +Kc 2 8. $\mathrm{Rc} 8+\mathrm{Kb} 29$.
$\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Ka} 3$ 10. Bc5+/ii Kxa4 11. Rb5 Bc3 12. Bd4 alQ 13. Rxa5 + Bxa5 14. Bxa1, drawn.
i) $5 \ldots$..Bxf8 6. Bd4 Bh6 7. Kxa5 Ke2
8. Kb4.
ii) 10 . Rb5? alQ 11. Bc5 +Ka 2 .


No. 6805: Jaroslav Polašek (Prague). Judge: Jaroslav Pospisil, who, together with E. Pavlovsky, assisted EG with translations. There were 121 entries from 82 composers. Although this was a formal tourney judged anonymously studies could be corrected after the closing date in cases where the judge returned a faulty composition to its composer via the organiser.
The judge reports that '"The level of the honoured studies is extraordinarily high..."

The blue book containing the multisection award was printed in only 500 copies and is simply dated '1986'. Some studies in the award appeared earlier in Pospisil's monthly column in Ceskoslovensky Šach. 1. $\mathrm{Sc} 2+/ \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Ke2/ii} 2$. $\mathrm{Sd} 5 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Sg} 3+/$ iv 3. Kf4 d1Q 4. Sc3 + Kd2 5. Sxd1 $\mathrm{Se} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kf3} / \mathrm{v} \mathrm{Sc} 17 . \mathrm{Ba} 4 \mathrm{Kxd1} 8$. Ke3 Sa2 9. Sb4 + Kc1 10. Sd3 +/vi Kb1 11. Kd2 Kal 12. Bc2 wins, but not 12. Kc2? $\mathrm{Sb} 4+13$. Sxb4 stalemate.
i) 1. Sd3+ Ke2 2. Sf4+/vii Ke1 3. $\mathrm{Sg} 2+\mathrm{Ke} 2$ 4. Sd5 $\mathrm{Sg} 3+5$. Kf4 d1Q 6. $\mathrm{Sc} 3+\mathrm{Kf} 2$.
ii) 1...Kf2 2. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 2$ 3. $\mathrm{Bc} 4+$ $\mathrm{Kd1} 4 . \mathrm{cSe} 3+$
iii) 2. $\mathrm{Bc} 4+$ ? Kf 2 3. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 14$. Be 2 (-Se3,Sd6 + ;) Sg3 + .
iv) 2...d1Q 3. Sc3 +Kd 2 4. Sxd1 $\mathrm{Sg} 3+5 . \mathrm{Kf} 3$.
v) 6. Ke4? Kxd1 7. Ke3 Sc3 8. Kd3 Sb1 9. Sa3 +Kc 1 10. Sc4 Sa3 11. Sxa3 Kb2.
vi) 10. Sxa2? Kb2 11. Sb4 Ka3.
vii) 2. Sb2 Se3 3. Sd5 d1S. 2. Sd5 $\mathrm{Sg} 3+3$. Kf4 d1Q.
'The engagement lasts 12 thrilling moves, and in miniature form. The first part concerns securing the winning BSS vs. S (GBR class 0015) force, and after strong counterplay bS is overcome. Ideas for attack and defence show equal merit: we may single out the tries on moves 6,10 and 12 as especial ornaments of this first class composition."


No. 6806: Nikolai Ryabinin (Zherdevka, USSR). 1. Ra8 Kf7 2. Kf3/i Re5 3. Rxe8 (Kxg2? Bc6+;) with: 3...Sh4 + 4. Kg4 Re4 + 5. Kh5 Kxe8 6. $\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Kxe} 7$ 7. $\mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kxe} 8$ stalemate.
3...Se1 + 4. Ke2, and either 4...Bf4 (g5, h6) 5. Kd1 Кхе8 6. Rb8 + Kxe7 7. Re8 + Kxe8 stalemate, or $4 \ldots$
$\mathrm{Ba} 7+$ 5. Kf1 Kxe8 6. Rb7 Be5(d4) 7. $\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Kxe} 7$ 8. $\mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kxe} 8$ stalemate.
i) 2. Rxe8? Kxe8 3. Kf3 Rd2 4. $\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Kxe} 75 . \mathrm{Rg} 8 \mathrm{Rf} 2+$ wins.
2. bRb 8 ? $\mathrm{Rg} 5+3$. Kf3 $\mathrm{Bc} 6+$ wins.
''The three echoed stalemates are dispersed unobtrusively over the chessboard and call for no comment. The work is in the best traditions of the Czech composing style and would have been appreciated by both deceased GMs."


No. 6807: I.G. Davletshin (Kazan, USSR). 1. Sd5 + Kb7 2. Se3 Bc1 3. Sf1 Bxf1/i 4. Se4/ii Ba3 + 5. Kd4 $\mathrm{Bb} 2+6$. Ke3 Bxg7/iii 7. Kxf2 Bh3 8. Kg3 Bf1 9. Kf2, with a positional draw to be added to those on pp. 13-14 of EG83. With the (now irrelevant) addition of bPh 7 this draw seems to have been shown first by the soviet composer Perelman in 1954 (No. 1294a in Chéron II).
i) $3 . . . \mathrm{Bxg} 54$. Sh2 Bf4 5. Bd4 Bg 36. Kc4.
ii) $4 . \mathrm{Bd} 4 ? \mathrm{Ba} 3+5 . \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Bg} 2+$.
iii) $6 \ldots \mathrm{Ba} 6$ 7. Sc5 + . 6...Bb5(c4) 7. Sd6+.
"'An elegantly conceived solution with two pieces sacrificed is given point by an original domination draw... all pieces move into place."


No. 6808: Evgeny Kolesnikov (Moscow). 1. c6/i Kxh2 2. c7 Ra8/ii 3. c8Q Rxc8 4. d7 Kg1/iii 5. dcB h2 6. Bh3 Kxf2 7. Bg2 Kg1 8. Bh3 h1B 9. Bg 2 Kh 2 10. Bh3/iv Bxf3 11. Bg2 $\mathrm{Bd} 1 / \mathrm{v}$ 12. Bf3 Bc2 13. Be4 Bd1 14. $\mathrm{Bf} 3 / \mathrm{vi} \mathrm{Ba} 415$. Bc6 drawn, for example $15 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 1$ 16. Bxa4 f3 17. Kg3 f2 18. Bb5 f1Q 19. Bxf1 Kxf1 20. Kf3 Ke1 21. Ke3 Kd1 22. Kd3 Kc1 23. Ke3.
i) 1. d7? Rxd7 2. c6 Kxh2 3. cd Kg2 4. d 8 Q h 2 .
ii) $2 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 2$ 3. c8Q h2 4. $\mathrm{Qh} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 1$ 5. d7 Rxd7 6. Qxh2 + .
iii) $4 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 2$ 5. dcQ h2 6. Qh3 +Kg 1 7. $\mathrm{Qxh} 2+$
iv) Or 10. Bf1-see the judge's comment on this dual.
v) $11 \ldots \mathrm{Be} 2$ 12. Bf 3 Bf 1 13. Be 4 Kg 1 14. Bxg6 f3 15. Bf7 f2 16. g6 Bd3 17. g7 draws.
vi) 14. Bxg6? f3 15. Be4 f2 16. Bd3 Bc2 17. Bc4 Bg6.
''Subtle underpromotion by both sides leads into the second phase with its stalemate motif. The finesses of the BB combat underlines the temptation 10. Bf1 Bxf1 11. Bd3? Bd1 12. Be 2 Bc 2 13. Bd 3 f 3 14. Bxc 2 f 2 15. Bd 3 Kg 2 and Bl wins. The fact that this line arises only out of a dual (and is avoided by $10 . \mathrm{Bh} 3$ ) caused this grandly conceived study to be placed fourth and not higher."


No. 6809: Bronislav G. Olympiev (Sverdlovsk). 1. Rh8 +Kg 5 2. Se4 + $\mathrm{Kg} 4 / \mathrm{i} 3$. Rh7/ii Kf3/iii 4. Rxg 7 Bg 4 5. $\mathrm{Sd} 2+\mathrm{Kf} 4$ 6. $\mathrm{Rf} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 5 / \mathrm{iv} 7$. $\mathrm{Se} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 6$ 8. Rf6 $+/ \mathrm{v} \mathrm{Kg} 7$ 9. Rf1 Bb 2 10. Rh1 $\mathrm{Bc} 7(\mathrm{~b} 8)$ 11. Rg 1 Bb6(a7) +12 . Sc5 wins.
i) $2 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 4$ 3. $\mathrm{Rf} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 4$ 4. Rf 7 ( Rg 8 ? Kh3;) Bc6 5. Rxg7 + Kf4 6. Sxg3 wins.
ii) 3. $\operatorname{Rg} 8$ ? Kh 3 4. $\operatorname{Rxg} 7 \quad \mathrm{Bg} 4 \quad 5$. $\mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 6. Rg 7 Kh 3 7. Ke3 Be1. iii) 3...Kf4 4. Rxg 7 Bg 4 5. $\mathrm{Rf} 7+\mathrm{Bf} 5$ 6. Sxg3.
iv) $6 . . . \mathrm{Bf} 5$ 7. Se4 Bel 8. Sd6 Bf2+ 9. Kd5.
v) $8 . \mathrm{Rf} 8 ? \mathrm{Bc} 79 . \mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kf} 5$.
', There is rich content in this demanding pieces battle with its surprising moves in both attack and defence. The technique reminds us of Fritz' best compositions. bPa6 is necessary for soundness."


No. 6810: M.G. Muradov (Narikamend, USSR). 1. Rd3 + Kf4 2. $\mathrm{Rf} 3+\mathrm{Ke} 5$ 3. Sc1/i Rxh4 + 4. Bh3 elQ 5. Sd3 + Ke4 6. Sxel Rxb1 7. Kg 3 /ii Rxel 8. Kf2 Bb4 9. Kg3 Be7 10. Kf2 Bb4 11. Kg3, drawn.
i) 3. $\operatorname{Re} 3+$ ? Kxf 5 4. $\mathrm{Sd} 4+\mathrm{Kf} 45$. Rxe2 Rxb1 6. g3 + Kg4 7. Re4 + Kh5 8. g4 + Kg6.
ii) 7. Rf1? Rh8 and W is in zugzwang: 8. Sf3 Rxf1 9. Sd2 + Ke3 10. Sxf1 + Kf2 11. Sd2 Bd6 + 12. Kh1 Re8 13. Sf3 Ra8.
8. Rg1 Bc5 9. Rh1 Bb4 10. Sc2(f3) Bd6 + 11. g3 Rxh1 + 12. Kxh1 Rxh3 + .
8. g3 Bd6 9. $\mathrm{Kg} 2 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Rb} 2+10$. Rf2 Rxf2 + 11. Kxf2 Rxh3.
iii) 9. Rf6 Rxe1 10. Rxd6 Re2 + .
9. Sf3 Rb2 + 10. Rxd6 Re2 +
9. Rg1 Bb4 10. Sf3 Rxg1 11. Sxg1 Bc5 12. Se2 Kf3 13. Sf4 Bf2.
9. Rh1 Bb4 10. Kg2 Rb2 + 11. Kf1 Rf8 + .
'"A complex concept somewhat heavily composed in its introduction to the central situation at move 7 , when, after a surprising and analytically demanding 'pointe' there is an interesting pendulum draw."


No. 6811: Alexander Grin (Moscow) and David Gurgenidze (Chailuri, Georgian SSR). 1. $\mathrm{Rc} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 82$. Rxh7 a5 3. Ka3/i a4 4. Ka2 a3 5. Rg 7 Rc 8 6. b7 Rc2 + 7. Kb1 Rb2 + 8. Kal Ra5 9. $\mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 7$ 10. $\mathrm{Rc} 8+$
draws, for if $10 \ldots \mathrm{Kxb} 711$. Rc7+ Kb6 12. Rc6 + Kb5 13. Rc5 + K- 14. Rxa5 Kxa5 stalemate.
i) 3. Kb5? a4 4. b7 a3 5. Kc6 Ra6 + 6. Kb 5 a 2 wins.
3. Rg 7 ? Rc 8 4. $\mathrm{Kb} 5 \mathrm{a} 45 . \mathrm{b} 7 \mathrm{cRb} 86$. Kb6 a3 wins.
"A R-composition in the Gurgenidze style, where advantage in space sets off material disadvantage and facilitates a splendid stalemating finale."


No. 6812: Velimir Kalandadze (Tbilisi). 1. $\mathrm{Ra} 8+/ \mathrm{i}$ Kxa8 2. fe $\mathrm{Rb} 1+3$. Ka3 Rxb3 + 4. Ka4/ii Rxb4+ 5 . Kxb4 Rb1 + 6. Ka3 e1Q 7. e8Q + Qxe8 8. $\mathrm{Ra} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 8$ 9. $\mathrm{Ra} 8+\mathrm{Kxa} 8$ stalemate.
i) 1. fe? $\mathrm{Rb} 1+2 . \mathrm{Kc} 2 \mathrm{eRc} 1+3$. Kd3 elQ wins. 1. Ra7? Rd2 +2. Ka 3 Ra 1 wins.
ii) 4. Kxb3? Rb1 + 5. Kc2 elQ 6. Rh8 +Kb 7 7. $\mathrm{e} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Qd} 1+$ 8. Kc3 $\mathrm{Rc} 1+9 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{Rc} 2+$ wins.
"A firework display of somewhat shallow sacrifices attend the concluding stalemate. The tries on moves 1 and 4 are noteworthy."

No. 6813: Mario Matous (Prague). 1...Rb1+/i 2. Ka2 Rb6/ii 3. Ra5 Bxc4 4. Ka1 (Ka3? Rb1;) Re6 (Kc2; $\mathrm{Be} 4+$ ) 5. Ra3 + Kc2 6. Ra2 + /iii Bxa2 7. Bd5 Re5(e7) 8. Bb3 +, and
8...Kxb3 stalemate, or $8 \ldots$ Bxb3 stalemate, or $8 \ldots \mathrm{Kcl(c3})$ 9. Bxa2 drawn.
i) $1 . . \mathrm{Re} 2$ looks strong, for if 2. Rh1(h4)? Kb3 winning, or 2. Rc5? $\mathrm{Re} 1+3 . \mathrm{Ka} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 1+4 . \mathrm{Ka} 3 \mathrm{Bc} 25$. $\mathrm{Ka} 2 \mathrm{Bb} 3+$ wins, or 2. Bd5? Re1 + 3. Ka2 Re7 wins. However, 2. Rh3 Rel + 3. Ka2 Rel + 4. Rxd3 + draws.
ii) 2...Rb8 3. Bc6 draws, for example 3...Rb6 4. Ba4 Ra6 5. Ka3 Bc2 6. Rh3 + .
iii) 6. Be4 + ? Rxe4 7. Re3 Rd4 wins.


No. 6814: Virgil Nestorescu (Bucarest). 1. f5/i c2/ii 2. Ra3+/iii g3 3. Rc3 d4 4. Rxc2 g2 5. Rc1 d3 (Kh2; $\mathrm{Kg} 4)$ 6. $\mathrm{Rd} 1 / \mathrm{iv} \mathrm{Kh} 27 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q}+8$. Rxg1 Kxg1 9. Kf3 wins.
i) 1. Ra3? d4 2. f5 g3 3. f6 c2 4. Ral d3 5. Rh1 + Kg2 6. Rc1 Kh3 7. $\mathrm{Rh} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 8. Rcl Kh3.

1. Ra1? d4 2. f5 c2 3. f6 d3 4. f7 d2 5. $\mathrm{Rh} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 6. f8Q d1Q 7. $\mathrm{Qa} 8+$ Qf3 draws.
ii) $1 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 3$ 2. f6 g2 3. f7 wins.
iii) 2. Ra 1 ? d4 3. $\mathrm{Rh} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 4. Rc 1 d3 5. f6 Kh3 6. f7 d2.
iv) 6. f6? Kh2 7. f7 d2 8. Rd1 glQ 9. $\mathrm{Rxd} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 1$ 10. f8Q $\mathrm{Qc} 5+11$. Qxc5 stalemate.
''A fine miniature, hard to compose, seasoned agreeably with a hidden stalemate obstacle."


No. 6815: Axel Ornstein (Enskede, Sweden). 1. Be6 Kb6 2. Ke4 Kc6 3. Sg6/i Kc7 4. Kd5/ii Kd8 5. Kc6 Ke8 6. Kc 7 Sf 77 . Bd 7 mate.
i) 3. Ke5? Kc 7 , and if 4. Sg 6 Kd 8 draws, or if 4. Kf4 Kd6 5. Bc4 e6 draws.
ii) 4. Kf4? Kd6 5. Sf8 Sf7 6. Bxf7 + $\mathrm{e} 5+7 . \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Ke} 7$ draws.
"A simple-looking but sophisticated mate with self-block on a practically empty chessboard. We are reminded of a study by Z. Birnov...",

No. 6816: Ladislav Salai (jr., of Martin, Czechoslovakia (?)) and Michal Hlinka (Kosice, Czechoslovakia). 1. c7 Rg8 2. Bxg8 h2 3. Bh7 +
(c8Q? h1Q;) Kb2 4. c8Q h1Q 5.
$\mathrm{Qc} 2+\mathrm{Ka1}$ 6. $\mathrm{Qc} 3+\mathrm{Ka} 2$ 7. $\mathrm{Qd} 2+$ Ka1 8. Qd4 + Ka2 9. Qf2 + Kal 10. Qxf6 + Ka2 11. Qf7 + Kb2 12. $\mathrm{Qg} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 3$ 13. $\mathrm{Qg} 8+\mathrm{Kc} 314$. Qh8 +Kd 2 15. Qd4 +Ke 216. $\mathrm{Bd} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 2$ 17. $\mathrm{Be} 4+$ wins.


No. 6817: Gamlet G. Amiryan (Erevan). 1. Rg1 Rc2 2. Re1 Rcl 3. Rxb5 + Ke6 4. Rg1 Rc2 5. e5 h4 6. Rel Rcl 7. Rb6 + Ke7 8. Rg1 Rc2 9. e6 h3 10. Re1 Rcl 11. Rb7 + Ke8 12. Rg1 Rc2 13. e7 h2 14. Rel Rcl 15. Rb8 + wins.
"This complicated rhythmical movement in a R-ending is analytically demanding. The setting leaves an impression of heaviness."


No. 6818: Eduard A. Asaba (Moscow). 1. Be7/i Sd7 2. f5 + Kxh6 3. Kh4 Sb5/ii 4. Bb4 Sc3 5. Ba3/iii Se2 6. Bd6, and either 6...Sxf6 7. Bf8 mate, or $6 \ldots$..Sf4 7. Bxf4 mate.
i) 1. Bc3? Sc4 2. f5 + Kxh6 3. Bb4 $\mathrm{Se} 3+$ draws.
ii) 3...Sc6 4. Ba3 cS-5. Bc1 mate.
iii) Not 5. Bxc3? Sxf6 6. Bxf6 stalemate.
'This is a fine minor piece tempo struggle. The mating conclusion is evident from the start."


No. 6819: N.G. Danilyuk (Novoalekseyevka, USSR). 1. f7 Rd8 2. Se8 $\mathrm{Kc} 4+$ 3. Ke2 b2 4. Be6 + Rd5 5. Sd6 + Kd4 6. Sxb5 + , with: 6...Rxb5 7. f8Q b1Q 8. Qd6 + Kc3 9. Qd2 mate.
6...Ke5 7. f8Q b1Q 8. Qf5 mate.
"'A fresh, even festive, combination with two mates."


No. 6820: Alexander Hildebrand (Uppsala, Sweden). 1. gf + ? is a theoretical draw. 1. h6 +Kg 82. $\mathrm{h} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ 3. $\mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{Q}+\mathrm{Kxh} 8$ 4. gf Rf1 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 6. g 8 R wins, but not 6. g8Q? Rh1 + with perpetual check or stalemate.
'A little thing with an elegant point. We are reminded of a 2 nd prize winner by the late Swedish composer K. Runquist..."

No. 6821
Commended, UV CS TV
Pachman and Fritz Memorial, 1985


No. 6821: M. Hlinka. 1. Bh2 Ra1 + 2. Ke2 Rh1 3. Bg1 Rxg1 4. Kf3 Ke7 5. Bh5 Kf6 6. h4 Kg7 7. Bg4 Kg6(h6) 8. Bd7 Kh5 9. Bh3 Kxh4 10. Bxg2 Kg 5 11. Bh3 Rcl 12. Be6/i Rc3 + 13. Kg2 Kh4 14. Bd5 Kg4 15. Be6 + Kg5 16. Bd5 Kf5 17. Bf3, positional draw.
i) 12. Bd7? Rc3 + 13. Kg2 Kh4 14. Be6 f3 + wins.
"'Another good example (see the next study) of a tempo struggle on familiar lines."


No. 6822: M. Hlinka and Emil Vlasak (Usti on the Labe, better known as the Elbe). 1. d7 Be7 2. Re6 Bd8 3. Bxd8/i Rd5 4. Re7 Kf8 5. Kg2, with these two lines:
5..e3 6. Kf1 e4 7. Ke1 Rd6(d4, d2) 8. Rh 7 Kg 8 9. $\mathrm{Bc} 7(\mathrm{~b} 6, \mathrm{a} 5) \mathrm{Rd} 5$ 10. $\operatorname{Re} 7$ wins.
5...Rd3 6. Kg1 Rg3 + 7. Kh2 Rd3 8. Kg 2 , with Bl in zugzwang, for instance $8 . . . \mathrm{Rd} 1$ 9. Kf2 Rd3 10. Ke2, or $8 \ldots \mathrm{Rd} 2+9$. Kf1 Rd1+/ii 10. Kf2 Rd3 11. Ke2.
i) 3. Re8+? Kf7 4. Bxd8 Rd5 5. $\mathrm{Re} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 6$, with a positional draw. ii) $9 \ldots \mathrm{e} 310$. Rh7 Kg 8 11. Ba5 wins.
,'After W's move 3 we see a complex struggle for tempo that is well managed both as a composition and in the analysis. Earlier treatments were less involved."

No. 6823: V.I. Kondratev (Tavrinov posad, USSR). 1. $\mathrm{Ba} 7+\mathrm{Ke} 42$. $\mathrm{Sd} 6+\mathrm{Kd} 5$ 3. Sxb4 + Sxb4 + 4. Kc3 Kxd6 5. Bb8 + Kd5 6. Kxb4 S5c6+ 7. Kb 5 Sxb 8 8. a6 Bd7 + 9. Kb6 Bc6 10. Ka7 Sd7 stalemate.
"A rather brutal piece struggle finishes in a nice stalemate, for which I did not find a precedent."


No. 6824: Vladimir Kos (Brno, Czechoslovakia). 1...Sa8 2. Bxa5 b6 3. Bel Kf1 4. Kg4 Ke2 5. Kf5 Kd3 6. Ke6 Kc4 7. Kd7 Kxb5 8. Kc8 Ka6 9. Kb 8 wins.

DVH: wBel to prevent 9...b5 10. Kxa8 Bf2.


No. 6825: H.G. Koslowski (Bremy, ??). 1. Bc6 Qe2 2. Bh1 a4 3. Ka3 Qf2 4. f6 Qc5 + 5. Ka2 Qc4+ 6. $\mathrm{Kb} 1 \mathrm{Qc} 2+7$. Ka1 a3 8. Bd5 a2 9. f7 wins.


No. 6826: Josef Stasiak (Kvasice, Czechoslovakia). 1. Kxc3/i a1Q+2. $\mathrm{Kb} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 2+3$. Bxb 2 ab 4 . e4 h5 5. e5 h4 6. e6 h3 7. e7 h2 8. e8Q b1Q + 9 . Bxb1 h1Q 10. Qe3 + Kd1 11. Bc2 mate.
"A light piece with clever differentiation of the try (move 1). Excellent for a solving contest."
i) 1. Bxc3? Kxc2 2. e4 h5 3. e5 h4 4. e6 h3 5. e7 h2? 6. e8O h1O 7. Qe2+ Kb 18 . $\mathrm{Qd} 3+\mathrm{Kcl} 9 . \mathrm{Bd} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 210$. $\mathrm{Qb} 3+\mathrm{Ka} 1$ 11. Bc3 mate looks fine, but 5...alQ 6. Bxal h2 7. e8Q hlQ 9. $\mathrm{Qe} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 1$ draws.


No. 6827: E. Vlasak. 1. Qf3/i elQ 2. Be4 Qg1 3. Qe2 Qf2 4. Qd1 + Qg1 5. Bxg2 + Kxg2 6. Qf3 mate. i) 1. Qe4? e1Q 2. Qxe1 + g1Q. 1. Qd5? e1Q 2. Be4 Kg1 3. Bxg2 $\mathrm{Qe} 2+4 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 / \mathrm{ii} \mathrm{Qe} 3+5 . \mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{Q}$. 1. Kh3? e1Q 2. Qf3 Qe6 + 3. Bf5 $\mathrm{Qh} 6+4 . \mathrm{Kg} 4(\mathrm{Kg} 3, \mathrm{Qe} 3 ;) \mathrm{Qg} 7+5$. Kf4 Qd4+ 6. Be4 Qf6+.
ii) 4. $\mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{Q} .4 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Qf} 2+5 . \mathrm{Kh} 3$ Qe3 + .
''Precise use of an advantage in space by wQ tempo moves despite stalemate and other obstacles. The placing would have been higher but for Sedlak having anticipated the mate."


No. 6828: Julio Cesar Infantozzi (Uruguay). 1. Qe8 + Kxe8 2. Rxc8 + Kf7 3. Bg8 + Kxg8 4. Sg6 +Kh 75. Rh8 + Kxg6 6. Sf4+ Kf6 7. Rf8 + Ke5 8. $\mathrm{Bg} 7+$ Rf6 9. Bxf6 + ef 10. Re8 + Se6 + 11. Rxe6 + Qxe6 12. Sg6 + Bxg6 13. f4 + Rxf4 14. gf + Bxf4 15. Re4 + Bxe4 16. d4 mate.
"A modern mansuba, in a way an 'anti-study'. The enforced liquidation down to the bare essentials for the mate do get our attention. Neither V. Pachman nor J. Fritz were fond of captures, but they both looked kindly on chess extravaganzas."


No. 6829: M.S. Liburkin. Judge: An.G. Kuznetsov. 1. Be6 Be8. 1... Bh5 2. Bd5 Sg3 3. Kf2 Sc3 (Sxf5: $\mathrm{Be} 4)$ 4. $\mathrm{Bf} 3 \mathrm{Se} 4+$ 5. Ke3. 2. f6 Sd6 3. f7 Sxf7 4. Bf5 + Kc1. Now if 5. Be 4 ? Sg 3 6. Bg6 Se5 7. Bxe8 Sd 3 is checkmate. 5. Bg6 + Kb2 6. Be4. Now is the time! 6...Sg3 7. Bg6 Kc3 8. Kf2 Sh1 + 9. Kg1 Sg3 10. Kf2 and drawn by perpetual attack.


1 Hon. Mention,


No. 6830: M.S. Liburkin. 1. Sc5 Sc2 2. Kxc2 e3 + 3. Kd1 Bc2 + . More cunning than the immediate 3 ... Bb 1 4. Sa 4 , the main line but sooner. 4. Ke2(e1) ed(+) 5. Kxd2 Bb1. The material equilibrium is reestablished. 6. Sa4 Bxa2 7. Sc3 Bb3 8. Bd6 and zugzwang decides. bK and bB are both caught.

No. 6831: A.A. Troitzky. 1. b6+. This frees the b5 square. 1...Rxb6 2. Bd6 + . So that if $2 \ldots$ Rxd6 3. Sb5 +

Kc6 4. Sxd6 Kxd6 5. b4 and wP crosses the Troitzky line to draw. 2...Sxd6 3. Se6 + Kc6 4. Sd4 + Kc5 5. $\mathbf{S e} 6+$ Kb5 6. Sd4 + Ka5 7. b4 + Sxb4 8. Sb3 + Kb5 9. Sd4 + Kc5 10. Se6(b3) + Kc6 11. Sd4 + Kc7 12. Se6 + , drawing by perpetual check. '"A brilliant working of a schema already known. It seems that this was the last study of Troitzky to be published."


No. 6832: D. Nikolaev. 1. Bb2 e2. If 1...Kb4 2. Se6 e2 3. Sf4. 2. Bc3 + Ka4 3. Se6 b2. Or 3...e1Q 4. Bxel b2 5. Sc5 + Ka3 6. Bb4 + Kxb4 ( Ka 2 ; Sa 4 ) 7. $\mathrm{Sd} 3+\mathrm{Kxc} 48 . \mathrm{Sxb} 2+$ Kd4 9. Ka6. 4. Bxb2 e1Q 5. Sc5 + Ka5 6. Be1 Qxc1. W was threatening 7. $\mathrm{Bd} 2+\mathrm{Qxd} 28 . \mathrm{Sb} 3+$, or $7 \ldots \mathrm{~Kb} 4$ 8. Sd3 + . 7. Sb3 + Kb4 8. Sxc1 Kxc4 9. Sd3. But not 9. Kb7? c5 10. Kc6

Kd4 11. Se2 + Ke5 12. Kxc5 Kf6 and 13...Kg5. 9...Kxd3 10. g5 c5 11. g6 c4 12. g7 c3 13. g8Q c2 14. Qg5 and wins.
"A study of two phases with a surprise sacrifice in each (6. Bc1! and 9. Sd3!)."


No. 6833: E. Somov-Nasimovich. 1. b7 Rb8 (else 2. Sc8) 2. Ba7 Rxb7 3. Bd4 + (Sxb7? Sb5;) Ke6 4. Sxb7 Sa2 5. Sc5 + Kd6. Otherwise 6. Kxb2 Sxb4 7. Bc3. 6. Kb1. Not 6. Kxb2? Sb4 and W is in zugzwang. 6...Sxb4 7. Kxb2. Now Bl is in zugzwang. 7...a3+8. Kb3, winning.


No. 6834: F. Simkhovich. '"A preposterous position!" 1. Rd4 + Ke5 2. Rd3 + d4 3. Bxd4 + Kd5. ''Bl seems to have scrambled to safety." 4. Rxd6 + Kxd6 5. Bh8 + and the perpetual check that follows does not have to be played through.


No. 6835: G.M. Kasparyan. 1. Be4 $\mathrm{g} 2+$. 'The following mating attack has its amusing side: $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 12$. $\mathrm{S} 4 \mathrm{f} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 3. Sh4 $+\mathrm{Kh} 24 . \mathrm{dSf} 3+$ Kh1 5. Kxg3 f1S + 6. Kf2 Rc1 7. $\mathrm{Sg} 5+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ 8. hSf3 +Kh 1 9. Se5 + and 10. Sg4 mate. '2. Sf1 Rxf1. The threat was $3 . \mathrm{Sg} 3+$ and $4 . \mathrm{Sf} 3$ mate. 3. Kh3 Rg1. This time the threat was 4. $\mathrm{Bxg} 2+$ and 5. Sf3 mate. 4. Se2 f1S 5. Bb1. Zugzwang. 5...S- 6. Sg3 mate. "A veritable string of checkmates."


No. 6836: A. Belyavsky and L.A. Mitrofanov. Judge: G.A. Umnov (Podolsk). The 'missing' second prize winner is EG's No. 6564.

1. $\mathrm{Sg} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 7$ 2. $\mathrm{Sf} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ 3. Bf4 Rd5 4. Sg6 + Kh7 5. Se5 g1Q 6. $\mathrm{g} 6+\mathrm{Kh} 87 . \mathrm{Be} 3$ Rxe5 8. Bd4 Qg3 9. Ba1 a5 10. a4 ef 11. Bc3 Qxg6+ 12. Kxg6 Kg8 13. Bxe5 wins.


No. 6837: N. Yurlov. 1. c6 d2 +2. Kd1 Ral + 3. Kxd2 Rxa6 4. Sf3 Kc5 5. c7 Rxd6 + 6. Sd4 Rxd4 + 7. Ke3 wins.


No. 6838: P. Arestov. 1. Kb7 Sxa6 2. Rxf6 Rb8+ 3. Ka7 Bxd3 4. Bcl Bxcl 5. Rf1 + Kg2 6. Rf2 + Kg3 7. $\mathrm{Rf} 3+\mathrm{Kg} 4$ 8. Rxd3 Sb4 9. $\mathrm{Rd} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 5$ 10. Rc4 Bf4 11. Rxf4 Sc6+ 12. Ka6 $\mathrm{Ra} 8+$ 13. Rc4 Bf4 14. Kc8 Se7 +15. Kb8 Sc6 + 16. Kc8 Ra8 + 17. Kb7 $\mathrm{Rb} 8+$ 18. Ka6 Sb4 + 19. Ka7 Sc6 + 20. Ka6, positional draw.

No. 6839: A. Sochniev and L.A. Mitrofanov. 1. Sf6 + Ke7 2. g8Q d1Q 3. $\mathrm{Sd} 5+\mathrm{Kd6} 4 . \mathrm{Qb} 8+\mathrm{Ke6} 5$. Qe8 + Kd6 6. Qe7 + Kc6 7. Qc7 + Kb5 8. Qd7 + Kc5 9. Qxa7 + Kb5 10. Qb6+ Ka4 11. Qb4+ Sxb4 12. Sc3 mate.


No. 6840: A. Malyshev. 1. Sb1 a4 2. Bxa4 e3 3. Sxe3 Bb5 4. Bb3 Bc4 5. Sd2 Bxb3+ 6. Sxb3 mate.


No. 6841: V. Kichigin. 1. d7 Bf6 2. Sh5 + Kf7 3. Sxf6 Ke7 4. Kf4 Kd8 5. Ke5 Ke7 6. Kd4 f4 7. Kc5/i f3 8. Kc6 f2 9. Kc7 f1Q 10. d8Q + Kf7 11. Qg8+/ii Ke7 (Kxf6;Qf8+) 12. Qg7 mate.
i) 7. Ke4? e5 8. Kd5 f3 9. Kc6 f2 10. Kc7 f1Q 11. d8Q + Ke6 12. Qe8 + Kf5.
ii) 11. Qe8 + ? Kg 7 12. $\mathrm{Qg} 8+\mathrm{Kh} 6$.

This study is labelled " 3 rd" commendation, but other 'commendeds" are not known.


No. 6842: Anders Gillberg (Sweden). Apart from the really exceptional case of the Central Chess Club of the USSR in the centre of Moscow I know of no precedent for an otb club having its own magazine with a composing tourney for studies. Moreover, this Dutch club's magazine has started with an international tourney. The mind boggles. Yet its driving force Jan van Reek seems to take the achievement in his stride.

Judge: Freek Spinhoven, with 15 originals presented for his scrutiny. 1. Rxd2? Bxg8 draws, for example 2. Rd8 Bc4 3. Rc8 Ba6 4. Ra8 Bb5, or 2. Rc2 Kc7 3. Rc3 (Kd4, Bb3; for Ba4;) Bf7 for Be 8 , or 2. Rg2 Bf7 3. Rg 7 Be 8 . 1. Rc5 Kxc5 2. c7 Bf4+ 3. Kxf4 Be6 4. Bxe6 Kd6 5. c8R wins.

No. 6843: W.J.G. Mees (Santpoort). r. Rd1 Bc3 2. c5 a1Q 3. Rxal Bxal 4. c6 e4 5. f4 ef 6. Kxh3/i Be5 7. c7 Bxc7 stalemate.
i) 6. c7? f2 7. c8Q $\mathrm{Be} 5+8$. Kh$\mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{Q}+$ wins.
6. Kg3? h2 7. Kxh2 Kg4 8. c7 Be5 + wins.


No. 6844
3rd Prize "'En Passant"" Reek
(Maastricht) 1986


No. 6844: Jan van Reek (Margraten). 1...Bd4/i 2. Sc5/ii Kg2 3. Se4 g5 4. Kxg5 Bh8 5. Kg6 e5 6. Kf7 f2 7. Sxf2 Kxf2 8. Kg8 Bf6 9. Kf7 Bh8 10. Kg8, positional draw.
i) $1 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 6+2$. Kxg6 Bd4 3. Sc5 Kg2
4. Se4 f2 5. Sxf2 Kxf2 6. Kf7 draw. ii) 2. Kg6? f2 3. h8Q f1Q 4. Qb8 + Kg4.

No. 6845: Jan van Reek, with a dedication to H.J. van Donk. 1 . Bg6/i Sd3 2. b3 Sc1 3. b4 Sa2 4. b5 Sc3 5. b6 Sa4 6. b7 Sc5 7. b8S and Sd7 mate.

1) 2. Bd7? Sd3 2. b3 Sc5 3. Be6 Sxb3 drawn.
1. Bb5? Kxf5 2. Ke7 Kxf4 3. Kd6 Ke4 4. Kc5 Sc2 and Bl draws.


No. 6846: Vasily Evgenievich Kozirev. E.B. Fomichev of the town of Gorky writes about the composer under the heading "The Shalyapin of the chess study". The province of Nizhegorod has long been proud of the talents of its sons, including its chessplaying sons. Among them is VEK, who was born 12.iv. 51 in the village of Shershovo in the Gorky region. Starting as a solver in the column run by K.A. Gavrilov in 'Gorky Pravda' he soon made his mark, first by persistent analysis and then with a first study, the present one. It is a beginning that could be the envy of any composer grown wise through experience, for it sports an echo, presaging the pattern of many a later Kozirev study.

1. Sf 3 c 3 2. Se 3 g 4 3. Sf 6 g 3 . On the face of it, all is over, with the two bPP proving stronger than the leaping horses. But, 4. Sd7, and after 4...c2 5. Sxc2 g2 6. Sd4 g1Q 7. Sb 3 and 8. bSc5, with a blockade. And there is a parallel scenario after 4...g2 5. Sxg2 c2 6. Sf4 clQ 7. Se6 and 8. eSc5, blockading. (The newspaper's title could be translated "'At battle stations!')


No. 6847: M. Gromov and V.E. Kozirev. The set theme was "sacrificial offers by both W and Bl , at least one of which is declined". Before Fomichev's very eyes this study took shape within 48 hours, based on a finale proposed in 1984 by Gromov, who was not present at the 1985 festival.

After 1. Qe6 + Sd7 2. Qe8 + Kc7 3. Se6 + Kd6, only the sacrifice 4. Sc5 can fuel the attack. 4...Sxc5 5. $\mathrm{Bg} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 5 / \mathrm{i}$ 6. Qa8 +Sb 77. Qxb7 + Kd4 8. Bf2 + Qxf2 9. Qa7 (b6) + and 10. Qxf2, winning.
i) $5 \ldots \mathrm{Qxg} 36 . \mathrm{Qb} 8+$ and 7. Qxg 3 is an echo of the main line.

Fomichev suggests that the mantle of Aleksandr Seletsky, studies genius of the 30 's from the same part of the world, has fallen on worthy shoulders! Fomichev quotes the following
studies in his article: Nos. 6846, 5831, 3720, 3531, 4142, 4408 and 6847. All Kozirev's other studies that EG has published: Nos. 2350, 2880, 2896, 3151, 3175, 3226, 3293, 3323, 4952, 5010, 5268, 5672, 5916, 6088, $6200,6250 \mathrm{j}, 6466$, and 6522.


Vasily Evgenievich Kozirev

No. 6848: F. Moreno Ramos (Spain). Judge: E. Iwanow (Poland). 1. Bd4/i Rc4 2. Rxc1 + (Rd8? d2;) Kh2 (Rxc1;Bxe3 +) 3. Rxc4 Re4+ 4. Kh5 d2/ii 5. Bg1+/iii Kxg1/iv 6. Rxe4 Bxf7+/v 7. Kxh6 d1Q 8. $\operatorname{Rg} 4+\mathrm{Qxg} 4 / \mathrm{vi} 9 . \operatorname{Rg} 8 \mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{B}) \mathrm{xg} 8$ stalemate.
i) 1. Bb2? Be6 2. Bd4 Rc4 3. Rxc1+ Kh2 4. Rxc4 Rh3 mate.
ii) 4 ...Bxc4 5. Bc3 Bxf7 + 6. Kxh6.
iii) 5. Be5 + ? Rxe5 + 6. Sxe5 d1Q+ 7. $\mathrm{Sg} 4+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 8. Rf4/vii Bc 2 (for Qh1 +;) 9. Kxh6/viii Kg3 10. hRf8 Qh1 + 11. Kg7 Qh7 + 12. Kf6 Kxf4 wins.
iv) $5 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 1$ 6. Rxe4 and $6 \ldots \mathrm{Bf} 7+7$. Kxh6 d1Q 8. Bd4, or 6...d1Q+ 7. Kxh6 Bxf7 8. Bd4, with the identical drawing outcome.
v) $6 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 1 \mathrm{Q}+$ 7. $\mathrm{Rg} 4+\mathrm{Kf} 2$ 8. Rf8 drawn.
vi) 8...Kf2 9. Rf4 + and 10. Rxf7. Or 8...Kh2 9. $\mathrm{Kg} 5(\mathrm{~g} 7)+$ mates.
vii) 8. Rb4 Qd5 + . Or 8. Rc3 Be6 9. $\mathrm{Rc} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 1$. Or 8. hRc8 Bxc4 9. Rxc4 Qd5 + 10. Kxh6 Kg3.
viii) 9. $\mathrm{Rf} 2+\mathrm{Kg} 3$ 10. $\mathrm{Rg} 8 \mathrm{Qd} 5+$.


No. 6849: Jan Rusinek (Poland). 1. $\mathrm{Sg} 3 \mathrm{Bd} 3+$ 2. Kb2 Bxe4 3. Rd8 + Ke3 (Ke1;Re8) 4. Kb3 Rd4 5. Sf1 + Kd3 6. Bc4 mate.


No. 6850: D. Gurgenidze (USSR). 1. Re4 + Kd5/i 2. Re5 + Kd6 3. Re6 + Kd7 4. $\operatorname{Re} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 85 . \mathrm{Re} 8+\mathrm{Kd7} 6$. R1e7 $+\mathrm{Kd6}$ 7. Re6 $+\mathrm{Kd5} / \mathrm{ii} 8$. Re5 + Kd4 9. Re4 + Kd3 10. Re3 + Kd2 11. Re2 + Kd1 12. Rxc8 f1Q 13. cRc2/iii Qxe2/iv 14. Rxe2 Kxe2 15. h4 Kd3 16. h5 Kc2 17. Ka3 Kc3 18. h6 b4+ 19. Ka4 b3 20. h7 b2 21. $\mathrm{h} 8 \mathrm{Q}+$ wins.
i) $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kd} 32$. R1e3 + Kd2 3. Rf3.
ii) $7 . . . \mathrm{Kd7} 8 . \mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{e} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 89$. Rf7.
iii) Threat: 14. eRd2 + Kel 15. Rcl + .
iv) 13...Qf4 14. Kbl Qf5 15. Qf2 Qh3 16. Qf1 +.


No. 6851: J. Rusinek. 1. Ba2 Bf2 + 2. Kc3/i Bxa7 3. Sc8 + (for Sd 6 ) Bb 8 4. Sd6 Bxb6 5. Kc4 and 6. Bb3 mate.
i) 2. Kc4? d5 + 3. Kc3 Bxa7 draw.

No. 6852: A. Sochniev (USSR). 1. Sf2 dRg3 +/i 2. Kf4 Rf3 + 3. Ke4 hRg3/ii 4. Sh1 Re3 + 5. Kd4 gRf3 6. $\mathrm{Bb} 7 / \mathrm{iii} \mathrm{Rd} 3+(\mathrm{Rh} 3 ; \mathrm{Sf} 2) 7$. Kc4 Rc3 + 8. Kb4 fRe3 9. Sf2 Ke7 10. Sd1 draws.
i) $1 . . . \mathrm{hRg} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kf} 4$ and $3 . \mathrm{Se} 4+$.
ii) $3 . . \mathrm{Re} 3+4 . \mathrm{Kd} 4$ and $5 . \mathrm{Sg} 4+$.
iii) $6 . \operatorname{Bg} 4 ? \operatorname{Rd} 3+7 . \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{fRe} 3$ wins.


No. 6853: F.S. Bondarenko and B. N. Sidorov (USSR). 1. Qh3 $+\mathrm{Ke} 1 / \mathrm{i}$ 2. Qg 2 Bc 6 3. $\mathrm{Sc} 2+\mathrm{Kd} 14$. $\mathrm{Se} 3+$ Ke1 5. Sd5 Ba8 6. Qf3/ii Bc6 7. Kg2 wins.
i) 1...Kf2 2. Qxf5 +. 1...Ke2 2. Qh5 + Ke1 3. Kg2 and 4. Kh3.
ii) 6. Qa2? Kf1 7. Qxa8 g2 + draws.

Unless, as in the case of the HARMAN MEMORIAL tourney, there happens to be an EG formal tourney, EG does not solicit originals.

There is no EG informal tourney. However, EG's friends who are composers do like to support the journal by showing their appreciation. The following four clear the backlog.


No. 6854: Ioan Murarasu (Botosani, Romania). 1. Rd7/i Qc8/ii 2. Qd1/ iii $\mathrm{Rg} 1 / \mathrm{iv} 3$. Qd2 $+\mathrm{Kh} 5 / \mathrm{v} 4$. Qe2 + Kh6 5. Qe3 + Kh5 6. Qf3 +/vi Kh6 7. Qf4 + Kh5 8. Qg4 + Rxg4 (Kh6; Rh7 +) 9. Rh7 mate.
i) 1. Rg8? Qa3 + (Kh7? Ra8) 2. $\mathrm{Kxg} 4 \mathrm{Qxb} 4+3$. $\mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Qb} 3+$. 1. Rc7? Rc4 draws, but not $1 .$. Rxb4? $\mathrm{Qcl}+$.
ii) $1 \ldots$ Rc4 2. Qf3 Qc8 3. Qe3 +
1...Rf4 2. Qc1 + . 1...Qa3 + 2. Kxg4 $\mathrm{Qxb} 4+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Qc} 3+4$. Qf3.
iii) 2. Qd5? Qc4 3. Qd2 + Qf4 draw. iv) $2 \ldots \mathrm{Rf} 4$ 3. Qd2 Qc4 4. Kg3 g5 5. $\mathrm{hg}+\mathrm{Kxg} 5$ 6. h4 + Kf5 7. Rf7 + Qxf7 8. Qxf4 + Ke6 9. Qxf7 + .
v) 3...g5 4. $\mathrm{hg}+\operatorname{Rxg} 5$ 5. $\mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Qc} 4+$ 6. Rd4 Qg8 7. Rg4, or, in this, 4...Kg6 5. Qd6 + Kxg5/vii 6. Qe5 + Kg6 7. Qe6 + , or 4...Kh5 5. Qe2 + . vi) 6. Qe5 + ? g5 7. $\mathrm{Qe} 2+\mathrm{g} 4+$, but not $6 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 6$ ? 7. $\mathrm{Qg} 7+$ mates.
vii) $5 . . . \mathrm{Kf5} 6$. Qf6 + Ke4 7. Qe6 + .

No. 6855: Nikolai Andreyevich Reznichenko (Dniepropetrovsk region). 1. Ke4 (e7? $\mathrm{Se} 3+$;) Se 32 . Kxe3 (e7? Sxc4;) g2 3. Bd5 Bf2+ 4. Kf4 (Kxf2? Kh2;) Bxc5 5. Kg3 Bd6+ 6.

Kg 3 Kg 1 7. Bxg2 Kf2 8. e4 Ke3 9. Kg4 Kd4 10. Kf5 Be7 11. Kg6 Ke5 12. Kf7 Kd6 13. e5 + wins.


No. 6856: Viktor V. Kichigin (Perm). 1. Kf6 b2 2. Ba5 b1S 3. $\mathrm{Be} 1 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{d} 5$ (c4;Bb4) 4. Ba5 g2 5. Bc7 g1Q $6 . \mathrm{Bf} 4+$ wins.
i) 3. Bc7? Bc3 4. Bxd6 Se4 + .


No. 6857: V.A. Krivenko (Komsomolsky, Kharkov region). 1. Kd3/i Bf4/ii 2. Rf6 Bg5 3. Rf5 h6 4. Bc3 Sb 3 /iii 5. Kc2 Sc 1 6. Bd2/iv Bxd2 (Sb2(e2);Re5) 7. Kd2 Sb3 + (Sa2; Rb5) 8. Kc3 Sc1 9. Rf2 and 10. Rc2 winning.
i) 1. Kxd2? Bf4. 1. Rxd6? Se4+.

1. Be 3 ? $\mathrm{Se} 4+$ 2. Kd 4 Sg 3 3. Kd5 (Rf6,Ke7;Rf3,Sh5;) Bf8 4. Re6 + Kf7 5. Re5 h6 6. Bf4 Bg7 7. Re3 Sf5.
ii) $1 \ldots \mathrm{Bb} 4$ 2. Rb6 Ba5 3. Rb5. iii) $4 . . . \mathrm{Sb} 15 . \mathrm{Bb} 4$ and 6 . Kc2.
iv) It is suggested that $6 . \mathrm{Bb} 2$ is a cook.
We repeat: EG does not want originals. What does EG want? EG wants tourney awards (complete!) and EG wants articles and EG wants information relevant to studies. If none of the foregoing seem possible or relevant, try sending us new, or not-so-new, books on studies or the endgame. Of course, EG also needs new subscribers!


No. 6858: V.N. Dolgov (Krasnodarsk province) and A. Maksimovskikh (Kurgan region). The judge was G.A. Umnov, who had 67 soviet, Swedish and Czech studies to separate. He regretted that no composers participated from Penza, the town associated with a central period of Troitzky's later life.
'"W's hope lies in his fP." 1. f7 Rf6 2. Bc4 Bb5. ''Guarding against $\mathrm{Ra} 2+$, while if 3 . $\mathrm{Rg} 1+$ ? Kb 24. Rf1 Rxf7 +., 3. Bb3 Bd3. If 3...d5 4. Bxd5 Bc6 5. Ra2+ and 6. Ra6. Bl now threatens Bg6. 4. Rg8 Bc2. bB is ready to pursue his opposite number ad infinitum. 5. Be6 Bf5 6. Rg1 + Bb1 (Kb2;Rf1) 7. Kb6 Kb2 8. Rg8 Bf5 9. Rg2 + . The reason for wK's choice of square on move 7 is now clear: with $\mathrm{wKb7}$ there would now follow Kc3;Rf2? Be4 + ; while with wKb 8 there is a different draw: Kc3; Rf2, Bxe6; Rxf6, Bxf7; Rxf7, d5; and so on. 9...Bc2 10. Kc7 Kc3 11. Rg8 Bf5 12. Rg3 + Bd3 13. Kxd6 and wins.
"A great and memorable product with subtle play by both sides and an original systematic movement by four pieces! This study stood out from all its competitors by the originality of its thought and execution."

Defects were found in the study provisionally placed next so ''it was decided not to award a second prize".


No. 6859: B. Gusev (Moscow). wBa6 is under fire, but whither should it flee? 1. Bb7? c6 2. Rh7 Ra5 3. Rxg7 + Kd8 4. Rg5 Kc7 5. Ba8 Kd7 is a draw, and so are 1. Bd3? g5 + 2. Kxg5 Ra5 3. Bc4 Kc6 4. Be4+

Kb5 5. Bd3 + Kc6, and 1. Bc4? Ra5 2. Rh5 Ra4.

1. Bb5 + c6 2. Bd3 g5 + 3. Kxg5 Ke6 (Ra5;Bf5 +) 4. Kg6 (Bc4+? Ke5;) Ra3. 4...Rg2+? 5. Kh6 Ke5 6. Be4 Rg8 7. Kh7 Rc8 8. Bh1 wins. 5. Be4 + Ke5. bK gradually draws closer to the undefended wPc5, and W seems to lack any promising plan. 6. Kg7? Rf3. 6. Kf7 Ra5. wPc5 is lost, but there is a surprise in store. 7. Ke8. 7. Ke7? Rxc5 is drawn, as is 7. Kf8? Kf6. 7...Rxc5. The distribution of force is a standard draw. 8. Ke7. But Bl is suddenly in zugzwang, and loses bR.
''The initial position is a natural one, there are unusual manoeuvres by wK and wB , and there is a reciprocal zugzwang, an excellent study."


No. 6860: A. Hildebrand (Uppsala, Sweden). '"W may be material ahead, but both wBB are in jeopardy and bPP are ominously far advanced. The position cries out for instant action." 1. Re7 + Kxf6. If 1...Kf8 2. Kg6 g2 3. Bb6. 2. Re8 + Kg7 3. Rxh8. 3. Bf6 + ? Kxf6 4. Rxh8 g2 5. Rg8 f2 6. Rxg2 $\mathrm{Sg} 3+$. 3...g2 4. Bb6 Kxh8 5. Kg6 g1Q + 6 . Bxg1 f2 7. Bxf2 Se3. With wKh6 (instead of f6) there would now follow 8. $\mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Sg} 4+9$. Kg 6 Sf 6 , or 8 .

Bh4 $\mathrm{Sg} 4+$ 9. Kg6 Se5 +, with a draw in both cases. But there is now a difference. 8. Be1 Sd5 9. Kh6 and the win of BB vs. S comes into play.


No. 6861: V. Kondratev and A.G. Kopnin (Chelyabinsk). 1. Rd4? h3 2. Rh4 + Rh7 3. Rg4 h2 4. Kf8 Rh3. 1. Rh3? Rh7 2. Kf8 Rh6 3. Kf7 Kh7 4. Rh1 h3 5. Rh2 Kh8 6. Kf8 Rh7 7. Ke 8 Kg 7 wins. 1. Kf8 Rh7. 1...Rb4 2. Kf7 Kh7 3. Kf6 Kh6 4. Kf5 Kh5 5. Rg8 Rb5 6. Kf4 Rb4 + 7. Kf5 Kh6 8. Rd3. 2. Rd4. This has an air of uselessness, attacking the soundly protected bPh4. 2...h3 3. Rg4 Rh5. The sense of W's 2. Rd4 is to be found in the elimination of Rh4; for Bl. 4. Kf7. There is now the threat of perpetual check. 4...Rh7 + 5. Kf8 Rh5 6. Kf7. The positional draw depends on threats of checkmate and perpetual check. An elegant lightweight.

No. 6862: A. Tikhomirov (Kharkov). 1. $\mathrm{Bc} 3+\mathrm{Ka} 2$ 2. Bg 8 Kb 3 3. Be 1 (Ba5? Ka4;) Kc4 4. Bf2 e4 5. Ba7/i e3 6. Kf3 Kd3 7. Bxd5 g4 $+8 . \mathrm{Kg} 3$ e2 9. Kf2 Kd2 10. Be3 + Kd1 11. $\mathrm{Bb} 3+$ wins.
i) There was a threat of $5 \ldots \mathrm{c} 36$. Bxe3 Kd3, drawing.


No. 6863: A. Davryanyan (Donetsk region) and M. Zinar (Odessa region). 1. Ke3 with two lines:
1...d5 2. ed + Kxd6 3. Kxe4 Ke6 4. Kf4/i f5 (f6;a5) 5. ab Kf6 6. b6 Ke6 7. b5 Kf6 8. b4 Ke6 9. Kg5 Ke5 stalemate.
1...f5 2. ef + Kxf6 3. Kxe4 Ke6 4. Kd4 d5 5. ab b6/ii 6. Ke3 Ke5 7. Kd3 d4 8. Kc4 Ke4 stalemate.
i) 4. ab? b6 5. Kf4 f6 puts W in zugzwang.
ii) There is a third stalemate after $5 . . . K d 6$ 6. b6 Ke6 7. b5 Kd6 8. b4 Ke6 9. Kc5 Ke5.
'"Although the three 'Grigoriev' stalemates are put together with masterly skill the result remains dull."

No. 6864: Yu. Solovyov (Ivanovsk region). 1. $\mathrm{Sd} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 5$ 2. Bf8 a1Q 3. Bf3 + Ke6 4. Bg4 + Kd5 (Bf5;Sc5 +)
5. $\mathrm{Bf} 3+\mathrm{Kc} 4$ (Be4;Sb6+) 6. Be2 Kb 3 (Bd3;Sb6) 7. Bd1 +Ka 2 (Bc2; $\mathrm{Sc} 5+$ ) 8. $\mathrm{Bg} 7 \mathrm{Bh} 7+9$. Kxh7 Qxd1 10. Se5 and "the appearance of the well known fortress comes as a surprise".


No. 6865: V. Kondratev (Ivanovsk region). Presumably this is the familiar name Kondratev that EG has difficulty in spelling consistently, and not a namesake. 1. $\mathrm{Se} 4+\mathrm{Bxe} 4$ 2. g8Q Qa6+ 3. Ba7 e6 4. Qf7/i $\mathrm{Bxd5}+5 . \mathrm{Kb} 8 \mathrm{Qb} 5+6 . \mathrm{Kc} 8 \mathrm{Qc} 6+$ 7. Qc7 Qe8 + 8. Qd8 Bb7 + 9. Kc7 Qc6 + 10. Kb8 Ba6 11. Qa5 + Kd3 12. Qa3 + Ke4 13. Qe3 + Kxe3 14. d5 +, drawn.
i) 4. Kb8? Qd6+ 5. Kc8 Bd3 6. $\mathrm{Qg} 5+\mathrm{Kd} 1$ 7. $\mathrm{Kb} 7 \mathrm{Ba} 6+$ 8. Ka8 Qc7 and Bl wins.


No. 6866: A. Grin and B. Gusev (Moscow). 1. Ra7 b2 (Sg4+;Kf3) 2. $\mathrm{Re} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 6$ 3. Rb7 b1Q 4. Rxb1 Bxb1 5. c4/i dc 6. Kd4 Bd3 (Ba2; Bf1) 7. Bd5 Sxd5 stalemate. i) 5. $\mathrm{Kd} 4 ? \mathrm{Ba} 2$ 6. Bf1 Se 4 7. c4 Sd2 wins.


No. 6867: V.S. Kovalenko and the late T. Amirov. A Yugoslav tourney - probably. Judge: Franko Vrabec (Yugoslavia). 1. Ra6+/i Kxa6 2. Sxg5 Sf7 3. Sxf7 Sb6 + 4. Kb8 Sxa8 5. Sd6 Bc6 6. Sb7 Sc7 7. Sc5 + Kb6 8. $\mathrm{Sd} 7+\mathrm{Bxd} 7$ stalemate.

1) 2. Sxg5? Sxf6 2. Kxd8 Kxa8 3. Ke7 Se4, wins.
1. Rf5? Sb6 + 2. Kc7 Sxa8 + 3. Kd6 Sf7 + 4. Ke6 Sc7 mate.

No. 6868: M. Luchin. 1. Bg4+ Kf2 2. b8Q g1Q 3. Qf4+ Kel 4. Qc1 + Kf2 5. Qd2 +Kg 3 6. Qd3 +Kh 47.

Qh3 + Kg5 8. Qh5 + Kf4 9. Qh6 + Kg 3 10. Qh3 +Kf 4 11. Qf3 +Kg 5 12. Qf5 + Kh6/i 13. Qxf6 + Kh7 14. Qf7 +Kh 6 15. Qh5 +Kg 716. $\mathrm{Qg} 5+\mathrm{Kf} 8$ 17. Qh6 + Ke8 18. Qh8 + Kf7 19. Bh5 + Ke7 20. Qe8 $+\mathrm{Kf6}$ 21. Qe5 mate.
i) $12 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 4$ 13. Qxf6 +Kg 314 . Qf3 + Kh4 15. Qh3 +Kg 516. Qh5 + Kf6 17. Qh6 + Kf7 18. Be6 + Ke8 19. Qh8 + Ke7 20. Qh7 + Kf6 21. Qf7 + .


No. 6869: E. Gavrilov and R. Fedorovich. 1. Bg6 + Kh8 2. Be4 Rxe4 3. g 5 h 1 Q 4. g6 Qxh6 + 5. g7 +Kh 7 stalemate.


No. 6870: V.S. Kovalenko. 1. $\mathrm{fg}+/ \mathrm{i}$ $\mathrm{Kh} 3 / \mathrm{ii}$ 2. $\mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{fg} / \mathrm{iii}$ 3. Kh1 and either $3 \ldots$ gh stalemate, or $3 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 2+4$. Kg1 g3 5. hg Kxg3 stalemate. i) $1 . \mathrm{hg}+$ ? fg $2 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{gf} 3$. Kxf2 Kh3. ii) $1 \ldots \mathrm{fg} 2 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{gh} 3 . \mathrm{Kxh} 2$.
iii) 2...f3 3. Kh1 f2 stalemate.


No. 6871: Jan Rusinek. National championships are for compositions by nationals of the country concerned but published anywhere. They offer a useful check on two aspects of contemporary communication, namely: the comprehensiveness of EG's coverage; and the time-scales for the distribution of award details before EG catches them. (It happens, occasionally, that EG never does catch an award! But we do try, hard.) In this case: two primary sources have (as at viii.87) not rea-
ched us from any quarter: the 1984 Saloniki Olympiad and Solidarity 1984 awards; two studies eluded EG's net because they were not included in awards; the Polish award includes studies which in fact won honours that the award omits to mention; while No. 6875's tourney award was severely delayed, due to a change in judge. The championship judge was Eugeniusz Iwanow (Czestochowa) who placed 20 studies from the 50 entered by the individual composers. Rusinek with 89 points took the championship narrowly (sic!) from Halski, with 86.
The other 15 placings will be found in EG:
1-3 : Nos. 6698, 6590, 5227.
5-7 : Nos. 5496, 5963, 6235.
10-14: Nos. 5796, 6425, 6776, 5711, 5694.

16-17: Nos. 5982, 5954.
19-20: Nos. 5223, 6257.

1. Bb2 alQ 2. Bxal Kd1 3. Rc1+ Kxc1 4. Kxe2 h3 5. Bxe5 h2 6. Bxh2 b2 7. Bd6 b1Q 8. Ba3 + Kc2 9. Sd4 mate.
If SCHACH-ECHO has published an award covering the year 1983 I have been unable to trace it.


No. 6872: M. Halski. 1. Be6 + Kb5 2. Ra8 Kc6 3. Bf5 Re8 4. Ba7 Re3 + 5. Ka4 Kb7 6. Bxc5 Re5 7. Rb8+ Kc7 8. Rc8 $+\mathrm{Kb7}$ 9. Bd7 wins.


No. 6873: M. Halski. 1. Rb4 a3 2. Rxb6 Ka1 3. Re6 Kb2 4. Re1 a2 5. Kg3 a1Q 6. Rxal Kxa1 7. Kf2 Kb2 8. h4 gh 9. g5 h3 10. Kg1 Kc2 11. g6 Kd2 12. g7 K-13. g8Q drawn.


No. 6874: Jan Rusinek. 1. Bc7 Bc1 2. Bxf4/i Se7 + 3. Ke4 Re6 + 4. Be5 Sc6/ii 5. c4 + /iii Kc5 6. Rd5 + Kxc4 7. Rd4 + and either 7...Sxd4 stalemate, or $7 \ldots \mathrm{Kc} 58 . \mathrm{Rd} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 49$. Kf5.
i) $2 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 ? \mathrm{Sg} 3+$. 2. $\mathrm{Rf} 3 ? \mathrm{Se} 7+$.
ii) $4 \ldots . . \mathrm{Sg} 65$. Kf5 is effective because bB is hindered by the (unmoved!) wPc3.
iii) 5. Rd5 + ? Kc4 puts $W$ 'in a fatal zugzwang".

This study was not included in DIE SCHWALBE's award (viii.86).

No. 6875
G. Rinder(vii.86) Schach-Echo


No. 6875: Gerd Rinder (Haar, West Germany). A. GBR class 0023 draw to add to those in EG83 (pp. 13-15). See also No. 6807. 1. c6 Bc5 (Bxc6; $\mathrm{Sa} 7+$ ) 2. Ка6 Kb8 3. Sa7/i Kc7 (Bxa7; c7+) 4. e7/ii Bxe7 5. Sb5 + Kxc6/iii 6. Ka7 Bb7 7. Sd6 Bxd6 stalemate.
i) 3 . $\mathrm{c} 7+$ ? Kc 84 4. e7 $\mathrm{Bb} 7+5 . \mathrm{Ka} 5$ Kd7, and will win, if the 'game' goes to an adjudication!
ii) 4. $\mathrm{Sb} 5+$ ? Kxc6 5. e7 $\mathrm{Bb} 7+6$. Ka5 Bxe7.
iii) Kc8 6. Kb6. Or Kd8 6. Sd4.


No. 6876: Em. Dobrescu (Romania). Judge: G. Grzeban, Warsaw. 38 studies by 36 composers from 11 countries participated. 1. Rh4/i Bg6 2. Rg 4 Se 5 3. $\mathrm{Ra} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 2 / \mathrm{ii} 4 . \mathrm{Rh} 4 \mathrm{Bg} 7$ 5. Rh2 + Kxb3 6. Rg2 Bh8 7. Rh2 Bf7 + 8. Kf5 $\mathrm{Bg} 6+$ 9. Ke6 Sf7 10. Rg2 Bh5 11. Rh2 Bg6 12. Rg2 Se5 13.

Rh2 Bg7 14. $\mathrm{Rg} 2 \mathrm{Bf} 7+15 . \mathrm{Kf} 5 \mathrm{Bh} 8$ 16. Rh2 positional draw.
i) 1. Ra4+? Kxb3 2. Rh4 Bg6 3. Rg4 Se5 4. Rh4 Bg7 5. Rh3 + Kc4 6. Rg3 Bh8 7. Rh3 Sf7 8. Rg3 Bh5 wins.
ii) 3...Kxb3 4. Ra8 Bg7 5. Ra7 Bh8 6. Ra8 Bf7 + 7. Kf5 Sg6 8. Ra7 Be8 9. Ra 8 Bf 7 10. Ra 7 Se 5 11. Ra 8 Bg 7 12. Ra7 Bh8 13. Ra8, likewise a positional draw.
',..two symmetrical drawing lines differentiated by the presence or absence of wPb3..."


No. 6877: Virgil Nestorescu (Romania). 1. $\mathrm{Qg} 5+/ \mathrm{i} \quad \mathrm{Kc} 2 / \mathrm{ii}$ 2. $\mathrm{Qd} 2+$ Kb3 3. Qd5 +Kc 2 4. Qd3 +Kc 15. $\mathrm{Qd} 2+\mathrm{Kxb} 1$ 6. Bd3 + Ka2 7. Bc4+ Kb1 8. Qd3 + Kc1 9. Bb3 Qb1 10. Qe3 mate.
i) 1. Qh6 + ? Kxb1 2. Bd3 +Ka 23. Qa6 + Kb3 4. Qc4+ Ka3 5. Qxc5 + Ka2 6. Qd5 + Ka3 7. Bc2 Kb4 draw. ii) 1...Kxb1 2. Bd3+ Ka2 3. Qd5 + Ka3 4. Bc 2 Qa 2 5. Qxc5 mate.
"'A pair of quasi-identical mates, on a3 and $\mathrm{cl}, \ldots$ interesting first move try..."

No. 6878: A. Sochniev (Leningrad). 1. Rf8 + Ke7 2. Rg8 Ra5 3. Rxg7 + Kf8 4. Rd7/i Ke8 5. Rd6/ii Ra3+ 6. Kb2 (Kxb4? Rxa2;) Ke7 7. Rd5 Ke6 8. Bc4 Rc3 9. Rd4+/iii Kf5 10.

Rh4/iv Kg5 11. Re4 Kf5 12. Bd5 Rc5 13. Bb 7 Rb 5 14. Ba6 Ra5 15. Bd 3 wins, as 15...Ra3 16. Bc2(b1) and the $W$ material advantage is safe.
'"Multiple formation of a triumphant $w R / w B$ battery, and tries ending in a positional draw."
i) $4 . \mathrm{Rg} 3$ ? $\mathrm{Ra} 3+5 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \mathrm{e} 4$ draws.
ii) 5. Bf5? e4 6. Bg 4 Rg 5 7. Bh3 Rh5 8. Be6 Re5, positional draw.
iii) 9 . Rc5 +? Kd6 10. Rc8 Kd7 with a repetition draw (perpetual attack). The main line shows $W$ wriggling out of another threatened repetition draw.
iv) $10 . \mathrm{Bd} 3+$ ? Ke6 11. Rd8 Ke7 12. Rd5 Ke6 13. Be4 Re3 14. Bh1 Rel 15. Bf3 Re3 16. Bh1, is yet another draw on the study's general theme.


No. 6879: Genrikh M. Kasparyan (USSR). 1. Re6/i Bc7 + 2. Kh4 Bc4 3. Rxc5 Bd8 + 4. Kg3 Rg1 + 5. Kf3 Rf1 + 6. Kg3 Bxe6 7. Rh5 + Kg1 8. Rh1 + Kxh1 stalemate.
i) 1. $\mathrm{Rh} 4+$ ? Kg 12 . $\mathrm{Rh} 6 \mathrm{Bc} 7+3$. Kh4 Be 2 4. Rxc5 $\mathrm{Bd} 8+5$. $\mathrm{Rg} 5+$ Kh2.

1. Rh5 + ? Kg1 2. Re6 Bc7 + 3. Kh4 $\mathrm{Rf} 4+$ 4. Kg 5 Ra 4 5. Rc6 $\mathrm{Bf} 4+6$. Kf6 c4 7. Ke7 Be3 wins.
''One of the best of the group of studies recently created by the composer with RBB vs RR."

No. 6880
Y. Hoch (ii.84)

1 Hon. Mention,


No. 6880: Yehuda Hoch (Israel). 1. d3 + Rxd3/i 2. Rh4 + Kd5 3. Rd8 + Ke5 4. Re8 + Kd5 5. Rh5 + Kd4 6. Kh8. "'An extraordinary position of zugzwang." (DVH: ''Surely not a zugzwang as W threatens Rh 7 '') 6...a5 7. Rh7 and now the threat of 8. $\mathrm{Rd} 7+$ is decisive.
i) 1...Kxd3 2. Rb3 + Ke4 3. Rh4 + Kd5 4. Rd3 + Ke5 5. Rh5 + Kf6 6. Rxd7 Kg6 7. hRd5 wins.

No. 6881: Yu. Makletsov (USSR). 1. f7 a1Q 2. $\operatorname{Bd7} 7 / \mathrm{i}$ Kxd7 3. f8Q $\mathrm{Sf} 3+4 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 1+5 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Qh} 2+6$. $\mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Se} 5+$ 7. $\mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Qg} 3+$ 8. Kf6. A side-effect of 2 . Bd7 + is that bK blocks the square d7. 8...Qf4+ 9 . $\mathrm{Kg} 7 \mathrm{Qg} 5+10$ Kh7 Qg6 + 11. Kh8 Sf7 + 12. Qxf7 Qxf7 stalemate.
i) Not the over-hasty 2. $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{Q}+$ ? $\mathrm{Sf} 3+3 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Qg} 1+$, winning.
'"This and the next are in the same style, namely stalemates as in the works of former times."


No. 6882: Oscar J. Carlsson (Buenos Aires). 1. Rxf7/i d2/ii 2. Rf1 +Kg 2 3. Ra1 Sd7 4. h7 Sf6 + 5. Kh4 Sxh7 6. Rd1 Bxd1 stalemate.
i) 1. Rh8? d2 2. Rd8 d1Q + 3. Rxd1 $\mathrm{Bxd} 1+4 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{Bc} 25 . \mathrm{Kf} 6 \mathrm{Sd} 7+6$. Kxf7 Sc5 7. Kg7 Se6 + 8. Kg8 Sg5 and $w P$ is harmless.
ii) $1 \ldots$ Bxf7? 2. h7 d2 3. h8Q +Kg 2 4. Qd4. 1...Kg2 2. Rf6 d2 3. Rd6 d1Q + 4. Rxd1 Bxd1 + 5. Kg5 Bc2 6. $\mathrm{Kf6} \mathrm{Sd} 7+7 . \mathrm{Kg} 7$ and the draw is reached.

No. 6883: Mario Matous (Prague). 1. Sf5 + Kf4 2. e3 + Ke5 3. fSd6 a1Q 4. Sc4 + Kd5 5. Sb6 + Ke5 6. Sd7 + Kd5 7. eSf6 + Kd6 8. Se8 + Kd5 9. Sc7 + Kd6 10. Sb5 + Kd5 11. e4 mate.
"'A checkmate in the middle of the board, but with a single line lacking black counterplay."


No. 6884: M. Zinar (USSR). 1 Ka6/i e1Q/ii 2. f7/iii Qa5 + 3. Kxa5 Kb7 4. f8Q e2 5. Qa8 + Kxa8 6. Ka6 e1Q 7. e7 Qa5 + 8. Kxa5 Kb7 9. e8Q b2 10. Qxe5 b1Q 11. Qb2 + Qxb2 stalemate.
i) 1. f 7 ? Kb 72 2. f 8 Q e1Q mate.
ii) 1...b2? 2. e7 b1Q 3. e8Q + Qb8
4. Qxc6+ and W wins.
iii) 2. e7? Qa5 + 3. Kxa5 Kb7 4. e8Q b2 5. Qxe5 b1Q 6. Qxc5 Qe1+ 7. Qb4+ Qxb4+ 8. Kxb4 e2 9. f7 $\mathrm{e} 1 \mathrm{Q}+$ wins.

No. 6885: Gai A. Nadareishvili (Tbilisi). 1. $\mathrm{Ra} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 52 . \mathrm{Rb} 4+\mathrm{Kc} 53$. Rc4 $+\mathrm{Kd} 5 / \mathrm{i}$ 4. Rd4 +Ke 5 5. Re4 +

Kxe4 6. Kxh3 + Kf3 7. Rf4+ Kxf4
8. Kxg2 drawn.
i1) $3 . . \mathrm{Kd} 6$ ? 4. $\mathrm{Rd} 4+\mathrm{Ke} 7$ 5. $\mathrm{Rh} 7+$ wins.

No. 6885 G.A. Nadareishvili (iii.84)
Commended, L'Italia Scacchistica,


No. 6886 C.M. Bent (vi.84) Commended L'Italia Scacchistica,


No. 6886: C.M. Bent (England). 1. $\mathrm{Sd} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 4$ 2. Sc6 $+\mathrm{Kc5}$ 3. Qf8 + Kxc6 4. Bc2 Qxc2 5. Qc8 + Kd5 6. Qxc2 b4 7. Kg 3 wins.


No. 6887: P. Angelini (Italy). 1. $\mathrm{Sd} 2 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Qa} 3+2$. Kf2 Qxa4 3. Qb1 + Ka3 4. Kg3 b5 5. Kh3 Qb4 6. Qal mate.
i) 1. Sd 4 ? $\mathrm{Qe} 8(\mathrm{a} 3)+$ 2. $\mathrm{Kd} 3(\mathrm{e} 4)$ Qxa4 3. Qf2 + Kb1 4. Qe1 + Kb2 5. Qc3(d2) +Kb 1 drawn.


No. 6888: F.S. Bondarenko and B. N. Sidorov (USSR). 1. Ra4 g5 2. Rh4 + gh 3. Se3 Sxe3 4. Bf5 +Sg 4 5. Bxb1 Sh6 6. Bf5 + Sg4 7. Bb1 draw.


No. 6889: B.G. Olympiev (Sverdlovsk). 1. Sd3 + Ke4 2. Sc5 + Kf3 3. Sd4+/i Kf2 4. Sd3 + Kf1 5. Bg4 e2/ii 6. Sxe2 Sxe2 7. Bh3 + Sg2 8. Bxg2 mate.
i) 3. Kxg 1 ? e2 4. Sd 3 Ke 3 5 . cSe 5 Kd2 drawn. 3. Bd5 + ? Kf2 4. Sd3 + Ke2 5. Sf4+Kd2 6. Kxg1 e2 drawn. ii) 5...hSf3 6. Sxf3 Sxf3 7. Bxf3 e2 8. Bg 2 mate.

No. $6890 \quad$ A. Koranyi (iii.84)
Special Mention, L'Italia Scacchistica, 1984


No. 6890: A. Koranyi (Budapest). 1. e7 Rg4+ 2. Kh1 Rh4+ 3. Bh3 Rxh3 + 4. $\mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 3+5$. Kf1 Rf3 + 6. Ke1 Re3 + 7. Kd1 cRe2 8. d8Q + Kg 7 (Kh7; Qd3 + ) 9. Qf8 +Kg 610. Qf6 + Kh5 11. Qf3 + wins. The composer has doubled the idea of Gurgenidze seen in No. 5130.


No. 6891: N. Kralin (Moscow). We known nothing more about the "'Science and Life"' tourney. The six studies here given are the six out of 25 in the 'final' of the XVII Soviet Championship for the years 1982 to 1984 published in our source - and not already in EG. The Kralin study scored 13 points out of the maximum of 15 and was placed 5th. The judge: IGM Gia Nadareishvili (Tbilisi). A 'semi-final' (203 studies by 39 composers) preceded the 'final'
(44 studies, 14 composers). We should like to know more about the semi-final and how it was judged: will a soviet reader help? Kralin and Neidze shared the top places with 49 points, followed by Gurgenidze (39), Vlasenko (35), Katsnelson (34), Maksimovskikh (33), Zinar (32), Sochniev (32), Grin (31), Bazlov (27), Krikheli (25), Akobiya (24), Kozirev (21) and Slepyan (20). EG has already published the first four: Nos. 5831, 5609, 5608, 6042; the sixth and seventh: Nos. 5906, 5532; tenth to thirteenth: Nos. 5899, 6193 (corrected), 5610, 5541; fifteenth and sixteenth: Nos. 5833, 5612 (corrected); eighteenth to twenty-second: Nos. $5965,5375,6878,5616$ and 5693; twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth: Nos. 5378 and 5540. Our source: an viii. 87 issue (No. 22) of the BULLETIN OF THE CENTRAL CHESS CIUB OF THE USSR.

1. a7 + /i Kxb7 2. Qxe4 d5 (Qxe4; Sxd6 +) 3. a8Q + Kxa8 4. Qxd5 b4 + (Qxd5; Sb6+) 5. Kxb4 Rh4+ 6. Bf4 Rxf4 + 7. Ka3 Ra4 + 8. Kb2 Rb4 + 9. Kal Qxd5/ii 10. Sb6+ Rxb6 stalemate.
i) 1. Bd2? Qxa6 + 2. Ba5 b4+ 3 . Qxb4 Rh5.
ii) $9 \ldots \mathrm{Qb} 7$ 10. $\mathrm{Qxb} 7+\mathrm{Kxb} 711$. Sd6+ Kc6 12. Sf5 Re4 13. Kb2.
"A witty stalemate study on the theme of consecutive wQ sacrifices on the long diagonal."


No. 6892: M. Zinar (Feodosia). '" 12 points." 1. Kb7/i c5 2. d3 Kg6/ii 3. Ka7/iii Kf7/iv 4. g6 +Kg 8 5. g7 Kxg7 6. Kb6 and, having unloaded wgP $W$ has reached a theoretical draw.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Kc}(\mathrm{d}) 7$ ? c5 $2 . \mathrm{d} 3 \mathrm{c} 4$ wins. 1. d3? Kxg5 2. Kb7 Kf4 3. Kxc6 Ke3 wins. 1. g6? Kxg6 2. Kb7 c5 3. d3 Kf6 wins.
ii) $2 \ldots$..c4 3. dc d3 4. g6 Kxg6 5. c5 d2 6. c6 draws, which explains why Bl preserves the 'hostage' gP .
iii) This is the whole point. The natural 3. Kb6? loses after 3...c4 4. dc c3 5. c5 d2 6. c6 d1Q 7. c7 Qd7 8. Kb7 Kf5 and the drawing power of BP on the seventh (stalemate) is neutralised by the extra wgP.
iv) $3 . . . \mathrm{Kxg} 5$ 4. Kb6 c4 5. dc c3 6. c5 d2 7. c6 d1Q 8. c7 Qd7 9. Kb 7 draws, or 3...c4 4. dc d3 5. c5 d2 6. c6 d1Q 7. c7 Qd7 8. Kb8 with a draw, the mystery of 3 . Ka7 being now cleared up.


No. 6893: N. Kralin. '"12 points.' 1. $\mathrm{f} 8 \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{Ke7}(\mathrm{Kc} 8 ; \mathrm{Sg} 6+$ ) $2 . \operatorname{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 8$ 3. Se6 + Qxe6 4. h8Q + Qe8 5. $\mathrm{Rg} 8 / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{Ra} 2+$ 6. Kf3/ii $\mathrm{Ra} 3+7$ 7. Kf4 $\mathrm{Ra} 4+$ 8. Kf5 Ra5 + 9. Kf6 Ra6 + 10. Sb6 Rxb6 + 11. Kf5 Rb5 +12 . Kf4 Rb4+ 13. Kf3 Rb3 + 14. Kf2 $\mathrm{Rb} 2+$ 15. Qxb2 Qxg8 16. Qb8 + wins.
i) 5. Qxe8 + ? Kxe8 6. Sc7 +Kf 8 draws.
ii) 6. Kf1 Ral + is a loss of time, since 7. Qxa1? Qxg8 and the win of bQ interferes with wS.
''The roman theme used to win bQ takes place with the active participation of the promoted wS."


No. 6894: A. Maksimovskikh. '"11 points.". 1. Qa5 + Kb7 2. Qd5 + Kb6/i 3. Qxh1 Bd4+ 4. Ka2 Rg1 5. Qh6 + Kb5/ii 6. Qh5 + Kb4 7. Qd1 $\mathrm{Rg} 2+8 . \mathrm{Kb} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 1$ 9. Ka2 Kc5 10. Qh5 + Kb4 11. Qd1 with a positional draw.
i) $2 \ldots \mathrm{Ka} 6$ 3. $\mathrm{Qa} 8+\mathrm{Kb5}$ 4. $\mathrm{Qb} 7+$ with perpetual check. See (ii).
ii) With bKc7 there would follow 6. $\mathrm{Oh} 7+$ and 7. Ka3. If 5...Kc5 6 Qf8 +Kb 5 7. Qb8 + .
"'An unusual positional draw with wQ playing the principal role."


No. 6895: A. Grin. "10 points." 1. e5 + Bxe5/i 2. Bb4 + Kc7 3. Ba5 + Kb8 4. Bc3, and either 4...Sxc3 5. Rh1 Sb1 6. Be4 alQ 7. Rxbl+, or 4...Bxc3 5. Bd5 a1Q 6. Ra2, with draws in both cases.
i) $1 . . . \mathrm{Kxe} 5$ 2. $\mathrm{Bg} 3+\mathrm{Kf} 6$ 3. $\mathrm{Bh} 4+$ Ke5 4. Bg3 + Kd4 5. Bf2 + Kc3 6. Be1 +, draw.


No. 6896: I. Krikheli. "' 9 points." (The pre-correction position: g6h8 0407.11 g1d5f1a5g5.g4g7.) 1. Kg6+ Kg 8 2. Rh5 Sd7 3. Rxg5 $\mathrm{Se} 5+4$. Kh5 Kh7/i 5. Sd4/ii Ra5 6. Se6/iii $\mathrm{g} 6+7 . \operatorname{Rxg} 6 \mathrm{Sxg} 6+8 . \mathrm{Sg} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ stalemate.
i) $4 . . . \mathrm{Kf} 75 . \mathrm{Rf} 5+\mathrm{Ke} 76 . \mathrm{Kg} 5 \mathrm{~g} 67$. Rf1.
ii) 5. Sd2? g6 + 6. Kh4 Kh6.
iii) 6. Kh4? Sg6 + 7. Kh5 $\mathrm{Sf} 4+8$. $\mathrm{Kh} 4 \mathrm{Sg} 2+9$. Kh5 g6 mate.


No. 6897: Michal Hlinka (Kosice). All composers in this tourney are Czech. We think this tourney was sponsored by the rail union of Trnava via the weekly publication 'Pravda'", but we are open to correction. The award is taken from the publication of the Bratislava chess circle under the leadership of our old friend Bedrich Formanek.
I: 1. Rh8+/i Kd7 2. Sxh2 Re1 + 3. Kb 2 Ke 7 4. Rh4 Rh1 5. Rf4 Bf3 (Rxh2;Rxf2) 6. Sf1/ii Rxf1 7. Rxf3 and it's drawn.
i) $1 . \mathrm{Rxh} 2$ ? $\mathrm{Re} 1+$. 1. $\mathrm{Rd} 3+? \mathrm{Ke} 82$. Sxh2 Be4.
ii) 6. Rxf3? Rxh2, with 7. Kc3 Rh3, or 7. Kc1 Rh1+, or 7. Kc2 f1Q + .

II: 1. Rd3+/i Ke7 2. Sxh2 Rh4/ii 3. Rd2 (Re3+? Be4+;) Rxh2 4. Rxf2/iii Be4+ 5. Ka1 Rxf2 stalemate.
i) 1. $\mathrm{Rh} 8+$ ? Ke 7 2. Sxh2 $\mathrm{Re} 1+3$. Kb2 Rh1 4. Rh7 + Ke6 5. Rh6 + Kf5 6. Rh8 Kf4 7. Rf8 +Kg 3 .
ii) $2 . . \mathrm{Re} 1+3$. Kb2 Rh1 4. Rd2 Rxh2 5. Rxf2 drawn as in I.
iii) 4. $\operatorname{Re} 2+$ ? $\operatorname{Be} 4+5 . \operatorname{Rxe} 4+\mathrm{Kf} 6$ 6. Rf4+ Ke5 7. Rf8 Rh1 +


No. 6898: Lubos Kekely (Zilina). 1. $\mathrm{Bg} 3+/ \mathrm{i}$ Kf3 2. f7 (Kb3? Rh8+;) Rh8 + 3. Bh4/ii Rxh4+ 4. Kg1 $\mathrm{Rg} 4+5 . \mathrm{Kf1}$ Rf4 6. e6 and W wins. i) 1. Kh3? Kf3 2. $\mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Rh} 8+3$. Bh4 Kf4 4. e6 Kf5 5. e7 Ke6.

1. Be3 + ? Kxe3 2. f7 Rf8 3. e6 Kf2
2. Kh3 Kf3 5. Kh4 Kf4.
3. Kh1? Rf8 2. Bh2 Kf3.
ii) 3. Kg1? Kxg3 4. e6 Ra8, positional draw.


No. 6899: M. Hlinka. 1. $\operatorname{Re} 7+/ \mathrm{i}$
Kd 2 2. $\mathrm{g} 7 \mathrm{Rb} 1+$ 3. Ka2 Rb8 4. Bd5/ii Sf5 5. Rb7 Ra8+ 6. Kb1 Sxg7 7. Rb2 +/iii Kc3 8. Bxa8 and W wins.
i) 1. Rf7? Rg1 2. g7 Sh5.

1. Bg 2 ? Rf 4 2. $\mathrm{Re} 7+\mathrm{Kd} 2$ 3. g7 Rg4 4. Bd5 Sf5.
ii) 4. Rb7? Ra8 + 5. Kb1 Sxh1.
iii) With bKd1 the checking move Bf $3+$ could be played.


No. 6900: Lubos Kekely. 1. g3 +/i Kxg3 2. Bg 2 /ii Kxg2 3. f6 h1Q 4. f7 Qe1 5. Kd7 (f8Q? Qb4+;) Qb4 6. Ke8 with a known draw.
i) 1. f6? h1Q 2. f7 Qxf1 wins.
ii) 2. f6? h1Q 3. f7 Qb7 4. Ke6 Qb4 5. Kf6 Qf8, winning, a manoeuvre discovered by Grigoriev.


No. 6901: Stefan Todek (Banska Bystrica). 1. Bxb7 Kxb7 (else Bc6) 2. d6 g2 3. Rg 8 e 2 4. d7 e1Q 5. d8S + Kc8 6. Sc6 $+\mathrm{Kd7} 7 . \mathrm{Rd} 8+\mathrm{Ke} 68$. Re8 + wins.


No. 6902: Lubos Kekely. 1. Rb3/i Rxb3 2. a5 Rb6+ 3. ab c5 4. Ka5/ii Kb7 5. Ka4, and either 5...Sc2 6. Kb5 or $5 . .$. Kxb6 6. Kxa3 drawn. i) 1. $\mathrm{Rb} 8+$ ? Kxb 8 2. a5 Kc8 3. Ka 7 Rb8 4. a6 Rb6.
ii) 4. b7 + ? Kb8 5. Ka5 Kxb7 6. Ka4 Kc6 7. Kxa3 Kd5 wins.

No. 6903: A.P. Kazantsev. Judge: A. Kalinin. The award in this formal tourney is prefaced by the words
''This traditional composing tourney sponsored by the capital's sports and municipal committees comprised, as formerly, six sections. This time the organisers introduced an agreeable novelty: the number of pieces should not exceed, in the problems, 15 , and in the studies, 10 . The resulting creativity was extremely high despite the restriction: it was no accident that the judges of four sections increased the size of their awards. ...there were over 400 entries... including veterans long in experience and others trying their luck in the All-Union arena for the first time."

1. Kb 8 ? Rxg2 2. $\mathrm{g} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Rg} 8+3 . \mathrm{Kb} 7$ Rxa8 4. Bxa8 Bxa6 loses in banal fashion. 1. Kb7 Be4 2. Kc6 Sb5 3. a8Q. Bl wins easily after 3. a8S? Sc3 4. Sb6 Sxd5 5. Sxd5 Rxg2 6. a7 Ra2. 3...Bxd5 + 4. Kxd5 Sc7 + 5. Kc6 Sxa8 6. Kb7. Now what? 6...Rh1 7. Kxa8 Rb1. Now what for W? If 8. a7? Kg 4 9. g3 Kf5 10. g4 +Ke 511. g5 Kd6 12. g6 Kc7 13. g7 Rg1 14. g8() Rxg8 mate. There is only one move for salvation. 8. g4 Kg5 9. a7 Kg6. Bl must switch plans, for $9 \ldots$ Kf6 10. g5 + Ke6 11. g6 Kd7 12. g7 and there's no more than a draw (Rg1; Kb7, Rb1+;). 10. g5 Kg7 11. g6 Kg8 12. g7 Kf7 13. g8Q + Kxg8 stalemate.



No. 6904: E. Asaba. How is wPg 2 to be mobilised? 1. Kb4 g4 2. Kc5. But not 2. Kc4? d5 + . 2...d6+. Or 2...d5 3. Bb8, which is the main line. 3. Kd4 d5 4. Bb8 Kxb8 5. Kxd5 Kc8 6. Ke6 Kd8. Now it's too soon to go after bPP, as bK is too active. 7. Kd6 Kc8 8. Ke7 Kb8 9. Kd7 Ka8 10. Ke6 Kb8. bK is now two files worse off than at move 6 , while wKe6 is as before. 11. Kf5 Kc8 12. Kxg4 Kd7 13. Kxg3 Kc6 14. Kh4. Not the common-sense 14. Kf4? Kxb6 15. g4 Kc7 16. g5 Kd7 17. Kf5 Ke7 18. Kg6 b5 19. Kh7 b4, with a draw. 14... Kxb6 15. g4 Kc7 16. g5 Kd7 17. Kh5 b5 18. g6 Ke7 19. Kh6 Kf8 20. Kh7, winning.


No. 6905: V. Vlasenko. You'll love this! 1. fg ? Kg 5 2 . g7 $\mathrm{Bd} 4+$ and $w \mathrm{Pg} 7$ is lost. 1. Kf4 g5 +2 . Kf3 c4 3. f6 c3 4. f7 c2. Now comes the
first of a number of intensely concentrated points. 5. Bf4. This offer anticipates $5 \ldots . \mathrm{gf} 6$. f8Q c1Q 7. Qf6 mate, while $5 \ldots \mathrm{Be} 3$ allows 6 . Bxg3, an almost incidental mate. Bl therefore drives wK away. 5...g4+6. Ke4 Be3. It would be stalemate after 7. Bxe3? c1Q 8. Bxcl (f8Q is hopeless), while 7. f 8 Q ? Bxf4 suffices to draw. 7. f8S Bxf4 8. Kf5 and 9. Sg6 mate.


No. 6906: O. Pervakov. 1. Kf3? h3 2. Bh6 gh 3. Kf2 Bh2 4. Kf3 h5 wins. 1. Kf2 h3 2. Bh6 g6 (gh; $\mathrm{Kg} 1)$ 3. Be3 + Ka6 4. Kf3 Kb5 5. Bg1 Kxc6. Or 5...h2 6. Bxh2 Bxh2 7. Kg 4 and $8 . \mathrm{Kg} 5$, demonstrating the point of forcing bP to g6. 6. Kg4 Bc5 7. Bh2 draws, but not 7. Kxh3? Bxg1 8. Kg4 Be3.


No. 6907: E. Pogosyants. 1. Rb7 Be6 (Bc6;Rb6) 2. Rg7 + (Rb6? $\mathrm{Se} 3+$ ), and now:
2...Kf3 3. Rxg2 Bh3 4. Kg1 Bc5+ (Bxg2 stalemate) 5. Kh2 Bxg2 echostalemate.
2...Kh3 3. Rxg2 Bc4+ 4. Kg1 Bc5 + 5. Kh1 Bd5, pin stalemate.

Those are the five prizes. The award continued with the composers' names and K-squares of 3 Hon.Mentions and 3 commendations, sans positions and sans solutions. Strictly speaking this is not an award, since the missing studies will never be identifiable with certainty. Shortage of space (undoubtedly the excuse for the omissions) cannot change this verdict.


No. 6908: A.P. Grin (Moscow) and Yu. Makletsov (Yakutsk). Judge: G. Umnov. 1. Rh4 Bc3 2. b5 Sf2 3. Rc4 Sd3 4. b6 Kb3 5. Rxc3 + Kxc3 6. b7, and aither 6...Se5 7. Kb8, or 6...Sb4 7. Kıo, winning.

No. 6909: L.I. Katsnelson (Leningrad) and A. Maksimovskikh (Kurgan). 1. c6 dc 2. Rg8 + Kxe7 3. Rxg3 f4 + 4. Kxf4 f2 5. Re3 + Kf6 6. Rf3 c2 7. Ke3 + Ke5 8. Kd2 wins.


No. 6910: M. Zinar (Odessa region). 1. c8S +Kc 7 2. Kg 2 Kxc 8 3. d5 Kc7 4. e7 Kd7 5. d6 g4 6. e3 Ke8 7. e4 Kd7 8. e5 Ke8 9. e6 h1Q + 10. Kxh1 $\mathrm{g} 2+11 . \mathrm{Kxg} 2 \mathrm{~g} 312 . \mathrm{d} 7+$ wins.


No. 6911: V.S. Kovalenko. 1. Sa3 + ba $2 . \mathrm{Sc} 3+\mathrm{Kc1} 3 . \mathrm{Sa} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 14 . \mathrm{Sb} 4$ c1S + 5. Kd1 Sxb3 6. Sd5 Ka2 7. Sc3 mate.


No. 6912: V. Dedeshin. 1. Kb2 Kc5 2. Kc3 Kb5 3. Kd3 Kc5 4. Ke3 Kd6 5. Ke2 Kc6 6. Kd2 Kc5 7. Kd3 Kb5 8. Ke3 wins.


No. 6913: A. Dzalilov. 1. f7 Sxf7 2. e7 Sd6 3. Rxd6 Bf7 4. Re6 + Kd2 5. Rd6 + Kc2 6. Rc6+ Kb1 7. Rb6+ Kal 8. e8Q Bxe8 9. Re6 g1Q 10. Re1 + Qxel stalemate.


No. 6914: L. Katsnelson (Leningrad). Judge: A. Maksimovskikh. There were 175 entries (from 120 composers in the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Yugoslavia) to this 'Peace to the World' tourney for miniatures (maximum 7 men). The award occupied a whole A3-size page, or $25 \%$ of the total space in the 2 -kopeck newspaper.

1. Bd7 +Kh 4 2. Sb4/i Rc3 + 3. Ke 2 (Sd3? Rxd3+;) Rc4/ii 4. Sd3 Rc2+ 5. $\mathrm{Kf1} \mathrm{~g} 2+6 . \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Kg} 3$ 7. Bb5/iii Ra2 8. Se1 Ra1 9. Bf1 Rxf1 stalemate, or $9 \ldots . \mathrm{gfQ}+10$. Kxf1 with a standard draw.
i) 2. Kf3? Rc2 and ...g2 follows.
ii) 3...Rb3 4. Sc2 Rb2 5. Bf5 Kg5 6. Bh7 Kg4 7. Be4 Kf4 8. Bd3 Rb3 9. Sel drawn.
iii) 7. Ba4? Ra2? 8. Bd1 Rd2 9. Sel Rxd1 is indeed stalemate, but it's a thematic try, as Bl plays instead 7...Rc4 8. Bd1 Rh4 9. Sf2 Rf4 10. $\mathrm{Sh} 1+\mathrm{ghQ}+11$. Kxh1 Rf1 mate.

The 'theme' combines stalemate with pin of wB, with a try ending in stalemate with wS pinned.


No. 6915: Alexander Manyakhin (Lipetsk). 1. Sc5 elS 2. Kc7 Sc2 3. $\mathrm{Bg} 4 / \mathrm{i}$ Sb4 4. $\mathrm{Bc} 8 \mathrm{Rg} 7+5$. Sd 7 $\mathrm{Sa} 6+6 . \mathrm{Kb} 6 \mathrm{Rg} 6+7 . \mathrm{Ka} 7 \mathrm{Ka} 1 / \mathrm{ii} 8$. Se5 Rd6 (else wSd3) 9. Sc4 Rg6 10. Se3 Rd6 11. Sf5 Rf6 12. Sd4, and wS having reached this central square, W wins easily.
i) 3. Bf7? loses a tempo, Rh8 4. Be6 Sb4 5. Bc8 Rh7 + 6. Sd7 Sa6 +7. Kb6 Rh6 + 8. Ka7 Ka3 9. Sb6 Sb8 10. $\mathrm{Sc} 4+\mathrm{Kb} 4$ 11. Kxb8 Kxc4 12. Kc7 Rh7 + 13. Bd7 Rh8 14. Bc8 Rh7+, drawing.
ii) This is the most stubborn. If 7...Ka3 8. Sb6, and Sb 8 9. $\mathrm{Sc} 4+$ Kb4 10. Kxb8 Kxc4 11. Kc7, or Sb4 9. Bd7 Rg8 10. Sc4+ Ka2 11. Sd6 Rd8 12. Bb5 wins.


No. 6916: Valery Vlasenko (Kharkov region). 1. Bb2/i g2 2. Bd4 Sd2 3. f5 Se4 4. Ka4/ii Kf1 5. Kb4 Ke2 6. Bg1 Ke1 7. Ka4 Kf1 8. Bd4, with a positional draw, since 8...Sf2 9. f6 g1Q 10. f7 and W also secures himself a wQ.
i) 1. $\mathrm{Bc} 5 ? \mathrm{Sc} 3+2 . \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Se} 43 . \mathrm{Bg} 1$ Kf1 4. Ba 7 g 2 5. f5 Sf2 and Bl wins. ii) 4. Kb4? Sf2 5. f6 g1Q 6. f7 Sd3 + 7. K- Qf1 wins.


No. 6917: Leonard Katsnelson. Let's look first at the thematic try $1 . \mathrm{Bf} 3$ ? Bf1 2. Kg3 + Kg1 3. Re4 Sc5 4. Re1 Sd 3 5. Ra1 Sf2 6. Bxg2 Se4+ 7. Bxe4 stalemate with bB pinned. W must play more precisely! $1 . \mathrm{Kg} 3+$ Kg1 2. Rd4/i Se5 3. Rd1+ Bf1 4. $\mathrm{Be} 2 \mathrm{Kh} 1 / \mathrm{ii} 5$. Bxf1 and gfQ +6. Rxf1 mate, or g1Q+6. Bg2 mate.
i) 2. Ra4? Bf1 3. Ra1 Se5 4. Be2 Sc6 5. Rd1 Sd4 6. Bg4 Kh1 drawn.
ii) 4...Sf7 5. Bf3 Sh6 6. Be4 Sg4 7. Re1 Sf2 8. Bxg2 Se4 + 9. Rxe4 Bxg2 10. $\mathrm{Re} 1+$ wins.


No. 6918: Velimir Kalandadze (Tbilisi). 1. Rf1 Kc6 2. b7 Ra5 + 3. Kb8 Ra1/i 4. Rf6+ Kd7 5. Ra6 Rcl 6. Ka8/ii Ra1 7. Kb8, and either Rc1 8. Ka8, positional draw, or b1Q 8. Rxa1 Qxa1 stalemate.
i) $3 . . \mathrm{Rb} 5$ 4. Rf6+ Kd7 5. $\mathrm{Rf} 7+$ Ke6 6. Rf1 draws.
ii) 6. Ka7? b1Q 7. b8Q Rc7 +8 . Ka8 $\mathrm{Qe} 4+$ and Bl wins.


No. 6919: Lars Falk (Sweden). 1. c7 Rd5 + 2. Kc6 Rd8 3. Sf7 Ra8 4. Kb7 Kd7 5. Se5 + Kd6 6. Sc4+ Kd7 7. Sb6+ Kd6 8. Sxa8 wins. bR is offered, and declined, twice.


No. 6920: T.G. Whitworth. The main line moves are the same as Falk's. The two studies were composed independently of each other. TGW comments: ''I composed the study in 1984 to show the unintended second solution of a study by Leonid Kubbel (No. 923 in Kasparyan's anthology SILA PESHKI). Kubbel's study suffers from the fact that 7. Sf7 wins as well as the intended 7. Kb7. It is curious that I shifted wS from h8 to h6 in order to bring in the try 3 . Sf5?, whereas Lars Falk moved wS from h6 to h8 to show the corner to corner journey."


No. 6921: Mikhail Zinar (Odessa region). 1. h4 Kf2 2. Kb3 Ke3 3. Kxc3 Kf4 4. Kd4 Kg4 5. Ke5/i Kxh4 6. Kf4 (Kf6? Kg4;) Kh3 7. Kf3 Kh2 8. Kf2 f6 9. Kf3 Kg1 10. Ke4 Kf2 11. Kd5 Ke3 12. Kc6 and draws.
i) $5 . \mathrm{Kd} 5$ ? f5 6. Ke5 f4 7. h5 f3 8. h6 f2 9. h7 f1Q 10. h8Q Qal + skewers. (Consulting a Russian dictionary can be hilarious: 'prostrel' is a part of a verb meaning 'to shoot through', ie a skewer, but what one finds first is the noun 'prostrel' with the meaning 'lumbago', no doubt for the best of pathological reasons. No wonder there are international misunderstandings.)


No. 6922: G(H)amlet Amiryan (Erevan). How many Englishmen are there called Hamlet? 1. Rh6 Bxh6 2. b8Q h1Q 3. Qg3+ Kf1 4. Qh3 +, and:
Kg 1 5. $\mathrm{Qg} 3+\mathrm{Qg} 2$ 6. $\mathrm{Qe} 1+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ (Qf1;Qxf1+) 7. Qh4 + Qh3 8. Qf2 + Kh1 9. Qe1 +Kg 2 10. Qf2 + Kxf2 stalemate, or Qg 2 5. Qh1 +Kf 2 6. Qe1 +Kf 3 7. Qf2 $+K x f 2$ stalemate.

No. 6923: V. Balanovsky (Kiev). 1. $\mathrm{Bf} 1+\mathrm{Kd} 2$ 2. Kxe4 Ke1 3. Bh3 Kf2 4. Sf 3 Kg 3 5. Bf1/i Kf2 6. Sh2 Kg3 7. Ke3 Kxh2 8. Kf2 Sc5 9. Sf6 Kh1 10. $\mathrm{Bg} 2+\mathrm{Kh} 2$ 11. Sg 4 mate. i) 5. Sg1? Kf2 6. Kf4 Kxg1 7. Kg3 Sc5 8. Sf6 Sd3 9. Se4 Sf2 10. Sxf2 stalemate.


No. 6924: M. Zinar. 1. Kg1 Kd2 2. Kh2 Ke2 3. Kg2 Kd3 4. Kh3 Ke3 5. Kg3 Kd4 6. Kh4 Ke4 7. Kg4 Kd5 8. Kh5 Ke5 9. Kg5 Ke4 10. Kg4 Kd5 11. Kh5, positional draw.


No. 6925: Vazha Neidze (Tbilisi). 1. Sa 7 , with Qxa7 2. Qe3 $+(\mathrm{Qg} 1+$ loss of time) Ka6 3. Qd3 + Kb6 4. Qxd6 mate, or Kc7 2. Qg7 + Kb6 3. Qd4+ Kc7 4. Qc4+ Kd7 5. Qf7+ Kd8 6. Qf8 + Kc7 7. Sb5 + wins.


No. 6926: A. Kopnin and V. Kondratev' (Chelyabinsk). 1. Ke4 Rh1 2. Bg5 Rg1 3. Bh6 Re1 + 4. Kd3 Rh1 5. Bg7 Re1 6. Bh6 Rg1 7. Ke4 Rel + 8. Kd3 Re2 9. Be3 Ra2 10. Ke4 Re2 11. Kd3 Kel 12. Ke4 Kf1 13. Kf3 Rh2 14. Ke4 Re2 15. Kf3 Ke1 16. Ke4, positional draw.


No. 6927: N. Ryabinin (Tambov region). 1. Sc5 Bg8 2. Sf6 Se6 3. $\mathrm{cSd} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 7$ 4. Se5 Kd6 5. Sc4 + Kc5 6. Kc3 Bf7 7. Se5 Sd8 8. fSg4 and bS is lost.


No. 6928: I. Garayazli (Sumgait, Azerbaidzhan). 1. Rd8/i h2 2. Rd2 Re5 + /ii 3. Sxe5 h1Q 4. Rf2 + Ke1 5. $\mathrm{Sd} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 16 . \mathrm{Rd} 2$ mate.
i) 1. Rxb6? -- see note (ii).
ii) $2 \ldots \mathrm{~h} 1 \mathrm{~S}$ 3. $\mathrm{Rd} 1+\mathrm{Kg} 2$ 4. $\mathrm{Rg} 1+$ Kh3 5. Kf4 Ra5 6. Rxh1+ Kg2 7. $\mathrm{Rh} 2+\mathrm{Kf} 18$. Kg3 wins, but after 1. Rxb6? the move 8...Ra2 draws.

```
No. 6929 A. Davranyan
8 Hon. Mention,
```



No. 6929: A. Davranyan (Donetsk region). 1. Bc4 Rb7 2. Bf8 f3 3. gf Rf7 4. Bc5 Rf6+ 5. Kg5 Rxf3 6. Kg4 Rf6 7. Bd4 Kd7 8. Kg5 wins.

No. 6930: Nikolai Kralin (Moscow). 1. Sf7 Sf4 + 2. Kf3 Sxe6 3. Kg4 Be7 4. Re 2 Kd 7 5. $\mathrm{Se} 5+\mathrm{Kd6}$ 6. $\mathrm{Sc} 4+$ Kd7 7. Sb6 + Kd6 8. $\mathrm{Sc} 8+\mathrm{Kd} 79$. Sxe7 Kxe7 10. Kf5 wins.


No. 6931: Iosef Krikheli (Gori, Georgian SSR). 1. Re6 + Kc7 2. Re5 Bh6 3. Rc5 + Kb7 4. Rb5 + Ka7 5. $\mathrm{Ra} 5+\mathrm{Kb7}$ 6. Rb5 + Kc7 7. Rc5 + Kd7 8. Rxh5 g2 9. Rd5 + Ke6 10. Rd1, with Bl P now harmless.


No. 6932: O. Pervakov (Moscow). 1. Sf5 Ba5 2. Sd6 + Kd7 3. h6 Bb6 4. Kd3 Bd8 5. Se4 Bc7 6. Sf6+ Ke6 7. h7 wins.


No. 6933: David Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). This Special Honourable Mention was for a synthesis of two ideas. 1. Rg1 g2 2. c4 Kc3 3. c5 h2 4. Rxg2 h1Q 5. c6 Qxg2 6. c7 draws, or $1 . . . \mathrm{h} 22$. $\mathrm{Rg} 2+\mathrm{Kcl} 3$. Rxg3 h1Q 4. Rc3 Qh8 + 5. Rc8 Qf6 6. c4 Kc2 7. c5 Kd3 8. Rc7 draws.

DVH observes that this study deserves a highé placing, ''or is 'special' above other HM's?', a question to which we have never had a satisfactory answer.
Judges do what they like and tend not to explain what they do.


No. 6934: A. Zhuravlev (Tula). 1. Se1 b2 2. Bc2 +Kc 1 3. Kc3 b1S +4. Bxb1 Bxf3 5. Bg6 Bd1 6. Be4 Bh5 7. $\mathrm{Sd} 3+\mathrm{Kd} 1$ 8. Bd5, with Bg 49. $\mathrm{Sf} 2+$, or Ke 2 9. $\mathrm{Sf} 4+$, or Bg6 9. Bf3 mate.


No. 6935: V. Kalyagin (Sverdlovsk). 1. $\mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{Qg} 4+$ 2. $\mathrm{d} 7 \mathrm{Qc} 4+3$. Qc 7 $\mathrm{Qg} 8+$ 4. $\mathrm{d} 8 \mathrm{~S} \mathrm{Qg} 4+5$. Qd7 Qc4+ 6. Sc6 + Kb6 7. Qxb7 Kc5 8. b6 Qb3 9. Se5 Qxb6 10. Sd7 + wins.


No. 6936: B.N. Sidorov (Apsheronsk, Krasnodarsky krai). 1. Sc5 g2 2. $\mathrm{Sa} 4+\mathrm{Ka6} 3 . \mathrm{b} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 54 . \mathrm{b} 6 \mathrm{~g} 1 \mathrm{Q}$ 5. b7 Ka6 6. Sc5 + Qxc5 7. b8S + Kb5 8. c4 + Ka5 9. b4 +, with Kxb4 10. Sa6 + , or Qxb4 10. Sc6 + drawn.


No. 6937: P. Arestov (Rostov region). 1. f4 Rh5 + 2. Kg4 Rxh7 3. f5 + Kh6 4. Rg8 Reciprocal zugzwang. g5 5. Rg6 mate, or Rh8 5. Rxh8 mate.


No. 6938: Anders Gillberg (Sweden). 1. Kg8 Sf4 2. h7 Bh8 3. h6 Ba1 4. h8Q Bxh8 5. h7 Sg6 stalemate.


No. 6939: Sergei Kasparyan (Erevan). 1. $\mathrm{Bg} 3 \mathrm{Se} 7+2 . \mathrm{Kf} 7 \mathrm{Sd} 5$ 3. c4 Sb6 4. c5 Sa4 5. Bf $2 \mathrm{Kd5} \mathrm{6}. \mathrm{Sc8}$ Sxc5 7. Sb6 +Kd 6 8. Bg3 mate. "'Very neat -- ideal mate" (David Hooper).

No. 6940: V. Lizunov and M. Bordenyuk (Moldavia). 1. g8S + Kf7 2. Sh6 + Kg6 3. Sg4 Rb2 4. Sc1 Rc2 5. Sd3 Rc3 6. Kh4 Rxc3 7. Se5 + Sxe5 stalemate.


No. 6941: Edward Asaba and Ernest L. Pogosyants (Moscow). 1. $\mathrm{Sg} 3+$ Kf3 2. Sh5 Kg4 3. Sxg7 Kg5 4. Sf7 + Kf6 5. Sd6 Kxg7 6. Se4 h5 7. Kb7 h4 8. Kc6 h3 9. Kd5 h2 10. Sf2(g3) Kf6 11. Ke4 wins.


No. 6942: B. Lurye and Leopold A. Mitrofanov (Leningrad). 1...c2 2. c7 $\mathrm{Sb} 5+3 . \mathrm{Kb} 3 \mathrm{Sxc} 7$ 4. Sb 2 Kb 15. Sc4 clQ 6. Sa3 +Ka 1 7. $\mathrm{Sc} 2+\mathrm{Kb} 1$ 8. $\mathrm{Sa} 3+$ and so on, drawing.


No. 6943: R. Margalitadze (Tbilisi). 1. $\mathrm{Sb} 4 \mathrm{e} 4+2$. Kxe4 a1S 3. Kd3 Sb3 4. Kc2 Sd2 5. Sd3 +Ke 2 6. $\mathrm{Sc} 1+$ Kel 7. Bá́ K- 8 . Bxd2 wins.


No. 6944: M. Morozov (Kurgan). 1. Be4 Qc3 2. Bd5 + Kh8 3. $\mathrm{Sg} 5 \mathrm{Qg} 7+$ 4. Kf5 Qe5 + 5. Kg6 Qg3 6. Be6 Qe3 7. Bd5, positional draw.

No. 6945: A. Lewandowski (Poland). Judge: David Hooper, replacing J.P. Arriaga (Spain), whose abandonment of his voluntarily assumed responsibility for the Lommer Memorial Tourney still awaits explanation. Whatever that finally turns
out to be it should account also for this second defaulting. 1. $\mathrm{c} 4+\mathrm{Ka} 2$ 2. Ke2 Sxc2 3. Ra1 + Sxa1 4. Kd3 + $\mathrm{Sc} 2 / \mathrm{i}$ 5. Rxc2+ Kb1 6. $\mathrm{Se} 4 / \mathrm{ii}$ $\mathrm{Ra} 3+/ \mathrm{iii} 7$. Bc3 Qg6 8. Rb2 +Kc 1 9. Rc2 +Kd 1 10. Rd2 $+\mathrm{Ke1} 11$. Rd1 + Kxd1 stalemate.
i) $4 \ldots \mathrm{Bf} 25 . \mathrm{Rf} 2+\mathrm{Ka} 36 . \mathrm{Sb} 5+\mathrm{Kb} 4$ 7. $\mathrm{Bc} 3+\mathrm{Kc} 58$. $\mathrm{Bd} 4+\mathrm{Kc} 69$. Rf6 + .
ii) 6. $\mathrm{Rb} 2+$ ? Kc 1 7. $\mathrm{Rc} 2+\mathrm{Kd} 18$. $\mathrm{Se} 4 \mathrm{Ra} 3+$ 9. Bc3 Qa4 10. Rd2 + Ke1 11. Sxc5 Rxc3 + 12. Kxc3 Qa5 + .
iii) 6...Bb4 7. Bb3 Bxb3 8. Sxc3+ Ka 1 9. $\mathrm{Rc} 1+\mathrm{Kb} 2$ 10. Rb1 +Ka 3 11. $\mathrm{Sb} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 2$ 12. $\mathrm{Sc} 3+$.
'"Lively play, sacrifice and movement by all but one of the 12 men leads to an ideal pin stalemate that is not easily foreseen."


No. $6946 \quad$ A. Sochniev (iii.83) $=1 / 2$ Prizes, The Problemist,


No. 6946: A.A. Sochniev (USSR). 1. a6 (Bb6? Bc4;) Bc4 2. Sc7 Bxe2 3. $\mathrm{Sd} 5+\mathrm{Kxf3} 4$. a7 Bg3 + 5. Kh1 Kg4 6. Se3 $+\mathrm{Kh} 3 / \mathrm{i} 7$. a8B (a8Q? Bf3 + ; Bf2/ii 8. $\mathrm{Bg} 2+(\mathrm{Bxf} 2$ ? $\mathrm{Bf} 3+$;) Kg 3 9. Bh2 mate.
i) $6 \ldots \mathrm{Kf} 47 . \mathrm{Sg} 2+$ and $8 . \mathrm{a} 8 \mathrm{Q}$.
ii) $7 \ldots \mathrm{Bb} 88 . \mathrm{Bf} 2$, or $7 \ldots \mathrm{Be} 18$. Bh2.
', Almost all one could ask of a study: economy, counterplay, underpromotion, and a surprise finish. Only Bl hP remains unmoved, but it also serves."


No. 6947: the late GM Vladimir Pachman (Czechoslovakia). 1. Sg 5 Rf5/i 2. Se4 + Kf3 (Kh3;Sf2 +) 3. $\mathrm{Sd} 2+\mathrm{Kxe} 34 . \mathrm{Ra} 3+\mathrm{d} 35 . \mathrm{Ra} 4 \mathrm{c} 4 / \mathrm{ii}$ 6. Rxc4 Re5 7. Ra4/iii Re6 8. Rb4 a6 9. Rc4 Re5 10. Ra4 Re6 11. Rb4 a5 12. Ra 4 wins.
i) $1 . . . \mathrm{Rg} 72 . \mathrm{Bxf} 4+\mathrm{Kxf} 43 . \mathrm{Se} 6+$. ii) $5 . . . \operatorname{Re} 56 . \mathrm{Sc} 4+\mathrm{Kd} 4+7$. Sxe5 + wins.
iii) 7. Rb4? Re6 8. Ra4 a5.
'"Might well have take first place but for anticipation by Perkonoja."
EG20.1109, see also EG23 p. 204.
"Nevertheless, Pachman's setting is a great improvement, with more movement, subtler tempo-play, and an added mate (12...f3 13. Sf1)."

No. 6948: D. Gurgenidze (USSR). 1. c6 Ba6 + 2. Kb4 Sd3 + 3. Ka5 Se5 4. Bxe5 Bb7 5. Bg3+/i Kxg3 6. cb Be5
7. Ka6/ii Bb8 8. Kb5 Kf4 9. Kc6 Ke5
10. Kd7 Kd5 11. Kc8 wins.
i) 5. cb? Bxe5 6. Ka6 Bb 8 7. Kb5 Ke3 8. Kc6 Kd4 9. Kd7 Kc5 draw. ii) 7. Kb5? Kf4 8. Kc6 Ke4 9. Kd7 Kd5 10. Kc8 Kc6 draw.
"'A surprise sacrifice (5. $\mathrm{Bg} 3+$ ) gains a tempo and a feint (7. Ka6) gains another."


No. 6949: Edward Asaba (Moscow). 1. $\mathrm{Sc} 7+\mathrm{Kb} 8$ 2. $\mathrm{Sa} 6+\mathrm{Ka} 83$. Bxd7+/i Kb7 4. Rb8+ Kxa6 5. Rxb2 e1Q + 6. Kxel g2 7. Bb5 + Ka5 8. Bf1 a3 9. $\mathrm{Rb} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 410$. Bxg2 a2 11. Bc6 a1Q + 12. Rb1 + wins.
i) 3. $\mathrm{Bb} 7+$ ? Kxb 7 4. $\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Kxa} 65$. Rxb2 elQ + 6. Kxel g2.
''Entertaining, not without surprise and counterplay, but the introductory 5. Rxb2 is somewhat brutal."
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