Editorial Changes
Two 'life-blood' ingredients of *EG* are the 'Spotlight' and 'Originals' sections. Jürgen Fleck has patiently and authoritatively orchestrated 'Spotlight' since *EG*116 in April 1995. With the help of reader-analysts he has in effect monitored the analysis of the world's output of studies in this 8-year period. Our gratitude is inexpressible -- we trust that these labours, those of Sisyphus and Hercules combined, have not ruined his health! He takes with him our admiring good wishes as well as our thanks and, if we have come to know him at all, we are sure we have not heard the last of Jürgen Fleck! He is replaced by Jarl Ulrichsen of Norway, who has a tough act to follow, but with reader support we know he will succeed.

Noam Elkies has produced 14 'Originals' columns since the ground-breaking section was announced with a flourish -- "Calling all composers!" -- in *EG*126 (x1997). He is disappointed, as indeed we are, that the hoped for steady flow of high-class fuel has not reached him, and that his column has for that reason alone failed to appear recently. But he should not be down-hearted: not only can composers who have figured there feel proud to have been selected, but Noam himself, a busy lecturer in mathematics, has blazed the trail for his successor, his equally talented countryman Gady Costeff (Israel and USA), from whom *EG*'s readers can expect fireworks!

AJR

Noam Elkies  Gady Costeff  Jürgen Fleck  Jarl Ulrichsen
(photo of Jürgen Fleck courtesy René Olthof, other photo's courtesy Harold van der Heijden)
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EG145's editorial appealed for 'balance' in dealing with the influence, usually beneficial but sometimes baleful, of the omni-present computer, in particular its manifestation in the 5-man or 6-man oracle database or 'odb'. Without apology we return to the topic. Consultations formal and informal will surely take place during the FIDE PCCC/WCCC gathering in Moscow at the end of July 2003, as they have done on previous occasions, but it is unreasonable to expect firm recommendations from the studies sub-committee (of which your editor is still chairman) so soon on a matter on which not only do opinions diverge widely, but they are frequently adhered to strongly, even vehemently: at one extreme is the view that since we can never be certain that a computer has been used it is pointless to attempt a distinction, so we should simply evaluate a 'study' on its content, without reference to its origins; at the other extreme is the view that using a 'mouse' to lift an interesting position from a ready-made computer-generated list is in no sense composing, so we should outlaw every such position.

Dear EG-Reader, whether you like it or not you are involved. Are you, dear EG-Reader, a composer? Are you a solver? Are you an amateur, either critical or uncritical? Are you perhaps an editor or tourney organiser? Are you even a judge or would-be judge? Do you dabble in endgame theory? Are you an analyst or cook-hunter? Many an EG-Reader, we know, identifies with more than one of the foregoing.

Here are some questions for you, whatever your standpoint. Please, dear EG-Reader, give them your whole and honest attention.

**QUESTIONS:**

- for the **composer**: when a study of yours is place lower in a tourney award than one which may well have been 'mined' from an odb, how do you feel? In submitting a study to a tourney do you always declare any use you have made of the computer - even it was only for testing, but in particular if there was consultation of an odb or a list of computer-generated reciprocal zugzwangs?
- for the **solver**: when is it admissible, and when is it inadmissible, to use a computer to assist in solving a study?
- for the **amateur or collector**: is it important to you whether, and if so how, an odb was used in writing a book or article or annotation?
- for the **editor or tourney organiser**: do you keep up-to-date with odb technology, and if your answer is 'no', can you justify remaining uninformed? In inviting a judge do you make sure that he is familiar with odb's?
- for the **judge**: can you distinguish between a *C* submission and a 'purely' human one? Do you trust composers to be honest in declaring their use of a computer? Should a FIDE composition title be awarded even partly on the basis of slick use of the computer?
-for the endgame theorist: how would you modify your opinion of A.A.Troitzky's ground-breaking work on GBR class 0002.01 (two knights against pawn) a century ago if it were discovered today that Troitzky had used an 'early' computer?!

And a final question, this time for everyone: can study-composition in the twenty-first century remain the glory of the creative human spirit that it was in the twentieth?

John Roycroft
chief editor of EG
FIDE international judge (studies) wef 1959

EG has, as yet no policy on the complex question broached in our EG149 editorial. Unsurprisingly, views vary among EG's editors. One thing alone is clear to us: the distinction between classical composing and computer composing should be preserved for as long as possible: if there is a name associated with a study diagram that name is a claim of authorship. There is, however, one line of reasoning on which we should like to comment. It may be argued that what the computer is doing is simply extending endgame theory, and that therefore there is no break in continuity in the study's relationship with endgame theory. This argument is surely fallacious. The computer provides us with evidence, we draw the conclusions. When, as with two bishops against knight, we learn from, and accept, and understand, the evidence, then and only then is theory advanced. What is crucial is not some computer output but our understanding -- or rather, the understanding of an accepted authority, for it is not necessary that each of us has the ability to win or defend to perfection every endgame known to theory. Blind acceptance of what one or more of us thinks the computer is telling us is not, and will never be, endgame theory. The big practical snag is that there is still no accepted public forum, inside FIDE or outside of it, where the gripping debate on the expansion of endgame theory can be conducted. But this major difficulty makes no difference to the fundamental principle and the need to keep the latter constantly in our sights.

AJR

SPOTLIGHT
editor: Jürgen Fleck

This time Spotlight's contributors were Ilham Aliyev (Azerbaijan), Marco Campioli (Italy), Peter Gyarmati (Hungary), Guy Haworth (England), Harold van der Heijden (Netherlands), Alain Pallier (France), Michael Roxlau (Germany), Ignace Vandecasteele (Belgium), Andrei Visokosov (Russia).

141.11858, F.Vrabec. I stumbled across the game Santasiere vs. Kashdan, USA championship 1938, where the initial position of Vrabec's study arose after 120 moves. The ending is analysed in Euwe's highly recommendable book "Die Endspiellehre und ihre praktische Anwendung" ("Endgame Theory and its practical
Application”). Needless to say that Euwe’s accurate analysis covers all subtleties.

145.13178, A.Kuryatnikov, E.Markov. This looks like serious self-anticipation, c.f. 140.11820.

146.13262, P.Gyarmati. The composer has brushed up his analysis of the try 1.Re3? as follows: 1.Re3? Bh7! (1... Bc2? 2.Ra3 Ba4 3.Sg5 Bd1 4.Rh3+ - Roger Missiaen’s improvement - Kg1 5.Rd3 Kh1 6.Sh3 Be2 7.Re3 Kh2 8.Re6 Bb5 9.Rf6 Bd3 10.Sg5 wins) 2.Rg3 (2.Re7 Bd3 3.Rg7 Kh3 draw) Be4 draw.

147.13302, G.Kasparyan. Anticipated by J.Fritz, Sachove Studie 1954 (correction), e1c2 0840.00 h1h6a2d7g4b5 4/4+, 1.Rh6+ Kb1 2.Bxd7 Rxh2 3.Bf5+ Bd5 4.Bxd5+ Ka1 5.0-0+ and wins.

147.13302, M.Markovic. No solution: 4... g2 5.Rg4 Se3 6.Rxg2+ (forced, else the c-pawn marches through) Sxg2 7.dxc5 Bxc5, which somewhat surprisingly is a win according to the database. The main line starts 8.Se5 Kh3.

147.13371, V.Prigunov. It should be mentioned that 6... Qh1 fails to 7.Rb7+.

147.13425, A.Kuryatnikov, E.Markov. No solution, Black draws by 4... Bd8 5.Rf1 (5.Rxd8 Rd2+; 5.Rg6 Rxh6) Bd6+ followed by Rxh6.


148.13479, K.Velikhanov. There doesn’t seem to be a win after 1... Qb8, e.g. 2.Sh6 Qe6 3.Bf4 Qd2 draw or 2.Se7 Kb5 3.Be8 Qd8 draw.

148.13485, N.Rezvov, S.Tkachenko. 7.Bf4 is a micro-dual.

148.13486, A.Sochnev. There is a typo in the numbering. See 148.13846.


148.13498, G.Amiryan. The database points out the dual 3.Qh8+ Kg6 4.Qf6+ Kh5 5.Qf3+ Kg5 (other moves allow a straightforward mate in a few moves) 6.Bf4+ Kf5 7.Bh6+ Kg6 (7... Ke5 8.Bg7 mate) 8.Qf6+ and mate next move.

148.13500, A.Visokosov. A diagram error: bSb4 is missing.

148.13502, G.Umnov. "Black’s 7... Ba2 seems somewhat supine" to GH, and indeed most other moves hold on a little longer. Perhaps the composer has selected this as his main line, because only this forces White to find two successive unique (albeit quite obvious) moves.


148.13505, S.Sakharov. The main line should read 7.f6 d1Q 8.f7 draws. Quite surprising, with the white king as far back as g5.
148.13508 ff. Here is the missing study from this match:

No 13556 Hillel Aloni (Israel),
4th place, study section,
Israel vs. St Petersburg match, 2000,

No 13556 Hillel Aloni 1.d7+ Rxd7 2.Bxd7+ Qxd7/i 3.aSc7+/ii Qxc7 4.Sxe7+ Kf8
5.Sf6+ Kg8/iv 6.gxf7+ Kxf7 7.fxg7+ Kf8/ix 8.Sd6-f5 xh4 and wins,
i) Thematic content: 2... Kxd7 3.aSc5+, not 3.aSc7 Qc1+.
ii) Thematic content: 3.aSc5? Qd1+.
iv) Thematic content: 5... Kxe8 6.fxg7, not 6.gxf7+ Kxf7. If 5... fxg6 6.fxg7+ Kf7
The composer tells us that he has no pretensions for his creation and had asked that it
be not included in the award prepared in St Petersburg while allowing it to score a
point in the match. This was agreed.

148.13519, A.Visokosov. The composer complains about his study being published
with all his notes cut off. Unfortunately common practice of tournament directors! In
this case the supporting analysis is definitely worth being published, so here is a full
solution by the composer, slightly edited (please note a diagram error, the white bishop
belongs on e1):
Rxf6 draw.
ii) 3... exd2? 4.Qd3+ wins; 3... Rhl+? 4.Kg6 exd2 5.Qe4+ wins.
Rg5+ 11.Kh3 Rh5+ draw is a good try.
v) 6... h5 7.Qd3+ Kb2 8.Kg5 wins, but not 7.Kg5? Se5 draw.

148.13545, M.Hlinka. A question for the would-be-judge: How far is this anticipated
by 133.11319 and 132.11252?
148.13549, I.Jarmonov. This is spoilt by the duals 5.Qc1 and 7.Qb3.
148.13551, H.v.d.Heijden. MR feels reminded to the beautiful goals by Klinsmann
and Brehme in the world championships 1990. Admittedly, van Basten’s “russian”
goal wasn’t that bad either.
148.13846, A.Sochn. See 148.13486.

I am honored to assume editorship of this column. EG’s unique standing as an
international publication dedicated to studies, coupled with following in the footsteps
of Noam Elkies make this a daunting task suited only to a study lover or a fool,
which makes me doubly qualified.

My sole demand from AJR was that we run an informal studies tourney. The artistic efforts of
composers should never be taken for granted and the least we should provide them with is artistic
feedback by a very knowledgeable judge. In this respect we have already succeeded with the

It is customary for a new editor to state his artistic manifesto in his first column so readers can skip
it safely. I will eventually give my views but due to sad circumstances I shall share my thoughts about
someone far more worthy at the end of this column.

Gerhard Josten recently celebrated his 65th jubilee
with a tourney won by Andrei Vysokosov. Perhaps inspired by
Andrei’s favorite theme, Gerhard shows a mutual
zugzwang motivated by the need for white’s rook
to avoid hoofs of the black knight.

No 13556 Gerhard Josten

4.Kc1 e2/vi 5.Re8 Kc4
6.Re3 Kb5 7.Kb1 draw

i) 1...e3 2.Kc1 e2 3.Re7 Kc4 4.Re3+; or 1...c2+
   2.Kc1 e3 3.Re3++

ii) White must lose a tempo. 2.Re8? e3 and it is
   white who is in zz so the white rook must come too
   close with 3.Re7 Nf4
   4.Rb7+ Kc4 5.Re7 Nd5
   wins. Or if 2.Re5? Nf4
   3.Rb5+ Kc4 4.Re5 Kd3
   wins
iii) Now that the rook is beyond the knight’s reach
v) Other black moves do not help. 3...Ng3 4.Rb8+ Ke4 5.Re8+ Kd3 6.Rd8+ or
vii) 4...e2 5.Re3+ draw.

David Antonini also contributes a mutual zugzwang, this time revolving around a troubled white knight. Whether his light setting is due to residing in the ‘city of lights’ or to his appreciation for the works Rinck, Afek, Akobia, Gurgenidze Vysoskov and Pervakov, is unknown.

Fritz also makes David’s favorites list but in a sign of the times, refers to the software rather than to the great Czech composer.

---

**No 13557 David Antonini**

```
3f4 0034.11 3/4 draw
```

**No 13558 Amatzia. Avni & Yochanan. Afek**

```
f8 0301.14 6/3 draw
```

Amatzia Avni and Yochanan Afek are well known for sparkling ideas and play. Readers are sure to enjoy their latest co production. The position following black’s 10th move in our next study dates back to F. Healey, Westminster Papers, 1874(!) and of
course several later works. Velimir Kalandadze supplies a new introduction using systematic movements of his beloved rooks.

No 13559 Velimir Kalandadze

It is also not an original. On May 10 Dr. Milan R. Vukcevich passed away at the age of 66. Thankfully, he lived to see his second chess book, "My Chess Compositions", which I highly recommend. I never met Dr. Vukcevich, yet I feel a great personal loss. Sometime in the early eighties while thumbing through a Fide album, I decided to look at problems. Once I saw one Dr. Vukcevich's problems I went directly to the index and looked at every single problem of his. I have never stopped. Dr. Vukcevich was a renowned scientist and among his professional books is 'The Science of Incandescence'. It is the perfect way to describe his chess problems as well. A Milan Vukcevich problem provides its own light.

Two years ago I read an article by Dr. Vukcevich titled 'The Beauty of Bristol' (http://www.matplus.org.uk/BRISTOL.HTM). I loved the article but the lack of study examples in the article touched a nerve and I set out to show that no less spectacular effects can be shown in a study. It took a couple of minutes to abstractly define my thematic goal of perpetual, mutual and maximal Bristols. It took another two years to make it work, Die Schwalbe and Spotlight readers willing. Wherever he is composing now, I hope Dr. Vukcevich enjoys it.

No 13560 Gady Costeff

Die Schwalbe, Dec. 2002
Dedicated to Jan Rusinek

Our final study shows something very different.
7. Bxh7 (7.Bf7 Nxe8
8. Rxe8 Bf8) 7...Qxh7
8. Rxe7 Kxc7 8.Rxe7 Qxd3
iii) 6...Ke5 7.Rxe7 mate
iv) 7.Bxe6+ dxe6 8.Rxg8
Qxg8 9.Rxg7 Qxg7
10.Nxg7 Bxg7
v) The forced tactics are
over and white must find a
plan to contain the black
force.

8.Rcc8? Qh7 9.Re7
Qxd3 10.Rxg7 Ke5
vii) Rxc2? Qh7 10.d4
Qxg6 11.Rd2 (11.Rc1 Bf7
(Also 11...Bxd4 ) 12.Rxa1
e5 13.Rd1 exd4 14.Rxd4+
Ke5 15.Rc1 Bxa2)
11...Bf7 12.Ng3 (12.Rc1
e5 13.Ng3 e4 14.Nf5 Qf6
15.Rxa1 h5) 12...Bxd4
12...e5 13.e4+ Ke6
14.d5+ Kf6 15.Rd3 Kg7
14.Rd1 d5 15.a3 a15,Rc7
Kd6 16.Rce8 Qh7 17.a3
Bg6 18.Kb4 Bd3 19.Re3
Be2 20.Rdc1 d4 21.exd4
Qg7 22.Nxe2 fxe2 23.Rd3
Qf8 24.f3 e5 25.dxe5+
Kxe5+ 26.Kb3 Qf7+
27.Kb2 Kf4 28.Re1 Qe6
29.a4 Kg3; b)15.Kb3 d4
16.exd4+ (b)16.Nf1 dxe3
17.Nxe3 d5 18.Rc7 Kf6
19.Rxa7 (b)19.Rc6 d4
20.Nf5 h5 21.Nxd4 hxg4
22.Ka3 g3 23.Re3 g4
24.fxg3 Qe4) 19...d4
Qc1+ 22.Kb3 Qc1--+
16...Kf4; 15...d6 16.Rc3
Be8 17.Kb4 Qh7 18.a4 a6
19.bxa6 (19.Ra1 axb5
20.axb5 Kf6 ZZ 21.e4
Qxe4) 19...Qa6 20.Kb3
Qxa6 21.Rd4 Qa5 22.Rc1
b5 23.axb5 Bxb5 24.Rb1
Be4+ 25.Kc2 Qa2+
26.Rb2 Qa4+ 27.Kb1 Qa5
28.Kc2 Qe1 29.Rd2 Be2
fxe2 32.Rxe2 Qf3
vii) 9...Ke5? 10.Rxa1 d5
11.d4+ Kd6 12.Rac1 Ke7
(12...Qh7 13.Nf6 Qd3
14.Rc7) 13.Rc1 Qh7
14.Rxg8 Qxg8 15.Rxd7+
Kxd7 16.Nf6+ Ke7
17.Nxg8+ Kf7 18.Nxf6+
Kg7 19.Kb4 Kxh6 20.Kc3
Kg6 21.Kd3 Kf6 22.e4
ix) 10.Rc2? Qb1 11.d4 e5
exd4+ x) 10...Qe5? 11.d4 Bxd4
(11...Qa8 12.Rc8++)
12.Rd2
xi) 11.d4 Bxd4 12.Rd2
Bb7 13.Rxd4+ Ke5
14.Ng3 Qa8+--
(xii) Black completes the
return Bristol and now
threatens 12...Qb7
followed by Bf7. The
alternatives fail as follows:
11...Bb2 12.Rc2;
Andrei Selivanov jubilee tourney (Selivanov-30JT)

This international formal tourney of the magazine Uralsky problemist was judged by A. Selivanov. Entries outside Russia came from Ukraine, Belarus, Latvia, Armenia, Georgia, Mongolia, Sweden, Israel. There was no set theme. The unsigned definitive award was published in a jubilee's award book (Moscow, 1997). 117 entries by 57 composers of which 67 were published. Remarks: It must be unique to have a jubilee tourney for a 30-year-old! But it's not every day that a study composer is also President of his national Chess Federation, a parliamentary (Duma) deputy, and President of the Russian chess composition committee - let alone be all these by the age of 30.

After the publication of the 'jubilee's' award book, Boris Sidorov sent useful comments. Marco Campioli prepared this award for EG, his comments are added in *italic*.

**No 13561**  N.Rezvov, S.N.Tkachenko
1st prize Selivanov-30JT

```
N. Rezvov, S. N. Tkachenko

(a8f4 0301.21 4/3 Win)

No 13561  Nicolai Rezvov, Sergei N. Tkachenko
Rb8/v 4.Kc7 Ra8/vi 5.Kb7 Rh8/vii 6.e4/viii, with:
  ii) But if now Rd4 2.Se6+ is fork-time.
  iii) "Black intends to take the 8th rank, and having neutralised the d7 pawn, play bKd3 and bKxe2, and shake hands.
  vi) Deflecting wK from the d-pawn.
  ix) This threatens to play 7...Rd8. If Kg5 7.Sc8 Rh7 8.Kc6 Rxd7 9.Kxd7 Kf4 10.Sc6 wins. And if Kxe4 7.Sc8 Kh7 8.Sc6+ wins.
```

7.Sd3 Kxe2 draw. It follows that White must defer making this check.

```
```

"A natural starting position, active play by both sides,
and the kernel move 6.e4!! make this study into something wholly exquisite, a worthy winner of the contest."

No 13562 N. Kralin, O. Pervakov
2nd prize Selivanov-30JT

- b2 10.h8Q b1Q 11.Qd4+ Ke2 12.Qe3+ (vacant!)
Kd1 13.Qd2 mate, or
- e1Q 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 (Kxe1; Qg1+) 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins.
   ii) 7.Kg6? would facilitate a future check from b1, and 7.Kg7 would block the a1-h8 diagonal.
   iii) 9...e1Q? 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins bQ one way, or if Kxe1 13.Qg1+, the other way.
   "Another natural position, stubborn black resistance, and the tempting try 5.Bh2? lend this study both charm and mystery."

*C* In the line 9... e1Q also 13.Qg4+ wins.

No 13563 V. Kalyagin, B. Olympiev
3rd prize Selivanov-30JT

- b2 10.h8Q b1Q 11.Qd4+ Ke2 12.Qe3+ (vacant!)
Kd1 13.Qd2 mate, or
- e1Q 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 (Kxe1; Qg1+) 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins.
   ii) 7.Kg6? would facilitate a future check from b1, and 7.Kg7 would block the a1-h8 diagonal.
   iii) 9...e1Q? 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins bQ one way, or if Kxe1 13.Qg1+, the other way.
   "Another natural position, stubborn black resistance, and the tempting try 5.Bh2? lend this study both charm and mystery."

*C* In the line 9... e1Q also 13.Qg4+ wins.

No 13563 V. Kalyagin, B. Olympiev
3rd prize Selivanov-30JT

- b2 10.h8Q b1Q 11.Qd4+ Ke2 12.Qe3+ (vacant!)
Kd1 13.Qd2 mate, or
- e1Q 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 (Kxe1; Qg1+) 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins.
   ii) 7.Kg6? would facilitate a future check from b1, and 7.Kg7 would block the a1-h8 diagonal.
   iii) 9...e1Q? 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins bQ one way, or if Kxe1 13.Qg1+, the other way.
   "Another natural position, stubborn black resistance, and the tempting try 5.Bh2? lend this study both charm and mystery."

*C* In the line 9... e1Q also 13.Qg4+ wins.

No 13563 V. Kalyagin, B. Olympiev
3rd prize Selivanov-30JT

- b2 10.h8Q b1Q 11.Qd4+ Ke2 12.Qe3+ (vacant!)
Kd1 13.Qd2 mate, or
- e1Q 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 (Kxe1; Qg1+) 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins.
   ii) 7.Kg6? would facilitate a future check from b1, and 7.Kg7 would block the a1-h8 diagonal.
   iii) 9...e1Q? 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins bQ one way, or if Kxe1 13.Qg1+, the other way.
   "Another natural position, stubborn black resistance, and the tempting try 5.Bh2? lend this study both charm and mystery."

*C* In the line 9... e1Q also 13.Qg4+ wins.

No 13563 V. Kalyagin, B. Olympiev
3rd prize Selivanov-30JT

- b2 10.h8Q b1Q 11.Qd4+ Ke2 12.Qe3+ (vacant!)
Kd1 13.Qd2 mate, or
- e1Q 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 (Kxe1; Qg1+) 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins.
   ii) 7.Kg6? would facilitate a future check from b1, and 7.Kg7 would block the a1-h8 diagonal.
   iii) 9...e1Q? 10.Bxe1 b2 11.h8Q b1Q 12.Qd4+ Ke2 13.Qf2+ Kd3 14.Qf5+ wins bQ one way, or if Kxe1 13.Qg1+, the other way.
   "Another natural position, stubborn black resistance, and the tempting try 5.Bh2? lend this study both charm and mystery."

*C* In the line 9... e1Q also 13.Qg4+ wins.
No 13564 S.N.Tkachenko, N.Mansarliisky
4th prize Selivanov-30JT

No 13564
Sergei N.Tkachenko, Nikolai Mansarliisky
(Ukraine) 1.Rh1/i a2/ii
2.Rc1+iii Kb5 (Kb4;Sxc5)
3.Rxc5+ Kb4 4.Sd4 a1Q
(Kxc5;Sxb3+) 5.Rb5+
Kc4/iv 6.Rc5+ Kb4 7.Rb5+
Kc3 8.Rxc3+ Kc4 9.Rb4+
(Rd3? Qb1;) Kc3
(Kxb4;Sc2+) 10.Rb3 with
a positional draw by virtue
of the checks on the b-file.
i) 1.Rxb3? Kxb3 2.Sxc5+
Kc4 3.Sd3 a2 wins for
Black, as does 1.Sxc5? b2
2.Rxa3 b1Q+ 3.Sd3 Qb7+
4.Kf4(Kf5) Kd4, when the
coordination of White's
pieces is disrupted.
ii) 2.Rb1 a2 3.Rxb2 a1Q
4.Rc2+ Kb4 5.Rxc5 draw.
iii) 2.Ra1? b2 3.Rxa2
b1Q+ wins.
iv) Ka4 6.Ra5+ Kxa5
7.Sb3+ draw.
"The familiar composers
please us this time with a
pair of positional draws."

No 13565
N. Kralin
5th prize Selivanov-30JT

No 13565
Nikolai Kralin
(Moscow) 1.a4 Kf4/i
2.a5 Be2 3.Kb7 Ke5
4.a6/ii Kd6 5.a7 Bf3+
8.Kb8 Kb6/iv 9.f4 Sf2
10.f5 Sd3(Sg4) 11.f6 Se5
12.f7 Bb7/v 13.a8S+, and the
completion of the
(intermittent) excelsior by
wPa2 secures White the
draw.
i) Ke4 2.f3+ Ke5 3.a5 Bf7
4.a6 Bd5 5.a7 draw,
ii) Try: 4.f4+? Kd6 5.a6
Sf2 6.a7 Bf3+ 7.Kb8 Ba8
8.f5 Sd3(Sg4) 9.f6 Se5
10.f7 Sd7+ 11.Kxa8 Ke7
12.f8Q Sb6 mate, including
an 'excelsior' (again
'intermittent', but wPf2
does promote in the course
of the solution).
iii) But not 7.Kxa8? Kc7
7.f4 - for which see (ii).
iv) It is not good to occupy
d7: Kd7 9.f4 Sg3 10.f5 Se4
11.f6 Sc5 12.f7, and there
is no check.
v) Sd7+ 13.Kc8 Ke6
"No question, this was a
study to the judge's taste -
pawn against knight and
bishop, and an excelsior.
Well done, Nikolai
Ivanovich."

No 13566
A.Manvelyan
6th prize Selivanov-30JT

No 13566
Aleksandr Manvelyan (Armenia) 1.b7
Re6+/i 2.Kg5 Re5+
3.Kf6/ii Rb5 4.b8Q Rx8
5.Bxb8 a3 6.bxa3/iii Kd3
7.Ke7 Kc4 8.Kd8 Kb5
11.Kc7, winning.
i) Rh1+ 2.Kg7 Rg1+ 3.Kf7
Rf1+ 4.Ke7 wins.
ii) Thematic try: 3.Kf4?
Rb5 4.b8Q Rx8 5.Bxb8
a3 6.bxa3 Kd3 7.Ke5 Kc4
10.Kd8 Ke6 11.Kc8
Kb6/zz, so a draw
iii) 6.b4? Kd3 7.b5 Kc4
8.b6 Kb5 9.b7 Kb6 draw.
"There is a strong thematic
try, and a mutual zugzwang, now in White's favour, now in Black's."

*C* Bb3 dual.

No 13567 Y. Bazlov
7th prize Selivanov-30JT

![](image1.png)

No 13568 Sergei Rumyantsev (Omsk) We read "1.Sb6+? Ke8, and Black will slowly win, according to new computer analysis." Well, two bishops 'always' win against a lone knight (the computer has effectively shown that to be so), and if there is a pawn on the knight's side that pawn may often be safely captured (even if sometimes after a positional struggle), so that in such cases the pawn 'makes no difference' to the result. However, there is (as yet) no computer that tells us infallibly when knight and pawn against two bishops (GBR class 0023.01) is, and is not, a win. A suggestion (which we have made before) is that a study whose soundness depends on a presumption of a certain general result in a specific GBR class on which there is currently no 'oracle' and no agreement is a valid study provided the composer clearly states his assumption. This would be a modern (ie computer age) corollary of the traditionally accepted convention of accepting known endgame theory as the backdrop for studies.

[AJR]


"A joint composition by computer and composer [it says here]. The material is of a new type, and the stuff of marathons. The try turned out to be more intriguing than the main line."


iv) 6.Rg7++ Kh8 7.Rf7 Kg8 draw.


"White makes ready a cell for the black queen, doomed to passivity for the whole solution length."

*C* Also 3.Ba4 draws.

No 13573 Viktor Razumenko (St Petersburg) 1...d1Q+/i 2.Kxd1 b1Q 3.Qg6/i Qxg6 4.h8Q Bh6 5.Qh7 Qxh7 stalemate.

i) b1Q+ 2.Kxb1 d1Q 3.h8Q Bh6+ draws.
ii) 3.Qb7? Bb2+ and White will be mated, albeit in 11 moves.

"Effective quiet sacrifices of two white queens prepare a pure ('ideal') stalemate."


i) 1.hRf7+? Ke8 2.fRe7+ Kd8? 3.eRd7+ Ke8 4.Kd6 wins, but 2...Kf8 scuppers this attempt.
ii) Ke8 4.Rc7+ Kd8 5.Ra7 Kc8 6.hRc7+ Kd8 7.Kf7 Rg1 8.Rd7+ Ke8 9.aRc7 mate.

"This heavy piece study with equal forces illustrates the attacker's possibilities."
No 13575 Y. Bazlov
honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

No 13576 S. Zakharov
honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

No 13577 P. Arestov
honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

c8a8 0520.01 3/3 Win
No 13575 Yuri Bazlov
(Vladivostok) 1.Bd6/i
Rd2/ii 2.Be4+ Ka7 3.Bc5+
Ka6 4.Be3 Rd1 5.Bc2 Rd5
Ka5 9.Bd2+ Rb4
10.Kc6(Kd6) wins.
i) 1.Be4+? Ka7 2.Bd6 Kb6
draw.
ii) Rf3 2.Be4+. Or Ka7
2.Bc5+. Or Rf6 2.Be4+
Ka7 3.Bc5+ Ka6 4.Bd3
draw.
"Thanks solely to bPa5 the
wBB dominate bR."

c3g4 0010.22 4/3 Win
No 13576 Sergei Zakharov
(St. Petersburg) 1.f3+/i
Kf4/ii 2.Bd4 Kxf3
5.a5 h3 6.a6 h2 7.a7 h1Q
8.a8Q+ and the stalemate
niche is no more, so White
wins.
i) 1.a5? h3 2.f3+ Kf4
draws. Not 1.Bd4? h3
2.f3+ Kxf3 3.Bg1 Kg2
draws.
ii) Kf3 2.a5. Or Kg3 2.Bf6
h3 3.Be7 wins, but, in this,
not 2.a5? h3 3.a6 h2 4.a7
h1Q 5.a8Q Qxf3+ draw.
iii) 3.a5? h3 4.a6 h2 5.a7
d5 6.a8Q h1Q 7.Qxd5+
Ke2 8.Qxh1 stalemate. Not
draws.
iv) Kg3 5.Bg5 h3 6.Bf6 h2
7.Bxd6+ wins.
"It's good to see White
clearing the stalemate reefs
underlying Black's
defence."

a4e6 0041.11 4/3 Win
No 13577 Pavel Arestov
(Moscow region) 1.Sd4+
Kd5/i 2.Sf3 Ke6 3.Sg5+/ii
Kf5 4.Sf7 Bg7 5.Kb5 Ke6
6.Sd8+ Ke7 7.Sb7 Ke6
8.Sc5+ Ke7 9.Sa6 Ke6
10.SC7+ Kf5 11.e6 Bxa1
12.e7 and wins.
i) Ke7 2.Sb5 Ke6 3.Sc7+
Ke7 4.Kb4 d6 5.exd6 Kxd6
6.Sb5+, with access to c7.
ii) And here's the thematic
try: 3.Kb5? betting on
Bg7? 4.Sg5+ Kf5 5.Sf7
Ke6 6.Sd8+ Ke7 7.Sb7
Ke6 8.Sc5+ Ke7 9.Sa6 (for
Sc5) winning because of
the capture check if Black
plays d6:, but Black has the
answer in playing the
p-move immediately:
3...d6, with either 4.Sg5+
Kd5 5.e6 B6 6.Bx6
stalemate!, or 4.Sd4+ Ke7
7.exd6+ Kxd6 8.Sf5+ Ke6,
drawing.
"The black piece bastion
systematically demolished
by neat manoeuvres of the white knight."

*C* 6... Kf5 draws.

No 13578 V. Dolgov
honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

c3h7 0405.00 4/3 Win

No 13578 Vasili Dolgov
(Krasnodar Province)
1.Sf8+ Kh6 2.Sf7+ Kh5
3. Sd7 Rb7/i 4.Sf6+ Kh4
7.Sd5 Rb5 8.Sf4+ Kh2
9.Rg2+ Kh1 10.Sg3 mate.
i) Rb5 4.Sd6 Rd5 5.Sf6+
ii) Rb8 6.Sf5+ Kh3 7.Sg4
and Rg3 mate to follow.

"The composer keeps faith to his theme, which here is a 4-piece systematic movement leading up to a pure checkmate."

*C* Duals: 2.dSe6;
3.Rg5+(Sg6); 4.dSe5;
5.Rg4; 6.dSe4; 7.Sg4;
8.dSe3; 10.Rg5.

No 13579 A. Kuryatnikov,
E. Markov
honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

h5f8 0164.00 3/4 Draw

No 13579 Anatoly
Kuryatnikov, Evgeny
Markov (Saratov) 1.Sg3,
with:
   - Bxg3 2.Re3 Sf4+ 3.Kg4
   - Bh2 4.Re3/i Bd5 5.Re2
   - Be6+ 6.Kf3 Bd5+ 7.Kg4
   - Be6+ 8.Kf3 Bd5+ 9.Kg4,
positional draw, or
   - Bf3+ 2.Kg6 Bxg3 3.Re3
   - Se1 4.Kg5 Bd2 5.Re6/ii
   - Kg7 6.Re7+ Kg8 7.Re8+
   - Kg7 8.Re7+ Kf8 9.Re6zz
   - Kf7 10.Re5zz Kg8
   - 11.Re8+ Kf7 12.Re5 Kf8
   - 13.Re6 positional draw again.
i) 4.Ra3? Bd5, and there is no Ra2.
ii) 5.Re5? Kf7zz - this time recizug to Black's gain.

"Two positional draws are amalgamated, the second of them even with mutual zugzwangs."

*C* In the line 1... Bxg3
also 5.Re8+ (and 6.Rc2) goes well.

No 13580 G. Slepyan
honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

a5c1 0016.11 3/4 Draw

No 13580 Grigor Slepyan
(Belarus) 1.Be5 hSf6
4.Kb7 Kd2 5.Bxb2 Kxb2
6.Kc8 Kc3 7.Kd8 Kg4
12.Kf8 Ke5 13.Kf7 Ke4
14.Kg6 Kf4 15.Kh6 Kg4
18.Kg6 Kd5 19.Kf7 Kd6
20.Kf8, positional draw.

"The way to the saving square h8 for a positional draw is far from straightforward. The king must tread with caution and it is to White's credit that he is equal to the task."
No 13581 V. Kalandadze  
honourable mention  
Selivanov-30JT

No 13582 N. Mansarliisky  
honourable mention  
Selivanov-30JT

No 13583 E. Markov  
commendation  
Selivanov-30JT

c8c1 0420.01 4/3 Win

No 13581 Velimir Kalandadze (Georgia)  
1.Bh6+ Kd1 2.Be2+/i Ke1  
3.Rxh2 Rc5+ 4.Kb7 Rc7  
5.Kb6 Rc6+ 6.Kb5 Rc5+  

i) 2.Bb7? h1Q 3.Rd2+ Ke1  
4.Bxl Rh5 5.Rdi+ Ke2  
draw.

"After the efforts of bR to  
surrender to wK fail, all the  
pieces arrive on the right  
squares for a known mating  
finish."


h1d3 0143.01 3/4 Win

No 13582 Nikolai Mansarliisky  
1.Bf4/i Bh5  
2.Kgl Ke2 3.Re6+/i Kf3  
4.Bxh6 Sg3 5.Re3+ Kg4  

i) 1.Kgl? Sd2 2.Bf4 Sf3+  

ii) 3.Ra2+? Ke1, and if  
4.Kg2 Bg4 5.Bxh6 Be6  
6.Ra1+ Ke2 7.Rxf1 Bh3+,  
or if 4.Ra1+ Bd1 5.Ra2  
Bb3 6.Rb2 Ba4 7.Kg2  
Be6+ 8.Kgl Ba4 9.Rbl+  
Bd1 10.Rb2 Ba4 11.Ra2  
Bb3, positional draw.

"The white pieces force  
Black to block two squares  
adjacent to their monarch,  
setting up the square for  
checkmate."


No 13583 Evgeny Markov  
(Saratov)  
1.b8Q h1Q  
2.Qg3+ Kf1+ 3.Kf4 Ke2  
4.Qe3+ Kd1 5.Qd3+ Kc1  
6.Qc3+ Kb1 (Kd1;Qa1+)  
7.Qb3+ Kc1 (Ka1;Bf6  
mate) 8.Bg5 f6 9.Bh6 Kd2  
10.Kg3+ with a quick  
mate.

"An attractive study with  
an unexpected ambush by  
the white bishop and  
setting up of a battery  
deadly for Black."


e4g2 0010.13 3/4 Win
No 13584 A. Kuryatnikov
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13585 A. Sadykov
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13586 Yuri Zemlyansky (Krasnoyarsk)
1...a2/i 2.Se2/ii b2 3.Sc1
b1Q 4.Sd3 Qb8+ 5.Kg1/iii
Qg8+ 6.Kf1 Qb3 7.Re1+
wins.
i) 1...Kb2 2.Se2 a2
3.Rxb3+. Or 1...Ka2 2.Se4
Kb2 3.Rc8 a2 4.Ra8 Kc2
5.Sc5 wins.
ii) 2.Re1+? Kb2 3.Se2 a1Q
4.Rxa1 Kxa1 5.f4 Kb1
6.Sc3+ Kb2 7.Sb5 Kc2 8.f5
b2 9.f6 Kb3 draw.

A 'plaything' study of the
kind to enrapture the
solver. By sacrificing his
knight White clears the
way for his queen on both
rank and file. Exquisite!

No 13587 Y. Lalyushkin
(Ekaterinburg)
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13588 Y. Zemlyansky
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

h3a5 0041.11 4/3 Win

No 13584 Anatoli
Kuryatnikov (Saratov)
1.Sb7+ Kb6/i 2.Sa5 Kxa5
3.Be1 Bxe1/ii 4.g7 b2
5.g8Q b1Q 6.Qa8+ Kb6
Or Kb4 2.Be7+ Kc4
ii) Kb4 4.g7 b2 5.g8Q b1Q
Re3+ 10.Ka4 draw.

As a consequence of
Black's Achilles heel, his
a2 pawn, White prevails
despite the appearance of a
new black queen.
i) 1.e7? Rxg7 2.e8Q Re7+ wins.

No 13589 B. Sidorov
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

Ra7 5.e7 Ba3 6.Sxg3+ Kf3
7.Sf5 Kf4, winning.

“The phoenix theme in
miniature form: white
makes a piece sacrifice to
replace it by promotion.”

Identical to V. Kalyagin
Schach #14108/1987.

No 13588 V. Kovalenko
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

“No 13590 B. Sidorov
commendation
Selivanov-30JT

h5c6 0610.20 4/3 BTM Draw

No 13590 B. Sidorov
(Apsheronsk) 1...Rg5+
2.Kh4 Rg4+i 3.Kh3 Kc7
4.h7 Rg3+ 5.Kh2/i Rg2+
Kh4+ 7.Kg7 Rg5+ 8.Kf6
draw.

drawn.

No 13589 Boris Sidorov
(Apsheronsk) 1.Qd4+
(Kf2+? Kd2;) Kc1 2.Qa1,
with:

- Qf7+ 3.Bf5+ Kd2

- Ra8 (Qc4+; Bf3+)

ii) 5.Kh4? Rg4+ 6.Kh5
Rh4+ 7.Kg7 Rg5+ 8.Kf6
draw.

"White is the underdog but
gets the upper hand through
harmonious play."
**No 13591** L.Togo-okhuu (Mongolia)

**Commendation**

Selivanov-30JT

1. Sc6 0-0+ 2. Kxg6, with:
- Re8 3. Sd4 Kg8 4. Kf6
  Ra8/i 5. Se6+ Kg8 6. Kg6
  Kf8 7. Re6 wins, or
- Ra8 3. Rd7 Re8 4. Rg7+
  Kf8 5. Rf7+ Kg8 6. Se7
  wins, or
  - Kh8 3. Se5 Kg8/ii 4. Sg4
  Kg8 5. Sf6+ wins.
  i) Rb8 5. Rd7 Ke8 6. Re7+
  Kd8 7. Sc6 wins.
  ii) Ra8 4. Sf7+ Kg8 5. Re6
  and 6. Sg5 wins. Or, lastly,
  Rg8+ 4. Kh6 Ra8 5. Sg6+
  Kg8 6. Rd7 wins.

"White's (extra) knight is used neatly and harmoniously to set up a theoretically winning position."

**C** *Duals. 5. Rd5 in the line 2... Re8. 3. Rd5; 4. Kf6; 4. Se7+ after 2... Ra8. 3. Se7; 4. Sc6 in the line 2... Kh8.

---

**No 13592** I. Bondar (Belarus)

**Commendation**

Selivanov-30JT

1. f6 Qh4+ 2. Kf7 h2

3. Rf8 Qh1 4. Qf4+/i Kg5

5. Qd4+ Kc6 6. Qc4+ Kd7

7. Sd6+ Kg7 8. Qa4+ Kg8

9. Qe8+ Kg7 10. Qe7+ Kb8

11. Qd8+ Ka7 12. Qd7+ Kb8

13. Qc8+ Ka7 14. Sb5

mate.

i) 4. Qb8+? Kg5 5. Qa8+ Ke5

6. Qxh1 stalemate.

"White uses his material preponderance to drive bK into a mating net."

---

**No 13593** Valerij Kalashnikov

(Ekaterinburg) 1. d7/i Sd4/ii

2. Bxd4 Kc7 3. g7, with:
- Ra3+ 4. Kb5 Ra8/iii

5. d8Q+ Rxd8 6. Bb6+ wins, or
- Rh5+ (Rg3;Be5+)

4. Kb4(Ka4) Kg5 5. d8Q+

Kxd8 6.Bf6+, another decisive check.

i) 1.g7? Ra3+ 2. Kb5 Ra8

3. d7 Sc3+ 4. Kc5 Sa4+

5. Kb6 Sxb6 draw.

ii) Rh5+ 2. Ka4 Rh4+

3. Ka3 Rh3+ 4. Kb2 Rd3

5. d8Q Rxd8 6. Bxd8 Sf4

7. g7 wins.

iii) Rh3+ 5. Kc4 Rh8, and the diagonal check 5. Be5+ does the trick.

"However hard he tries, Black cannot dodge the white bishop's dastardly daggers."

**C** *In the line 3... Ra3+ also ... 5.d8R(B+,S) go well; after 3... Rh5+ ...

5.d8B+ wins, too."
No 13594 Viktor Kichigin
9.Sd2 b1 10.g6 Kd3 11.Sb1 Kc2 12.g7 Kxb1
13.g8Q wins.
"A near-miniature with sacrifices of wS that are
out of the ordinary."  
8.Sd2 is a move inversion dual.

No 13595 Eduard
Kudenich (Tyumen region) 1.c8S+ Kb8/ii 2.a7+ Kc7/ii
"The fresh wS leaves bQ no escape clause: the forks
are not to be denied."  

No 13596 N.Argunov
(Barnaul) 1.fBR Bb4+ 2.Kxb4 flQ 3.Bxc3+ Ka2
4.Ra8+ Kb1 5.Ra1+ Kc2 6.Rxfl wins. If Lf8Q?
then 3...Kc2 4.Qxfl stalemate.
"White prudently
underpromotes on the very first move."  
*C* Unsound: both 1...
f1Q and 1... Ka3(Kb1,Kb3)

No 13597 Sergei
Borodavkin (Ukraine) 1.a7,
with - Kb2 2.a8Q a1Q 3.Qh8+
Ka2 4.Qg8+ Kb2 5.Qb3
mate, or
- Ba3+ 2.Kd7 Kb2 3.a8Q
a1Q 4.Qh8+ Ka2 5.Qg8+
Kb2 6.Qg7+ Ka2 7.Bb3+
Kb1 8.Qg6+ Kb2 9.Qc2
mate.
"A miniature synthesis of
two echo-mates with
self-block on a1 by bQ not
present in the diagram."  
Published in Pat a Mat
issue 16, 1992 and in 64-
Shakhmaty Obozrenie#08
*C*
2...
Bd2(Be3,Bf4,Sf3,Sf7,Sh3)
draw in the line 1... Kh2
and 2... Be5 [or 2... Kh2
3.a8Q Bb4(Bc5)] in the
line 1... Ba3+.  

71
No 13598 E.Chumburidze, D.Makhatadze (Georgia)
E.Chumburidze, Dzhemal Makhatadze (Georgia)
I.b7/i Ka6/i 2.b8Q Sc6+3.Kd6 Sxb8 4.f6 a2 5.f7
a1Q 6.f8Q, with
- Qa3+ 7.Kc7 Qxf8 stalemate, or
- Qd4+ 7.Ke6 Qe4+
i) 1.Kd6? Kxb6 2.Kxe7 a2 3.f6 a1Q 4.f7 Qg7 5.Ke8
Kc7 6.f8Q Qd7 mate.

No 13599 Sergei Radchenko (Rostov-on-Don) White’s
commendation White’s basic plan is 1.f6? Kxg5?
2.f7 Rf5 3.Re5, but at the moment there is Rxg5 2.f7
Rg2+ and Rf2;
1.h4 Kxh4 2.f6, with:
- Kxg5 3.f7 Rf5 4.Re5
Rxg5 5.f8Q wins, or
- Rxg5 3.Rh7+ Kg4
4.Rg7 Kh5 5.Rxg5+ Kxg5
6.f7 wins.
 "Short but complete in itself. BR is pinned in the
variations, once on the file and once (via a sacrifice)
on the rank"

No 13600 Sergei Osintsev (Ekaterinburg) 1.Kh4/i
Kg6 2.Kg4 Kg6 3.Kf4 Ke6
6.c4+ Kd6 7.c5+ Kc6
10.c6 Ke8/i 11.Ke4(Kd4)
Kd8 12.Kd4(Ke4) Kc8
13.Kd5 Ke7 14.Kc5zz Ke8
17.Kb5, with a win after
capturing the pawn.
i) 1.Kg4? Kg6 2.Kf4 Kf6
Kc6, and it’s a recizug: 6.c5
Kb5 7.Kd5 stalemate. White
must therefore lose a
tempo.
ii) Tempting White into
11.Kd6? Kd8 12.c7 Ke8
13.Kc6 stalemate. Or
 "The sole P-study among
the entries."
It may seem that many moves will do, but this is not so. 1.Qd8 Rd6+ 2.Kb8/ Kb6+ 3.Kc8 Bh3+ 4.Qd7 Bxd7+ 5.Kxd7 wins.


"A miniature with choice of first move."

No 13603 S.Abramenko commendation
Selivanov-30JT

Black is already cramped and the play essentially goes forward towards a single goal. The goal is to win the hP by choosing the right tempo moves, after which there is a dual-rich march by wK to c8.

"C* After 1... Bf6 also 2.Kf3 wins; in the line 1...
Bh4 ... 3.Kc4 goes well, too..."

special awards for malyutkas (maximum 5 chessmen)

No 13604 Grigor Slepyan
1st special prize
Selivanov-30JT

g7e8 0002.01 3/2 Win

No 13603 S.Abramenko
(Volzhsky) 1.Sc6, with:
- Bf6 2.Kh3 (Kg3? Bg5;)
Be5 3.Kg3 h4+ 4.Kh3 (Kg4? Bf6;)
Bf6 5.Kg4 wins, or
- Bh4 2.Kf3 Be1 3.Kf4 h4

"The tourney's best malyutka. White avoids..."
stalemate and, by losing a tempo, wins the opposition. An unexpected find in such familiar territory.

*C* Dual: 2.Sd5 (then ...
4.Sf6+).


No 13605 Y.Bazlov
2nd special prize
Selivanov-30JT

g3g1 0041.00 3/2 Win
No 13605 Yuri Bazlov
(Vladivostok) 1.Sf3+ Kh1
2.Sg5/i Kg1/ii 3.Bc4 Bf5
4.Ba6/iii Bd7 5.Sf3+ Kh1
i) 2.Sd2? Bd1 3.Kf2 Bg4
4.Sf1 Be6 5.Sg3+ Kh2
6.Sf1+ Kh1, the perpetual stalemate theme.
Kg3 5.Sh3+ Kh1, and a similar perpetual finale, but White wins by playing instead 3.Bd5+ Kg1 4.Bg2 with mate to follow.
iii) "Mutual zugzwang."
"One surprise follows another: recizug and domination in a malyutka. It is all so natural, but it is far from straightforward."

*C* 3.Sf3+; 4.Sf3+; 6.Sf2
waste time.

If 6...
Be6(Bf5) then
7.Bb7+ is unique.

No 13606 V.Kalandadze,
D.Pachkoria
3rd special prize
Selivanov-30JT

e1h6 0301.10 3/2 Win
No 13606 Velimir
Kalandadze, D.Pachkoria
1.e7 Rg1+i 2.Ke2(Kd2)
Rg2+ 3.Kd3 Rg3+ 4.Kd4
Rg4+ 5.Kd5 Rg5+ 6.Kd6/ii
Rg6 7.Sf6 Rxf6 8.Kd5
Rf3+ 11.Ke2 wins.
i) Rg8 2.Sf8 Rg5 3.Sg6
wins.
ii) 6.Ke6? Rg8 7.Sf8 Rg1
8.Sg6 Rxg6+ 9.Kf7 Rg7+
draw.

"An elegant malyutka showing an uphill march by the white king is followed by a Caucasian downhill slide. The knight sacrifice is a good plus."

*C* Minor duals: 3.Ke3;

No 13607 A.Manyakhin
4th special prize
Selivanov-30JT

g6f8 4010.00 3/2 Win
No 13607 Aleksandr
Manyakhin (Lipetsk)
1.Qc5+ Ke8 2.Kg5+ Kd8
3.Bg4 Qa6 4.Bf5 Ke8
5.Qe5+ Kd8 6.Qb8+ Ke7
7.Qc7+ Kf8 8.Qd8+ Kf7
9.Be4 and White wins.

"He does like his queen and bishop against queen! With no pawns around, White shows us how the pieces combine together."

*C* Duals: 1.Qg7+;

And "wastes of time" alternatives from move 3 onwards.
No 13608  V. Ryabtsev
5th special prize
Selivanov-30JT

1. a7 g1Q 2. a8Q+ Kb4 3. Qa4+ Ke3 4. Qb3+ Kd2 (Kd4; Se6 mate)
5. Se4+ Ke2/ii 6. Qc2+ Kb1 7. Qd3+ Kg2
8. Qg3+ Kh1 9. Qh3+ (Sf2+? Qxf2;) Qh2 10. Kg1 11. Qf1 mate.

ii) Kb5 3. Qa4+ Kb6 4. Qa6+ Ke7 5. Qb7+, and Kd6
6. Qe4 mate, or Kd8 6. Qd7 mate.
iii) Kb5 3. Qa4+ Kb6 4. Qa6+ Ke7 5. Qb7+, and Kd6
6. Qe4 mate, or Kd8 6. Qd7 mate.

"The white queen and
knight do not give Black a
chance - it's mate in one
long expulsion of breath."

*C* Duals:
5. Qa2(Qb2) waste time.

No 13609  D. Gurgenidze
special honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

I: diagram
II: remove wSf3, add wSf5

No 13610  S. Rumyantsev
special honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

I: identical (mirrored) to E. Pogosyants, source unknown, 1981.

*C* Wastes of time:
4. Bd3(Bb4); 5. Bc2.

No 13611  V. Samilo
special honourable mention
Selivanov-30JT

"A pair of echo checkmates
in one and the same
malyutka. A synthesis of
this kind is a great joy."
(Kharkov) 1.0-0-0 Ke3
2.Rd3+ Kxd3 3.Kxb2 Kd4
4.Ka3 Ke5 5.Ka4 Kb6

"A first-time synthesis of long castling with I.Dritina's pawn study - in malyutka form."

No 13612 V.Zheglov special honourable mention Selivanov-30JT

No 13613 Evgeny Markov (Saratov) 1.Kf3, with:
- h5 2.Kg3 h4+ 3.Kh3 Kg1 4.a4 Kf2 5.a5 Kf3 6.a6 g4+ 7.Kxh4 g3 8.a7 g2 9.a8Q+ wins.

"Two known finales - in malyutka form."


"A stubborn struggle ends in stalemate. Many tries provide embellishment."

*C* Duals: 1.Sd6 Sh6 and now 2.Sb5+; 2.Sb3+. 
No 13615 David Gurgenidze (Georgia)
1.Kg1, with:
"Unique moves in two variations each showing corner to corner movements by the white king."
*C* Minor dual in the line 1... Kg3: 7.Kc1.

No 13616 Ivan Bondar (Belarus) 1.Bb2, with:
- Sd3 2.Kf4 Sf1 3.Bc1 Kd7 4.g4 Ke6 5.g5 Kf7 6.Kf3 wins.
"A tasteful cornering of the isolated knight - in malyutka form."
*C* In the line 1... Kd6 there are "wastes of time": 2.Kf5; 5.Kf4(Kh3,Kh4).

"The white pieces have to cope with a pawn on the threshold of promotion, and then when it turns into a knight."
Identical (mirrored) to E.Pogosyants Stavropolskaja Pravda 1977 (see Mat v Etyudakh#3262)
*C* Duals: 1.Kc4(Kd4); 2.Sc4.
A lot of wastes of time from move 5 to move 6.
No 13618 V.Kalyagin

special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13619 D.Gurgenidze,

Yochanan Afek

special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13620 D.Pikhurov

special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13621 V.Zheglov

special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13618 Viktor Kalyagin
(Ekaterinburg)
1.Sd2/i f2 2.Kh4/ii Be1/iii
3.Sf1 Kf3 4.Kh3 Bf4 5.Sg3
Bb8 6.Sf1 Ke2 7.Kg2 Bf4
8.Kh1 Ke1 9.Kg2 Ke2
10.Kh1 Kf3 11.Sg3 Bb8
12.Sf1 Ke2 13.Kg2 Bf4
14.Kh1 Kf3 15.Sg3,
position draw.
i) 1.Kh4? Ke3 2.Kh3 Ke2
3.Kg3 Be5+, and Black
wins.
ii) 2.Sf1? Kf3 3.Kh4 Kg2
4.Se3+ Kg1 and 5...Bc1.
Black avoids mainline
stalemates on moves 5, 8
and 11.
"Horwitz, 1852 vintage,
developed with a 4-move
intro that has all the active
force move into position."

No 13619 David
Gurgenidze (Georgia),
Yochanan Afek (Israel)
1...Rd5+ 2.Ke2 Rd8 3.Kh3
Kf3 4.Kf4 Kh4 5.Kf5 Kh5
"The white king takes the
long way round to reach
familiar territory."

No 13620 Dmitri Pikhurov
(Horwitz, 1852 vintage,
developed with a 4-move
intro that has all the active
force move into position."

No 13621 V.Zheglov
(Moscow) 1.Qh5/i Qg4/ii
2.Qe5+ Kg8 3.Qb8+ Kf7
i) 1.Qe8+? Qg8 2.Qe7
Qxe6+ 3.Qxe6 stalemate.
ii) Qg2(Qg1) 2.Qh4 Kg8
3.Qd8+Kf7 4.Sg5+ wins.
Or Kg3+ 2.Kg6+.
iii) 3.Sg5? Kf8? 4.Qg7+
Ke8 5.Qf7+ Kd8 6.Se6+ is
a good idea, but it falls foul
of Qh4+ 4.Kg6 Qh7+ Sxh7
stalemate.

No 13622 B. Sidorov
special commendation
Selivanov-30JT
I:

A curious pair of neat
pawnless malyutkas.
*C*
I: Duals: 1.Qe3(Qg3,Qh3); 2.Qd5(Qe3); 3.Qb6(Qb7);
4.Qb6(Qe6); 5.Qg3; 6.Qd3(Qh4); 7.Qa7; 8.Ke1.
"Wastes of time"
alternatives from move 1 to
move 6.
II: Duals: 4.Kh6;
5.Qd5(Qd6,Qd8,Qh3).
"Wastes of time":
5.Qc6(Qe8).

No 13623 D. Gurgenidze
special commendation
Selivanov-30JT
I:

h5h7 1330.00 2/3 Win
II:

h5h7 1330.00 2/3 Win
No 13622 Boris Sidorov
(Apsheronsk) I:1.Qd3+
Ka2 2.Qa6+ Kb1 3.Qg6+
Ka2 4.Qg8+ Kb1 5.Qh7+
Kb2 6.Qb7+ Kc3 7.Qc7
Kd4 8.Qb6(Qa7)+ wins.
II: 1.Qb1+ Kg7 2.Qf5+2
Re8 3.Qd7+ Kf8 4.Kg6
Re7 5.Qf5+ Ke8 6.Qe8
mate.

No 13624 D. Makhatadze
special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13623 D. Gurgenidze
special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

No 13624 Dzhemal
Makhatadze (Georgia)
1.Kc7 Ke6 2.Kc6 Ke5
3.Kc5 h5/i 4.d4+ Kf6
5.d5/i h4 6.d6 h3 7.Kb6 h2
8.d7 Ke7 9.Kc7 h1Q
10.Qd8+ draw.
i) Ke4 4.d4 h5 5.d5 and
White wins.
ii) 5.Kb6? h4 6.d5 Ke5,
and 7.Kc6? is a clear
blunder.
"Somehow both pawns
promote 'simultaneously'."

No 13623 David
Gurgenidze 1.h5 Re1
2.Kb4 (Ka4? Rb1;) Kg4
3.b6 Kf5 4.Kb5 Ke6 5.b7
Kd7 6.b8+ drawing.
"Promotion to knight - is
what saves White."

No 13624 Dzhemal
Makhatadze (Georgia)
special commendation
Selivanov-30JT
See EG113.9493 by the
same author. Also
No 13625 A. Grin = special commendation
Selivanov-30JT

A3a5 0332.10 4/3 Draw
No 13625 A. Grin
(Moscow) l.Sd7 (for b7)
Rxd7 (Bxd7; Se5) 2.Se5
Rg7 3.b7 Rxg7 4.Sc4+ Ka6
5.Sd6 draw.

"This special honour is for an unprecedented work by such a Methuselah." Luis Parenti of Argentina might dispute the 'unprecedented'! Published (A. Gulyaev) in Shakhmaiyv SSR 1938.

*C* Black wins: 2... Rd1
(Deutsche Schachzeitung/5 1938)

Československý šach 1999-2000 *H*

This informal tourney was judged by Jaroslav Polasek (Czech Republic). 40 studies were published, but three appeared in the delayed Hoch JT award, and were disqualified by the judge. After testing, 30 correct studies remained.

No 13626 Mario Matous

h3h1 0000.14 3/6 Win
No 13626 Mario Matous
(Prague) l.g8Q Kg1/i
2.Qxg5 h1Q+ 3.Kg4 Bd6/ii
4.Qf6/iii Bc7/iv 5.Qe7 Bb8
6.Qd8 Be5 7.Qd2/v Kh2/vi
8.Bf2 g1Q+ 9.Bg3 mate.

i) g1S+ 2.Kg4 gxh4


iii) 4.Qd2? Qxh4+ 5.Kxh4
Kf1 6.Qd3+ Kf2; 4.Qh6?
Bb8 ZZ.

iv) Bb8 5.Qh6 ZZ, with: a5
6.Qb6+, or: Be7 6.Qc1+,
or: Be5 6.Qe3+, or: Qxd4+
6.Qxh4 Kf1 7.Qh3 Kf2

v) 7.Qa5? Bd6 8.Qd5
Qxh4+.

vi) Qxd4+ 8.Kxh4 Kf1
"White avoids by precise play a reciprocal zugzwang and forces bB to e5. This eliminates the Q sac threat on h4. Black's last chance - promotion with check - ends with an unexpected mate. Surely the best study in this tournament".

No 13627 Ladislav Salai
2nd Prize Československý šach 1999-2000 viii/1999

e7a1 0000.34 4/5 Win
No 13627 Ladislav Salai
(Slovakia) l.bQ b1Q
2.d7/i b2/ii 3.Qa8+ /iii Qa2
4.d8Q b1Q 5.Qh8+ Qb2
6.Qh1+ Qb1 7.Qa8+ Qa2
10.Kd4 h3 11.Kc3 Qxh1/v

i) 2. Qa8+? Qa2 3. Qh1+ Qb1 4. Qxb1+ Kxb1 5. d7 b2 6. d8Q Kc2.

ii) Qe4+ 3. Kd6 b2 4. Qa5+ Kb1 5. d8Q.


"An original four-Queens duel. White paralizes the Queens from a long distance, and wins the 'pawn ending'".

No 13630 Virgil Nestorescu
4th Prize Ceskoslovensky šach 1999-2000 xii/1999

iv) Qc4 3. d3 Qc8+ 4. Sg6; Qg1+ 3. Kh6 Qg4 (Qg8; Sg6) 4. Sg6+ Qh3+ 5. Kg7 Qd7+ 6. f7 Qxc7 7. e6.


vi) 3. Qh1+ Ke2 4. Qxh2+.

No 13629 Mario Matous

d3f2 0312.01 4/3 Win

No 13630 Virgil Nestorescu (Rumania)
4. d3/vi Kxe5/vii 5. d4/viii Ke4 6. f8Q Qc1
7. d5 Qg1+ 8. Kf6 wins/vx.


ii) Kbd 2. f7 Qe5 3. d4 Qf8
4. Kg6 Kxc7 5. d5 Kd7
6. Sg7 Qb4 7. Sf5 Qg4+
8. Kf6, or here Qe7+ 4. Kg6
Kxc7 5. Sf4 Kd8 6. Kg7
Qd7 7. Sg6 Qa7 8. e6

iii) 2. f7? Qxe7 3. f8Q Qxe5+ 4. Kg6/xi Qe4+
5. Kh6 Qe6+ 6. Sf6 Qh3+
7. Sh5 Qe6+ 8. Kh7 Qe4+
9. Kh8 Qe5+ 10. Kg8 (Sg7; Qh2+) Qg5+.

No 13630 Virgil Nestorescu
4th Prize Ceskoslovensky šach 1999-2000 xii/1999

g5c5 3001.40 6/2 Win

No 13629 Mario Matous
(Prague) 1. Bd4+ Ke1
(Kg3; Se2+) 2. Sg2+ Kd1
3. Se3+ Ke1 4. Se2+ Kd1
5. Sc4 Rb1 6. Sb2+ Ke1
7. Kc3 Rxb2 8. Se3+ Kb1

"White forces bK into the corner by a S's sac. A nice creation of the final zugzwang!".

No 13628 Mario Matous

d3f2 0312.01 4/3 Win

"White forces bK into the corner by a S's sac. A nice creation of the final zugzwang!".

No 13630 Virgil Nestorescu (Rumania)
4. d3/vi Kxe5/vii 5. d4/viii Ke4 6. f8Q Qc1
7. d5 Qg1+ 8. Kf6 wins/vx.


ii) Kb6 2. f7 Qe5 3. d4 Qf8
4. Kg6 Kxc7 5. d5 Kd7
6. Sg7 Qb4 7. Sf5 Qg4+
8. Kf6, or here Qe7+ 4. Kg6
Kxc7 5. Sf4 Kd8 6. Kg7
Qd7 7. Sg6 Qa7 8. e6

iii) 2. f7? Qxe7 3. f8Q Qxe5+ 4. Kg6/xi Qe4+
5. Kh6 Qe6+ 6. Sf6 Qh3+
7. Sh5 Qe6+ 8. Kh7 Qe4+
9. Kh8 Qe5+ 10. Kg8 (Sg7; Qh2+) Qg5+.

iv) Qc4 3. d3 Qg8+ 4. Sg6;
Qg1+ 3. Kh6 Qg4 (Qg8; Sg6) 4. Sg6+ Qh3+ 5. Kg7 Qd7+ 6. f7 Qxc7 7. e6.

v) 3. Kg6? Qxe7 4. f7 Qf8; 3. e6? Qe5+ 4. Kg6 Kxf4
5. f7 Qg5+ 6. Kh7 Qh5+
7. Kg7 Qg5+ 8. Kf8 Qh6+, or here 5. e7 Qg5+ 6. Kg7
Qh5+ 7. Kf6 Qe5+.

vi) 4.f8Q? Qxe5+ 5. Kg4
Qg7+ 6. Qxgl first stalemate.

vii) Kf3 5.f8Q Qxe5+
6. Qf5 Qe7+ 7. Kh5 Qe8+
8. Sg6+.

viii) 5.f8Q? Qd8+ 6. Qxd8 second stalemate.

ix) a theoretical win, e.g.

x) 2.Kg6 Qg2+ 3. Kf5/xiii
Qh3+ 4. Kf6 Qh4+ 5. Ke6
Qg4+ 6. Ke7 Qg5+ 7. Kd7
Qf5+ 8. e6 Qd5+ 9. Ke7
Qd6+; 2.Kf6 Qh6+ 3. Ke7
Kxe6 4. BQ (e6; Kd5)
Qxf8+ 5.Kxf8 Kd5; 2.Kf5
Qd3+ 3. Kf6 (Ke6; Qd5+)
Qd8+ 4.Kg6 Kxc6 5.Sf6
Qe7 6.Sg4 Qe6+.

xi) 3.Kg6 Kxc6 4. Se6 Qe7
5. f8Q Qxe6+ 6. Qf6 Kd5.

xii) 4.Qf5 Qxg5+ 5.Kxf5
Kd3 4.Kg4 Qe2+

xiii) 3.Kh6 Qxe6+ 4. Sf6
Kd4; 3.Kh7 Qe4++; 3.Kf6
Qxc6+ 4. e6 Qf3+ 5. Ke7

"A remarkable duel of White's pawns with the bQ.
White has to avoid promotion two times because of stalemate".
No 13631 Emil Vlasák  
1st Hon. Mention  
Československý šach 1999-2000 i/1999

b6a1 023.01 3/4 Win

No 13631 Emil Vlasák  
(Usti nad Labem) 1.Rf2/i  
Bd5/ii 2.Re1/iii Bc6/iv  
3.Rg1 Bd5 4.Rf5/v Bb3  
5.Ka5+ Ba2 6.Rb5/vi Bc4  
7.Rb4/vii Bd5 8.Rd1 Be6  
9.Re1 Bg8/viii 10.Kg7  
Ka2/ix 11.Re3/x Sd2 (Bd5;  
Rd4+) 12.Ra4+ Kb1  
13.Kxg8 Kc1 (Kc2; Ra2)  
wins/xiii.

i) A Vorplan. 1.Rf1? Ka2  
2.Rxb1 Bc2; Thematic try:  
1.Ra7+? Ba2 2.Rb7 Bd5  
3.Ra7+ Ba2 4.Re7 Bb3  
5.Re2 Bd5 6.Rg1 Ka2, or  
6.Rf1 Be4, or 6.Rd1 Bf3.  
ii) Bc4 2.Kg7; Ka2 2.Rhh2.  
iii) 2.Rhh2? Sd2; minor  
dual: 2.Rd1 Bc4 3.Rg1 see  
main line, or here Be4  
iv) Ka2 3.Re2; Interesting  
is Be4 3.Kg7 Bd3 4.Rf3  
Be4 5.Ra3+ Ba2 6.Rc3,  
preventing Bb3, Bd5 7.Re5  

see main solution.

v) The main plan begins  
here. 4.Kg5? Ka2 5.Kf4  
Sa3 6.Ke3 Kb3 7.Kd4 b1Q  
8.Rxb1+ Sxb1.

vi) Preventing Bb3; 6.Kg5?  
 stalemate.

vii) This tempo move is  
necessary, else Ka2, for  
example: 7.Rb6? Ka2  
8.Rg2 Bb3 9.Ra6+ Sb3  
10.Kg5 Bc2 11.Rxc2 Kb3  
12.Rc8 b1Q 13.Rb6+ Ka2  
14.Rxb1 Sxb1.

viii) Bb is dominated. After  
9...Bd5 there is a pointe:  
10.Re2 Sd2 11.Rxd2 b1Q  
12.Rxb1+ Kxb1 13.Rxd5  
wins, so square d5 is  
poisoned.

ix) The last chance. After  
10...Ba2 Black would  
loose, although it does take  
some time: 11.Kf6 Bg8  
12.Rg1 Bd5 13.Ke5 Bf7  
16.Rc1 Bg8 17.Kd3 Bd5  
18.Kc2 Bxb7 19.Rxb1+  
Ka2 20.Rxb2+ Ka3  
21.Rxb7, or here Be4+  
19.Rxe4 Sb3+ 20.Kc3 b1Q  

x) 11.Kxg8? Sc3 12.Re8  
Ka1 13.Ra8+ Sa2 draws.  
xi) b1Q 15.Re1 mate; Kc2  
15.Re2.

xii) 15.Ra8? Kc2 16.Re8+  
Kd1 17.Rb3 b1Q 18.Rh1+  
Kc2 19.Rxb1 Sxb1 20.Kf7  
Kd3.

xiii) e.g. Kc2 16.Rh3 Kb1  
17.Ra8 Kc2 18.Re8+ Kd1  

"An interesting duel of  
white's Rooks with the bB.  
A very difficult study.  
Unfortunately, after the  
most logical defence 10...Ba2  
the finish is unambiguous,  
else the study would have  
been a candidate for a top  
ranking."

Harold van der Heijden  
2nd Hon. Mention  
Československý šach 1999-2000 ix/1999  
See page 90.

"It is astonishing that it is  
still possible to find  
original zugzwangs with  
such limited material.  
The reciprocal zugzwang is  
nicely highlighted with a  
thematic try (3.a7).  
But the difficult technical  
lines are a little worrisome."

No 13632 Mario Matous  
3rd Hon. Mention  

b8g8 3200.01 3/3 Win

No 13632 Mario Matous  
(Prague) 1.Rg1+ (Rg2+?;  
Kh8) Kf7 (Kh8; Kb7)
2.Rf1+ Ke7 3.Re1+ i/ Kg7
4.Rd1+ Ke7 5.Re2+ Kg7
6.Rf1+ Kg7 7.Rg2+ Kh8
8.Kc7 wins.
i) 3.Re2+? Kd6 4.Rd1+
Kc5 5.Re2+ Kb4 6.Rb1+
Ka3.
"A six-piece study with a
fine introduction and final
quite move that will be
attractive to o.t.b. players".

No 13633 Mario Matous
4th Hon. Mention
Československý šach 1999-
2000 ix/1999

b8d4 0040.21 4/3 Win
No 13633 Mario Matous
(Prague) 1.a5 (c6; Bd8)
Be7 2.c6 Bd6+ 3.c7 (Kb7?;
Kxd5) Ke5 4.Kb7 Bxc7
5.a6 (Kxc7?; Kb5) Bb6
f2 9.a8Q f1Q 10.Qa6+
wins.
"A miniature for solvers".

No 13634 Karel Husák
1st Commendation
Československý šach 1999-
2000 i/2000

No 13635 L. Koblizek
2nd Commendation
Československý šach 1999-
2000 xii/2000

e6h8 0030.42 5/4 Draw
No 13635 L. Koblizek (Fr.
Lazne) 1.g6 Bc5 2.Kf5/i
Bd6 3.Kg5/ii Bg3/iii 4.h6
gxh6+ 5.Kh5 ZZ Kg8 6.g7
Kg7 7.g5 Bxh2 8.g6+
Kxg7 9 Kh4 Bf4 10.Kxh3
draws.
i) 2.h6? gxh6 3.Kf7 Bd4
4.Kf8 Be5 5.Kf7 Bg7
6.Kc6 Kg8 7.Kf5 Bf8 8.g5
h5 9.g7 Bd6 wins.
ii) 3.g5? Bxh2 4.Kg4 Bf4
5.Kxh3 Bxg5 wins.
iii) Bxh2 4.Kh4 Bf4
5.Kxh3 Bg5 6.Kg3 Kg8
"The idea attracted me so,
that I added two extra
move to the introduction".

b8d4 0040.21 4/3 Win
No 13633 Mario Matous
(Prague) 1.a5 (c6; Bd8)
Be7 2.c6 Bd6+ 3.c7 (Kb7?;
Kxd5) Ke5 4.Kb7 Bxc7
5.a6 (Kxc7?; Kb5) Bb6
f2 9.a8Q f1Q 10.Qa6+
wins.
"A miniature for solvers".
No 13636 Vassily Dolgov & Viktor Kolpakov
3rd Commendation

No 13637 Aleksandr Stavrietsky
4th Commendation

No 13638 Karel Husáč
Special Prize
Československý šach 1999-2000 xi/1999

**No 13636 Vassily Dolgov & Viktor Kolpakov**
(Russia) l.Qf3+ Qb7 2.Qf8+ Ka7 3.Qf2+ Kb8 4.Qa2+ Qa7 5.Qg8+ Ka7 6.Qa8+ Kb8 7.Qg4+ Ka8 8.Qa1+ Qa7 9.Qd4+ Kb8 10.Qg5+ Qa7 11.Qa5+ Kb8 12.Qg3+ Ka8 13.Qd8+ Qa7 14.Qc5+ Qa8 15.Qd5+ Qb7 16.Qd8+ Ka7 17.Qc5 wins/i.


"Impressive manoeuvre of wQ, but the finish is not unique".

**No 13637 Aleksandr Stavrietsky**
(Russia) 1.Rd7+/i Kb8 2.Rxf7+ Rxd5+ 3.Kxd5 Bg8 4.Ke6 Bh4 5.a6 Ka8 6.a7 draws/ii.


**No 13638 Karel Husáč**

- Kd3 9.Sh6/vi Kg3 10.Sf7 Kg2 11.Se5 draw, or

- f3 9.Sg3+ Ke3 10.Sh1/vii draws.


**No 13638 Karel Husáč**

- Kd3 9.Sh6/vi Kg3 10.Sf7 Kg2 11.Se5 draw, or

- f3 9.Sg3+ Ke3 10.Sh1/vii draws.


- v) 8.Sg6? f3 9.Se5 f2


An original PP vs R win. Resourceful black’s counterplay is surpassed by an unexpected King decoy. But the introduction is a little rough".

Tidskrift for Schack 2000

Judge Jarl Ulrichsen (Norway) comments that the entries of the informal annual tourney are not of the quality, nor quantity (only 16 studies) this magazine received during the 60's and 70's, when the best composers of the world used to compete. Steen Vestergaard (Denmark) and Marco Campioli (Italy) cooked a number of entries. The provisional award was published in TFS no. 5 y-vi/2001 with a three months confirmation period.

No 13642 Emil Melnichenko 1st/2nd Prize Tidskrift for Schack 2000

1f4 0300.64 7/6 Win

i) 1.d3+? Ke3 2.f7 Rg4 3.f8Q Rf4+ draws.
ii) Rg5 2.d3+ Ke5 3.e4 Rg6 4.d4+ wins.
iii) Rg5 3.d3+ Ke5 4.e4


vi) 5.h3? Sh8 6.h4 Sg6 7.Kf5 Sf4+, or here 6.e6 Sg6

No 13643 Harold van der Heijden 1st/2nd Priz Tidskrift for Schack 2000

1f3 0006.43 4/3 Win


v) Sh(d)4+ 4.Kf5.
vi) 5.h3? Sh8 6.h4 Sg6 7.h5 Sf4+, or here 6.e6 Sg6
No 13644  Franjo Vrabec
1st Hon.Mention Tidskrift
for Schack 2000

No 13645 Harold van der Heijden
2nd Hon.Mention Tidskrift
for Schack 2000
No 13646 Karel Husák
1st Commendation
Tidskrift för Schack 2000
b3>d3 0540.23 6/6 Win
No 13646 Karel Husák
(Czech Republic)
1.Bxe4+i Kxe4 2.Rxe2+i
Bxe2 3.a7+/ii Bdl+ (Bf3;
Rf8) 4.Kb4/v Bxa4
Rb1+ 7.Ka2 Rb2+ 8.Ka1
Rb3 9.Rd8+ Kc2 10.a8R
Rb1+ 11.Ka2 Rb2+ 12.Ka3
Rb3+ 13.Ka4 Kb2 14.Rab8
Rxb8 15.Rxb8+ Ka2
16.Rc8 Kb2.
vii) 7.Qxe8? Rbl+;
7.Qd+? Kd2 8.Qe4 Re1
9.Qd4+ Ke2 10.Qxc3
(Kxe3; Kf3) Kf2.
ix) 7.a8Q Rxal+ 8.Kb4
Rxa4+ 9.Qxa4 Bxa4
No 13647 Marco Campioli
2nd Commendation
Tidskrift för Schack 2000
No 13647 Marco Campioli
(Italy) 1...d1Q+ 2.Kxd1
a1Q+ 3.Kc2 Qb2+ 4.Kf1
Qc1+ 5.Kf2 Qd2+ 6.Kg1
Qe1+ 7.Kh2 Qh4+ 8.Qh3
Qf2+ 9.Kh1 Qe1+ 10.Kg2
Qd2+ 11.Kg3 Qxg5+
12.Qg4 Qe3+ 13.Kh4
Qxb6+ 14.Qh5+ Qxh5+
15.Kxh5 Kxe6 16.Kg6 e3
17.f7 e2/i 18.f8Q+ e1Q
19.Qe8+ wins.
Springaren 2000
The judge, Amatzia Avni
(Israel), received 20 studies
for adjudication for this informal tourney. HvdlH
was consulted for correctness
and anticipation checking. The
judge considered the overall
level quite reasonable.
The award was published in
Springaren no. 85, vi/2000,
without mentioning a confirmatory period.
No 13648 Sergei Rumyantsev
Springaren 2000 ix/2000

No 13649 Johann Furhoff, Gunnar Holmqvist, Bo Lindgren, Axel Ornstein & I.Werner
Springaren 2000 iii/2000

No 13650 Axel Ornstein
Springaren 2000 iii/2000

e3h1 0408.02 4/6 Draw


ii) Qa3+ 7.Sg3+ Kg1 8.Rf4.

"The star move 6.Kh3! forces the draw, and the side variation 3...Sd3! is a bonus".


"White waits until Black plays 4...a4 to unleash a rook sacrifice that catches Black's knight with no flight squares".

No 13650 Axel Ornstein


"Two 'quiet' piece sacrifices, a good key, but the play is a bit obvious".
**ARTICLES**

*C* THE ETHICAL ENDGAME STUDY
Annotating interesting odb positions for studies -- the moral stance
John Roycroft

Consider this most attractive study which, we suggest, illustrates many of the posers a judge may encounter when the use of a computer is suspected. The reader is invited to act as judge.

**No 13653** Harold van der Heijden
2nd honourable mention, Československý sach 1999-2000

d5e8 0301.31 5/3 Win


"A precise series of checks proves the strength of the Q-S pair".
i) Rfl 3.a7/v Rd1+ 4.Kc6 Rc1+ 5.Kb7 Kd8 (Kd7; Sb6+ Ra1 7.a8Q+ Rx8 8.Kx8; Rf7 3.Kc6 Kd8 4.a7 is the main line; Kd7 3.Sb6+ Kd(e)c 4.a7.


The above solution is from the composer. 4.a7!! is a delicious move! We add only that the study's central pillar of reciprocal zugzwang is *C* and can be found online at: chess.jaet.org/cgi-bin/dtmc?fen=3k4/rlN5/2KP4/8/8/8/8/8

Our article that follows does not relate to the above study, but develops an aspect that has as yet to receive the full attention we believe it warrants.

In this article we set down our considered personal viewpoint, as composer, solver, FIDE judge, author and editor. We look on the computer as a friend, but friendship can be abused. We see a deep distinction between composing as the classical composers did and composing by lifting a position from a published list generated by computer. This distinction, we aver, must be maintained as long as possible. The only question is, how?

The composer's name above a diagram is both a claim of originality and an acceptance of responsibility. If a composer lifts a tempting position from an odb (or from a list derived from an odb) and incorporates it into a study for publication then he is under a moral obligation plainly to state what he has done, just as he would acknowledge a fellow composer's joint authorship. There is more: to repay the implicit debt of the free gift, the composer has a duty to expound the selected *C* position(s) in terms understood by the ordinary player-solver. Until a position can be explained - - with a minimum of variations -- it should not figure in a study.

It is this duty of exposition that we now address.

A built-in but under-used capability of an odb is to explain what is going on inside it. To achieve this in a particular instance the qualified user starts from a conjecture of his own which he refines recursively (by making conjecture-consistent moves and examining the odb's optimal responses) until the conjecture is transformed into a hypothesis that holds water. This procedure works because of the rock-solid certainty of the oracle.

Our article takes a necessarily superficial and preliminary look at the *C* longest reciprocal zugzwang in the almost unexplored 6-man...
pawnless endgame GBR class 0134 (rook and knight against bishop and knight) and gives a simple example of the above outlined procedure in action. It is hoped greatly to expand this article for submission for publication elsewhere.

Our conjecture is that where there is a very long maximum-length solution to a 6-man endgame (for instance the longest reciprocal zugzwang) then practically everything that there is to know about that endgame can be gleaned by diligent and intelligent ‘analysis’ using the online database itself (for instance the one bequeathed by Ken Thompson to internet users) as a tool.

The conjecture goes further. A deepest reci-zug will be an extreme exception to the general behaviour of that endgame: it will be atypical, even the antithesis of typical. But when there are alternative black moves that lose quickly, then by worrying away at these inferior defences as a dog gnaws a bone we should be able to learn at least two useful lessons: typical tactics (avoided the main line optimal black move); and something of the nature of the precarious protracted ‘hold’ that White exerts.

We can illustrate. As usual in EG, an asterisk * identifies a unique value-preserving move, and an exclamation mark ! identifies a sole optimal.

\[\text{d8f8 0134.00 3/3 BTM Win}
\]

This is the deepest recizug with this force: BTM, White wins in 179 moves (to conversion, not checkmate).

It's BTM. This ending is in general drawn, but not here. Why this is, we do not yet know, but with patience we can tease the odb to divulge. Let's start.

We should like to know what is wrong with 1...Kg7. Well, the odb tells us there's a DTC win in 11, like this: 1...Kg7

2.Ke7! Bb3 3.Sf4! Bd1 4.Re4! Sb6 (Sb3 is equioptimal) 5.Rb4! Sc8 [depth now 3, but Sa4; has depth 7] 6.Kd7! Bg4 [1 Sa7; 2] 7.Sc6+* Bxe6+ 8.Kxe6* Kg6 9.Rb7. If this looks simple we note (from the *C*) that the hair-trigger win is jeopardised by any other 7th move by White, as this allows Black both to safeguard his king and not lose material.

If there is a win it due less to the marginal superiority of force than to a general positional characteristic. By virtue of some idiosyncrasy of the force this characteristic is preserved, if only with optimal moves, in the sense that the nebulous bind that White enjoys is never released: like a judo hold in groundwork on the mat, it is transformed into another bind -- instead of the arm it's the leg or the neck that is in the lock -- every judo-move being a logical step towards submission.

Let's try again. The diagram shows bK almost surrounded. Because of the remotesness of bB and bS bK runs the risk of being driven towards the h-file and there mated.
Consider: 1...Kf7 2.Sg5+! Kg8 3.Re7! Sd6 4.Sh7+* Kg8 5.Sf6+* Kf8 6.Sd7+* Kg8 7.Re2 (gaining time ['gt'] and freeing e7 for wK) Be4 8.Rd2 (gt so that bS will be less of a nuisance to wK -- Rf2 10) Sf5 9.Sg7! (gt and occupying an impregnable dominating square that will restrict to a greater or less extent the mobility of all three black men) Bb3 10.Rf2! Sg7 (compact, but no cover of bS by bB is legal, and g7 does block a square from bK) 11.Rb2! (gt, but to what end? Maybe to tickle bB to a square where more time can be gained later, maybe by wK or wS) Bd1 12.Rg2! Kg8 13.Rf2+! Kg7 14.Ke7? (ah! with bBd1, no longer bBb3, e6 is not now available for bS) Kh7 15.Rh2+ Sh5 16.Rh1! Be2 17.Ke6! (not obvious why this is best, but the general observation about optimal, as distinct from unique, moves is that the occurrence of equi-optimals is in part dependent on the choice of metric) Kg7 18.Rg1+! Kh7 19.Kf5! Sg7+ 20.Kg5! Se8 21.Rb1! Sd6 22.Rb6!, and the remainder is fairly straightforward, for instance: Se4+ 23.Kf5! Sd5 24.Rc6! Kg8 25.Rc7! Kg7 26.Rc8+ Kg8 27.Rc7! Bb5 28.Rc8+ Kg7 29.Rc3! Sg2 30.Sg6 Kf7 31.Sc5 Ba6 32.Re5 Kg8 33.Re7, a final sequence which seems to illustrate the non-human character of computer choice because most humans would have a sigh of relief at having reached a clear win and would choose a slower, sub-optimal, but equally effective course.

The above lines teach us:
(a) that the black force is inadequately coordinated for an attempt to secure greater freedom for bK to succeed,
(b) that bK is sufficiently circumscribed by the well-coordinated white force for mate threats in the h8 region to arise, and
(c) that familiarity with the 4-man 0103 endgame is a desideratum.

Complementing the foregoing we give below one complete, optimal line, with scarcely any comment. Instead of conventional move numbering the more informative Ken Thompson depth figure is supplied every ten moves or so, immediately preceding the white move that reduces that depth by one. As if the ending were not already intriguing enough we count no fewer than 41 asterisks in the play -- ie 22.9% of all of White's moves are unique: failure to play any one forfeits the win.

... a2b1
[179] e6e7* c4d6 h3g5* d6f5 e7c7* b1a2 c7c2* a2b1 c2c1! b1d3 c1c7* fg8 g5h3* d3e2 c7c5* e2d3 h3f1! d3b1 c5c1* b1e4 c1c7! e4a8 f4d3! g8f8 d3e5! a8d5 c7a7 d5b3 a7b7* b3d5 b7c7! d5a2 c7c6! a2b1 d8d7* f5e3 c6c1! b1f5+ d7b8* f5c2 c1e1! e3f5 d8d7* fg6 c7e4 e6f6* c2b3+ e6f6* h6g8+ f6g6* b5c2+ g6g5* f8c7 e1a1* e7e6 c5g4* c2e4 [151] a1e1* e6d5

Who can squeeze or tease from the odb why the wR's e1-e1-e1 'switchback' is uniquely necessary to the win?!
We observe that no move by bK or bS draws.
d2b2+! b8a7
d5c3 e8c6
[020] e5d4 c6a8
d4e5! a8b7
b2b3 a7a8
c3d5! a8b8
b5b4! b8a8
d5c7+ a8b8
c7e6! b8a7
e6d8! b7g2
b4g4! g2h1
g4g8! h1e4
[010] g8e8 e4g6
d8c6+ a7b7
e8d8 g6f5
d8g8! b7a6
g8g? f5e4
c6b8+! a6a5
g7f7! e4g6
b8c6+! a5a6
c6b8+! a6a5
[001] f7f6!

† Milan VUKCEVICH
(1937-2003)
Born in Yugoslavia Milan Vukcevich crossed the Atlantic in 1963 and soon made the USA his home. The van der Heijden database shows a mere dozen studies standing to his name, but there were hundreds of problems, of every conceivable type. Whatever genre he chose he never departed from the ideal of thematic unity. In 1988 his compositions selected for inclusion in the triennial FIDE Album series secured him the points required for the grandmaster title. He was also a player of the highest class, with the scalps of Reshevsky and Bisguier among many on his belt. And he could solve with quicksilver speed. He was lead editor and guru of Mike Pricic’s composition magazine StrateGems (USA).

His 1981 book Chess by Milan contains head-scratching eye-openers on every page, in the text as much as on the diagrams. What are we to make of the tongue-in-cheek ‘It must be that I live in a curved universe -- a place in which nothing simpler than the change of a change can stay the same forever!’?

Vukcevich died at his Shaker Heights home, Ohio, after a severe illness.

SNIPPETS

1. 7.WCCT

The seventh international team composing event (the 8-genres, set themes, 7.WCCT) is right on schedule. The valiant Makedonian organisers despatched the 78-page booklet from Skopje to the 38 competing countries (from Azerbaijan to Mongolia to the USA) on 10v2003. Protests (relating to soundness and anticipation only, not thematicity) were required by 15vii03, replies to protests by 15x03 so that judging can be complete by 1li04 for the results to be published on 15vi04.

In a bold attempt to avoid the controversies of the 6.WCCT awards, each section is now judged by five countries, each country being responsible for choosing the who. As to the how, marking is on the FIDE Album principle, from zero to 4 in half-point steps, refined by an optional ‘+’ or ‘-’ modifier. The FIDE sub-committee for the WCCT offers this guideline for awarding the maximum of four points -- for an “Outstanding problem: an accurate and intensive rendering of the set theme, without blemishes in any of the main lines, and showing originality and flair. Perfect construction and economy.” The guideline will be tough to apply to studies, where 'intensive rendering' conflicts with 'perfect economy', while 'a natural setting' is a conspicuously absent criterion. How will the judges rate a successfully tripled theme compared
with an outrageously daring concept expressed just the once? How would you?!
There are 86 entries (no entry may be further divulged) in the studies section, where
the judging countries are Belgium, Georgia, Israel, Romania and Russia. Reserve:
Belarus.

2. The old tradition of quoting Shakespeare is revived with a difference in the Russian
Chess Weekly, on the front page of which a classic study is offered for solution each
week under the heading 'The experts will help you'. The quotes are taken, wittily, even
wickedly, from well known figures in politics, such as Boris Eltsyn ("We're crawling
with too many generals", 1997), Viktor Chernomyrdin ("Let's hope we don't get
constipation abroad", 1996), and Vladimir Lukin ("Being a diplomat calls not only for a
sharp brain but also for skill at the other bodily extremity, to outwit your opponent",
2001).

3. The current position with Slovak (as distinct from Czech) composition periodicals
appears to be this:

PAT-a-MAT edited by Bedrich Formánek (Bratislava): continues.
Umenie-64 quarterly edited by Salai senior: continues.
Šachovy skladba column in general magazine MAT-64 ran from 2000 to 2002
(including some studies) published up to xii2002 in MAT-64 can currently be accessed
via: www//goja.szm.sk/mat-64 Thanks to Ladislav Salai, jr. for the above
information.

4. Two New Statesman stalwarts
A pair of prominent British solver-contributors to Assiac's 1400 studies-orientated
columns (from 1949, fortnightly, then every week until 1976) in the left-wing political
weekly New Statesman and Nation are no longer with us. Don H.R.Stallybrass was 82
when he died in 2003, Peter Cathcart Wason (1924-2003) was nearly 79. Don
composed a few studies and many poems and was consistently loyal to his faith in
astrology, in whose technicalities he was formidably adept. He attended the first pre-
EG meeting at St Bride's Institute, off Fleet Street. Peter's short wins in international
correspondence games found frequent space in Assiac's column, and he too could
compose studies. He had an international reputation in cognitive psychology.

5. Adam Sobey, mathematician, is the new President of the British Chess Problem
Society. Composer of some 40 studies (he's not sure himself of the exact figure) Adam
was an early solver/contributor to ASSIAC's column in the New Statesman. He
supported EG from the start and he ran the studies section of the BCPS's magazine
The Problemist from 1968 to 2000. Something of a polymath and omnivore, Adam has
composed and solved many a non-chess puzzle, including compiling crosswords for
The Listener under the pseudonym 'Adam'. The centre of his chess allegiance switched
from studies to fairy chess under the influence of his work (aeronautics) colleague
Cedric Lyton. Other Adam (we think this is not his given name but the one he asks his
friends to use) hobbies that we are aware of include music and energetic, adventurous
cycling.
6. In the May 2003 issue of *The Problemist* we read that the Serbian *Mat Plus* magazine, latterly only on the Internet, is now defunct.

7. Mircea Manolescu (1938-2003), overall editor of the Romanian *Buletin Problemistic* and the modest but always attentive and relevant delegate (replacing Nestorescu) at recent FIDE PCCC gatherings, has died suddenly.

† **František Macek** (1909-2003)

by Emil Vlasák with thanks to Harold van der Heijden for details of the collections

Major-General František Macek, Ing. (Prague, Czech Republic) died on 19iii2003 after a serious illness. In accordance with his wishes the cremation was held in silence and with no set ceremony.

Born 28ii1909 in Písařov in southern Bohemia Macek reached a venerable age still in excellent physical and mental health. Some years ago -- he was already over 90 -- I met František at a chess problem meeting in Zora (Prague). He complained that he would need spectacles as he had difficulty chopping firewood at his weekend house.

Macek's life was linked with two things: the army and chess. Having learned chess as a student, during his military career he represented chess clubs in major towns of Czechoslovakia such as Kroměříž, Brno, Bratislava, Litoměřice. He finally settled down in Prague in 1953. In 1951 he had founded the Central Army Chess Club (UDA) in Prague and some years later became its president. The club flourished under Macek's management. He supported publication activities and collected a chess library of over 1,500 volumes for the club. This had a significant influence on the club's sporting achievements, especially the flowering of a now legendary Czechoslovak generation of otb grandmasters: Hort, Jansa, Smějkal, Přibyl, Janata, Lechtýnský. In 1968 they won the Team Championship of the Eastern bloc armies ahead of the dominant Soviet team.

For two years Macek filled the chair of the Czechoslovak Chess Association and almost fulfilled a long-held dream to create a Prague chess centre. But the Soviet occupation in August 1968 put a stop to this. Desirous of keeping their positions and employment many people criticized him, publicly accepting the Soviet occupation, but Macek took an independent stance, accompanying a large anti-Soviet student demonstration heading for Prague's Hrad (castle). As result he was forced into premature retirement from the army, suffering dismissal from both the communist party (a usual practice at the time) and from the chess association -- and even from his chess club (which at that time was highly unusual).

Macek learned about endgame studies during the 1950's -- and began to collect them. At first this was just a hobby, but after the events of 1968 it became Macek's speciality. A new pattern to his life emerged, with two phases: the summer he spent in his weekend house in the mountains for health reasons, while the rest of the year in Prague he dedicated to chess. I met Macek for the first time some years later during the Czech national team league matches, where he was an arbiter. Already then I noticed how little time he spent on the games, but was for ever writing something or other down on small sheets of paper. Yes, he was indeed working on his legendary
endgame study collection, which later became the world's most comprehensive of its kind. -- with the help of many friends Macek collected over 50,000 cards arranged by author.

Later, when there were endgame study meetings in Prague, we became good friends. I supplied Macek with some new publications and many times we discussed his collection, sometimes verbally but also by correspondence. Macek well understood the drawbacks of the paper medium (for example, the perils of fire and robbery) but at his age he could no longer switch to a computer. He was nevertheless searching for help to set about this. Maybe I could have started the colossal job on my own but by this time I already had Harold van der Heijden's compact disk files, roughly comparable with Macek's collection. I told Macek that it would not make good sense to duplicate Harold's work -- the only effective way forward had to be co-operation. Every big collector has to have an element of mania, a touch of vanity, so it was natural that at first Macek was suspicious. But cooperation with Harold finally got under way. There were many problems to overcome -- barriers of concept, age and language. I translated the first letters from English to Czech and vice versa, but later they found they could correspond in German. They exchanged their lists of authors, differences were found and then individual study sheets followed. Harold writes: Of course for me it was relatively easy to produce "study sheets" with the studies he did not have in his collection, while Macek had to write all missing studies in my collection down by hand (later he also sent photocopies of the cards that he used). I was worried that it would give him too much work, but he wrote: "no problem. I like to work hard"!

Macek was 90 and he had to think about the future of his collection. He offered it to me, but I felt there were more competent hands. Finally there was a happy ending. An anonymous English sponsor (not AJR) purchased the collection from Macek and placed it at Harold van der Heijden's disposal. There is an amusing story about the conveyance from Prague to Holland: after Harold's friend loaded the cubic metre of paper into his car his girl-friend nearly had to travel back by train.

But seriously: Harold has up to now checked 27,383 of Macek's sheets (by 357 composers) and increased his own collection by just 1,136 new pieces (about four percent) -- a clear indication that both collections are close to saturation. But this is not the same as perfection, for there are quite frequent errors identified in sources, names and solutions. Harold's collection (as of the year 2000) can be purchased today from ChessBase so it is no surprise if enthusiasts continue to find faults. But most corrections will be subsequently incorporated. Maybe the next step in the development of the great collection will be an on-line Internet version with instant updating like computer software versions and modification levels. In any event ChessBase has an on-line updating facility for games, so the software is in principle ready...

Back to Macek. He was the driving force behind many a publication about chess composition. In 1970 he published (through UDA) the Artur Mandler "Studies" (an English translation by John Beasley is expected soon). In pre-computer times Macek himself undertook the back-breaking work of diagram pasting for Mikán's "Gallery of Czechoslovak composers" Vols. 8-13, for "Dobrodružství 64 poli" (An adventure of
64 squares), for Czechoslovak albums, and for a number of years of "Šachová skladba" (the Prague magazine for chess composition).
In Československý šach, in the Šachové umění section (ie 'chess art', for compositions) Macek headed the permanent solving contest ladder -- he broke the 500 points 'ceiling' no fewer than 23 times.
For his 90th birthday Macek organized an international endgame study tournament and subsidized it in the Czech republic with exceptional cash prizes (see Československý šach 10/1999).
We honour the memory of František Macek - a most excellent, honest and industrious gentleman, who did so much for chess and for chess composition.

photo of František Macek courtesy of Emil Vlasák
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