THEMES, THEMES . . .

by International Grandmaster of Chess Composition G. M. Kasparyan
(translation from the Russian by Paul Valois)

The First WCCT (1972-5) attracted many leading composers and aroused considerable competitive interest. I repeat — competitive interest. From the creative viewpoint such events bring little that is productive or progressive. This is my personal opinion.

Consider the study themes D1 and D2. It seems to me that theme toursneys in general significantly reduce composers' creative opportunities, placing them in the narrow confines of a set theme, which makes it very difficult to compose outstanding work. This seems to be truer for study than for problem composition.

Theme D1, set by H. M. Lommer, stipulated "Withdrawal of one or more W pieces from bK". This theme cannot constitute the real content of a study. It is abstract. The withdrawal of W pieces from bK of itself signifies nothing. In practically all studies W pieces are either moving closer to, or farther away from, bK. To be frank, we composers paid no attention to this factor, simply ignoring it. When Soviet composers began working on the D1 theme, I said jokingly "Why not take a ruler and measure the length of the withdrawal move? And how will the length of the withdrawal move affect the quality of the study?" Of course, this was in jest. But there is something in it. Naturally, in the final account the value of a study will depend not on the degree of W piece withdrawal, but on more important factors — originality of idea, good exploitation of material, unexpected manoeuvres, beauty of finale and other factors. The element of withdrawal moves is just a formal requirement. I think that the theme will find few exponents.

Theme D2, set by GM Y. Averbakh, stipulated: "2 W pieces which during the solution form a battery against bK (or another B1 piece), subsequently form a second battery, in which the roles of the thematic pieces are reversed". This theme is more concrete than D1. But here too one feels the restriction of creative possibilities. When I set about composing a study on the D2 theme I came to understand the following well. Quite a few studies with batteries like that existed. The majority of these studies concluded with the win of a B1 piece. I realised that to use these well known and standard devices would give no chance of success. The thought came to me to use the batteries to achieve a positional draw. Thus arose D233 (ie, the anonymous 33rd serial number identifying Kasparian's D2 entry to the judge, viz. No. 2829 in EG47). It is worth adding that the late IGMCC L. Loshinsky said after seeing my study, "This study could be used for theme D1 as well — after all, wR and wB withdraw from bK, and approach again". This comment of Loshinsky's reinforces the point that a formal examination of the study shows that the theme D1 does appear in it whereas of course the real theme is positional draw involving batteries.
To be honest, I derived no real satisfaction from composing D223. Why? Because the artificiality of the set theme restricted the imaginative possibilities, put barriers in the way of interpretation. Two set themes, both intended to inspire new and interesting compositions (leaving aside the competitive aspect). Eut, was that aim achieved? I think that the tournament produced little from the creative point of view. The competitors had to expend a great deal of time and energy but little of genuine value resulted. And another point. There is a multitude of study themes, and one can artificially devise new ones. But is it necessary to place such narrow restrictions on composers in such toursneys? It is much more pleasant for the composer to compose as he wishes, without limitations. The ordinary type of tourney, where all contestants can compose without conditions or restrictions, or the need to improvise, is much better. Even team toursneys can be conducted without set themes. It's simply done: each team nominates its representatives, numbered 1, 2, 3 and so on (for 2-ers, 3-ers, more-movers, studies and so on). Or there can be 2 representatives per category. I think that in this way the standard of composition will be improved. And surely this is the basic aim of all toursneys.

Footnote by AJR: We must thank IGCC Kasparyan for his illuminating comments. They are, as he says, his personal views — surely no one else in the world could derive “no real satisfaction” from No. 2829! We must all agree, though, that it is tragic when the dedicated work of FIDE volunteers (in this case, several years of effort by mainly Finnish composers) throughout the world produces anything less than a completely successful WCCT. Where we may beg to differ from IGCC Kasparyan is on the question of ‘set theme’ or ‘no set theme’. Lesser study composers are, I believe, encouraged to compete by set themes. I remain unconvinced for that studies there is necessarily a link between set ‘themes’ and a low standard of creativity. And the judging process ought to be more straightforward when a theme is imposed. But a pre-requisite must be more general agreement on ‘themes’ and their relationship to other components or aspects of studies. Only then will theme toursneys produce the required standards of composing and judging. To arrive at general agreement there must be debate — untrammeled international debate. IGCC Kasparyan’s use of the words ‘abstract’ and ‘formal’ and ‘artificial’ provides a starting point for this debate. Who will continue it?

Tourney Announcements

1. Problemas, the Spanish magazine for chess composition, announces a formal tourney under the patronage of the Spanish Chess Federation to celebrate (a) 40 years of the Spanish Chess Problem Association, (b) 75th birthday of its current President, Antonio F. Arguelles. The section for studies will be judged by H. M. Lommer. Closing date: 31. iii. 77. Send to the tourney director: Francisco Armengol, Calle de Sicilia 196, 4º, 2a, Barcelona 13, Spain.

Note: send 2 diagrams, one of them without the composer’s name, and the solution on a separate sheet. Prizes of 1,000 pesetas, 400 and 250. All participants will receive the award booklet which will be published in due course.

2. To celebrate 100 years of the German Chess Federation: send original win or draw studies to — Dr John Niemann, Habichweg 6, D6100 Darmstadt, West Germany. Closing date: 31.iii.77. Judge: Dr Hans-Hilmar Staudte. Single copy, with full solution required. Mark
envelope: “Composition Tourney of DSB”. The award will be published in Die Schwalbe. There will be 3 money prizes, H.M. (books) and Commendeds.

**New Statesman Assia’s column No. 1400 (24.ix.76) was his last. Assia, or Heinrich Fraenkel, is as hale and hearty as ever, but has been replaced as columnist by Grandmaster Tony Miles. We shall have more to tell about this in EG47.**

**RECENT PUBLICATIONS**

*Pishop v. Knight Endings*, by Y. Averbakh (Batsford, £4.50). The English version, in 165 pages, of the section of the original Russian work. The E. German version was originally dated 1963, and no example carries a date later than 1956, so the claim of ‘updated’ is open to doubt. An excellent book, of course.

**World Chess Compositions Tournament of the FIDE (1972-5)**. 104 pages, giving all the positions and results. Published by Suomen Tehtävänietkat, the Finnish Problem Association. The studies will appear as Nos. 2820-2847 in EG. The booklet is not a lavish production, but is very adequate.


**I. Album Ceskoslovenskyh Sachowych Sklaneb** (1972-3), 60 pages. 61 studies.

These 3 slim booklets appear by the efforts of Bedrich Formanek and other Czech and Slovak enthusiasts. They cover the composing championships, and an Album, for Czech compositions in the years concerned.

**Describing Pawn Structures.** This 1975 draft report by S. T. Tan is scheduled to appear in *Advances in Computer Chess 1*, Edinburgh University Press. There are 22 pages. Although not easy to follow, this is an exciting, and entirely new, attempt to define P-relationships with a view to the selection (by computer program) of promising strategies. Unfortunately, I understand that funds for further chess research are not available in Edinburgh. Dr Tan is now teaching in Libya, and has not been replaced in the Machine Intelligence Research Unit at Edinburgh.

(But see p. 399.)

**King and Rook against King**, by Donald Michie, 1976, from the same source as the Tan report, and also to appear in *Advances in Computer Chess*. 41 pages. The history of ‘mechanising’ this endgame is reviewed, and Professor Michie’s optimising algorithm is set out. In both papers the computer language employed is POP-2. Considerable attention is given to the interesting larger problem of KR checkmating on an infinite single-corner board, a poser first set by Jeno Ban.

**Teoria de los Finales: Alfiles y Peones**, by R. Toran, 1959. Not recent, but I have only just seen a copy! Small pocket size. 104 same-colour B endings, almost all pre-*Basic Chess Endings* (1941). There is no bibliography or acknowledgement list. Nevertheless, a useful book.

**Sakkoppgaver og Studier av Andre Fossm**, 1975. There are 11 studies by this (Norwegian) composer in this book. A. Fossum was born in 1899. AJR

**Editor’s Items**

There is a full-page article in *SHAKHMATY v SSSR* (vii. 76) on the story, origin, principles and future, of EG. It is a slightly abbreviated and edited version of a contribution I was asked to make. At the published edition-size of *SHAKHMATY* (58,000) this implies a literal circulation of three
times the total copies of *EG* printed in its life so far! The article is the first in an intermittent series on magazines devoted to chess composition, of which the USSR has none.

The vii. 76 issue of *GAMES & PUZZLES* features an AJR article, an exposition of a prize-winning Grigoriev P-ending.

I have also recently recorded a 90-minute cassette tape for the AU-DIOCHESS series promoted by M. J. Basman (£2.70 post free from 7 Billockby Close, Chessington, Surrey KT9 2ED). One side presents 10 studies; the other is devoted to the elements of P-endings.

There is no recent news of Walter Veitch, whose column SPOTLIGHT adds so much value to *EG*. There are several items awaiting SPOTLIGHT attention, so we hope that Walter will re-emerge soon.

We learn that the hitherto irregularly appearing Yugoslav magazine PROBLEM will be published quarterly in future.

---

**Obituary** Vladimir Vukovic (26. viii.98 — 17.xi.75), Yugoslav player, writer, interested in all aspects of chess, has died. Harold Lommer and I met him at Piran in 1958.

AJR

---

**AJR**

V. Vukovic
1st Prize, Sahovski Vjesnik, 1947

---

**Reviews**

**International Congress of Chess Composers, Tbilisi 1975** (in Russian, Tbilisi, 1976, 64 pages). A superb record of the XVIII meeting of the FIDE Commission. Included are: a summary of decisions taken; selected compositions by the participants; all the honoured compositions in the ‘lightning’ tourney, the principal entries for which came from the Soviet composers, who met separately. Finally, there are 22 pages of photographs, in which your editor is prominent!

**Selected Chess Studies**, by G. A. Nadareishvili (in Russian, Moscow, 1976). 125 of the author’s studies are presented in 7 groups, followed by an appendix of 57 positions illustrating the struggle of one or two pieces against the Q. This appendix is a very useful summary of theory and its known exceptions.

**XIX MEETING of FIDE COMMISSION** in Ribe, Denmark. The heart-warming hospitality of the Danish Chess Federation and the members of the Ribe Chess Club made this meeting memorable. It was great, too, to meet old friends, and one new one: Johanan Kopelovitch (Israel). But I find little else to report on the studies front.

AJR
No. 2728: Em. Dobrescu. 1. Kd2† Ka2 2. Qa8† Kb2 3. Qh8† Kb3 4. Qg8† Kb2 5. Qg7† Kb3 6. Qf7† Kb2 7. Qf6† Kb3 8. Qe6† Kb2 9. Qe5† Kb3 10. Qd5† Kb2 11. Qd4† Kb3 12. Qd3† Ka2 13. Kxc2 wins.

The 3rd H.M. was awarded to E. Dobrescu. However, it was given on p. 236 of EG9, but dated 1967, though also from Revista de Sah.


JRH: earliest for this theme is Horwitz, No. 91 in „T1000“.
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No. 2732: V. A. Korolkov. Only 14 undemolished studies remained for E. Pogosjants to judge in this annual informal tourney. "Promotion to bS is answered by 2 promotions to wS, one of them via 'excelsior'". 1. g4 Rh8 2. g5† Kh7 3. g6† Kh6 4. g7† Rg8 5. f7 e1S 6. g8† Rxg8 7. fg† Kh7 8. Sf6† Kh8 9. Sg8† Kh7 10. Sf6†.

No. 2733: A. P. Kuznetsov and Neishtadt. "A fresh romantic find, with the good and bad points of the genre". 1. Rd3 c4 2. Rd1† b1Q 3. Bg7† c3 4. Bxc3† bc 5. Rc1 Kb2 6. Sd3† Ka1 7. Se1 draw.

No. 2734: G. A. Nadareishvili. 1. g5† i Kh5 2. Rxb8 h1Q† 3. Rb1 Qa8 4. h8Q† ii Qxh8 5. Rb8 Qh7 6. Rb4 Qg8 (h8) 7. Rb8 Qh7 8. Rb4 draw.

No. 2735: N. Kralin. 1. Ba3† Kc4 2. Se5† Sxe5 3. a7 Rc8 4. a6 Sc3† 5. Bxc5 Sd7 6. b7 Re6 7. b8S† ii Sxb8 8. abS Kxc5 9. a7 Ra6† 10. Sxa6 Kb6 11. a8R wins.

JRH: Apparently Herbstman was the first to realise this R-promotion (1928), No. 65 in his collection. See also Bent (1966), No. 563 in EG12.


No. 2739: V. V. Yakimchik. The printed solution is not to hand, but it presumably runs: 1. Kf1 h4 2. Rg2 g5 3. Re2 h3 4. Re1 g2† 5. Kf2† with effectively two variations. 5. ... g1R 6. Rf1 Rxf1† 7. Kxf1 and B1 is stalemated, or 5. ... g1Q† 6. Kf3 Qxe1 and W is stalemated.

No. 2741: N. Kralin. 1. g7 Ra1† 2. Kb7 Rb1† 3. Kc7 Re1† 4. Kd7 Rd1† 5. Ke7 and now play splits: 5. ... Rd8 6. Kxd8 Kf6 7. g8B/i wins/ii, or 5. ... Rd7 6. Kxd7 Kf6 7. g8Q/i wins/iii. i) 7. g8Q? is stalemate. ii) 7. Kg7 8. Bxf7 Kxf7 9. Kd7 with the opposition.

No. 2743: B. Brekhov. 1. Qg2 Ka1 2. Qg7 Kd8 3. Sc6 b1Q 4. Sxb4+ Ka3 5. Sd3 (for Qa7 mate) 5. ... Qxd3 6. Qa1+ Kb4 7. Qa5† Kc4 JRH: A known mate (eg Katsnelson (1971), No. 1597 in EG29, but the introduction seems new.
No. 2743  B. Brekhov  (v. 73)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1973

3 Comm.,
Win 3-4

No. 2744  A. Kuryatnikov  (viii 73)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1973

4 Comm.,
Draw 6-4

No. 2744: A. Kuryatnikov. 1. Rc8 Qb2† 2. Kh1/i Qb1† 3. Kg2 Qxh7
4. g4† Kh4/i 5. Rc6 Qh8 6. Rb6. To keep control, as needed, of c2
i) 2. Kg1? Qd4† 3. Kg2 Qd2† 4. Kf1 Qd3† 5. Kg2 Qe2† 6. Kg1 Qe1†
7. Kg2 Qxg3† followed by 8. ... Qxh3† and 9. ... Qxc8.
ii) 4. ... Kg6 5. Rc6† and 6. Rc7†.

No. 2745  N. Kralin  (iv. 74)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1974

=1/2 Pr.
Award: x. 75

No. 2745: N. Kralin. Judge: A. Be-

lenky. Of 56 studies (46 authors),
19 were faulty.
1. f4†/i Kb6 2. Kd2 Sf2 3. Ba8 Ka7
(d1) Sg2 7. Ke2 Kb6 8. Kf2 and
now 8. ... Sxf4 9. gf leads to the
successful self-stalemate of (i),
while there is a fine echo in 8. ...
Sh4 9. gh Ke5 10. Kg3 Kd4 11. h5
Ke3 12. h3 Ke4 13. Kh4 Kxf4 stale-
mate.
i) 1. Kd2? Sf2 2. Bg2 Sd3 3. f4†/iii
Ke2 Ke5 7. Kf2 Sxf4 8. gf Kd4,
and now W plays for self-stale-
mate, 9. Kg3 Ke3 10. Kh4 Kxf4
11. Kh5, but lacks a tempo, 11. ... 
Ke3 12. h4 f4. The main line de-
monstrates how a tempo is won.
)ii 4. Bc6(d5)? Sd3, or 4. Bf3(g2)?
Sd3, with forks on b4 and e1 res-
pectively.
Ke2 f4 wins.
JRH traces 7 previous examples
of selfimprisoning of wK, but none
with an echo.

No. 2746  N. Kralin  (iv. 74)
Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1974

=1/2 Pr.

No. 2746: N. Kralin. Judge: A. Be-

lenky.


ii) 4. Bb7? Kgl 5. Kh3 f5 6. f4 h4 7. f5 h1Q 8. Bxh1 Kxh1 9. fg g2 10. g7 g1Q 11. g8Q Qg3 mate.


The judge draws attention to the several phases of the solutions to the equal prize-winners, suggesting that this is a possible way studies may develop in the future.


ii) 4. Bb7? Kgl 5. Kh3 f5 6. f4 h4 7. f5 h1Q 8. Bxh1 Kxh1 9. fg g2 10. g7 g1Q 11. g8Q Qg3 mate.


The judge draws attention to the several phases of the solutions to the equal prize-winners, suggesting that this is a possible way studies may develop in the future.


ii) 7. Rg7? Bd4 8. Rf7 Re7f,. As the judge says, „very beautiful”.

JRH: Cf. Bazlov (1971) in Chess Life and Review. wKe7, wRg1,

No. 2749  S. Belokon  
(1974)

No. 2749: S. Belokon. 1. c7 fRcl/i 2. e4/ii Kh7 3. Rh3† Kg6 4. Rg3† Kh5 5. Rg1 Ra1 6. Rd1/iii Kg5 (Ra8†; Rd8) 7. Kg7 f5 8. c8Q Rxcl (Ra8†; Qd7) 9. Rxa1 Re7† 10. Kf8 fe 11. Rf1 draw.


ii) 2. Ra7? Rb5 3. Kxf7 Rxe5 4. Ra8† Kh7 5. c8Q Rf1† wins.

iii) 6. Rh1† Kg5 7. Kg7 f5 8. c8Q Ra1†.

This study was published in an article of examples of 2R's v 1R. JRH: cf. Prokes (1940) Nos. 410 and 411 of his collection; Wotawa (1941), No. 33 in his book; Marwitz (1966), No. 209 in EG5.

No. 2750  O. Mazur  
(1974)

No. 2750: O. Mazur. 1. c6 h3 2. Sh5/i Sg4 3. c7/ii Sh5† 4. Kh6/iii h2 5. c8Q h1Q 6. Qh7† Sd5 7. Qh5† and bK is forced to allow wS to check, winning bQ.


No. 2751  V. Vlasenko  
(1974)


7. Bb1 Kb3 8. Kc1 Kc3 and there is no win.


JRH: cf. Khortov (1971), No 2026 in EG.

No. 2752: E. Belikov
(4 H. M., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1974)

No. 2752: E. Belikov. 1. b7 Qxb7 2. a8Q Qxa8 3. Qxd3. Now there are 2 batteries on the board. 3. ... Rg3† 4. Re6† Ka7 5. Qd4† Kb8 6. Qd8† Ka7 7. Qb6 mate, or 3. ... Rd2† 4. Re6† Ka7 5. Qe3† Kb8 6. Qe5† Ka7 7. Qa5† Kb8 8. Qe7 mate.

No. 2753: Y. Makletsov
(5 H. M., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1974)

No. 2753: Y. Makletsov. 1. Bg5/i Bxg5 2. Sa7† Kd8/ii 3. Sc6† Ke8 4. Sxc7† Kf8 5. Se6† Kg8 6. Sxd4 d2 7. Sf3 (Sxg5? Kf8) 7. ... d1Q 8. fSxg5 (this explains the first move) and it is a positional draw with blockade of bK.


No. 2754: A. Tulyev
(Special H. M., Shakhmaty v SSSR, 1974)


ii) 2. a7? Kb7 3. a8Q† Kxa8 4. Kf5 Sd6† 5. Ke6 Se4 6. Kf5 Sg3† 7. Kf4 Sf6† 8. Ke4 Sc3† 9. Kd4 Sb5† 10. Kd5 Sc7† (this square is free in this line) 11. Ke4 (Kc6, Kb8;) 11. ... Se6 and 12. ... Sf8.

iii) 2. ... Bg1 3. h7 Bd4 4. Ke6 Sd6 5. a7.

iv) 8. ... Bg1 9. h7 Bd4 10. Ke4 Kb6 11. a7.

v) 3. ... Ke7 4. h7 Sd6 5. h8S.
No. 2755: V. Kozirev. 1. Kg8/i Qc4 2. h8S† Bxh8 3. Rf1 Qxf1 4. f8S† Kh6 5. d8S Bb2 6. Pe7 wins.
   i) But not 1. d8Q? Kxh7 2. Rh1† Qxh1 3. Qxf6 Qa8†.
   i) 2. ... Kh7 3. g6† Kh6 4. Bd2† and 5. Be3†.
   iii) But not 5. Bxg5† Kxg5.
   JRH: Stalemate known. Perhaps closest (it starts with the same material) is Ling (1912): wKf1, wRf3, wBc8, wSd3; bKg6, bQg5, bBe6, bPf7, h7. 1. Bxf7† Bxf7 2. Sf4† Kh6 3. Rh3† Kg7 4. Rf3 Qxf3 5. Sh5†. (There is an echo by 2. ... Kg7 3. Rg3 Qxg3 4. Sh4†.
   ii) Second non-capture,
   iii) Third non-capture.
No. 2758: E. Asaba. 1. c5 Re4. To stop Kd4. 2. 6c Rc4 3. e4 Rxec4 4. c7 Re4 5. e4 Rxe4 6. ed draw.

i) Castling to avoid stalemate! 1. Rf1†? Ke3 2. Rxf5 is the try.


Some „academic duals“ in the moves of wK hardly spoil this ultra-lightweight.


A battle of the Zugzwangs.

JRH: Can be regarded as a development of Grigoriev (1938), No. 464 in ‘636’.

No. 2762: A. Gschwend, from Austria. The judge was Dr. Hans-Hilmar Staudte of Bonn-Bad Godesberg. „...W pieces must be deployed ... with strategic depth ...“. There were 28 studies to be
considered for this (informal) tourney.


ii) Now bpb5 can be attacked twice and defended twice. bB can protect from the top of the board or from the bottom. W can direct this defence. If wS can cover e8 and d7, with wK covering c6, then hB must defend from below (see 3. Sc3, 4. Se4, and 5. Sf6). By 6. Kc6 (with Sc7f as threat) bB is forced to the top. B1 needs two moves to transfer between top and bottom. By inducing bB to play to f1, the two-move transfer to e8 becomes impossible. The first two decoys of bB to e8 allow the tempo win with 8. Kd6. After the third decoy of bB to e8 a Zugzwang (11, Sd5) is in force, since bKa6 (a7) allows wSc7, and bBc4 (e2) allows wSc3. Thus 11. ... Bf1 is forced, and after 12. Sc3 Ka6 we find bB unable to reach e8 again in two moves.

iii) 4. ... Bh5 5. Sf6 Be2 6. Sd5 Kb7 7. Sc3.


vi) 11. ... Be4 12. Sc3 Ka6 13. a4 Bb3 (against Sxb5) 14. ab wins. Supporting analysis of this line and note (v), supplied by the composer, is not yet published.

vii) This is the best bB can manage, since there is no i4 square.


The point about a7 for wS is that in crucial lines it checks on c6 (after ... Kb4) or b5 (after ... Bxd4), thus forcing the main line.

Kf6\textsuperscript{i} Se8\textsuperscript{f} 14. Ke7 Sc7 1'. Kd6\textsuperscript{v} Sb5\textsuperscript{t} 16. Kc5 draw.

i) 1. ... h5 2. a4 Se2\textsuperscript{vi} 3. Ke3 Sg3 4. Kf4 h4 5. Kg4 Kxa2 6. Kxb4.

ii) 2. ... a6 3. a4.


vi) 2. ... h4 3. e6 h3 4. e7 h2 5. e8Q h1Q 6. Qb8\textsuperscript{t} Ke2 7. Qb3\textsuperscript{t}.

JRH: Nearest is Gorgiev (1971) No. 1894 in EG33.

No. 2765 G. Murkisch

\[3\text{ H.M., Schach-Echo, 1973-4}\]

No. 2765: G. Murkisch. 1. Kf7/i b2

2. Bh6 gh 3. Bd3 cd/i 4. Sf8 with 5. Sg6\textsuperscript{t}.


ii) 3. ... b1Q 4. Bxb1 Sxb1 5. Sf8.


The judge draws attention to the same composer's No. 1303 as an anticipation.

No. 2766 W. Issler

\[4\text{ H.M., Schach-Echo, 1973-4}\]

No. 2766: W. Issler. 1. f7 Bg7/i 2. Bb2/i Bf8 3. Ba3 Bxa3 4. Sd4\textsuperscript{t} Ka5 5. dc Kb4 6. f8Q\textsuperscript{t} Kxc4 7. Qxf4\textsuperscript{t} wins.

i) 1. ... Bb4 2. Sd4\textsuperscript{t} Ka5 3. dc and 4. Sc6\textsuperscript{t}.

ii) 2. Sd4\textsuperscript{t} Kc5 3. Se6\textsuperscript{t} Kd6 4. Sxg7 Ke7.
No. 2768: E. Hufendiek, 1. Sf5+/i Rx5/f ii 2. Se6 and B1 cannot stop both wP's. If 2. ... Rxes 3. f7 Rf5
4. a7 Rxf7 5. a8Q, or 2. ... Sxe5
3. a7 Rxf6 4. a8Q, or 2. ... Rxf6
3. a7 Rf8 4. Sg6+i and 5. Sxf8.

i) "... the worthwhile content of double wS-offer occurs too early
in the solution and without finesse — it should be a climax, not an introduction".

ii) 1. ... Kh5 2. g4† Kg6 3. Se7†, or in this, 2. ... Kxg4 3. Se3† 4. a7 Rxa5 5. Sh6† Kg5 6. f7.

No. 2769: G. Lauer, 1. Rg4+i Kh5
Kxf5 Kh7 3. Rg4 h1Q/iv 6. Rh4+ Qxh4 stalemate.

i) But not 1. Rg8? Bd1 wins,

ii) 2. Rg8? Kh6 3. Rg3 Bf5 wins, but 2. Rg3 will lead to the first

stalemate after 2. ... h1Q(R) 3. Rh3†.

iii) 3. ... Bh7 4. Rg3 repeats.

iv) 5. ... h1R 6. Kf6 draws.

JHB: The Patovs (1910) set up the stalemate in No. 1391 in '2500'.
AJR: The other Commend (Junker) is not given, being fully anticipated by Bron (1961), No. 119 in his 1969 book.

No. 2770: A. C. Miller, 1. Rxa4/i d1Q 2. Rh4+/ii Kg7 3. c6/iii Qd8/iv 4. Rc4 Cc7/v 5. Rc1 (c2)/vi Kf6
6. Rf1† Ke6 7. Re1† Kd6 8. Rd1† Kc5 9. Re1† Kb4 10. Rb1† Ka3 11.
Ra1† Kb6 16. Rb1† Ka7 17. Rb7† draw/x.

i) But not 1. c6? d1Q 2. c7 Sb6, or here 2. Rxa4 Qxa4 3. Kd7 Kg7 4. Kd6 Kf6
5. c7 Qe8 wins, or 2. Kxf7 Qf8.

ii) 2. Ra5 Qe1† 3. Kd7 Qxa5 4. c6 Qd5† 5. Kc7 Kg7, 2. Ra7? Qd5 3.
Rc7/iv Kg8 4. Kd7/ii Kg7 5. Rc8 Kg6 6. Rc7/xii Kg5 7. Re8 Ke5 8.
Rc7 Qe6† 9. Kd8 (Kf8, Kf6;) 9. ... Kd5 10. Re8 Qf7 11. Rc7 Qf8† 12.
Kd7 Qb8 13. Rc8 (Re6, Qb5;) or c6, Qf8; Rc8, Qf7† 13. ... Qb5† 14.
Kc7 (Kd8, Ke7; Rc7, Qb8; transposes) 14. ... Qb7† 15. Kd8 Qe8 16.
Re7 Qa8† 17. Rc8 Qd5† wins.

Rh2? Qd5 4. Rc2 Qe4†, 3. Rh3?
Qd5 4. Rg3† Kf6 5. Re3 Qe5†, 3.
Rh4? Qe2† 4. Kd7 Qd2†, 3.
Re4? Qd5 4. Re7† Kf6 5. Rc7 Ke6.

iv) 3. ... Qc2 4. Kd7 is a positional
draw, and if 3. ... Qe1† 4. Kd7 Qxb4 5. c7. So bK looks for the action.
vi) 4. ... Qe6† 5. Kd8 Qxc4 6. c7.
vi) 5. Re5? Kf6, 5. Re3? Kf6 6. Rf3† Ke6 7. Re3† Kd5 8. Rd3† Kc4, or 8. Re3 Qe5† 9. Kd7 Qxc3 10. c7 Qg7†.

vii) 11. Ra1† Kb2 12. Ra6 Kb3.

viii) 12. Rbi† Kc2.

ix) 14. Re—? Qe5† wins wR by a fork, eg 14. Re2 Qe5† 15. Kd8 Qh8† 16. Kc7 Qb7† 17. Kb8 Qxe2 18. c7 Kb6 19. c8Q Qh2† 20. Ka8 Qa2† 21. Kb8 Qa7 mate.

x) 17. Rc1? Qe5† 18. Kd7 Qd4† 19. Ke6 Qg4† 20. Kd8 Qg5†, or 20. Kc7 Qf4†. 17. Ra1†? Kb8 18. Rb1† Ke6 19. Rc1 Qe3† and 20. ... Qf4†.

xi) 3. Ra5 Qc6† 4. Kd8 (to avoid ... Qc7†). 4. ... Kg8 wins by Zugzwang.

xii) 4. c6 Qd6 5. Rc8 Kg7 and 6. ... Kf6.

xiii) 6. c6 Kf5 7. Rc8 Qe6† 8. Kd8 Qd6† 9. Ke8 Kf6, showing that wP must stay on c5 to cover d6.

No. 2771 E. Vladimirov

No. 2772: E. I. Dvizov. 1. e8Q d1Q 2. Bd4† Qxd4 3. Qh8† Ke5 4. Qh5† Qf6 5. Qh2 mate.

JRH: No anticipation in my collection.

No. 2773 N. Kralin

No. 2773: N. Kralin. Judge: A. Hildebrand. There were 129 entries by 60 composers from 11 countries for this formal Polish tourney. 1. Rg8† Kh1 2. Kg6 f1Q 3. Rh7† Kg2 4. Kh5† Kh3 5. Kg3† Kg2 6. Kh4† Kh1 7. Kg3† Kg1 8.

No. 2773 seems superior to these in economy, though Troitzky adds a bP to the domination. (AJR)
No. 2774. H. Stenicka (Austria).
1. Rh3† Kg2 2. Se6 Bxf5†/i 3. Kxg7 Rg4† 4. Sg3 Rxg5†/ii 5. Kxh6 Rg6† 6. Kh5 Kxh3 7. e4 Kg3. Or 7. ... Bxe4, stalemate. 8. ef Ra6 9. Kg5 Kg2 10. f6 Ke4 11. f7 draw. A draw with a lone wP on the second rank against bR and bB — unbelievable!
   ii) 4. ... hg 5. Rh5 Kg3 6. Kf6 Kf4 7. e3†.

No. 2775. E. Dobrescu

No. 2776. A. Maksimovskikh and P. Perkonoha (Austria)

JRH: Final phase known from Cheron (1945), No. 1000 in Cheron II.

No. 2778: J. Fritz, 1. ... g2/i 2. Ra4f Kxa4 3. abf Kb5 4. bcf Ke6 5. cdR Ke7 (K8) 6. Bf7f Ke8 (Kd8; Rd1f) 8. efR Kxe7 9. Rh7t Kg8 10. Rg7t Kxf8 11. Rxg2 wins.

i) 1. ... Ba 2. Rb6, or even 2. Rh3, both of which are powerful threats.

Judge: S. Limbach, the columnist of this Polish newspaper.


i) 1. a7? Kxa7 2. Kxc6t Kb8 3. Rfl Sg3 draw.

ii) 1. ... Sg3 2. Rblt Ka7 3. Rb7t Ka8 4. Kc7 h1Q 5. Kb6/iii c5/iv 6. Re7 Qh6t 7. Re6 wins, wR stopping any check on e3.

iii) 5. Rb8f? Ka7 6. Ra8t Kxa8 7. Kb6 c5 Note bSg1 echo-blocking bQ check.

iv) 5. ... S 6. Ra7t Kb8 7. Ra8t Kxa8 8. Bb7t Kb8 9. a7 mate.

The 5 Hon. Mentions and 8 Commendeds were identified in the award merely by their original serial diagram numbers, with one number omitted...

JRH found no anticipations for these two.
No. 2780: O. J. Carlsson and J. Mugnos


i) 1. Rd1† Kc3 2. Rg1 Bd5† 3. Ke7 Kg3 4. Sg6 Bf3 (Kf2? Sh3†) 6. Rg3 Kf4 7. Rxf3† Kg4 draw, or in this, 4. Sg6 Ke3 5. Kd6 Bf3 6. Rg5 Kf2 7. Sf4 g1S draw.


v) 8. Rc3† Kh2 9. Kd6 Bb7 10. Sf4 g1S draw.


No. 2781 J. Mugnos and O. J. Carlssson

1st Prize, Thèmes-64, 1974 Award: i-iii. 76

Draw

i) 1. Be4† Kg1 2. b7 Rf8 3. Bf5 Rb8 4. Be3 (e4) Sh3.


No. 2782: D. Gurgenidze. “Compared with the previous study, the play is more trenchant. The dangerous B1 battery fires 3 times, but W is on the alert to make sacrifices until wK reaches shelter on c2”. 1. ... Rb5† (Rg6†; Bd6†) 2. Kxb5 Rh5†/i 3. Bg5 Rxc5†/ii 4. Ka4 (Kb4? Rb5†) 4. ... Rg4† 5. f4
No. 2782  D. Gurgenidze
2nd Prize, Thèmes-64, 1974

Black to Move 5+4
White Wins

ii) 3. ... Bxg5 4. Qd6† and 5. Qg6.
iii) 5. ... Bxf4 6. Qd6† and 7. Qxf6.
iv) 7. ... Bxe3 8. Qd8† Ka7 9. Qc7†
and 10. Qc6†.
v) For instance, 8. ... Kc8 9. Qd6
Re2† 10. Kb3 Ed2 11. Qa6†, or 8.
... Rh3 (e6) 9. Qd8† and 10. Qd7†,
or 8. ... Bg5 9. Qd6† Ka8 10. Qc6†
Kb8 11. Qb6†.

No. 2783  J. Roche
Thèmes-64, 1974

1 H.M., 4+3

No. 2783: J. Roche. “Amusing,
though the solution is brief. A
‘draughts’ theme, W sacrificing 3S
(1) for stalemate.” 1. Sg6 Rxg6/i
2. g8S Re8 3. Se5† Rxe5 4. Se7†
Rxe7 stalemate.
i) 1. ... Rh5† 2. Kg8 Ra7 3. Se7†
Rxe7 4. Kf8. 1. ... Ra7 2. d5f4 Rg1
3. Kg8 Rb1 4. Se7†.

No. 2784  G. N. Zakhodyakin
(xii. 74)

2 H.M., Thèmes-64, 1974
To the memory of
V. Halberstadt

Win 3+4

No. 2784: G. N. Zakhodyakin. “A
pretty conceit, B1 promoting to S
to avoid mate, but then W can
capture it.” 1. Sc4† Kb4 2. Sa3
Ka2 wins, but not 5. Bf6 (e7)?
stalemate.
i) 2. ... a1Q, or 2. ... Kxa3 3. Bd6
is mate.

No. 2785  B. G. Olympiev
(iii. 74)

3 H.M., Thèmes-64, 1974

Win 3+4

No. 2785: B. G. Olympiev. “Amusing,
and the solution is brief. A
‘draughts’ theme, W sacrificing 3S
(1) for stalemate.” 1. Sg6 Rxg6/i
No. 2785: B. G. Olympiev. “Pretty mating combination, even if its originality is in question.” 1. Sf5 Rd7/i 2. Rhf+ Kf7 3. Rh7+ Ke8 4. Sd6f Kd8 5. Rh8+ Ke7 (c7) 6. Re8 (c8) mate. i) 1. ... Ke8 2. Sd6f, or 1. ... Kg8 2. Sh6f.


iv) 5. ... Kxc5 6. Bc4 Kxc4 7. f5. 
v) 13. ... Kd4 14. Bc3 Kd5 15. Bd7 
a4 16. Bc3 Ke4 17. Bb7 Kd5 18. Ra6 

I cannot trace the 1954 study.

No. 2790 S. Belokon 
2nd Prize, 
(1974)

No. 2791 F. S. Aitov 
3rd Prize, 
(1974)

No. 2789 V. Yakimchik 
1st Prize, 
(1974)

No. 2792: G. A. Nadareishvili. 1. 
Rb5 a4/i 2. Rh8+ Kb7 3. Rh4 a3 
4. Rh3/i a2 5. Ra3 draw. 
i) 1. ... Ra7 2. Kg2 a4 3. Rh1 a3 
4. Ra1 a2 5. Kf2 Kg7 6. Ke2 Kb6 
ii) 4. Ra4? Rg8 5. Rh2 Rb8 6. Kf2 
Kb5.
No. 2792  G. A. Nadareishvili
1 H.M., 64, 1974

Draw 2+3

JRH: Combines the ideas of Chéron (1944 I (No. 273) and Przepiórka (1926), No. 898 in '1234'.

No. 2793  N. Kralin
2 H.M., (v. 74)

Draw 3+4

No. 2794  V. Anufriev
3 H.M., 64, 1974

Draw 4+4

 perpetual check or 6. ... Bxh6 stalemate.

i) 1. ... Kxf7 2. Kf4 and 3. Sg5. 1. ... Kg7 2. f6t Kh6 3. Kd4 e2 4. Sc5 and bB is blocked off from f8.

No. 2795: L. Iskra
4 H.M., 64, 1974

Draw 4+5

No. 2793: N. Kralin. 1. Kh6 Sf8
2. Kg7 Rg8t 3. Kg7 Sg6 4. Rh3 Sh8t 5. Ke7 Rg7† 6. Ke8 Bg6† 7. Kf8 Rf7t 8. Kg8.


No. 2794: V. Anufriev. 1. f7t Kh8/i
2. Kf8 e2 3. Sc5 e1Q 4. f8Q† Bxf8 5. Sf7† Kg8 6. Sh6† and either

No. 2795: L. Iskra. 1. d4/i Kxd4/ii
2. Kf6 Kd5 3. Kg7 Ke6 4. Kxh7 Kf7 5. b4/iii a4 6. b5 a3 7. ba a2 8. a7 a1Q 9. a8Q Qxa8 stalemate.


ii) 1. ... Kxb3 2. d5 a4 3. d6 a3 4. d7 a2 5. d8Q a1Q 6. Qxb6† Ke2 7. Qc7† and 8. Qxh7.

iii) 5. Kh8? Kg6 6. h7 Kf7 7. b4 a4 8. b5 a3 9. ba a2 10. a7 a1Q mate.


RH: Cf. Nos. 787 (Kubbel, 1922) and 788 in ‘2500’.


RH: Similar promotion in Gunst, No. 16 in ‘111’.


No. 2800: A. Maksimovskikh.

i) 2. ... Kg2 3. Ke3† Kf2 4. Kg4†. 

JRH: Well known mate, see Kaila (1934), No. 34 in ‘11’.

No. 2801: E. Asaba.
i) 3. Rd3† Kf4 4. Rd4† Kf5 5. Rd5† Ke6.
ii) ‘Reti’ manoeuvre, combined with...
iii) ‘Duras’ (and others) decoy manoeuvre, luring bK into check when hP promotes.

JRH: Variant on well trodden path, such as Kuryatnikov (1972), No. 2079 in EG36.

No. 2802: A. P. Kazantsev.

JRH: Dedicated to the memory of B. A. Sakharov

No. 2803: A. Zlatanov (Bulgaria).

i) 7. g8Q† Kxe6 8. Sf6† Kf7 9. h7 Kg7 10. d6 Be6 11. Rg4† Kf7 12. h8S† Kxf6 13. Rg6† Kf5 14. Rxe6 Kxe6 draw.
No. 2804: Y. V. Bazlov (USSR).
   ii) 1. ... Ke3 2. Rc3f Kf2 3. Sd2 Ke4 4. Sb1. 1. ... Kd3 2. Se5f Kd2
   iii) 2. ... b1S 3. Sg5f Kd4 4. Rg3 Sc3 (Sd2; Rgl) 5. Sf3f Kd5 6. Sd2 wins, for example: 6. ... Kd4 7.
   Kg5 Sf5 13. Sc6f, or in this a winning alternative is 11. Rd3 Sc6f 12.
   Rd8 Ke5 16. Rg8 Kxc6 17.
   Re8f. If 3. ... Kf4, then 4. Rg4f Kg3 5.
   Se4f Kg2 6. Kg6 Sg4 7. Rd4 Sa3
   8. Sg5f Kg3 9. Rb3f.
   iv) 3. Kg5f b1S 4. Rb3 Se3 draw.
   v) 4. ... Sf2 5. Sg5f Kf4 6. Rf3f
   Rd2.
   vi) 6. ... Sb1 7. Rd4f Kg5 8. Sf3f
   ... Kg3 8. Rd1 Sc3 9. Rd3f Kg2
   10. Rxc3 Kxg1 11. Rg3f.
   "The judges agreed unanimously that these 2 entries (Nos. 2804 and
   2805) stood ahead of the field. Both are miniatures with inspired ideas and faultless construction. No.
   2804 ends with an ideal mate not previously shown. In No. 2805 one variation echoes another about
   the axis of a long diagonal; the
   play, ranging across the board, shows a remarkable 'double-fork' defence of the minor pieces."

No. 2805: R. V. Bazlov (USSR).
1. Sb4f Ka5 (Kb5; Bd3f) 2. Sc6f
   Ka4/i 3. Bc2f Kb5 4. Sxd4f/i Kc4
   5. Bb2 and now:
   5. ... Rg7f 6. Kd6 Rb7 7. Ba1 Ra7
   Ke2 11. Sf3f Rg7f/vi 12. Sg1f.
   5. ... Rg2 6. Ba1 Rg1 7. Sb3 Rg2 8.
   Sa5f Kb5 9. Sc6 (Sb3f/Ke4) 9.
   ... Rg1 10. Sa7f.
   i) 2. ... Kb5 3. Sxd4f Kc4 4. Bf7f
   Kxc3 5. Sc2f.
   Sd4f Kc4 7. Sxc2 Kd3.
   iii) 5. Bf5? Rg7f and 6. ... Kxc3.
   5. Se2f Rg2.
   Ra2.
   Bb3 Rb7 14. Sc4 Ra7 15. Bb2 Rb7
   16. Bc2f Kc4 17. Ba1 Ra7 18. Bb3f
   vi) 11. ... Kxf3 12. Bd5f. 11. ...
   Rxb3 12. Sd4f.
   Note: The above analysis is, of course, the composer's. David
   Hooper suggests an alternative presentation of the echo, by diver-
   ging after an extra move of the main line, namely 5. Bb2 Rg2 6.
   Ba1 and now 6. ... Rg1 or 6. ...
   Rg7f.
No. 2806: H. Osadnik (Poland).


"A duel between bR and wK. wK moves on a charted course preparing flight-squares for future use, and escaping the checks after 25 moves. A line composing achievement."

No. 2807: S. A. da Silva (Brazil).


i) 4. d6t Be6 5. Sc7 (g7) Bd7.

"An original and charming model mate. A study destined for the anthologists."

No. 2808: G. M. Kasparyan.

i) 1. Qf5† Kb4 2. Qb1† Ke5 3. Be3† e5d4 = 1. Be3† Kb4 2. Bd2† Ka4 draw.
ii) 1 ... c5d4 2. Qe5f Qd5f (Kb4; e8Q) 3. Qxd5f Ke5 4. e4f Kc4 5. Bf4 1. ... bSd4 2. Qe5f Kd4 3. Bd2f K– 4. e8Q 1. ... Qd4 2. Qc1†, but not 2. Qxd4f? c5d4 3. Bf4 Sf5.
iii) 2. ... Ke5 3. e8Q 2. ... Kb3 3. e8Q Sa5f 4. Qb6. 2. ... Qc3 3. Qxc3f Kxc3 4. Kxe6.
v) 5. ... Kb4 6. e8Q.

An ideal mate against bK in the centre. BQ only stands and waits, although she serves in the varia-
tinos.

No. 2809: S. T. Sahasrabudhe 6th Prize.


xii) 5. ... g2 6. Sd7 g1Qf 7. Kd6 Qf 8. Ke7 wins.

xiii) 11. ... Qh7† 12. Ke6, after which B1 cannot corner wK, and bK cannot 'escape' from his own fortress/prison.


"B1 queens a P but, incredibly, W has time to build a fortress of..."
original design in which bK is incarcerated. The composer also submitted a win-study showing the antiform of this idea and it was hard to decide which to select.”

No. 2810: A. Koranyi (Hungary).

Draw

No. 2810: A. Koranyi (Hungary).

i) 1. Kb8? Re4 and ... Re8 and ... Bd8. 1. Qe7? Rc8| and ... Rc7†.


iii) 7. ... Rd3 8. Ka(b)6 Rxa3 9. Ka(b)5.


10. Kb4? Ra1 11. Kb5 Rh1 12. Kxa4 h2 and ... Ra(b)1†. W is in zugzwang.


vi) 13. Kxa7 h2 and ... Ra(b)1†.


“wQ is soon imprisoned, but he manoeuvres his K with precision to draw against bP and 2 passed P’s.”

Computers and the endgame

1. David Levy lost a crate of whisky (in i.76) in a bet with GM Averbakh when a program held its own against the GM in a selection of R + P vs. R. endgames.

2. Some incidental work is being sponsored by the Science Research Council at the Dept. of Computer Science, Queen Mary College (London).

AJR hopes to keep in touch with this.

NEW STATESMAN 1975-6 Tournament, Provisional Award.

The 2 judges, David Hooper and Adam Sobey, appear to have cooperated harmoniously in evaluation of the 98 entries. They write: “The quality of the first 30 or so entries was as high as ever, although more than 12 were anticipated or cooked. Agreeing wholeheartedly with IGCC Kasparyan we have judged by beauty, originality and technical skill, but have used no ‘points’ scale for, as he says, art cannot be so judged. We enjoyed the task, and take comfort that so many entries showed new ideas although a century and a quarter has passed since Kling and Horwitz wrote their famous book. The 7 Prize-Winners have a distinctive originality that raises them above the next 5, and these, in turn, are noticeably finer than the Commendeds which we feel, should not be ordered.”
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