TWO BISHOPS AGAINST KNIGHT (continued from EG74) -- by AJR. Ofer Comay (alias Komay or Komai in these and other pages) is a system programmer with the Tel-Aviv University computer installation. He is also a champion solver and first class composer. Unknown to each other, Comay and Ken Thompson were working on the computer solution to the 0023 (GBR class) endgame at roughly the same time. Indeed, so much was their work simultaneous that a letter (dated 24. viii.83 and his first) on this subject was on its way to AJR from Comay at the very time that AJR was in the air travelling to Israel for the 1983 FIDE Commission meeting. EG74 proofs were already with the printer and could not be altered. And that was when and where AJR met Ofer Comay for the first time. So, EG75 is where we do justice to the other researcher. (I understand that Comay could have published his computer results elsewhere, but has not done so).

Now, Comay’s results do not tally exactly with Thompson’s, but they do confirm that the bishops always win. Comay’s maximum is 67, Thompson’s is 66. AJR amends both by prefacing each WTM (White-to-Move) series with a single Bl move, but this is unimportant. What is more important is that the positions of maximum solution length are quite different.

It is too early to summarise results. Here we merely present them. But it is important and valuable that two totally independent computer investigations should agree 99%. There can be no residual doubt that two bishops do always win against a single knight, and that for many solutions the play requires an extension to the famous, or infamous, 50-move rule.

Ofer Comay’s 12 positions are very closely related, as can be seen by listing them as follows:

**C1**: wKa4 wBb5, cl bKd1 b5 (a2, d5, e2, e4)
**C2**: wKa4 wBb2 bKc2 bSc3 wB (b7, f3, h1)
**C3**: wKd1 wBb2 bKb3 bSc3 wB (b7, h1)
**C4**: wKa3 wBf1 bSd2 and either wBc1, bKc3, or wBc3, bKc1
**C5**: wKb1 wBb5, cl bKd1 bSe2

All these positions provide very minor variations of introductory play leading to the same basic temporary incarceration of wK in C5, the one to be considered in detail below. In a C1 position, for example, the play would be 1. Bb2 Kc2 2. Ka3 Sc3 3. B5-Sb1 + 4. Ka2 Sc3 + 5. Ka1.

Now for the variationless play from C5, as originally sent to AJR, who has added just the "Kling and Horwitz" comments.

Now we give another line, also starting from C5, but this time with the computer's added "notes":


2) 5. Bc1, a3.
3) 5. ..., Kd4.
4) 6. ..., Kd3. 6. ..., Sc4, a4, d1, e2, b5.
6) 7. ..., Sc3


1) 11. Kb3, a3.
2) 11. ..., Ke4. 11. ..., Sf5, g4, f1
6) 17. ..., Sf4.
7) 19. ..., Kd4.
8) 23. ..., Kb3.


1) 24. Ba5.
2) 24. ..., Kd3, d2, b3.
4) 24. ..., Sc4, a4, d1, e2, b5.
5) 24. Bb6. The position is now: wBk4 wBa5 wBf7. bKc3 bSb2.
6) 30. Bb6 + Kf4 31. Bc7 + Ke3/i 32. Kc3 Sd1 + 33. Kb3 Sf2 34. Bb6 + Kf3 35. Bh5 + Kg3 36. Kc4 Sg4 37. Bc7 + Kh4 38. Bc6 Kg5 39. Bb3 Kf6 40. Kd5 Kg5/ii 41. Bb1 Se3 + 42. Ke4 Sc5 43. Bc2 Kf6 44. Be5 + Kg5 45. Bc3 Se7. Ba4/i Sg6 47. Bb3 Se7 48. Ba5 Kg6 49. Kf4 Sc6 50. Bc3/iv Sb8 51. Ba4 Kf7 52. Ke5/v Ke7. This concludes the next phase, or phases. It is the hardest to make sense of, since it conceals an as yet unknown number of strategic and tactical patterns which we humans will have to work on (assisted by conversational
tools enabling us to have a 'dialogue' with the data base). For the time being we can say only that it is "phase four", in which bK and bS are forced to the edge of the board but prevented from re-adopting a Kling and Horwitz position. The long succession of 'unique' moves is quite extraordinary -- moves 32 to 40 and moves 41 to 45 -- even making allowance for the fact that 'unique' does not mean unique in the study sense of 'only move to win', but in the computer sense of 'only move to secure the quickest win'.

i) 31. ..., Kf5
ii) 40. ..., Kf7
iii) 46. Bd1 b3.
iv) 50. Bc7
v) 52. Kf5.

The position is now: wKe5 wBa4 wBc3 bKe7 bSb8.

   /i Kb7 56. Bc5 Sa6/ii 57. Bc6+ /iv
   Kb8/v 58. Bb6 Sb4 59. Be4 Sa2 60.
   Kc5 Kc7/viii 63. Bf3 Sa4+/ ix 64.
   Be4 Sa3/ xi 67.

Kxa3. The final phase requires no commentary.

i) 53. Kd5.
ii) 55. Be5, c3, d2, e1, a3
iii) 56. ..., Kc8 a8
iv) 57. Be3 f2
v) 57. ..., Kc8
vi) 60. Kc6, 60. Bd4.

vii) 61. Bf3 g2
viii) 62. ..., Kd8
ix) 64. ..., Sb2
x) 65. ..., Sa2.

xi) 66. ..., Kd8, c8, b8, d7, d6. 66.

Sc3, d2.

Finally, the reader may care to examine what Comay's program makes of Ken Thompson's T1 from EG74. We would warn the reader against drawing any conclusions from his comparison.

*C* C6 (see T1 in EG74)

1. Bf8 (Bg7) 1. ..., Kf2 (Kg3) 2.
   Bc5 + Kf3 3. Ba7/i Kg3 4. Bg1 Kf3
   (Kh3) 5. Ka7 (Kb7) 5. ..., Kg3 6. Ka6
   (Kb6) 6. ..., Kf3 (Kh3) 7. Kf5 Kg3 8.
   Kc4 Kf3 (Kh3) 9. Kd3 Kg3 10. Ke2
   Sf4 + 11. Ke1 (Kf1) 11. ..., Sg2 + 12.
   Kf1 Sf4.

i) 3. Kb8, b7 a7. Bd6, d4, g1, b6, a7.
The position is now: wKf1 wBg1
   wBh1 bKg3 bSf4.

   Kf4 15. Bh2+ Kf5 (Kg5) 16. Be8/ii
   (Kd4) 18. ..., Se6 19. Kd5 Sg7.

iv) 17. ..., Kf5. Sg7, g5, c5 + .
The position is now of the Kling and
   Horwitz type: wKd5 wBc8 wBh2
   bKf6 bSg7.

   Kg6 22. Be2/ii Kg7 23. Bd1/iii Sh5/iv

i) 20. ..., Kf7, e7, g6, g5. Sf5.
iv) 23. ..., Kf7. Se8, h5.

24. Kd6, d6, c6.
vi) 26. Bc3, b2, a1, b3 + .
The position is now at the next, and
   complex, state: wKd7 wBc2 wBd4.
   bKf7 bSf5.

   (Bb6) 31. ..., Kf4 32. Bb6 Sg3 33.
   Bc7 + Kf3 34. Bd1 + Kf2 35. Ke6 Se2
   Kc3 39. Kd5 Kb3 (Kd2) 40. Kc5 Sd3
   41. Be6 + Kc2 42. Kc4 Sd1 43. Bf5+
   Kd2 44. Kd4 Sc3 (Ke2) 45. Be6 Sd1
   (Ke2).

Somewhat arbitrarily drawing a line
   in this point we enter the "Bl is con-
   fined" stage: wKd4 wBc2 wBe6 bKd2
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Bc6 Sg3 55. Bd8 Kf1 56. Bd5 (Be7) Sf5 57. Be6 (Ke4) Sg3.
i) 52. Bg6, f7, e8, g4, f3, d1.
ii) 52. ... Kg2, e1. Sf5.
iii) 53. Bf3, g4, b3, a4.
The final mopping-up operation stage, starts from: wKd3 wBd8 wBe6 bkf1 bSg3.
i) 64. ... Sa8, a6, b5.
ii) 65. ... Kg2, f2, g1, e1.
Naturally, the final note always must include every legal move.
P.S. We have not heard the last of GBR class 0023, but we must give it a rest for a while.

KUBBEL AGAIN!
EG69, p. 70, adaptation by Godes of a Kubbels classic: IGM Pal Benko (US) follows the composer’s solution (B1) 1. Bh6 Ke4 2. d3 + Kf3 3.

Kb7 a3 4. Bc1 but then diverges with 4. ..., a2 to draw. 5. Bb2 Ke3 followed by 6. ..., Kd2. Benko’s next point: "Actually the win is more simple: 1. Bh6 Ke4 2. Bf8 (despite the original note giving this move a ") 2. ..., Kf3 3. e4 and W wins after either 3. ..., de 4. dc Ke4 5. c4, or 3. ..., Ke2 4. Bb4 Kd3 5. e5.

Mr Whitworth’s article was of great interest to me. Personally I am against using a piece for no other purpose than to sacrifice itself. But even if one accepts this type of introductory play it may be possible to do it better. Here are two attempts. In B2 1. Se6 is more spectacular, exposing wK to a possible check on a1.


Se3 + and c3. 2. Sd4 + ed 3. Bg7 and so on. The wS moves are incorporated into the play and by changing the P-structure the solution is better concealed. In fact I agree with Tavariani’s suggestion to leave off wS. It
is a plus that the position becomes a miniature but the W1 and W3 versions are dull. I would like to offer B4 as perhaps the best setting as a miniature. 1. d3. A surprise. W makes no attempt to stop aP. 1. Bh4 d3 (or Ke4; first) 2. c3 Ke4 3. Kb7 a4 4. B4. Win 4 + 3 Be7 Kb3 5. Kb6 Kc2 draws (just). 1. ... a4 2. Bh4 Ke6 3. Bg5 (for Bc1-b2) and so on. This takes no credit from Kubbel, who after all introduced the theme. My examples may help the cause of true artistry by developing a more sophisticated taste in lovers of the endgame.

Second World Chess Compositions Tournament (2. WCCT). There was one studies theme set for this 10-section team event. Set theme: In the main line (or variation or try, and by W or B1) a promotion to Q creates instant stalemate. Hillel Aloni (Israel) precedes his award with the following words (here and there paraphrased). "It was a great honour for me and my small country to be assigned the responsibility of choosing the theme and judging the Endgames section of the Second WCCT. It seems that the trust placed in us can be ascribed to the outstanding development of Israeli chess study composition. "The WCCT was announced as a 'thematic tourney', and I would like to clarify here, in a few words, my personal attitude to this requirement in the specific case of studies. It seems to me that in contrast to problems, where there is short-range action and therefore the realisation of the theme becomes a main objective, the long and varied play which characterises endings in general renders such a requirement rather marginal, and more emphasis should be given to the value of the ending as a (whole) composition. The thematic limitation serves only as a kind of entrance permit to the special framework of the tourney in question, and this is the only way it differs from the 'classical' demand of a 'free theme'. "From this standpoint, then, the composer who cleverly presents a multiplication of the theme, but with poor play, is not assured of success in the tourney, while on the other hand a composer who presents only a minimal execution of the theme, but manages to create around it original and valuable chess content, may well reap rich reward. "Before turning to a detailed review of the compositions participating in the tourney it is my pleasant duty to thank the people who assisted me in this difficult but rewarding task: first and foremost Dr. J. Niemann (BRD) for his direction of the tourney; Mr. J.R. Harman (UK) who, in spite of severe illness (the very serious Cloward's operation was only one of Richard's ordeals. He is now having to learn to walk -- for the fourth time in his life. (AJR)) greatly contributed towards the testing of originality; Mr. A. Ettinger (Israel) for translating the award into English; and, last but not least, Mr. D. Lucas (Israel) for his competent translations from German. I am grateful to all. "31 competing compositions were submitted for adjudication. Most of them represent an a posteriori justification of my attitude, as expressed in the foregoing, towards the importance of thematic content, insofar a
they restricted themselves to a limited realisation of the thematic requirement, concentrating on the creation of as excellent by-play as possible. In this regard I felt disappointed in the following respects:

"a) our choice of theme was based on the great popularity it has enjoyed since endgame composition began, and on the possibilities which it opens up for imaginative composers. However, in the present case composers did not live up to expectation, since apart from a number of excellent compositions which hinted at the unanswerable possibilities inherent in the theme most of them did not rise above the routine which prevails in many ordinary tourneys today.

"b) The epidemic of 'deficiencies' which has been afflicting the best tourneys in recent years (as a reminder, consider the 1972-75 WCCT), beyond question pointing to a lack of care on the part of composers and judges alike, has not spared the current WCCT, in spite of the long time available to competing countries, which ought to have enabled them to check and analyse their entries thoroughly. No fewer than 12 (almost 40%) of the submitted entries, including some of the very best, had to be disqualified due to defects both apparent and concealed, even before the test for originality and evaluation of the study as a composition. This is definitely a warning sign, and unless a marked improvement occurs in the near future the whole field of endgame composition is in danger of losing most of its credibility.

"c) In a few cases there was an evident desire merely to win ranking points, without any real effort to create something of value, the composers contenting themselves with sloppy work barely satisfying the thematic demand; eg they 'dressed up' a well known element with banal by-play inferior even to that of its predecessors. In these cases I was in a dilemma to decide whether to include such efforts in the award at all. I think that my decisions will not encourage similar attempts in future...

"In checking the correctness of participating entries I had to examine, in a number of instances, some delicate aspects of endgame theory, including one known as fairly innovative (sic). Luckily I did not have to resolve problems requiring an exhaustive research of the authorities, and the questionable positions could easily be evaluated.

"Finally, a few words regarding the numerous objections and comments by the participating countries: the eagerness to expose errors and anticipations in competing entries is of course legitimate, and paradoxically even constructive, as it enhances the credibility of chess compositions. But this does not mean that such criticism is not itself subject to considerations of credibility. In some cases a questionable or even totally incorrect analysis was given in order to invalidate a composer's solution (or maybe to trip the judge up)? So more care seems to be indicated.

"After checking the 31 entries for correctness and originality I decided to include in the final award only 17 of them...

The above extensive extract is reproduced, with full acknowledgement to the West German "Die Schwalbe" fairy chess magazine and its remarkable band of workers (Peter Kniest, Bernd Ellinghoven, Dr. J. Niemann) who produced the whole 2. WCCT award booklet, which otherwise would not have appeared, in which event the tourney itself would not have taken place. (Result: 1st Place: USSR; 2nd: Israel; 3rd: USA; 4th: Czechoslovakia. 29 countries competed).
No. 5024: Zoltan Fekete (Hungary).


No. 5028: Cs. Meleghegyi (Hungary).
1. Bxb5 Sxb4 2. h6 Kf8 3. Bc4 Sc6 3. ...
   Bh5 Sf7. 7. ...
   Bh5 Sf7. 7. ...

No. 5030: L.A. Mitrofanov (Leningrad).
1. b6 h4 2. a6 Rb8 3. d6 Rf8 4.
   d8 Qd7 + 5. Kxh7 Kh7 8. Qd7.
5. ...
   Rg8 6. Qb3 7. d8 Qd2 8.
   Qxg8 + Qxg8 9. Qxg8 + Kg8 10. a7.

No. 5029: M.A. Zinar (Feodosia).
Judge: F.S. Bondarenko of Dnipropetrovsk.
1. a4 Kd4 2. Kh5/1 f5 3.
   Kb4 Kc5 4. Kg3 Kb4 5. Kf3(f2) Kxa4
   Kxf5 d4 10. Kg6 d3 11. f5 d2 12. f6
   d1 Qd1 + 13. Kh7, and a book draw.
   i) 2. Kg6? Kc5 3. Kf5 (Kxf6, d4;) 3.
   d4 4. Ke4 Kc4 5. a5 d3 6. Ke3 Kc3
   7. a6 d2 8. a7 d1 Q 9. a8 Q Qe1 + 10.
   Kf3 Qh1 + wins.

No. 5031: I. Bondar (Brest Region).
1. Bf4 + Ke8 2. cb +
   Kd7 3. Bc7 Re8 4. Sb2 Bh5 5. Sd3
   Rg8 6. Se5 + Ke6 7. Sc6 Kd7 8. Bd8
   Rg1 9. Sb4 Rb1 10. Kb5 Be2 + 11.
   Ka4 Bd1 + 12. Ka5 Ra1 + 13. Kb6
   Rb1 14. Be7, or if 11. ...
No. 5032: N.V. Rezvov (Odessa).

No. 5033: Al.P. Kuznetsov (Moscow).

No. 5034: A.P. Manyakhin (Lipetsk).

No. 5035: V.N. Dolgov (Dmitrievskaya, Krasnodarsky Krai).


No. 5044: G.A. Polin 2nd Prize, Podolsk "200 Years" Tourney, 1981 Award: Podolsky Rabochy 27.xi.81
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No. 5044: G.A. Polin (Saratov). The judge of this local tourney celebrating 200 years of the town of Podolsk was IGM and Judge V.A. Korolkov (Leningrad). There were 76 entries and the judge regretfully reports the exclusion of many from the award by reason of unsoundness. The 1st Prize went to A.G. Kopnin, with K9, to be found in the composer's article in EG74.


"...attractive position in which wB, fighting alone and with subtle manoeuvres against 3 B1 pieces, will not allow b5 access to freedom via c6 or b5".

No. 5045: G.A. Umnov (Podolsk). bPa2 is out of reach, but the poor situation of bK allows W to initiate mating threats. 1. Sc7+ Kb8 2. Sa6+ Ka8 3. Be6/i a1Q 4. Bd5+ Sb7 + 5. Kc8 Qxa6 6. dc g3 7. h6 g2 8. h7 g1Q 9. h8Q Qg3 10. Kd7+ Qb8 11. Qc8. There is now an original position of reciprocal zugzwang. B1 has bQQ but no useful move. After 11. ..., Qxg8+ 12. Kc8 B1 is once more in zugzwang. After a "random" move of bQ B1 will be mated.


No. 5046: Y.V. Bazlov (Primorsky Krai). 1. Qh6. wQ takes up the most active position possible. 1. ..., Qb1 + 2. Kxg2 Qb4 + 3. Ke2 (Ke3? Qc5 +;)


Without bPd5 B1 could have played 10. ..., Qa5 +. And so, to escape the menacing perpetual, W gives up his remaining piece -- wQ. But what happens next?

  ii) 7. Bhl? g4 8. Bg2 g3 and W is in zugzwang.

No. 5048: A.P. Maksimovskikh (Kurgan Region) and Y.M. Makletsov (Yakut Autonomous Republic).
  ii) Only in this way can wK evade the unpleasant attentions of bR.


  i) 3. Kg7? Rxa7 4. f7 c5.
But A.G. Kopnin reports that 3. Kg8 demolishes the study: 3. ..., h2 4. f7 Kg3 + 5. Kf8 Ra3 (h1Q; a8Q +) 6. Kg8 (g7) Rg3 + 7. Kf8, with a draw, meeting the stipulation.
  iii) 6. ..., h1Q serves no purpose, since bR blocks the a8-h1 diagonal.

No. 5052: G. Pozdnyak (Podolsk). 1. Kc7 h2/i 2. b4 b5 3. a4 ba 4. Kc6 Se3. Because w5 threatened to play to d5 square. 5. Sd5! Sxd5 6. b5+ Ka5 7. Bd2+ Sb4+ 8. Kc5 a3 9. b3 h1Q. B1 has conducted hP through to promotion, but the elevated foot-soldier has no time to spread his wings. 10 Bxb4 mate.


No. 5054: G. Nadarnashvili 1st Prize, Komnutri, 1982, "Gruziya-60" Award: Shakhmatny Tbilisi, xii.82
No. 5054: G. Nadareishvili (Tbilisi).
This important tourney is a text-book example of the very real difficulty there is in identifying a tourney. The award was published in "Tbilisi Chess" (Russian title 'Shakhmatny Tbilisi'), described as "a special bulletin of the Committee for Physical Culture and Sport of the Council ('soviet') of Ministers of the Georgian ('Gruziyan') Republic and of the Georgian Chess Federation". The award takes up 3 pages of the 8-page bulletin and is headed "'Gruziya-60'
Tourney, but the sub-heading (take another deep breath) reads, in translation: "provisional award in the All-Union tourney for study composition -- 'Gruziya-60', organised by the organ of the TsK (ie, Central Committee) of the Georgian 'Kom- party' (ie, the Communist Party), of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Georgian Republic, namely 'Komunisti', in celebration of 60 years of the Georgian Komparty and the inauguration of the Georgian SSR". Probably everyone will be happy to call the tourney "Gruziya-60". The judges were Vazha Neidze and Revaz Tavariani, both of Tbilisi. There were approximately 150 entries.


No. 5056: S. Varov (Erevan). 1. Re1 Bf3 2. Bg7+ e5 3. Rxe5 Qg8 4. Bf6 Qf8 (Qf7; Bh8) 5. Re5+. Had B1 played 1. ..., Bh5 then W would now draw with 5. Re5+ Kd5 6. Re5+ Kc6 7. Rxc5 QxR 8. Rxh5. 6. Re5+ Kd4 7. Be7 Qe8 (Qb8; Bh4) 8. Bf6. A new battery is set up, with the same threat to win bQ. 8. ..., Qd8 (Qd7; Bh8) 9. Rd5+ Kc4 10. Re5+ Kd4 11. Be7 Qe8 (Qh8; Bb3) 12. Bf6, and a draw by "perpeami battery", with symmetrical play. A highly successful debut by a little known composer.


No. 5064: I. Krikheli (Gori). 1. Re8? Bf1+ 1. Rc7+ Kb8 2. Re7 e2. Or 2. ...
   7. Ka5 Rxe4 stalemate.

No. 5066: S. Belokon (Kharkov) and An. G. Kuznetsov (Moscow).
   Rh2+ 7. Ka3 Rh7 8. Rd3+ and after 8. ..., cd 9. c8Q+ W wins on
   material.

No. 5065: A. Maksimovskikh (Kurgan Region) and Y. Makletsov (Yakutia).
1. Sd6. This threatens Sf7+, Kh5; Rh7+. 1. ..., Kg5 2. Se4+
   Kh6. If 2. ..., Kf5 3. Kg3 + 3. Rxd7
   c1Q 4. Bg7+ Kh5 5. Kg3 + Kg5 6. Rd5 + Kh4 7. Rh5 + gh 8. Bf6 + Qg5
   9. Sf5 mate.

No. 5067: E. Asaba (Moscow).
1. Rg4 a2 2. Rg1 Sb1 3. Sg8 + Kh7 4. Sf6 + Kh6 5. h4 a1Q 6. h5 and 7.
   Rg6 mate. A second line is: 3. ..., Kh5 4. Sf6 + Kh4 5. Rg4 + Kh3 6.
   Rg5 and 7. Rh5 mate.


No. 5071: L. Mitrofanov and V. Razumenko (both of Leningrad). 1. Kg2 h1Q + 2. Kxh1 c2 3. Kh2 c1Q 4. Bd8 + Qg5 5. c7 a2 6. f4. 6. c8Q? a1Q 7. Qc7 gQf6. 6. ..., g3 +. Had W played 3. Kg2? then B1 could survive with g/f here. However, now after 6. ..., gf follows 7. c8Q a1Q 8. Qh3 mate. 7. Kg2 a1Q 8. Bxg5 + Kg4 9. c8Q mate.


No. 5075: E.L. Pogosyants (Moscow). 1. g7 Sg4+ 2. Kf7 Kh5 (Sh6+; Kg6) 3. g8Q Sh6+ 4. Kg7 Sxg8 5. Kxg8 Rh4+ 6. Kh7 Rf4 7. Kg7 Rg4+ 8. Kh7 draws, and after the alternative 2. ..., Rf4 3. g8Q Sh6+ 4. Kg7 Sxg8 5. f7 Rg4+ 6. Kh7 Rf4 7. Kg7 Rh4+ 8. Kg7 Kf6 6. Sf6+ 7. Kh6/Sd7 8. f8Q Sxf8 it is stalemate.

i) 7. Kh8? Kg5 8. f8Q Rh4+ 9. Kg7 Rh7 mate.
No. 5076: D. Gurgenidze and L.A. Mitrofanov. 172 studies from 97 composers were submitted to the judge, V.A. Korolkov, a close friend of the great problemist Lev Loshinsky.


iii) "An interesting position of reciprocal zugzwang: bPd6 would ob-
struct bBf3 if it moved, while bB is also tied. If 8 ..., Bg2 9. f4 Be4 10. f5+ Ke5 11. f6 Ke6 12. f7 and 13. Bxd6, and bS is in turn tied to defence of bP. There remains the text move of bK.


ii) W hopes for stalemate with pin of wS.


i) W sets up his own battery to counter Bl's.

ii) The initiative continues to change hands.

iii) 6. dSe7 + Kg7 7. Sxg6 Kxg6. "Loshinsky loved batteries!"

No. 5081: L. Katsnelson. 1. Sc6 +/i Sxc6 2. bc + Bxb2 3. c7 + Kb7 4. c8B+/ii Kc6 5. Rc5 + Kb6 6. Rb5 +, or 3. ..., Ka7 4. c8S + Ka6 5. Ra5 + Kxa5 -- 2 stalemates, one with B-promotion, the other with S-promotion.


ii) 4. c8Q +? Kb6 5. Qxa8 Qh6 + and 6. ..., Qxg7 mate.
No. 5082: V. Kondratyev and A.G. Kopnin


i) 1. Rxd4? e2 2. Re4 Rbl + 3. Kxg2 e1Q.


ii) It is the aim of both Bl and W to engineer a promotion with check.


No. 5083: E. Ianosi (Romania).


No. 5084: G.M. Kasparyan.


i) 1. Bf5 +? Rxf5 2. Re8 + Kf4 3. g8Q Rg3.

No. 5085: G.N. Zakhodyakin.


No. 5086: A. Bezgodkov

1. Rd3 ab/i
i) 1. ... Bxb2 2. Rh3 Bf6 3. Rb3
ii) 3. ..., Bd4 is met, not by 4. Rb5 Bc3 5. Kxc3 b1Q + , but by 4. Rb4

No. 5088: N. Plaksin, the retro specialist. Beginning from No. 5088a,
after the very last pawn-move or capture 0. ..., g7-g6, play. 1. Kf6 2.
Kc6 11. Sd6 Rb8 + 12. Sc8 Ra8 13. ...
   Kb7 14. ... Kb8 15. Sd6 16. Sc4
   25. Sd5 Kh3 26. Sc3 Kg2 27. Sb1 Kf1 28. ... Kc6 29. ... Kd1 30. ...
   Kc1 31. Sc3 + Kb2 32. Kg1 Rb8 33. Kg2
   Kc1 34. Sd5 Kd1 35. Rb4 Qa1 36. ...
   Qc1 37. Rb1 Bg1 38. Ra1 Qb1 + 39. Sb6 Kc1 40. Rh2 Kb2 41. Rh3 Qf1
   42. Sc8 Qg2 + 43. Kb8 Bh2 44. Rg1 Qd5 45. Rg2 Qd6 46. Ka8 Bg1 47.
   gRh2 Kc1 48. Kb8 Kd1 49. Ka8 Ke1 50. Kb8 Kf1, and the initial diagram is
   reached after 50 moves, and it’s a draw by the Laws of Chess, on the assump-
   tion (false in a study) that there is a

No. 5087: A.G. Kopnin

1. b7 Rg8 2. Sh4. Now there follow 2 lines: 2. ..., Rg8 4. Qa7/i e1Q 5.
   Qd4 + Rg7 6. Qd8 + Rg8 7. Qf6 + Rg7 8. Qf8 + Rg8 9. Sg6 + hg 10.
   Qxh6 mate.
2. ..., Rb8 3. Sf5, and once again the lines divide:
i) 4. Qb4? Ra8 + 5. Kb3 e1Q.
"player" to make the claim -- but then we are all used to this study-convention interpretation of the game rules.

No. 5089: E. Chumburidze. This competition of the Georgian newspaper 'Soplis Tskhovreba' in the Georgian tongue (= Country Life, but bearing zero relationship to the glossy British journal of the same name!) was for non-town composers. It was even the 5th such tourney. The first was in 1964, and subsequent dates were: 1968, 1972, 1976 and 1980. It is not clear how many of these were for studies. The present tourney was judged by David Gurgenidze, himself a confirmed country-man and current USSR champion for studies. 52 composers entered 86 compositions, and the preliminary award appeared in 'Soplis Tskhovreba' on 25.xii.81. This is the final award. The composer of the 1st Prize-winning study comes from the village of Zeda Simoneti, Terholsky Raion (= local district, smaller than 'oblast' or 'krai') in the Georgian SSR.


No. 5097: I. Roiko (Ukraine, not more closely identified). 1 h7 Rxh2 2 Rxc2 b1Q 3 h8Q+ Rxh8 4 Ra7+ Kd8 5 Rd7+ Ke8 6 Re7+.

No. 5098: N. Pandzhakidze (village of Tsagveri, Georgian Republic). 1 Kg5 Sxg2 2 Ra7+ Ke8 3 Ra8+ Ke7 4 Ra7+ Kf8 5 Ra8+ Kg7 6 Rd8 c2 7 Rxg6+ fg 8 Rxd2 b1Q stalemate.

No. 5099: N. Chebanov (Moldavian Republic). 1 e5+ Kf5 2 Bg1 Kxe5 3 Bxf7+ Kxf7 4 Be5 a2 5 Bxe7 a1Q 6 Bf6+ Kxf6 stalemate.

No. 5100: N. Mansarliiskiy (Odessa Region). 1 Bd5 Kb8 2 c7+ Kc8 3 Re8+ Kxc7 4 Rxe4 Bf1 5 Re7+ Kc8 6 Re8+ Kc7 7 Re7+ Kd8 8 Re1 Ke2 9 Kg6 Kxd5 10 Ke1 Ke5 11 Re1 Ke4 12 Rc1 with a positional draw.

No. 5101: A. Maksimovskikh (Kurgan Krai). 1 c7 Rb2+ 2 Ka3 Rb3+ 3 Ka4 Rxc5 4 dc and either 4 ..., Rb7 5 c8R, or 4 ..., Rb8 5 cb8+.

(No, there were literally no annotations in the award source... AJR).
No. 5102: N. Ryabinin. 1. Bd7 + Kg6


No. 5103: E.L. Pogosyants (i-xii.80)
1st Prize, Bulletin Problemistic, 1980-81
Award: vii-xii.82

1. g7+. 1. Rxf6? Bg3 + 2. Kxg3 Qg5 +, or 2. Kgl Rel + 3. Rf 1 Qe3 +
4. Khl hg + 5. Kxg2 Re2 +. 1. ...,
Kh7 2. ef. 2. Rxf6?
Bg3 + .
2. ...,
Rg8 4. Bg4 Rh8 5. Bh3 Rg8 6. Bf1
Ra8 10. Ba3 Rb8 11. Bc1 Ra8 12. f7

No. 5104: E. Melnichenko (New Zealand).
Kxf5 3. f8Q + Ke4 4. Q- Ral mate.
Ra2+. 1. ...,
Rg8 2. Bg6 Rh8. 2. ...
Rg8 4. Bg4 Rh8 5. Bh3 Rg8 6. Bf1
Ra8 10. Ba3 Rb8 11. Bc1 Ra8 12. f7

No. 5105: D. Gurgenidze (vii-xii.82)
3rd Prize, Bulletin Problemistic, 1980-81

No. 5103: E.L. Pogosyants. Judge: Filipp S. Bondarenko. There were 24
participating studies, rather a small
number for 2 years.
1. g7+. 1. Rxf6? Bg3 + 2. Kxg3
Qg5 +, or 2. Kg1 Re1 + 3. Rf1 Qe3 +
Qxf6 + ? Bxf6 2. Rxh3 Bxe5 + 3. Kg1
Qxh3, or, in this, 2. Rh7 + Qxh7 3.
gh Bxe5 + . 1. ..., Kh7 2. ef. 2. Rxf6?
Bg3 + 2. ..., Bg3 + 3. Rxg3 hg + 4.
Rh3. 4. Kxg2 Qd2 + 5. Kh3 Qh6 +,
perpetual check. 4. ..., g1Q + 5. 
Kxg1 Qxh3 6. Qxg8 + Kg6 7. Qh7 + 
Kxh7 7. ..., Qxh7 8. g8Q + Qxg8 9.
Rg7 + 8. g8Q + Kxg8 9. f7 + Kg7
10. f8Q + Kxf8 11. e7+ Kf7 12.
e8Q + Kxe8 13. d7+ Qxd7 14. Sxd7
No. 5105: D. Gurgenidze. 1. Rg1 Rb1
2. Rg8 + Kh7 3. Rg7 + Kh6 4. Rg6 +
Kh5 5. Rg5 + Kh4 6. Rg4 + Kh3 7.
Rf4 Rg1 8. Rxa2 Re1 9. Rxa2 Kxg2
12. b6 Kd5 13. b7 Kc6 14. b8S + Kc7
15. Ka7 Ra1 + 16. Sa6 + Ka6 and Bl
wins. 11. ..., Ke4 12. b6 Kd5 13. b7
Kc6 14. b8S + draws, not 14. b8Q?
Ra1 mate. David Hooper suggests
that this is "book" from move 10.

5. ..., Be3 (f6) 6. Rxe8 Kxe6 7. Re8 + (Rg6) and wins. If 4. ..., Ba3 5. Kb3 Bc1 6. Rxe8.

No. 5109: V.N. Dolgov and A. Maksimovskikh.

1. Bf6 + Bg7. 1. ...., Kg8 2. Bf7 + 3. Ke6 c1Q 4. g7+ Bxg7 5. Be7 mate. 2. Bg5 Bb2 3. Bf6 + Bxf6 4. Kxf6 c1Q 5. g7+ Kh7 6. Bg6 + Kh6 7. g8S mate.

No. 5110: A.Kakovin and A.Motor.


No. 5111: V.V. Kichigin.

1. a6 1. c6? b2 2. c7 b1Q + 3. Kc8 Qc2. 1. ...., b2 2. a7 b1Q + 3. Kc7 Qb1 4. c6 Qh2 + 5. Ke8 Qh3 + 6. Kb7 wins.

No. 5112: A. Belyavsky (Leningrad).


Eliminated from the final award by Judge: S. Belokon. This was the 5th study tourney of the Kurgan newspaper. The eliminations were the result of comments by readers and competitors, but no specific analyses or other reasons were provided.


No. 5115: G. Amiryan (Erevan). 1. e4 g5 2. e5 g4 3. e6 g3 4. e7 g2 5. e8Q g1Q 6. Qe2 Qh1 7. Qf2 Qd1 8. Qd4 Qe1 9. Qe5 Qh1 10. Qh8 Qf1 11. Qf6.

Addresses of magazines and bulletins that run annual (or biennial) international informal tourneys for original endgame studies. The studies editor’s name, if any, is in brackets. (In an address, a comma generally indicates the end of a line.)

**BULETIN PROBLEMIST**  A.F. Ianovcic, Cartier Gh. Gheorgiu-Dej, Bloc P-1, scala B Ap. 26, 2400 Sibiu, Romania

**CHESS LIFE** (Pal Benko) U.S. Chess Federation, 186 Route 9W, New Windsor, NY 12550, U.S.A.

**DUE ALFIERI** (Enrico Paoli) viale Piave 25, 42100 Reggio Emilia, Italy

**GAZETA CZESTOCHOWSKA** (S. Limbach) Srytka Pocztowa 349, 42207 Czestochowa, Poland

**L’ITALIA SCACCHISTICA** (Prof. R. Ravarini) Via F. Nazari 8, 28100 Novara, Italy

**MAGYAR SAKKELET** (Attila Koranyi) ’Tanulmanyrovat’, P.O. Box 52, 1563 Budapest, Hungary

**PROBLEM** (Dr. S. Zlatic) Baboniceva ul. 35, Zagreb, Yugoslavia

**THE PROBLEMIST** (A.J. Sobey) 15 Kingswood Firs, Grayshott, Hindhead, Surrey GU26 6EU, England

**REVISTA ROMANA DE SAH** (I. Grosu) Sr. Bătistei 11, Bucuresti, Romania

**SACHOVE UMNENIE** (supplement to Československy Sach) (Vladimir Fachman) Cestmirova 27, 14000 Prague (Praha), Czechoslovakia

**SCACCO!** (Dr. E. Paoli) Editrice Scacchistica Internazionale, Via S. Brigida 39, 80133 Napoli, Italy

**SCHACH** (M. Zucker) Ernst Enge Strasse 96, 90 Karl Marx Stadt, DDR

**SCHAKEND NEDERLAND** (F.A. Spinhoven) van Kinsbergenstraat 25, Haarlem, Netherlands

**SCHWEIZERISCHE SCHACHZEITUNG** (Beat Neuenhöchwart) Nobstrasse 3, 3072 Ostermundigen, Switzerland

**SHAHMAT** (for Israel ‘Ring’ Tourney) H. Aloni, 6/5 Rishon-Le-Zion Street, Netanya, 42-274 ISRAEL

**SINFONIE SCACCHISTICHE** (Dr. E. Paoli) Viale Piave 25, Reggio Emilia 42100, Italy

**SUOMEN SHAKKI** (K. Virtanen) Vihdiniementa 3 D 20, SF-53430 Vantaa, FINLAND

**SZACHY** (Jan Rusinek) Ul. Wspolna 61, 00-687 Warsaw, Poland

**THEMES-64** Bruno Fargette, 45 Rue de Saint-Nom, 78112 Fourqueux, France
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Regular, but not international, tourneys are:

**Bulletin of Central Chess Club of USSR, Chervony Girnik.**

These are informal. Other tourneys are irregular, or 'one-off'.

*C* denotes, in *EG*, either an article relating to electronic computers or, when above a diagram, a position generated by computer.

The Chess Endgame Study Circle and *EG* 4 issues p.a. £75-78 for 1984 £ 4.00 or $ 10.00. Calendar year.
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1. Send money (cheques, dollar bills, International Money Orders) direct to A.J. Roycroft.
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New subscribers, donations, changes of address, ideas, special subscription arrangements (if your country’s Exchequer Control regulations prevent you subscribing directly):
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Editor: A.J. Roycroft

**THE CHESS ENGAME STUDY CIRCLE**

Next meeting:

Friday 6th April, 1984, at 6.15 p.m. At: 103 Wigmore Street London W1. (IBM building, behind Selfridge’s in Oxford Street).

This may be the last meeting of the CESC -- please come.
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