"ECE" is the ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHESS ENDINGS. The classification system of the twice-yearly Yugoslav CHESS INFORMANT ("CI") will be known to active chessplayers: each opening is given a code from A00 to E99, with transpositions cross-referenced.

In 1982 CI published the first volume of five that will systematically cover all endgames. The series draws on the data base built up since 1966. In addition many other endgame books, including 'Averbakh', have been keyed in. (What about copyright? AJR.) When complete the whole will represent the most comprehensive reference work available.

Of the five volumes, PAWN ENDINGS and ROOK ENDINGS I and II have been published, with MINOR PIECE ENDINGS and QUEEN ENDINGS expected over the next few years.

The first principle of the classification system adopted is the "most valuable" piece on the board. Thus R + P vs. S will be found in ROOK ENDINGS; Q vs. R + B + S will be in QUEEN ENDINGS.

Within each volume will be found up to 100 subclassifications, for example Q00 to Q99 (ECE actually employs figurines, not Q, R, B, S, P).

It is at this point that there is a radical departure from GBR principles. With the ECE code it is not possible to determine the sub-classification without referring to a detailed index and this varies with each piece-ending.

The full index runs to 53 pages and was published in 1978 as part of the CI anthology THE BEST ENDINGS OF CAPABLANCA AND FISCHER, a pilot run for the five-volume series.

Certain general observations about the second level classifications are possible. The first breakdown of each volume is into ten sections, generally by material, ignoring PP. For example, R0 comprises (all) R vs. PP and R vs. bare K, while R8 comprises (all) double-R endings, with R9 containing endings with more than 4 pieces. This covers the first "decimal place" of the hundred sub-classifications.

The second decimal place is generally by the number or disparity of PP. For example R3n (single -R endings) starts with R30 which includes R vs. R endings (without PP) and R + P (one P only) vs. R, while R38 is all single-R endings with 2 extra Pp. In all volumes the final classification (n9) includes all material not in the previous 0-8.
One of the few advantages of ECE over GBR is that certain 'important' features are distinguished. This is done partly by giving meaning to a numeric code, and partly by introducing symbols.

Examples of symbols are overlapping black and white rectangles and overlapping black rectangles used to indicate BB on opposite coloured squares and BB on the same colour respectively, while 00, 0...0 and a pair of vertically aligned circles mean, respectively and in context, united, separated and doubled Pp.

Thus, to find R + RP + BP vs. R, look up R3 (for single-R endings) and the locate R2 0...0 p : R to read the final code R31b, which can then be looked up as a compact section in its 'sequence' in the appropriate volume. Yes, within each hundredth there may be yet further sub-divisions of this type. But it is not a long process to locate examples of the target position.

One might be deterred by having to use an index to look up a classification, but although there are 5 x 100 sections, and sub-classifications within many of these, one can establish the volume and first digit very quickly, if not quite 'by eye'.

Overall, my conclusion is that it would have been better to have used a system such as the GBR code where the class is established without reference to an index. It would be possible to refine the GBR code to make it more player-orientated, by adding a seventh digit (while still avoiding symbols). For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>no further information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;opposite&quot; bishops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;like&quot; bishops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a P on its 7th rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>all PP immobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>doubled (or multiplied) PP present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>united PP for one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>separated PP for one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>passed P or PP present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>castling or en passant may be possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all such cases, I suggest, one would work down the table until one finds a satisfied criterion and uses that number whether or not further criteria also apply. Thus to code B + P (on 7th) vs. 'same' B one creates GBR code 0040.102, while Q + aP (on 6th) vs. Q gives 4000.108.

Expanding the above table to an 8th digit is always possible, but ease of use would suffer. The proposed 'third digit' table suffices to subdivide areas that already have a large body of theory.

JOSE MUGNOS MEMORIAL

The Argentine magazine AJEDREZ DE ESTILO announces an INFORMAL tourney to commemorate the 5th anniversary of the death of Jose Mugnos and to mark 50 years since "the beginning of endgame practice in Argentina". Closing date 30.vi.88; maximum 3 studies per composer; 4 to 8 original entries will be published in each monthly issue, with solutions two months later. Four prizes. Director: Luciano W. Camara. Judge: Francisco Benko. Award: 6 months after last entry published, with 90 days confirmation/claim period.
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AJEDREZ DE ESTILO
Cas. de correo 51
Sucursal 49
1449 BUENOS AIRES
Argentina
The author of the following article is a strong player active on the hectic British tournament circuit. He has a current FIDE rating of 2310. He began composing in 1985, but the dozen studies so far completed still await publication: members of the CESC who attend London meetings can vouch for the high quality of Colin's output.

Colin Crouch was born 14.x.56 at Bushey, Hertfordshire. He is currently finishing a doctoral thesis at Durham University entitled "The economic geography of recession in the United Kingdom; the early 1980's and historical perspectives".

wR vs. bPfPgPhP;
GBR class 0100.03
by Colin Crouch

In C1 both players were short of time. After 43. b6 g5 44. b7 f5 45. Ra4 Bl blundered with 45...Bd6??
46. Ra5 Kf7 (Kf6; Ra6) 47. Rxf5 and W won. Had Bl played 45...Bb8 an interesting theoretical draw, not in the textbooks, would have arisen. Play would probably have continued 46. Ra8 Bf4 47. b8Q Bxb8 48. Rxb8, reaching C2.

At first sight W is winning C2, but this is not so. If wR attacks bPP from the side bK simply plays to g6. Nor is it possible for wR to establish itself behind bPP: 48...h4 49. Kh3, and although Bl is forced to give ground the concession is not big enough to allow W to win. The demonstration of this: 49....Kf7! 50. Rh8 Kg7 51. Rh5 Kg6 52. Rh8 Kg7. We can note at this stage of our investigation that ...h4; is part of Bl's defensive plan.

As wR on its own fails to make progress, wK must try to reach e5, but while W strives for this Bl can set up C3, a drawn position that is in the books. In C3 bgP/hP are far enough advanced to frustrate any W attempt to win bPf5. For example, form C3, WTM: 1. Kxf5? h2. Or 1. Rb5 Kg6 2. Rxf5 h2 3. Rg5+ Kh6 4. Rg8 Kh7.
Keres, Hooper and Speelman all give C3, partly because analysis by Kopayev showed that if bK was even slightly misplaced W can win. We shall return to Kopayev’s position.

C2 is drawn, however, because Bl is always able to set up the C3 draw, or near enough, whenever W plays aggressively. This observation sets the composer/analyst an irresistible challenge: is it possible to set up a position where Bl has three UNMOVED pawns (f7, g7, h7) and bKg8, and Bl can still draw?!

After much analysis I have concluded that the answer is ‘yes’. C4 is the critical BTM position, following the usual convention employed in endgame theory that W has the superior force, rather than the studies convention that W draws, employed in the ‘artistic’ literature.

The play leading to these theoretical positions is, however, new, and often highly complex. This is how endgame theory develops. One generation of theorists identifies some critical positions, a later generation identifies a related set of critical positions, while another generation looks for new critical positions in which, after best play on both sides, already known critical positions may be reached.

1...g5 2. Rh5.

W tries to finagle a tempo by attacking bPP. 2. Ra4 would allow Bl to set up the target draw rather easily after 2...Kg7 3. Ra5 Kg6 4. Ra6+ Kg7 5. Kg2 f5; 2. Rh2 is a more subtle try, to restrain hP, when 2...Kg7 3. Kg2 Kg6 4. Kf3 f5 and Bl has transposed into our main line (see later). Frontal attack on gP makes no real difference: 2. Rg4 h6 3. Kg2 f5 and W is driven back.

2...f6 3. Kg2 Kg7 4. Kf3 Kg6 5. Rh1.

Not 5. Kg4?? f5+. 5. Rh2 leads to draws similar to those in the main line, and transposes into the 2. Rh2 line.

5...f5.

Bl must keep wK out of e4. 5...h5?

6. Ke4 wins comfortably after 6...f5+ 7. Ke5 h4 (g4; Kf4) 8. Rg2 (zugzwang) f4 (forced) 9. Kd4 Kf6 (Kh5; Kf3; Kg6; Kg4) 10. Ra2 Kg6 (h3; Rh2) 11. Kf3 Kf5 (Kh5; Rh2 we have seen) 12. Ra5+ Kg6 13. Kg4, or 6...h4 7. Rh2 Kh5 8. Kf5 g4 9. Ra2 h3 10. Ra8 Kh4 11. Kf4 Kh5 12. Rh8+ Kg6 13. Kxg4. In either case, W has successfully carried out a plan according to the formula of Nimzovich, namely to restrain, blockade and finally destroy.
6. Ke3 h5 7. Kd4

Bl must now decide whether to push fP or hP, for he must not permit wK to reach e5 even with all bPP on their 5th rank: 7...h4? 8. Ke5 loses immediately, and 7...f4? is also unsatisfactory because of 8. Ke4 h4 9. Re1! Now Bl has no safe P advance, so bK must move, relinquishing control of either the f5 square or the h5 square. The alternatives are: 9...Kh5 10. Kf5 h3 11. Rg5+ Kh4 12. Rg4+ Kh5 13. Rg8 Kh4 14. Kxf4, and 9...Kf6 10. Ra1 Kg6 11. Ra6+ Kh5 (otherwise 12. Kf5) 12. Kf3 h3 13. Ra8 Kh4 14. Rh8 mate.

White to Move

The foregoing means that 7...g4 is the only move, giving C5.

We are now seeing some critical positions. Bl has been forced to compromise his P-structure by moving gP first, leaving a hole on f4. To cover this weakness bK must advance, creating a vacuum in the rear in which wR can operate. In his turn W has a decision to take: direct attack by 8. Ke5, or to retreat wK (now that a weakness has been forced) to use him as a 'goalkeeper' while wR becomes a 'roving forward'.

bPP are in fact already too far advanced for the direct attack to succeed: after 8. Ke5 Kg5 9. Rf1 g3 10. Rxf5 + Kg4 it is W who has to play for the draw. So the retreating option poses Bl more dangers and W fewer.


Now Bl faces his toughest decision. Should fP advance to the sixth, or should hP? It may look more natural to advance hP, but this loses after 9...h4? 10. Ra8 h3 (f4++; Ke4 with Rg8+ wins, for with wR behind, a 'chain' is safer than a 'row') 11. Rg8+ Kh6 (Kf6; Kf4, Kf7; Kg5, Ke6; Rh5, or Kh5; Kf4, Kh6; Kxf5) and now 12. Ke2!!, a move discovered by Kopayev. 12. Kf4? is the obvious move but it only draws after 12...Kh7 13. Kg5 Kh6! 14. Rg8 Kh7. After 12. Ke2 Bl is in zugzwang: 12...Kh7 13. Rf5. So, 12...Kh5 is forced, when 13. Kf2 f4 (Kh4; Kg7, Kh5; Kg3, Kh6; Kg8, Kh5; Kf4, Kh6; Kxf5) 14. Rh8+ Kg5 15. Kg1 Kf5 16. Kh2 Ke4 17. Kg8 Kf3 18. Rg7 Ke2 19. Rxa4 f3 20. Re4+ Kf1 21. Kg3 (Kxh3? f2++) f2 22. Rf4 h2 23. Rxf2+ and W wins. Most of this analysis is due to Kopayev who started from C6: 1. Kg3 Kg5 2. Rg8+ Kh6 3. Kf2 Kh5 4. Ke3 and after 4...Kh6 we have the position after 11...Kh6 in my own analysis.

White to Move, wins

C6 Kopayev (1958)

based on Lehner, 1887
Kapayev clearly shows W's strategy if he is to win: he must prod bP forward to make space for wR behind them, while keeping wK ready to overhaul any bP that runs. In many ways this endgame reminds me of GBR class 1300.01 endings, generally drawn with bP on its second rank, lost if bP is slightly further advanced (when wQ can attack from behind), but drawn again if bP is still further advanced. (It is assumed that wK is ahead of bP which is guarding bR and protected by bk, forming a barrier.)

The foregoing is a digression, for Bl is not comelled to follow Kopayev's line. He can draw by advancing fP.

9...f4+!

This, in the light of the foregoing analysis, is not the straightforward move it might seem.

After the more natural 10...f3? W with 11. Ra6! can cut off bK's retreat. The following lines could then occur:

11...h4 12. Rb6 Kf4 (h3? Kg3 and wR picks off bPg4; or 12. Kf5; Rh6, Kg5; Rh8, or 12. Kh5; Rb8, Kg5; Rh8) 13. Rf6+ Ke4 14. Rh6 g3+ 15. Kf1 Ke3 16. Rxe4 and after either 16. ..., g2+ 17. Kg1 Ke2 18. Rf4 Ke3 19. Rf8 Ke2 20. Re5 + Kd2 Kf2, or 16...f2 17. Kg2 Ke2 18. Re4 + Kd2 19. Kf1 Kd3 20. Rg4 Bl is lost.


11...Kf4 12. Kg6, transposing into the 11...h4 line above.
11...Kh4 12. Rg6 Kh3 (g3 +; Kxf3, g2; Rgx2 wins) 13. Rg5 h4 (Kh4; Ra5) 14. Rg8 g3 + 15. Kxg3 g2 16. Kf2.

This does not exhaust the possibilities. Bl could have played 10...h4? when W can prove that three pawns on the fifth rank are weaker than three pawns on the fourth, because wR has more space behind them. Play could continue: 11. Ra5 + Kg6 12. Ra6 + Kf5 13. Kg2 and;

13...h3 + 14. Kh2 Ke4 15. Re6 + Kf3 (Kf3' Re8, Kg5; Re8, f3; Kg3) 16. Rg6 Ke2 (g3 +; Kxh3, Kg2; Ra6, f3; Ra2 +) 17. Rgx4 f3 18. Rf4 + and Kopayev’s analysis takes over: 18...Kf1 19. Kg3 f2 20. Rf4 h2 21. Rxf2 +.

13...f3 + 14. Kf2 Kf4 15. Rf6 + Ke4 16. Rh6 g3 + 17. Kg1 Ke3 18. Rhx4 g2 (Ke2; Re4 +, Kg5; Rd2; Rg8, Kd2; Kf1, Kg3; Kg8) 19. Rh8 Ke2 20. Re8 + Kd2 Kf2.


Finally, to show that passive play also loses:


Bl now has a drawn position if he plays with care: W’s only real winning attempt is to play wR to h8 to try for the type of zugzwang seen in the 11...Kf5 line above, but this can always be thwarted. The line that follows gives all W’s attempts to improve his position, while the notes show the possible pitfalls for Bl.

11. Ra8 Kg7.
Or 11...Kh7; but not 11...Kf7? 12. Rg8 Kg6 13. Kg2 f3 + 14. Kg2 (Kg3? Kg5; draw) Kg5 15. Kg3 as in the 11...Kf5 line above.
11...f3 falls into a similar zugzwang after 12. Rh8 Kg5 13. Kg3 Kg6 14. Kh4 Kf6 15. Rh6 +.

12. Ra4.
There is nothing to be gained by tempo moves along the back rank so long as bK has available the squares g7 and h7. W tries a different tack.

12...f3 13. Ra5 Kg6 14. Kg3 Kh6 15. Kh4 Kg6 16. Kg5 +.

The tempo move 16. Rb5 gains nothing after 16...Kf6.

16...Kh6 17. Kg8 Kg7 18. Rh8.
Progress at last! wR has penetrated to the critical square h8. Unfortunately for W, to achieve this he has had to place wK on an unfavourable square: were wK on g3 instead of g4 W would win, but here the zugzwang works in Bl’s favour.

Finally, to show that passive play also loses:


---

Bl now has a drawn position if he plays with care: W’s only real winning attempt is to play wR to h8 to try for the type of zugzwang seen in the 11...Kf5 line above, but this can always be thwarted. The line that follows gives all W’s attempts to improve his position, while the notes show the possible pitfalls for Bl.
18...Kg6 (C8).

We are now back in Hooper’s analysis above - see the note to 10...f3? (instead of 10...Kg6). Hooper notes that W wins BTM (Kf6; Rh6 + and Rxh5) but only drawn WTM. The main line in the continuation below follows Hooper.

19. Kg3 Kg5 20. Rg8 +.

20. Kf2 Kg6 is drawn, since if 21. Kf1 Kg5 22. Kg1 (hoping for Kg6? Kf2) g3!


If 21. Kh4, then 21...Kf7 holds, but 21...Kf7 loses now to 22. Rg5.

21...Kf5 22. Ke3.

Retreating doesn’t help: 22. Kf1 Kf4 23. Rh8 (Kg1, g3; draw) Kg5 24. Kf2 (Kg1, g3; draw) Kg6 25. Kg3 Kg5.

22...Kf6 23. Ke4.

This prises open Bl’s defences. The drawback is that wK is outside fP’s quadrant.


A fascinating endgame. Keres notes that H. Lehner first analysed C6 (AJR: who was Lehner? Where and when were his analyses published?) without finding the Ke2 idea due to Kopayev. Hooper notes the games Mason vs. L. Paulsen (Vienna, 1882), later analysed by Maizelis, and Weiss vs. Showalter (New York, 1889). In the 1882 game Bl had all bPPP on the fifth rank, not an ideal situation, as we have seen. In the 1889 game Bl lost by not taking care of the critical square g7. Hooper shows that Steinitz himself misassessed the position through not taking into account the critical zugzwangs.

Given all this flurry of activity in the 1880s it is perhaps appropriate that there should be fresh analysis of this very difficult ending in the 1980s. 1987 may be no bad centenary year!

Durham
June, 1987

THE EVOLUTION
OF AN OLD IDEA

Edward A. Asaba, Moscow

In the year 1851 the collection “Chess Studies” by J. Kling and B. Horwitz was published in London, laying down the foundation for the contemporary chess study. One position in particular caused the launch of a protracted creative excursion and competitive emulation among composers of several countries over a period of more than 130 years.

A1

J. Kling
and B. Horwitz

Chess Studies, 1851 (p.109)

A1:  1. Bd3 Kh6 2. Bc2, with two variations:

2...Bc1 3. Rb1 Bd2 4. Rh1 + Kg7 5. Rh7 + Kg8 6. Rb7.

2...Kg7 3. Rb7 + Kf6 4. Rh7 Sg6 5. Rh6.
Both here and in all the other studies which we shall see W has wK, wR and wB, while Bl has bK, bB and bS, with the sole possible addition of one bP, which does not upset the miniature status of the whole.

If one examines the Kling & Horwitz study closely its inherent defects soon come to the surface: the presence of duals, the possibility of an indeterminate (perhaps 'undecidable' -AJR) finale, the absence of a clear-cut idea for the content of the variations, and the forced character of the solution. Despite all of this the position did not lapse into obscurity but to this day it remains within the field of vision of study composers. This state of affairs arises from the fact that A1 was the first realisation of a winning method with the advantage of the exchange given specific peculiarities of the interacting material, the whole expressed in miniature form. At that time this was something of a novelty, but today it is the foundation of today's artistic and economical studies, as will be seen from the examples that follow.

Just as evolution in nature takes place one step at a time, so it is with the evolution of the idea of Kling & Horwitz, which pursued its long and painful way towards perfection: the first pace was taken half a century afterwards! A study by F. Amelung taking the idea further was published in the DEUTSCHE SCHACHZEITUNG during 1902.

A2: 1. Rh7, with three branching lines:

1...Se8 2. Bb5+ Kd8 3. Rh8
1...Ke8 2. Ke6 Bf8 3. Bg6+ Kd8 4. Rh8.

The shortcomings of A1 are not present in A2 and the winning motif of a pin is used for the first time. The result is feeble, but all the same it is a step in the right direction.

Events after this moved considerably faster. A mere 20 years were needed before a new development was injected. In 1924 the Swiss newspaper BASLER NACHRICHTEN conducted a thematic tourney for studies with the Kling & Horwitz material. This proved to be the occasion for a confrontation between H. Rinck and F. Prokop, resolved by a narrow margin, in my view, in favour of Rinck.

A3 H. Rinck
2nd Prize, Basler Nachrichten, 1924

A3: 1. Rg4, with:

1...Be1 2. Kf1 Ba5 3. Ra4 Sb7 4. Rc3.
1...Be7 2. Rg8+ Kb7 3. Rg7 Sc8 4. Bf6.
1...Bd8 2. Rg8 Sb7 3. Bf6.
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In A3 Rinck shows bB being won by means of a pin three times. It has to be acknowledged that the play is mechanical.


i) 2...Bb7 3. Ra5 mate.
2...Ba8 3. Ra5 + Kb7 4. Kxf3.

Prokop’s study is different from the Rinck brevity in that it holds the seeds of an artistic study, seeds which later on germinated in the products of other composers.


Here the win is shown against the background of a cross-pin. Prokop did not remain in the wings but took the stage with another study.


Prokop in A6 was the first composer to employ (a) the decoy of a piece under threat to set up a pin of the second Bl piece, a modus operandi taken up subsequently by many composers, and (b) a final squeeze position familiar to us from the works of L. Kubbel, Fritz and Dedrle.

Rinck was the first to show, in A7, the win of a piece by means of a battery.

Somov-Nasimovich entered the arena in 1928. He found no new method of winning, but instead showed interesting play by both sides.


A chef-d’oeuvre of the chessboard!

After A9’s publication a new period began, namely the contemporary phase in the evolution of Kling & Horwitz’ idea.


To develop play Somov-Nasimovich has added a Bl pawn.

So by the end of the 1920’s there was a family of ideas (pin, domination, battery, zugzwang, threats of mate, and so on) for exploiting the advantage of the exchange, but the extant examples stayed rooted in mechanical play. It remained to find a position with notable artistic content. This the soviet composer T. Gorgiev did in 1929.

i) 3. \(\text{Rg8? Se6!}\) draws because of the pair of threats \(\text{Sd4+}\) and \(\text{Sc5+}\), but 3...\(\text{Kh3?}\) loses to 4. \(\text{Rh8 Kg3}\) 5. \(\text{Rxh6 Kxf3}\) 6. \(\text{Rf6+}\).

In A10 the artist's canvas based on zugzwang covers the length and breadth of the board.

A11: \(\text{1. Re7 Bc4/i}\) 2. \(\text{Re3 Sa5}\) 3. \(\text{Ra3 Sc6/ii}\) 4. \(\text{Re3 Bd5}\) 5. \(\text{Re5 Be4}\) 6. \(\text{Bc2}\). This invites 6...\(\text{Bxc2}\) 7. \(\text{Rxc6 +}\) and 8. \(\text{Rxc2}\). 6...\(\text{Bf3}\) 7. \(\text{Kf2}\). The pressure continues. 7...\(\text{Bhl}\) 8. \(\text{Rxh5 Sd4}\) 9. \(\text{Rhx1 Sxc2}\) 10. \(\text{Rc1}\).

ii) 3...\(\text{Sb7}\) 4. \(\text{Rc3 Sd6}\) 5. \(\text{Be2}\). A dynamic study with a complex of winning motifs.

A12: \(\text{1. Bd8!}.\) Inaugurating a persecution of \(\text{bB}\). 1...\(\text{Be4}\) 2. \(\text{Rc7 Bd7}\). 2...\(\text{Be6}\) (\(\text{Sd6}\)) 3. \(\text{Re6+}\) decides. 3. \(\text{Re5}\). Threatening checkmate as well as \(\text{bS}\). 3...\(\text{Bc4}\) 4. \(\text{Re5 Bd3}\) (\(\text{Sg3}\); \(\text{Bh4}\)) 5. \(\text{Kc3 Bb1}\). \(\text{bB}\) thrashes about the board. 6. \(\text{Re1 Ba2}\) 7. \(\text{Rf1}\).

A12 shows the domination theme.

A13: 1. \(\text{Bf1}\). With the threat \(\text{Bg2+}\). 1...\(\text{Be4}\) 2. \(\text{Bc2}\). \(\text{Kf4}\) 3. \(\text{Ra4 Se6+}\) 4. \(\text{Kd6 Sg5}\) 5. \(\text{Bxe4 Sxe4}\) 6. \(\text{Kd5}\). On 2...\(\text{Ke3}\) 3. \(\text{Re3+ Bd3}\) 4. \(\text{Bf1 Se6+}\) 5. \(\text{Kb4 Sf4}\) 6. \(\text{Bxd3 Sxd3}\) 7. \(\text{Kc4}\) wins.

Fritz shows, and again this is an innovation, the win of a piece by pinning in a pair of echo-variations.

A14: V.N. Dolgov, 1974 - wKg7 wRh8 wBe8 bKb1 bBb4 bSe7 bPb5 (\(\text{EG's No. 2482}\)). 1. \(\text{Kf7}\) \(\text{Sf5}\). 1...\(\text{Bc5}\) 2. \(\text{Rb5}\). 2. \(\text{Bd7 Sd6+}\) 3. \(\text{Kc6 Bg3}\) 4. \(\text{Rg8}\) \(\text{Sf4}\). 4...\(\text{Bf4}\) 5. \(\text{Rgl + K-}\) 6. \(\text{Rg4}\) 5. \(\text{Bc6 Sc5+}\) 6. \(\text{Kd5 Bf2}\) 7. \(\text{Rf8}\) \(\text{Sd3}\) (\(\text{Be3};\) \(\text{Rf3}\)) 8. \(\text{Bxb5 Sb4+}\) 9. \(\text{Kc4}\) \(\text{Be1}\) 10. \(\text{Rf1 Sc2}\) 11. \(\text{Kb3 Sd4+}\) 12. \(\text{Ka4 Sc2}\) 13. \(\text{Bd3}\).

A unique study with its systematic movement of a complex of pieces!

The same year gave us a further masterpiece.


ii) 1...f2 2. Bxh1 f1Q+ 3. Bf3 + Oxf3 4. Kh3.

A beautiful study! The stalemate counterplay leads to checkmate. Once again we begin to see studies with interesting play.


A16 shows domination in conjunction with a threat of checkmate.


Examining the studies composed after Gorgiev's chef d'oeuvre one cannot help observing both their superior level of technique and, which is especially important, the prominence of the aesthetic, the artistic. Of course to compose studies of the contemporary type is incomparably more complex than to compose the brevities of Rinck and Prokop, but without the latter one can hardly conceive that we would have attained today's exalted level.

The first of the present author's following pair of contemporary studies was selected for inclusion in Kasparyan's 1982 anthology "Remarkable Studies", while A19 took 3rd place in the XV soviet championship judged by the late IGM V.A. Bron.

A18: E. Asaba 1st Prize, Molodoy Leninets, 1978

1. Rf1 Bg2 (Sd2; Kxd2) 2. Rf8 (for Re8) Kg7 3. Ra8/i, with:


ii) 3. Rb8? h5! 4. Rh4 Sc5!, s 'study within a study'.

A19: A. Asaba, 1980 - wKe1 wRg1 wBc6 bKb6 bBf3 bSb4 bPa5 (EG's No. 4737). 1. Rf1 Bg2 2. Rf8, with:

2...a4 3. Rh8+! (Re8? a3;) Kg7 4. Rh4 Kf6 5. Rg4! (Bxe4? K5;) a3 6. Rxd2 Sc3 7. Rg8 a2 8. Ra8.


The basis of A19 is A18's thematic try, with the addition of a further variation.

In analysing A18 and A19 I realised that by a small rearrangement, and without bP, one could make an interesting study conforming to contemporary artistic criteria: readers are invited to consider A20, an ultra-miniature original for EG.

A20: 1. Rf1/i Be3 2. Rf1 Bf2 3. Re8 (for Rd8) Kf7! 4. Rh8/i. Now that wR has reached h8 with bKf7 and BTM, Bl is in zugzwang! There are now three variations:

4...Ke6 5. Rf8/i Be3 6. Rf1 Be3 7. Re1.


vi) 6. Rf1 + ? Kg7 (Ke6? Re1) 7. Re1 Sc2 draws.

vii) 2. Rc8 Ke7! 3. Rc4 Ke6 and draws.

viii) 6. Ra4 Sb5 7. Ra6 Bf4 draw.

All may look simple, but the search for the position and the work on its analysis from both sides took over five years!

In this article we have observed the development of the Kling & Horwitz idea of winning with the advantage of the exchange over a span of 130 years. We have become acquainted with the best studies created by a variety of composers on this general idea. We have seen how the accumulation of technical motifs proceeded haltingly, and how the artistic aspect was perfected. We have seen the major contribution made by soviet composers. The question naturally arises what the further development of the Kling & Horwitz idea will be.

Both my own analyses and my own experience tell me that there are no grounds at all for expecting new developments in the foreseeable future! We cannot exclude the possibility of the appearance of refinements of the ideas of earlier composers, but there is hardly any scope for further originality. To illustrate this claim we cite
**A21**, the very latest study dealing with the theme under review.

**XXX FIDE CONGRESS FOR CHESS COMPOSITIONS**

The annual meeting of the FIDE Commission was held in 1987 in Graz, Austria, and was, by all accounts, an unqualified success. The following early information on studies-orientated decisions and events is entirely due to the kindness of Paul Valois, editor of the PROBI FMIST, who telephoned AJR.

1. The new British delegate is Colin RUSS, President of the British Chess Problem Society. Barry Barnes missed a meeting for the first time in twenty years.

2. The title of Honorary Master of Problem Chess was awarded to the veteran Gregor GRZEBAN, Warsaw.

3. The WCSC (world team solving championship) was won this time by West Germany, with the individual title shared between Michel Caillaud (France) and Marian Kovacevic (Yugoslavia), each scoring maximum points. Pauli Perkonoja (Finland) was a single point behind. For what may well be the first time there appear to have been no cooks.

4. The 1988 meeting is scheduled to be held in Budapest (Hungary), probably in September. No more details are known. Guests at these events are sure to be welcome, so why not follow AJR's example and provisionally plan your first visit to Hungary for 1988? it has attracted you months or years ago.

5. The 1989 meeting is scheduled for Bournemouth (England).

6. FIDE Composition Commission news, effectively orphaned for a number of years, is to have twin official outlets, apparently replacing the long-time-a-dying Yugoslav
PROBLEM. We are delighted that the English language outlet will be the PROBLEMIST, while the German language outlet will be the Austrian SCHACH-AKTIV. Is Eastern Europe, including the USSR, still relying on PROBLEM?

Supplementary information comes from two most welcome sources: the official minutes received from Dr Klaus Wenda, the Commission President, and an article by Viktor Chepizhny, 2nd Vice-President and Soviet delegate, in "64" 20/1987 (p.27).

1. The Judge's title is awarded to Alexander Maksimovskikh (USSR).

2. A study composing match is to take place between the USSR and the 'rest of the world'. Anyone will be able to compete, with a maximum of one study for each of the two set themes to be chosen. The first 30 in each theme award will score points. Averbakh and Kasparian are expected to be the Soviet judges, with John Nunn and AJR judging for the 'rest'. So, all you FG-readers who have never composed a study before, wherever you live, search out those old ideas that attracted you months or years ago, and get weaving on them! We don't know what the set themes will be for this unique contest, but you never know, YOUR idea might fit the bill. WATCH THIS SPACE!

International Tourney announcement
The newspaper KHLEBOROB UKRAINI celebrates the 50th birthday of V.M. Archakov. Judge: D. Gurgenidze. Closing date: 30.vi.88. Maximum one original study per composer(s). Send 3 diagrammed copies, with full solution. There is provision for a 'special' section in the award, which will have provisional and final phases. Address: CHESS/SHAKHMATY, "KHLEBOROB UKRAINI", ul. Pavlovskaya 11-G, Kiev 53, Ukrainian SSR 252053, U.S.S.R.

*C* CHESSPLAYING MICROS
A NEW ERA DAWNS

For £299 in the UK, or $249.95 in the U.S.A. (yes, at $1.6 to the sterling pound that's about £140 cheaper, but there are mailing costs, 7% customs duty and 15% Value Added Tax to be added on, while in the U.S.A. there is effectively no product guarantee), one can now possess a little chessplaying machine that will:

- checkmate with queen
- checkmate with rook
- checkmate with two bishops
- checkmate (efficiently) with bishop and knight
- win most winnable king and pawn against king endings
- correctly defend the classic Philidor 'barrier' position in rook against rook and pawn-on-5th-rank

...and all the above will be played at the machine's fastest speed. Playing slower it will also win the Scipione Genovino 'bridge-building' position in rook and pawn against rook generally misattributed to Lucena.

The machine is what the UK distributors (but no one else) call the CLUB version of the Fidelity "EX-CFI 68000" (U.S. name), latest in the long-running "Chess Challenger" series. For an unambiguous ID, call it the "Model 6094". It has its endgame limitations since it fails to win any significantly difficult position in queen against rook, but it's a big advance nevertheless.

However, would you believe, there's a MASTER (Model 6097) 'just out', £100 dearer than the CLUB, and 'even better' in the endgame. Certainly it's faster.

No, AJR is neither distributor nor agent for any chessplaying micro. For UK sales information ring COMPETENCE on 0491-34663.
Ken Thompson of New Jersey is no longer alone in the world in the active development of optimal play 5-man data bases. The hP case of GBR class 2.01 has now convincingly been solved (in the data base sense, not in the human understanding sense) by a Dutch team of three from Delft University of Technology. The result is reported in v.d. Herik's column in SCHAKEND-NEDERLAND, vii.87 and in the ICCA Journal, Vol. 10, No. 3 (ix. 87). There are comments AJR, two important advances on the Thompson technique: for the first time a black pawn is included ('black' logic differs from 'white'); and '50-move rule' implications are ignored in an ending with a pawn. On the other hand CP, BP and SP have still not been tackled in this 'Trotzky' endgame.

While Thompson had the sole use of a newly installed SEQUENT parallel processor in xi.85, the Dutch team used a CYBER 205. Thompson used the Bell Laboratories installation, where he works: the Dutch team secured a special research grant to use a machine elsewhere.

Thompson always works alone: the Dutch team consists of Sito Dekker (the arch programmer), Jaap van den Herik (lecturer) himself, and Professor Herschberg. Thompson's work has been published in a number of places, among them EG. Outlets for Dutch results are Schakend-Nederland and, for technicalities, the ICCA Journal. EG will report all as soon as possible, with proper acknowledgement. It is most encouraging that there are now two centres for these developments, but two are not enough: where will the third be?
84. Ke4 Ke1 85. Ke3 Kd1 86. Kd3 Ke1 87. Sc1 (Sd4) Kd1 88. Se2 (Sa2) Ke1 89. Sc3 Kf2 90. Kd2 Kg2 91. Ke2 (Ke3) Kg3 92. Ke3 Kh4 93. Kf4 Kh5 94. Kf5 Kh6 95. Kf6 Kh5 (Kh7) 96. Se2 (Se4) Kh4 97. Kf5 Kh5 98. Sg3+ Kh4 99. gSf1 Kh5 100. Se3 Kh6 101. Kf6 Kh7 102. Sf5 Kg8 103. Ke7 Kh7 104. Kf7 Kh8 105. Kg6 Kg8 106. Sg7 Kf8 107. Kf6 Kg8 108. Se6 Kg7 109. Kg5 Kg8 110. Kg6 Kh8 111. Kf7 Kh7 112. Sg4 Kh8 (h2) 113. Sg5 (Sf8) h2 114. Se5 h1() 115. Sg6 mate.

i) From now to the end this is as Bridier (No. 979 in Chéron II, after 31...Ka1).

v.d. Herik observes that at no point in this sequence could the 50-move rule be invoked to claim a draw, but he points out that with an unamended 50-move rule in mind Bl could have changed the outcome in his favour (from a loss to a draw) by deferring moving his hP (without suffering checkmate), for example by playing 63...Kf2 in place of 63...Kd1. It follows that if no 50-move rule existed (it still lives!), 63...Kf2 is the best move (if we trust the computer), but the 50-move rule changes the 'best move' to 63...Kd1. (We know that FIDE in 1978 extended the limit for this endgame. The point we wish to make is a general one.) We must not stop our train of thought: could W perhaps win nevertheless within the 50-move rule context (but taking in, say 150 moves) by choosing an intermediate objective (whenever mate cannot be forced within 50 moves), to wit the forcing of hP to advance? We do not know whether this strategy restores the win to W, but it is clear that these questions put endgame theory under a weird and artificial obligation that is foreign to its nature. This becomes even clearer if we consider that whole chapters of the theory of one-pawn endgames would be suspect whenever an alteration were decreed to that antediluvian number 50. To offer an exaggerated analogy (for the purpose of clarifying a point) there is the spectre of endgame theory becoming as volatile as opening theory. Who wants that? Surely not FIDE? Yet that is the consequence of retaining 'any kind of 50-move rule', which the Dutch researchers prefer to call a 'k-rule'. Can anyone seriously argue that the theory of the chess endgame should be subject to a k-rule? (A rule that includes a count of non-pawn moves is particularly pernicious.) On 4.vi.87 Bozidar Kazic, Chairman of the (player-body) FIDE Rules Commission, writing from Lucerne, circulated all FIDE members and GM's inviting comment on the revision of the 50-move rule, with a deadline for receiving replies of 20.viii.87. The CFSC, although affiliated to the BCF, was not informed, and AJR learned about it by chance. We have sent FIDE an argued case for abolishing the 50-move rule (or any k-rule replacement) in its entirety and introducing the flexible notion of a 'final session of play' (see EG83, p.16). This would allow endgame theory to pursue its proper aims unencumbered by 'k'-irrelevances. Naturally there may be acceptable alternatives, but since players refer to, and indeed contribute to, endgame theory, that theory had better be the same (GENS UNA SUMUS) for them as for the theorists, among whom one has to include everyone interested in endgame studies. To summarise, whatever provisions ultimately govern the upper limit to the length of an o-t-b game, they and endgame theory must be independent of each other.
To revert to the 115 moves above,
the principal mystery is to explain
why wSd2 has to snake its way
precisely to h8 before wSg8 can
move at all: one would have thought
that wSg8 could have found some
way of emerging, given that hP can
be blocked to win (bK almost any-
where) when it is on h6, h5 or h4.
An associated mystery is precisely
why Bl chooses the moments he does
to advance hP. An observation
(maybe it's a 'concept') to shed light
on the first mystery is that if wSS
defend each other away from hP
with bK straddling them, then in
general W has no winning chances.
But that does not take us very far.

The Dutch researchers have also (this
is not in the S/N article) tested all of
Pierre Bridier's 419 mating-lengths
(see Cheron II, pp. 242-3) and found
229 to be correct, while many others
are just a few too high and "Bridier
exceeds the database optimum by 10
or more moves in only 6 cases."

Finally, the Delft team investigated
the maximum length of a 'solution'
in which the advance of a P was de-
ferred longest (ie, given some k-move
rule that counts consecutive non-P
moves), with the following result:

\*C\*
Ka5 Kb2 (Kb3) 10. Kb4 Kc2 11. Ke4
Kc2 12. Sf6 (Sb6) Ka3 13. Kb5 Kb3
14. Sc4 Ka3 (Kc2) 15. Sc5 Kb2 16.
Kc4 Kc2 17. Sb3 Kb2 18. Sd4 Ka2
Sc5 Ka3 22. Kc4 Ka2 (Kb2) 23. Kd3
Kb1 (Kb2) 24. Kc3 Kc1 25. Sb3 (Sd3
Se4 Se6 Sd7 Sb7) Kb1 26. Sd2 (Sd4
Su5) Kc1 27. dSf1 (Sc4) Kb1 28. Se3
Sc4 (Ka3 Kc3). The position is now
identical with the position after 74.
Sc4 in the 115-moves line. The sub-
sequent play is identical, so that
after 70. Sg5 (Sf8 Sf6) Bl must play
hP and be mated.
LOLLI AND GBR CLASS 1060

Giambatista Lolli delivers and supports his verdict on this endgame on pp. 431-434 of his magnum opus of the year 1763. The defending side 'regularly draws when BB are united with their K'. His play from L1 goes: 1. Qd7 + Kg8 (f8) 2. Qe6 (+) Kg7 3. Kf4 Bh7 4. Qd7 + Kg6 5. Qe8 + Kg7 6. Kg4 Bg6 7. Qe6 Bh7 8. Qd7 + Kg6 9. Qe8 + Kg7 10. Kh5, giving L2. Lolli shows 10...Bb2 losing, but (on his p. 432) gives 10...Bf5, when we have the unique position of reciprocal zugzwang pinpointed by the computer (see EG84, p. 69). Now 'reciprocal zugzwang' was not known to Lolli (what an opportunity he missed to give the world an Italian equivalent) and he does not claim it. What he does write is: "sequestrando il Re contrario. Il B. e forzato giuocara la Don. dovunque puo; onde il N. dando sc. d'alf, bianco alla 3 del Cav. di Re, ritorna il giuoco com' erada principio, e con questo regola fa patto". This is good enough! Bl has re-formed the initial position as a direct consequence of wK being stalemated and hence through wQ being forced to play away Bl plays Bg6+ and the position is drawn. The 18th century humanist 'anticipates' 20th century technology!

*C*

A 1986 GUARDIAN interview with Anatoly Scharansky reported that as a young man he "trained as a mathematician, and as a graduate student worked on the application of chess endings to the problem of 'making decisions in situations of conflict'. He says chess endings are still the most difficult thing to program into a computer." Further details have been sought from a number of possible sources, but with no success.

THE FIDE ALBUM SERIES

YEHUDA HOCH (Israel), Director of the Studies Section for the 1980-82 FIDE Album, reports that 729 studies were sent in by composers. Such a quantity is normal. Displaying unbelievable altruism the judges demolished 71 of them, and, after the independent awarding of points, 93 were automatically selected, namely those with an aggregate points total of 8 or more. These will be included in the album expected to be published by the end of 1987. The Director draws attention to the new ruling, which applies to this and to future FIDE albums, whereby only compositions actually published in the given 3-year calendar period are eligible. In consequence a formal tourney's closing date within the period is no longer adequate -- the relevant date must be a date of printing. Some studies were rejected for this reason and must therefore be entered for the appropriate subsequent FIDE Album tourney, but unfortunately for composers unaware of this, the closing date for entries to the 1983-85 tourney is 31. vii. 87, which is already history... Our not-for-the-first-time comment is that there is still no method, efficient or otherwise, of ensuring that composers know of such rulings in good time. Of course, composers would have to know about and subscribe to any such FIDE periodical, and it is an open question how many could, and, if they could, how many would. We do our best in the pages of EG, but we too have to obtain the information somehow, which in practice proves far from straightforward. It would be helpful if the Albums were published quickly and if the details (of judges, addresses, closing date, conditions) of the subsequent Album tourney were included. But this is a 'simple' solution which will be
thought naive and unrealistic. But is it? Has it been considered? Nothing prevents the submission regulations, at the very least, from being included, which would be a notable improvement in information flow, given that the FIDE Albums are available world-wide in fair numbers and largely independently of currency regulations.

REVIEW

COMPREHENSIVE CHESS ENDINGS; Volume 3. Published by Pergamon, Oxford, in 1986 this is the translation of the 2nd edition Q-ending volume in the Russian 'Averbakh' series. At just under twenty pounds sterling the price of the hard-cover edition is steep, but the 309 pages and 734 diagrams are a joy to behold, a pleasure to handle, and a revelation to study. We say nothing more about the contents except to remind EG-readers that these volumes so far handle only endgames with not more than one piece on each side. On p. 30, following a succinct résumé of the development of ideas concerning Q + SP (on 7th) vs. Q, we read that "in the 1970's Soviet computer programmers wrote a program (for this ending) which confirmed the previous analysis". We are entitled to conclude from this isolated reference that no active use was made of that computer work by the Q-ending authors -- an opportunity missed. The Ken Neat translation is excellent.

COMPOSITION ON THE CHESSBOARD, by Zelepkhin and Mol dovansky (94 pages, paperback, Kiev 1985, in Russian). This little book is in an edition of 80,000 intended for schools. It includes 14 studies by Ukrainian composers.

CONVERSATIONS ABOUT CHESS, by E. Gik (160 pages, 216 diagrams, Moscow 1985, in Russian). For students, in an edition of 600,000. This is an attractive miscellany of odd, interesting, or just wonderful, facts and positions, presented by the author and several famous collaborators. Studies find their place in the latter half of the book.

EINDSPELSTUDIES, by Jan van Reek. This is a collection of 25 studies (and restorations -- see below!) by the Schakend Nederland studies editor, who also contributes originals to "En Passant", magazine of the Maastricht chess club, some miles west of the village of Margraten in eastern Holland where van Reek lives. The book is produced by a dot-matrix home computer printer.
and is a private distribution not generally available -- so there is no price. The earliest diagram date is 1960, the latest 1986. In an all-too-brief introduction we learn that the author places himself in the 'realistic' school, one of whose major aims is, he explains, the expression of romantic and complex ideas but employing few chessmen. van Reek is an ideas-man, and more, he is an idealist. He is sad whenever famous studies are found to be incorrect, and frequently devotes his talent to correcting them. This altruism has given him a unique reputation as a repair-artist. van Reek has included restorations of works by Villeneuve-Esclapon, Gorgiev, Mattison, Birnov and Proskurowski. Here is a very recent example of van Reek's work: the idea is a double excelsior in 4-man study form -- in this case the composer had to repair his own composition since an earlier version had been demolished.

1. e4 Kc2 (a5; Kd5, a4; Kc4) 2. Kd5 a5/i 3. Kc4 (e5? a4;) Kb2 (a4; Kb4) 4. e5 (Kb5? Kb3; Kxa5, Kc4;) a4 5. e6 a3 6. e7 a2 7. e8Q a1Q 8. Qe2 + wins/ii.

i) Kb3 3. e5 a5 4. e6 and 7. Qe5. There is a dual after 2...Kb2, by 3. Kc4 or 3. e5.

ii) 8...Kc1 9. Qe1 + Kb2 10. Qd2 + Ka3 (Kb1; Kb3) 11. Qb4 + Ka2 12. Qb3 mate.

"Materiaal-index" of Rueb's DE SCHAAKSTUDIE and BRONNEN VAN DE SCHAAKSTUDIE. This is a series of three meticulous GBR indexes prepared by the Dutch composer Mees. The original ten Rueb volumes each had an individual composer index incorporating K-squares only. The three booklets, which carry dates iii.87, iv.87 and v.87, allow instant location of volume and page in Rueb of all positions with any given initial material. wK position is also given. EG abbreviations, an explanation of the GBR code, and a bibliography are included. Thank you, Wouter! (Address: W.J.G. Mees, Hardroverslaan 60, 2082 HN Santpoort, Netherlands. There is no price).

THE PAWN ALPHABET, a series by Marinus Verburg. Six booklets from 1984 to iv.1987 cover GBR classes 0.10, 0.20 and 0.11. The aim is a reference work which can be used to look up elementary P-ends (and associated solutions) by wP-position, since the sequencing is by file and by rank. From the "0-0" issue we take the address: Marinus VERBURG, Leliestraat 83, 4461 PD GOES, Netherlands. Again, no price. So far the booklets have covered a wP on the a-file (plus one possibly elsewhere). We have yet to find practical value in these booklets.

MOSAICO AJEDRECISTICO is a swish, illustrated, hardcover Spanish (but from Moscow) version (1984) of Karpov and Gik's "Shakhmatnaya Mozaika". There is a handful of oddball or simple studies. The edition size: 18,845, would you believe.

TESTBUCH DER ENDSPIELTIKT, by Konikowski and Schulenburg, Beyer Verlag, West Germany, 1986. 120 pages. 140 highly tactical o-t-b positions are presented anonymously, each with 3 mutually exclusive 'evaluations' for the reader to examine. The aim is self-testing, with verdict, solution and time taken all considered on the supplied scoring sheet. The annotated continuations have narrative commentary. There are no studies, though the Ortueta vs. Sanz (1934) position is wrong and the Capablanca vs. Lasker (1914) position is hypothetical. Solution difficulty and length vary greatly, as does the helpfulness of the evaluation clues.
COLLECTED STUDIES AND GAMES, by G.M. Kasparyan, 352 pages, Erevan, 1987. In Russian. Edition size: 20,000. All Kasparyan’s (sound) studies and 124 of his games (some annotated) are prefaced by 8 pages of chess autobiography. The paper and binding were not designed to last -- in blinding contrast to the 400 studies published from 1928 to 1986.

**OBITUARIES**

+ **DMITRI FEDOROVICH PETROV**  
1909-1987  
For more than the last quarter of a century of his life D.F. Petrov, professor of biology, lived and worked in the Siberian town of Novosibirsk, but his composing career was much longer. The high quality of his output, influenced by the wellknown principles set out by the Platov brothers (natural position, economy of force, active play and counter-play, and where possible relevance to the theory of the endgame) can be seen in the studies spread throughout EG’s pages: Nos. 291, 731, 1439 (also EG61, p. 322), 1501, 1931, 2132, EG38 (p. 154), 2645, 3328 (p. 325 also), 4048 and 4579. Petrov naturally influenced composing in the region, and among the talent may be named V. Vinichenko and N. Grechishnikov. (With acknowledgement to K. Sukharev’s article in Shakhmaty v SSSR, ii.85. See also ’64” 15/1987 p. 32.)

+ **CONSTANTIN RAINA**  
(1910-1986), successful Romanian composer of studies for a period of half a century. (Reported in BULETIN PROBLEMISTIC 46, vii-xii. 86.)

+ Konrad KUMMER (14.ix.18 - 3.xii.86). The Swiss composer supported FG for many years. (From the PROBLEMIST).

+ **GORDON ‘Don’ WHITEHEAD**  
(3.v.11 - 31.xii.86)  
Quietly erudite, Don’s rare letters were always welcome and supportive. The PROBLEMIST records “a poignant letter, written shortly before his death from cancer, regretted that loss of concentration had finally denied him” the pleasure of solving. His library has passed to the BCPS.

+ Olavi RIHIMA, Finland, chess mathematician (7.iii.20 - 2.viii.87).

+ Meindert NIEMEIJER, Netherlands, bibliophile, who donated his library of 7,000 chess books to the Royal Dutch Library in The Hague (18.uii.02 - 5.x.87).

**FIDE PERMANENT COMMISSION**

FEENSCHACH has done it again! In issue No. 80 (x-xi.86) the official agenda and minutes ('protocol') of the 1986 meeting at Fontenay-sur-Bois are reproduced, in the original English. There is a selection of supporting correspondence; the new FIDE Album selection procedure is set out in detail, and there is a commentary on it by Kjell Widlert (Sweden); photographs; instant composing tourney results (none for studies); WCSC (ie, solving) rules, in German. Reading this extensive material could well provoke interest in finding out more. The way to do this is to attend a meeting. Observers are always enthusiastically welcomed and invited to participate, for instance on specialist standing committees that work in between the annual meetings...

(Enquiries concerning FEENSCHACH to: Irene Kniest, Pf. 1010, D-1544 WEGBERG, West Germany. DM 0.15 per photocopied side. pp. 393-413 of issue No. 80 refer to FIDE. FEENSCHACH Postscheckkonto 2042 32-507.)
   i) 1. Ke3? Sh3 2. Rg4 (Kf3, Kg5 +;) Sf2 3. Kg3 Se4 + 4. Kg8 Sg5.
   ii) 1. Rg7(g8)? Sf3 (Sh3? Kg3, or Sf3 +?) Kg3 2. Kg4 (Kg3, Kg1;) Sh4 3. Kg3 Kg1.
   iii) 1...Sf3 (h3) 2. Ra6 Qg1 3. Re6 (a2) Se2 4. Kxe2.
   iv) 2...Sg1 + 3. Kf2 Sh3 + (Se2; Re6)
   v) 4. Kg3 Sf4 (Sf2; Re6, or Kg1; Kh3)
   vi) 4...Sf4 5. Kg3 Sd3 6. Ra4 Se1 + (Se3++; Kg3) 7. Kf2 Sd3 + 8. Kg3.
   vii) 5...Sd3 + 6. Kg3 Kg1 7. Rxd3 Kh5 + 8. Kg3, or 6...Sf2 7. Ra4 Se4 + 8. Rxex4, this last line explaining why, for instance, 4. Kg3 in the main line would have been wrong.

No. 6589: David Gurgenidze (Georgian SSR). 1. Ra7 + Kh6 2. Ra6+/i Kh5 3. Rg8 a1Q (b1Q; gRa8) 4. Rh8 + Kg5 5. Rg8 + Kg5 6. Rf8 + Kg5 7. Re8 + Kg5 8. Rd8 + Kg5 9. Rc8 + Kg5 10. aRa8 Qh1 (b1Q; aRa8 +) 11. cRb8+/ii Kg6 12. Ra6+/iii Kg7 13. aRb6, drawn.
   i) 2. Rxg8? a1Q 3. Rh8 + Kg6 4. Rg8 + Kg6 5. Rf8 + Kg6 6. Re8 + Kg6 7. Rd8 + Kg6 8. Rc8 + Kg6 9. aRa8 Qxa8 10. Rxa8 Kg7.

i) 1...h8Q Sf6+ 2. Kf8 Bb6 3. g8S (or Rxh7+).


iii) 3. Kf5? Bh3+, 4...Sg6+ and 5...Rxg7.

iv) 4...Rg7 5. h8Q Sf3+ 6. Ke4 Sg5+ 7. Kf4.


No. 6592: Beat Neuenschwander (Switzerland). This is a correction of a 1983 study by the same composer.

1. b3/i g6/ii 2. g4/iii g5/iv 3. b4 c5 5. ba c2 6. a7/v c1Q 7. a8S/vi Kg6 8. Kg8 Qf4 9. h8S+/vii Kh6 10. Sf7+ Kg6 11. Sh8+ drawn.

i) 1. g4(g3)? c4. 1. b4? c4 2. b5 c3 3. ba.

ii) 1...c4 2. bc a5 3. g4 a4 4. g5 b5 c5 5. bc a2 6. a7/v c1Q 7. a8Q/vi Kg6 8. Kg8 Qf4 9. h8S+/vii Kh6 10. Sf7+ Kg6 11. Sh8+ drawn.

iii) 2. g4? c4 3. bc a5 4. c5 a4 5. c6 a3 6. cd Bxd7 7. c8Q Bxc8 8. d7 Bxd7 stalemate.

iv) 2...c4 3. bc a5 4. c5.

v) 6. ab? Bxb7 7. c8Q Bxc8 8. b7 c1Q 9. b8Q Qf4.

vi) 7. a8Q? Qf4.

vii) 9. h8Q? Qf7 mate.

viii) 4...a3 5. g6+ Kf8 6. c5 a2 7. c6 a1Q 8. cd Bxd7 9. c8Q Bxc8 10. d7 Bxd7 stalemate.

ix) 7.a1Q 8. d8Q Qxe5+ 9. Qf6+. 297


iii) 2...Rh3 + 3. Kd2.

2...Ba6? 3. d6 Rh3 + 4. Bf3 + Kb8 (Bb7; d7) 5. Rf8 + Ka7 6. d7 f1Q 7. Ra8 + Kb6 8. d8Q + wins.

iv) 3...Rh3 + 4. Bf3 + Kb8 (Be6; d7) 5. Rf8 + Ka7 6. Kb4 Rh4 + 7. Kc5, and Bf5 + wins. AJR: presumably 5. Ke6! (Kd6?) is the thematic point.
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i) W's move 3 ingeniously activates the battery (wP/wR), and Bl's riposte is an equally ingenious counter.


"A study packed with combinative combat."
No. 6598: A. Zinchuk (Kiev). 1. dSc4+ (bSc4 + ? Ka4;) 1...Ka6 (Ka4+; Sxa3) 2. Sxa3 elQ. A Bl phoenix. 3. bSc4 Qf2 4. Rxf2 Sfxf2 5. e5 Sd3 6. e6 Sf4 7. e7 Sd5 8. Sb5 (e8S? Sb6 +;) 8...Sxe7 9. Sc7 mate, or 8...Kxb5 9. e8Q +.

No. 6600: E.I. Dvizov (Zhlobin, Gomel region, Byelorussian SSR).

I: 1. g6 a3 2. g7 + Kg8 3. Kg6 a2 4. h6 alQ 5. h7 mate, and not 1. Kg6? a3 2. Kg7 a2 3. g6 alQ, another (themetic?) defeat of 1. Kg6? being 1. 1...Kg8 2. h6 a3 3. h7 + Kh8 4. Kh6 a2 5. g6 a1Q. II: 1. g6? b3 2. g7 + Kg8 3. Kg6 b2 4. h6 b1Q+, so: 1. Kg6, with: 1...b3 2. Kf7 b2 3. g6 b1Q 4. g7 + Kh7 5. g8Q + Kh6 6. Qg6 + Qxg6 7. hg wins, or 1...Kg8 2. h6 b3 3. h7 + Kh8 4. Kh6/i b2 5. g6 b1Q 6. g7 mate.

No. 6599 V.I. Kalandadze (Saratov), 1983

i) 4...Qxg4 5. Qd5 + Kh6 6. Qd2 + K-7. Qh2 +.

No. 6599: V.I. Kalandadze. 1. ba Bf3 2. Sxf3 d1Q 3. a8Q Oxq7 4. g4 + Kh6/i 5. Qxa6 + Se6 + 6. Qxe6 + Qxe6 7. Sf7 + Kg6 8. Sh4 + Kf6 9. g5 mate.

"After sharp replies by both W and Bl the former comes out on top by dint of the renowned Georgian cavalry ('Mkhedruli'). The play has an excellent finale with a pure P-mate."

i) 4...Qxg4 5. Qd5 + Kh6 6. Qd2 + K-7. Qh2 +.

No. 6600: E.I. Dvizov (Zhlobin, Gomel region, Byelorussian SSR).

V: 1. g6? b3 1. Kg6 b3/i 2. Kf7 b2 3. g6 b1Q 4. g7 + Kh7 5. g8Q + Kh6 6. Qg6 + Qxg6 7. hg c3 8. g7 c2 9. g8Q c1Q 10. Qg6 mate.

i) 1...Kg8 2. h6 b3 3. h7 + Kh8 4. Kh6 b2 5. g6 b1Q 6. g7 mate.
The composer informs us that his 5-fold study was composed in symbolic association with the completion of his fifth decade (15.i.87). The 3 + 3 position effectively repeats the composer's Hon. Mention study in Shakhmatnaya Moskva, 1965.

No. 6601: V. Neidze (Tbilisi). After one elimination the top places in the final award are the same as the top places in the provisional award, but the two leading positions are very different versions. We give both, for the edification (and headscratching!) of readers, and for discussion as to how far it is proper for composers to correct faults during the period of confirmation of a formal international composing tourney. We ourselves have an interest in the award and therefore abstain from comment.

Only the 6.ii.87 award, which was in Georgian, included comments by the judges, but these remain inaccessible to us, despite requests for translation.

1...Kbl 2. Ba3 Ka2 3. Rxa4 (Bc1? a3;) b2 4. Ra7(a5) b1Q 5. Bc1 + Kb3 6. Ra3 + Kc2 7. Rc3 mate.

No. 6601a: V. Neidze (Tbilisi). Judges: V.I. Kalandadze and R. Tavariani, with Ya. Lapidus as judge-organiser, a very useful person to have! "Zolotoye runo" is the Russian for Golden Fleece, and the eponymous (Colchis of antique Golden Fleece fame was situated in western Georgia) local term is "Merani".

It was a major international tourney with 150 entries from 87 composers. Only the Georgian bulletin ("Merani") gave comments. "Merani" is the chess supplement to the sports newspaper "Lelo".

No. 6602 A.P. Kazantsev Golden Fleece Ty, 1986 provisional award

No. 6602: A.P. Kazantsev (Moscow).
1. Qa1 d1Q + 2. Kg2 Qd2 + 3. Bf2 Bb2 4. a7 Kb7 5. a6 + Ka8 6. Qh1 Qd1 7. Bg1 Qe2 + 8. Sf2 (see No. 6602b for this position) and the selfstalemate cannot safely be lifted. A romantic theme in tune with the heroic associations of the Golden Fleece.

This entry was disqualified because of publication elsewhere during the period of judging. See No. 6602a.

No. 6602a A.P. Kazantsev

No. 6602b: position after 8. Sf2 in No. 6602a


The composer had worked on this for over a quarter of a century.

7...Kc7 8. c5 Rxfs 9. Rf6 Rxfs stalemate.
7...c5 8. Rh6 Rxfs 9. Rf6 Rxfs stalemate.
7...Rxfs 8. c5 + Kxc5 9. Rf6 Rxfs stalemate.

ii) 3...Kc5 4. Rh6 Sf8 5. Rf6 Sh7 6. Rh6 drawn, if 6...Sg5 7. Rh5 Rg2 8. f4 draw.

No. 6603a Yu. Akobiya


i) 4...Ke6 5. Se5 mate is the WCCT pinned mate theme, for which this study was composed, but Britain decided not to enter for this section.

4...Kd7 5. Bxd5 with a long-winded but theoretically inevitable win on material that recurs many times in the study.


ii) 6...Kxf4 7. Bd6 +.


iv) 6...Re7 7. Bc6.

v) Any of the other 3 squares also suffice.


Ke8, with three bRxwR stalemateing captures after 5...Be7+ 6. Kd8 or 5...Bh5+ 6. Kf8 or 5...Rg8+ 6. Kf7 Bf6+ 7. Kf6.

No. 6607  S. Kasparyan
1 Hon. Mention, Golden Fleece Ty, 1986

Draw 4+4

No. 6608  V. Kondratev and A.G. Kopnin
2 Hon. Mention, Golden Fleece Ty, 1986

Draw 5+6

No. 6609  Yu. Bazlov
3 Hon. Mention, Golden Fleece Ty, 1986

No. 6610  L. Silaev
4 Hon. Mention, Golden Fleece Ty, 1986

No. 6611  V. Vlasenko
1 Commendation, Golden Fleece Ty, 1986


i) Presumably 6. Sg8? b3 7. h8Q b2, when W would be well advised to offer a draw, since 8. Qd4 + ? Rb4.

No. 6612: N. Pandzhakidze

E. Asaba

CM. Bent

D.A. Gurgenidze


No. 6613: E. Asaba (Moscow). 1. g6 Kxe4 2. g7 Kf4 3. h6 Bg4 4. Se6 + Bxe6 5. ghS Be7 + 6. Kh5 Kf5 7. Sg6 Bf7 8. h8S Be8 9. h7 Bg5 10. Sf7 Bx7 11. h8S Be8 12. Sf7 Bx7 stalemate.

No. 6616: D.A. Gurgenidze (Chaluri, Georgian SSR). 1. c7 Re3 + 2. Kf1 Rf3 + 3. Kg1 Rg3 + 4. Kh1 Rxh3 + 5. Kg1 Rg3 + 6. Kf1 Rf3 + 7. Ke1 Re3 + 8. Kd1 Rxd3 + 9. Kc1 dRb3 10. c8Q + Kh7 11. Qxd7 + Kxh6 12. Qh3 + Kg7 13. Qc3 + Rxh3 + 14. Kg2 wins. It is not clear whether the special section in the award was announced for R-endings or whether it just arose out of the accidental content of the entries.

No. 6617: N. Yarmonov. 1. c6 Re8 2. Rxf7 f1Q 3. Rd2 + Kc8 4. Rc7 + Kb8 5. Re7 Qf8 6. Rd8 + Rxd8 7. c7 + Ka8 8. b7 + Ka7 9. b8Q+ Rxb8 10. c8S + and 11. Ra7 mate.

No. 6618: E. Kvezereli and R. Martsvalashvili. 1. g7 Kg3 2. Rf7 Rg6 3. Rf1 Rh6 + 4. Kg1 Rg6 5. Rf2 Kh3 + 6. Kh1 and wins.


No. 6621: P. Arestov. 1. Ra3 + Kg4 2. Rx4 + Kg3 3. Ra3 + Kg4 4. Rb3 Rc2 5. 0-0 Kg5 6. Rb4 Kg6 7. Rb5 Kg7 8. Rb6 Kg8 9. Rb7 Kh8 10. Rf8 mate.

This study was found to be defective and was eliminated.
This tourney was interestingly different, even innovative. DUE ALFIERI, or 'the pair of bishops', is an Italian monthly that began life in 1978. Its studies editor is the veteran IM player, Reggio Emilia tourney director, study composer, author, war-time interpreter and great endings enthusiast Dr Enrico Paoli. This was the magazine’s first study composing tourney, announced in 1984. Dr Paoli ‘scooped’ his regular o-t-b opponent IGM John Nunn to be sole judge; studies were published, with the solutions but without the composers’ names, in successive issues; the event was named consistently ‘1984’ (see later), but this date seems to reflect the intention to limit entries to those received in that calendar year -- in fact, of course, entries dribbled in well into 1985, and the first visible entry was published in the ii.85 issue while the last, the 40th, is in the iii.86 issue; the preliminary award, including, as one would expect from John Nunn, details of eliminations (7 by M. Dukic were demolished), appeared in the ix.86 number, where the tourney is for the first time captioned ’1984-85’ -- probably how it ought to have been announced in the first place. We understand that the editor received all entries, decided which to publish, when to do so (interspersed from month to month with other material), and how to set out each solution. The judge received all entries cursorily anonymised (ie as original but with the composer’s name excised) in a single batch and provided his award in short order. DUE ALFIERI's readers (there is no organised solving) did not, apparently, contribute analytical assistance, placing an unfair load on any judge, however competent, and thus nullifying the main advantage of an informal tourney. The innovation was the attempt to have the advantages of both informal and formal events, and the verdict has to be: it didn't quite succeed this time, but it might on another occasion, given a few refinements and the help of participating solvers and associated administrative assistance for the editor. The following analyses reproduce, with acknowledgement, those in our source’s pages. (DUE ALFIERI has now (1987) ceased publication, we understand.)


ii) 1... Rc3 2. Kb6 Ke6 3. d7 Ke7 4. Kc7 Rd3 5. Be2 Rd6 6. Bb5 Rd5 7. Ke8 1... Rg5 + 2. Kb6 and 2... Rxh5 3. c7
Rh8 4. d7, or 2...Ke6 3. d7 Ke7 4. Kc7.


"There are many compositions with B + PP vs. R (GBR class 0310.20) but few show such interesting play: W sacrifices one P, avoids a stalemate trap, and finally delivers checkmate with scant material."


"The struggle of wRR vs. bQ is embellished by a surprising sacrifice of wR..."


ii) 7...Sh4 + 8. Kg4 Sg2 9. Sf4 +.

"The author has added an interesting second variation to a study of Maksimovskikh."


"This study posed an interesting question. After 1. Kd5 Kd7 2. Sg7 Ke7 3. Sf5 + and 4. Sh4 W has avoided the immediate loss of wS. However, wSS are paralysed and Bl can try to win by stalemating wK, whereupon one wS is lost. Can this be done here? It is not easy to say, but an article by Kopnin in EG70 suggests that such positions are drawn when the paralysed SS are in the centre of the board, but lost when they are on the perimeter, as here. We are therefore disposed to give the composer the benefit of the doubt, despite the fact that had he analysed the possibility he might have made a valuable contribution to the theory of this ending."

"The originality is not high, and all moves on both sides are forced, but the attraction of the finale is not to be denied."

No. 6628: Emil Melnichenko (New Zealand). 1. Be3 + Kg7 2. Bxcl Bxg6 3. Bh6 + Kxh6 4. Kxf6 and if Bf maintains control of f7 by 4...Bh5 then 5. g5 mate follows.

"It is a pity that the composer failed to find a better way to introduce the spectacular Bh6+.

No. 6627: Michal Hlinka (Czechoslovakia). 1. Rg8 + Kb7 2. Rg7 + Kb6 3. Rg6 + Ka5 4. gRg1 Sd3 + 5. Ke3/i and either 5...c1Q 6. Rxc1 Sxc1 7. Rg8 Sb3 8. Rgl Sc1 9. Rg8, or 5...c1Q 6. Rxd1 Sc1 7. Rd8 Sb3 8. Rd1 Sc1 9. Rd8 drawn.

i) 5. Kg3 (g5)? c1Q 6. Rxc1 Sxc1.

5. Kf5? c1Q 6. Rxc1 Sxc1 7. Rg8 b1Q +.


"Accurate play by Wk on the 5th rank is this study's attraction, along with special interest in the refutation of 5. Kf3?"


No. 6630 A. Maksimovskikh and V. Shuleptsov (vii.85)

No. 6631 V.A. Bron (vii.85)

No. 6632 V. Kondratev and A.G. Kopnin (xii.85 and vi.86)

No. 6633 N. Ryabinin (xi.85)

No. 6634 V. Vlasenko (vii.85)

No. 6635 V. Tyavlovsky (vii.85)

---


---


1) 11...c1Q 12. e8Q + Qxc8 13. Rh7 + Kxh7 stalemate.

---

No. 6630: 1/2 Prizes, 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

No. 6631: 3rd Prize, 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

No. 6632: 4th Prize, 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

No. 6633: 5th Prize, 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

No. 6634: 1 Hon. Men., 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

No. 6635: Stalemate.
No. 6635: V. Tryavlovsky (ix.85)
2 Hon. Men., 64-Sh.Ob., 1985


No. 6636: G.G. Amiryan (ix.85)
3 Hon. Men., 64-Sh.Ob., 1985


No. 6637: F.S. Bondarenko and B.N. Sidorov (xi.85)
4 Hon. Mention, 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

No. 6637: F.S. Bondarenko and B.N. Sidorov. 1. Sh5 Bg2 + 2. Ke5 Sc6 +


No. 6639: E.L. Pogosyants and S. Kalikhmatov (vi.85)
2 Commend., 64-Sh.Ob., 1985


If 1...b4 2. e5 b3 3. Bh3 b2 4. Bf5 Kd4 5. e6 Ke5 6. e7 Kxf5 7. e8Q b1Q 8. Qg6 +.
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No. 6640

V. Sereda (iv.85)
3 Commend., 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

Win
4 + 3

No. 6641

E. A. Asaba (vi.85)
4 Commend., 64-Sh.Ob., 1985

Draw
4 + 6

No. 6642

A. Lewandowski
1st Prize, Polish 'Ring' Tourney, 1985-6

Draw
6 + 5

No. 6643

A. Doniec
2nd Prize, Polish 'Ring' Ty, 1985-6

Win
9 + 6

No. 6644 A. Daniec and H. Lados
Hon. Mention, Polish "Ring" Ty, 1985-6

6 + 4

No. 6645 Z. Chudzik
1 Comm., Polish "Ring" Ty, 1985-6

Win 8 + 5

No. 6646 S. Wojcik
2 Comm., Polish "Ring" Ty, 1985-6

Win 4 + 7

No. 6647 A. Lewandowski
Polish "Ring" Ty, 1985-6

Draw 3 + 5

No. 6648 D. Makhatadze
1st Prize, Chervony Girnik, 1986
award; booklet 1986

Win 3 + 3


No. 6645: Z. Chudzik (Wolow). 1. Rh1 Qxh1 2. Sd2 + Kc2 3. Sfl Kd3 4. f4 Kd4 (Ke4; Sg3 + ) 5. f5 gf 6. g6 hg 7. h7 wins.


The composer asks if this is the first example of a pin-mirror model stalemate in which all the men in the stalemate have moved.

No. 6648: D. Makhatadze (Georgian SSR). Judge: L. Topko. The multisec tioned award was published in booklet form, with an extensive descriptive title incorporating references to the "BO-GATIR" sports club of the "Krivorozhstal" combine and the XXVII Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR. 1. Kg4 h3/i 2. Kg3 g4 3. a5 Kxe3 4. a6 a2 5. Kg2 h1Q + 6. Kh1 Kf2 7. a7 g3 8. a8Q wins.

i) 1...Kxe3 2. a5 h3 3. Kg3.
"An ultra-miniature P-ending executed with a contemporary treatment, namely a systematic movement of wK and two bPP."

No. 6649: An.G. Kuznetsov, D. Godes and V. Neishtadt
2nd Prize, Chervony Girnik, 1986

No. 6649: An.G. Kuznetsov, D. Godes and V. Neishtadt (Ryazan) and V. Neishtadt (Barnaul).

i) 1...Ke4 2. Bxe2 Bxe2 3. f6 Kxd5 4. f7 drawn.

ii) Threat: Bc6 mate. Note bBc4 blocking the c-line against checks. If 7...Ba2 8. Bc6 + Kc4 and there is the check on d2.
"Behind the interesting play there is a beautiful, though known, finale."

No. 6650: Yu. Kuruoglu
3rd Prize, Chervony Girnik, 1986


No. 6651: Ya. Roiko
Special Prize, Chervony Girnik, 1986


"A 'picture' ('scaccographic') P-study showing the number 27."

No. 6652: V.S. Kovalenko
1 Hon. Mention, Chervony Girnik, 1986

No. 6652: V.S. Kovalenko (far east maritime province).
1. Kf2 d5 2. a4 d4 3. a5 d3 4. a6 d2 5. a7 d1S + (d1Q; a8Q + ) 6. Kf1 Se3 + 7. Ke2 Kg1 8. a8Q h1Q 9. Qa1 + /i Kh2 10. Qe5 + Kh3/ii 11. Qh5 + Kg2 12. Qg5 + Kh3 13. Qh6 + Kg2 14. Qg7 + Kh3 15. Qxh7 + wins. 15...Kg2 16. Qxh1 + Kxh1 17. Kxe3.

ii) 10...Kg2 11. Qg7+. 10...Kg1 11. Qxe3+.

"bP h7 is the principal character!"


"The initial position is out of the ordinary, and there is an original final position too."


i) 1. gSe2? Rxh3 + 2. Kg5 Bxc2.

ii) 2...Rd3 3. gSe2 Kf2 4. Kg5 Bf7 5. h4 drawn, or 4...Be4 5. Se6 drawn.

"A miniature concluding with a dynamic positional draw."


"A memorable miniature with subtle double-edged play."


"A trot by wSS leads to a position of checkmate."
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i) 1...Kh8 2. Qg6 d3 3. Qf7 c6 4. Qg6 c5 5. Qf7.

ii) 3...d2 4. Qh4 + Kg6 5. Qg3 + Kh5 6. Qxb3 Se3 7. Qf7 +, and variations like: 7...Kh4 8. Qf4 + Kh5 9. Qh2 +, or 7...Kh6 8. Qf4 + Kg6 9. Qg3 + Kf5 10. Qf2 +, or 7...Kg5 8. Qe7 + Kg6 9. Qe8 + Kh6 10. Qxe3 +, with, in this, 8...Kh6 9. Qh4 + Kg6 10. Qg3 + Kf5 11. Qf2 +.

iii) 4. Kc1? Sb3 + 5. Kd1 Sb2 + and B1 wins.

iv) 6...d2 7. Qh4 + Kg6 8. Qg3 + Kh5 9. Qxb3 Se3 10. Qf7 + Kg5 11. Qe7 + Kg6 12. Qd6 +.

"A classic treated in the contemporary manner."


"A R-ending with R-points."


i) 1...Kxa6? Kxe5 2. Se7 Rc7 3. Sg6 + Ke4.


"A little thing, but piquant."

No. 6660: V. Kichigin (Perm). 1. c7 b3 (d2; Sxf3) 2. c8Q b2 3. Qc3 b1Q 4. Sc2 Qc1 5. Se3 + Qxe3 6. Qc2 + Kxe2 stalemate.
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Notes from the editor’s chaotic desk (and carpet).

1. Before both you and I forget, RE-NEW your 1988 subscription (EG91-94) NOW - and (just as important) persuade a friend to subscribe also. The rate’s unchanged, but (for readers in distant lands) by popular and vocal demand AIRMAIL is now offered, for a $5 or £3 supplement.

2. ASSIAC MEMORIAL. The closing date for entries is 31.xii.87 (NOT ‘86!). See EG88, p. 201 for other details.

3. *C* 3.1 Through the intermediary of AJR the GBR class data base has been licensed by BELL LABORATORIES, USA, to the TURING INSTITUTE in Glasgow, for research.

3.2 Despite any contrary impression that may have been created AJR does NOT, repeat NOT, have access to 5-man data bases. In general a data base is the property of its developer(s). EG publishes results only. Anyone wishing to know the data base verdict on a specific 5-man position (such as one from the 4000.10 endgame concluding the 7th Karpov/Kasparov match game in Seville) should encourage a local research establishment to set up a project similar to those described in the pages of EG and of the ‘5-man’ booklets (see EG85).

3.3 Astonishingly, researchers in the Netherlands under the tutelage of Jaap van den Herik (who has recently transferred from Delft to Limburg University) have ‘data based’ a 6-man endgame, the one Jan Timman investigated (see EG89 pp. 228-230, under the title FIVE FOR COMPUTERS, SIX FOR HUMANS -- that title has failed to stand the test of time!). Some shortcuts to Timman’s analyses were discovered, and they have been endorsed by the IGM himself. From SCHAKEND NEDERLAND x.87 (pp. 23-4): *C* 1.
3.4 David Hooper has listed over a dozen trivial corrections affecting EG83 pp. 4-7 and EG88 pp. 194, 196-8, and one non-trivial update. Re p. 9 col. 1 line 17, DVH confirms the Dutch "C" work (SCHAKEND NEDERLAND ix,87 pp. 31,30) and writes "The position f8d7c7 is not a zugzwang. Black to play draws by 1...Kg7 2. Ke6 Kh6! 3. Se8 Kg6z, a neat triangulation." "C" gives 3. Kf6 Kh5 4. Kf5 Kh4 5. Kf4 Kh5 6. Se6 Kg6 7. Ke5 Kf7 drawn. What is new here is the apparent determination by the computer of a 'drawing line', something that the Ken Thompson approach does not readily offer.

3.5.1 For anyone reading Dutch the 6-times-a-year COMPUTERSCHAAK is worth subscribing to. The 1987 issues include extensive endgame tests on a dozen chess-micros. Address: T.F. Sassenus, Acacialaan 24, 6862 XC Oosterbeek, Holland.

3.5.2 The West German COMPUTER SCHACH UND SPIELE is also good, though with less endgame emphasis.

3.6 Extraordinary! Is endgame data base news now so common that it's relegated to the back end of EG?

4. Demolitions

4.1 "C" A letter from Larry Nelson in California gives details of convincing cooks and demolitions by supercomputer Cray Blitz of a number of endings from the late Chernev's CHESSBOARD MAGIC! They include a Bron and a Kazantsev, Nos. 73 and 129 in the 1960 reprint.

4.2 Correspondents Pfannkuche (West German champion solver) and Professor Caputto (Argentina) report interesting cooks/reconstructions to a Liburkin and a Karstedt. As we have said before EG regrets there is no space to do justice to analytical matters outside what properly belongs to David Friedgood's "Analytical Notes".

4.3 The FIDE Commission reports, and supports, a West German initiative to record, for public reference, confirmed known errors in books (not maga-
zines) of chess compositions. The address: G. Büsing, Raffesienstrasse 3, D-8195 Endlhausen, West Germany.

5. The greatly respected French composition quarterly THEMES-64 has ceased publication after 31 years. A final issue (No. 125) is promised, to tidy up solutions, etc. The demise of the Italian magazine DUE ALFIERI is reported elsewhere in EG90.

6. The x.87 meeting of the CESC took place on 2.x.87, not 9.x.87, at the request of Paul Lamford, 'our man at Batsford's'. However, Paul now works for publishers Pergamon, with whom he will 're-launch' B.H. Wood's popular magazine CHESS and perhaps even re-introduce studies to its pages. In consequence there is a change of venue for the i.88 CESC meeting.

7. David Hooper's EG83 (v.86) article on GBR class 2.01 was translated and published in the soviet SHAKHMATNY BULLETIN (vi.87). David has been promised royalties in roubles. However, the Russian editors 'forgot' to mention the article's EG provenance. The BRITISH CHESS MAGAZINE thereupon compounded the misinformation by reporting (ix.87) the soviet source but, for different reasons, likewise failing to draw attention to the 13-month 'anticipation' in EG, despite the existence of a magazine exchange arrangement between the editors of BCM and EG.

8. We congratulate Dutch and Belgian study composers and enthusiasts on their decision, taken at a meeting held in the EUWE CENTRUM in Amsterdam on 17.x.87, to establish an endgame society.

9. Graham Lee has resigned as General Secretary of the British Chess Federation, after only a short term in office. We have lost a friend in high places.

10. François Fargette draws our attention to the correct birthplace (not St. Petersburg/Leningrad but ?/Krasnodar - see EG89, p. 234, the word 'native') of the late Vladimir Korolkov.

11. A list of awards (and numbered originals) published in EG from EG51 to EG90 is available from AJR at a cost of £2 (NOT in dollar cheques!), postage included. The sequence is EG diagram number. The suggested use is to enable the speedy retrieval of an honoured study, of a complete award, or of the (unlikely) fact of the total omission of an award. More than 3,500 studies over a whole decade -- at your fingertips!

12. Sources of biographical data.

12.1 Jeremy Gaige, CHESS PERSONALIA, A BIOBIBLIOGRAPHY, contains 14,000 names. The publishers are McFarland & Company.

12.2 DIE SCHWALBE No. 106 includes many details in its index to Vol. XVIII, for the years 1983-1985.

12.3 The third in Peter Kniest's series CAISSAS SCHLOSSBEOHNER (1987) includes the usual page of biographical matter for each of the 58 contributors - among them Hillel Aloni, Uri Avner, Vladislav Bunka, Eugeniusz Iwanow, Werner Keym, Aleksandr Kislyak, and Cedric Lytton (Sells). If you, EG reader-composer, are to figure in a later volume, then you must purchase this one, because it contains instructions (in German, English and French) on the preparation of an entry. (Price: DM 24.50 or DM 20.00, from Irene Kniest, Mühlthalweg 32, 5144 Wegberg 1, BRD.)
"EG" PRIZE QUIZ

In 1987 FIDE studies Judge "A" wrote about the "endgame study compositions" of "B", another contemporary FIDE studies Judge, that they "may be analytical, often-constructed types of 'themes' that have been carefully followed in their arithmetic progression, but they are neither 'romantic', nor even truly natural studies, and when 'themistic' they are not aesthetic." The words quoted have not been translated. "A" and "B" are of different nationalities. EG readers are invited to guess the identities of "A" and "B", giving their reasons. Answers to AJR, please. A book prize (maybe "STITCH") will be awarded to the best, or most amusing, entry.