Champagne Award 2014 Bern

Section A

13 entries by 11 composers in this section. 1 problem was cooked.

I accepted a loose definition of cross-check : n+1 consecutive checks = n cross-checks. This allows checks with capture, but of course more elegant are cross-checks without capture.

Under the large definition, the record to my knowledge is 7 cross-checks, given as Annex, difficult to improve in short time competiton.

The authors were left to work either on quantity (looking for "local records") or on quality (homogeneity, originality,...). Of course, the personal tastes of the judge are essential in the final ranking.

1° Prize

Kostas PRENTOS



1.a4 a5 2. ⊑a3 ⊑a6 3. ⊑ç3 ⊑d6 4.b3 b6 5. ≜b2 ≜b7 6. ≝ç1 ≜×g2 7. ဩf3 ᡚç6 8. ⊑g1 ≜h1 9. ⊑g5 ≝a8 10. ⊑h5 g5 11. ≜h3 ≜h6 12. ≜f5 啥f8 13.h3 啥g7 14. ဩh2 啥f6 15.f3 啥é5 16.d4+ 啥×d4 17. 啥d2 g4+ 18. ⊑é3+ 啥ç5+ 19. ≜d3+

« Only » 4 thematical checks but of the same nature : they are all battery checks without capture, the most sophisticated nature of thematical moves. Very « professional » realization.







 $\begin{array}{c} 1.\acute{e}3\ d6\ 2.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}h5\ \overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}d7\ 3.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}\times h7\ \overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}h6\ 4.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}\acute{e}4\ f5\ 5.f3\ \overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}f7\ 6.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}f2\ \overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}g6\ 7.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}g3\ \overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}h5\ 8.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}h3\ f4+\\ 9.g4+\ f\times g3\ e.p.+\ 10.\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}g4+\overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}\times g4+\ 11.f\times g4+\ \overset{\textcircled{m}}{=}\times g4+ \end{array}$

Great intensity (number of cross-checks / total number of moves = 6/22). « Local record » of 7 checks with homogeneous play around square g4.

3° Prize

Joaquim CRUSATS



The composer succeeds in equalizing the existing record by splitting the play in 2 sequences of croos-checks (5+2). The aesthetical drawback is 2 promoted Bishops apparent on the diagram.

1° H.M.

Jonathan MESTEL, Allan BELL



1.a4 é5 2.a5 é4 3.a6 é3 4.a×b7 é×d2+ 5.a×d2 bé7 6.bé3 bf6 7. \blacksquare a6+ bg5 8. \blacksquare h6 aa3 9.bd6 aé7 10.b×ç7 \blacksquare é8 11.b×ç8 bb6+ 12.bç5+ af5+ 13.bf3+ \blacksquare é3+ 14.a×é3‡

2° H.M.

Ivan BENDER, Marko FILIPOVIC, Marko KLASINC



1.é4 h5 2.é5 Ξ h6 3.é6 Ξ g6 4.é×d7 + $\textcircled{B} \times d7$ 5.d4 $\textcircled{B} \varsigma$ 6 6.B d2 A c6 7. $\textcircled{B} \varsigma3 \textcircled{A} \times a2$ 8. $\Xi \times a2$ $\textcircled{B} \times d4 + 9. \textcircled{B} b3 \textcircled{A} d7$ 10. $\Xi \times a7 \textcircled{E} b8$ 11. $\blacksquare a4 \textcircled{E} g3 + 12. \textcircled{B} f3 + \textcircled{B} d5 + 13. \ddddot{C} \varsigma4 + \textcircled{A} \varsigma5 +$

1st and 2nd HM both show a nice sequence of 5 checks without capture. 2nd HM is more homogeneous (5 direct checks as there is a battery check in 1st HM) but 1st HM adds a thematical capture check, with pin-mate as non thematical bonus.

3° H.M.

Kostas PRENTOS



1.d4 ç5 2.d×ç5 ≝b6(a3) 3.\$d2 d5 4.ç×d6 e.p. \$\overline{e}66(f3) 5.\$c3 \$\overline{a}d7 6.d×67 \$\overline{e}63(h4)+ 7.\$b4 \$\overline{a}×a2 8.\$\overline{a}d4(a5) \$\overline{a}×67 9.\$\overline{e}×63(f6)++\$\$c38(\$\overline{a}d4)++\$\$

Cross-double check is clearly impossible in orthodox chess. Possibly other fairy conditions than Circe Parrain allow to do it, but this problem will be a pioneer.

1° Com.

Marco BONAVOGLIA



6 checks as 1st HM (and 3rd Com.) and still a better intensity (5/18) than 2nd Prize but a lacking in homogeneity



Allan BELL



1.é3 a5 2.豐g4 a4 3.f3 單a5 4.皇a6 d6 5.當é2 皇é6 6.當d3 當d7 7.公é2 當ç6 8.單g1 皇f5+ 9.豐é4+ 單d5+ 10.公d4+

A final sequence similar to that of 2nd HM, but one check less. Additional originality is that the play is totally without capture (32 units on diagram). A « local » record with this constraint?

3° Com.

Vidmantas SATKUS



SPG 15,5 (14+11) C+

6 thematical checks as in 1st HM and 1st Com. Well done.

4° Com.

Hitoshi YANAMI



1.g3 ②a6 2.皇g2 罩b8 3.皇ç6 b×ç6 4.公ç3 罩b3 5.公d5 罩ç3 6.公b4 d5 7.d×ç3 d4 8.皇é3 d×é3 9.豐d5 公ç5 10.豐g2 當d7 11.0-0-0+ 公d3+ 12.當b1 當d6 13.當a1 當ç5 14.罩b1 公ç1 15.公f3 豐d1 16.公d4 豐g1 17.豐f1 皇d7

All other entries have a King in check on diagram. Author had original idea to hide the cross-check sequence in the middle of the game. But only one cross-check is insufficient for a higher ranking.

Annex

Kostas PRENTOS, Andreï FROLKIN Orbit 2010



SPG 15,5 (15+15) C+

 $\begin{array}{l} 1.a4 \ g5 \ 2. \blacksquare a3 \ \$ h6 \ 3. \blacksquare g3 \ \$ f8 \ 4. \varsigma3 \ \$ g7 \ 5. \between \varsigma2 \ \$ f6 \ 6. \between g6 + \ \$ e5 \ 7. d3 \ a5 \ 8. \And e3 \ \blacksquare a6 \ 9. \And d2 \\ \blacksquare e6 \ 10. \And b6 \ \textcircled c6 \ 11. \And e3 \ \textcircled d4 \ 12. \And d2 \ g4 + \ 13. f4 + \ g \times f3 \ e.p. + \ 14. \blacksquare g5 + \ \textcircled f5 + \ 15. \between \times f5 + \ \And d6 + \ 16. \And e4 + \end{array}$

Current record for 8 consecutive checks = 7 cross-checks.

Section B

This tourney was in memory of **Paul VALOIS** and **Uri AVNER**.

Disappointingly (again for this section) only 2 entries by 3 composers were received.

Both entries showed the same basic idea. A castling is demonstrated to be illegal in a reflex problem because otherwise it would have been forced to be played before by the reflex condition. One of the entry added some complications in the retro construction, ending in a much heavier position. Well, it is generally true nowadays than to be on top of an award, you have to display some complexity. But chess composition is not only "sport" but also "art". And clarity of exposition of the idea was here the decisive point.



1° Place

James QUAH

1.h7! $[2. \& \times f7 + \& \times f7 \ddagger]$ (1...0-0-0? is illegal) 1... $\& d8 \ 2. \& g7 \blacksquare f8 \ddagger$

Black Pawns captured the 10 missing white pieces. Every possible black last move (except King and Ra8 moves that distroy castling) leaves position with mate by castling that should have been played if castling was legal.

2° Place

Joaquim CRUSATS, Andreï FROLKIN



 $1. \& e^2 \sim 2. \& f_1 g \times f_1 = "" \ddagger (2.0-0-0 \ddagger; illegal)$

If last move was 262-d1 (other 26 moves are illegal because of reflex mate 262‡), then 0-0-0 is illegal otherwise reflex condition would have forced it as last move. Other last black moves have to be studied, such as -1. 363 g8-g5 g5×366 h6 -2. 366 f6 given by composers; but I see no point in this complications : there would have been some point for example in a twin presentation, where a sequence of moves save the castling in a position and not in the other one, but this is not the case here...

Michel Caillaud