CORRESPONDENCE

HOW TO DISCRIMINATE SOLUTIONS 1

Brian Gosling

36 Westwood Drive, Frome
Somerset, BA11 4JR / UK

I would like to make a few comments about John Nunn's letter in the September 1992 issue of the *ICCA Journal*.

He is technically correct when he says there is a second solution to my correction of the Platov Study which appeared in the March issue of the Journal. However, this variation is time-wasting and not the most efficient way to win. His solution does not invalidate my analysis of this position. The intended solution 1. g5+ etc. is still the most efficient way to win.

As a work of art my correction is unsound because there is a second solution, not because my analysis is incorrect.

I hope this clears up the misunderstanding that might arise.

HOW TO DISCRIMINATE SOLUTIONS 2

Gary A. Crum

5822 Sunland
Louisville, Ohio 44641 / USA

The more I think about John Nunn's complaint, September 1992, page 175, the more annoyed I become.

Chess literature is chock-full of faulty analyses; there must be literally millions of instances. I have (with the help of Mephisto Lyon) found 666 in Fine's endgame book. Added to others in other sources, over 1000 instances in just this one highly-overrated book. Undoubtedly, Deep Thought could find 3000 instances in this same one book.

And yet Nunn complains because he finds an inferior alternative win in Gosling's correction to Platov's study. But this alternative win of Nunn's is totally without merit. Whereas Gosling's win is short, sweet, and simple, Nunn's win is long, difficult, and uninteresting. In short, I can hardly consider Nunn's solution to be a "genuine correction".

Regardless of whether an endgame occurs in actual play or is composed, in probably 99% of the cases, there is going to be an alternative win. But to be meaningful, to be regarded as a "genuine improvement/correction", the alternative has to be superior in some way. For example, it might be shorter, more decisive (for example, mating instead of winning a Bishop), more forcing (for example, a mate consisting entirely of six checks might be preferable to a mate in five, involving dozens of variations) or more beautiful. I repeat: no matter what standards you use, Nunn's alternative win is far inferior to that by Gosling. Oh yes, Gosling uses the basic idea of Platov, whereas Nunn does not. Speaking of the pot calling the kettle black.