"This has the interesting consequence that most study ideas are ruled out, because you can always find additional solutions based on the method indicated by Rezvov. It would also be interesting to know whether his method is unique; otherwise even Rezvov's study would be incorrect in the sense of study composition!

To clarify my meaning consider the position Kc2, Re2, Pa6 - Kb6, Bal. According to theory Black can draw this position easily if he can reach the diagonal g1-a7 with his Bishop, but in the present case White has a studylike win by 1. Kd3! (White covers d4 and threatens Ra2; the Bishop has only one field) Bh8 2. Re8! Bal (once more the only field; after forcing Black to pass the diagonal twice White can now win by Zugzwang) 3. Kc4! Ka7 (now the Bishop has no moves at all) 4. Rd8! (threatens Kb5) Bf6 5. Rd7+! Ka8 6. a7 followed by Kc4-b5-a6 winning.

All this is impressive and possibly near optimal but even if White plays inefficiently he can probably win, though in a very complicated manner. Say that White plays sloppily, for instance 1. Re6+ Ka7 2. Kd3 Bh8 3. Kc4 Bb2. According to Rezvov's analysis he can still win by 4. Kd5! looking for mating threats at the right moment. The main line according to Rezvov is 4. Kd5! Bc3 5. Re3! Bb2 6. Rb3! Bf6! 7. Rh4! Bb2 8. Rh6 Bc3 9. Re6!! (Zugzwang; this is the same position as at move 4 but with Black to move) 9. ... Bb2 10. Rc6!! (Zugzwang, forcing the Bishop into the corner) 10. ... Bh8 11. Rd6! Bc3 12. Kc6 Kxa6 13. Rd3 Bb4 14. Rd1 winning.

I have two doubts. The first one is about the analysis itself: is it correct? The second one: what are configurations which would satisfy a problemist's wishes for the position to be free from duals? Probably only the computer can tell. The Russian endgame theoretician Kopnin has been analysing this material for some years and will probably publish an analysis of the a-Pawn, too. So far he has only written about b-, c- and d-Pawns. I think it would be an excellent idea to cover the same field with a computer, since this endgame is exactly of the type where the database excels, i.e., where there is a large number of Zugzwang positions."

A WIN BY KARPOV JUSTIFIED

Lars Rasmussen

Jegstrupvaenget 409
8310 Tranbjerg
Denmark

We have received the following note by Rasmussen, pointing out a potential correction to a statement of Vol. 12, No. 3, p. 116. The Correspondent disputes that Karpov should have won from a *drawn* position and contends that the win was computable. We quote:

"The game referred to must be Karpov - Ftačník, in which the following position arose with Black to move: Ke6, Rf7 - Kh3, Nb6. White's last move was to capture a Pawn on e6. Play continued 83. ... Nc4 84. Rf3 Kg4 85. Rd3! Kg5 86. Kd5 Nb6 87. Ke5 Nc4 88. Ke4 Nb6 89. Rd8 Nc4 90. Rd4 Nb6 91. Ke5 Nc8 92. Ke6 Na7 93. Kd7 and Black resigned.

In his notes in *Chess Informant* (Vol. 46, game 38) Karpov suggests that 83. ... Kg3 84. Rc7 Kf3 should lead to a draw. However, White wins with 85. Rc3 Ke2 (85. ... Ke4 86. Rc6 Nd5 87. Rc4) 86. Rc6 Na4 87. Rc4 Nb6 88. Rb4 Nc8 89. Kd7. In fact, the initial KRKN position is not a draw, but a win for White.