

1. Ausschreibung / Announcement

Gedenkturnier Attila Schneider

Aus Anlass der Wiederkehr des Todestages des Internationalen Meisters Attila Schneider, der am 7. Juli 2003 verstarb und kurz zuvor ein neues, kooperatives Verfahren zur Beurteilung von Studien in die Turnierpraxis einführte, rufen wir zu einem neuen Studienwettbewerb in seinem Sinne auf. Jeder Teilnehmer darf nur mit einer einzigen Studie an diesem Turnier teilnehmen – entweder als Einzelwerk oder in Kooperation mit einem anderen Teilnehmer. Das Thema ist frei. Die Arbeiten sind im pgn-Format bis zum 30. April 2006 per Email einzureichen beim Turnierdirektor Gerhard Josten (nc-jostenge@netcologne.de). Fragen und Antworten zum Turnier werden auf dieser Webseite in anonymer Form veröffentlicht werden. Dort erfolgt später auch die Veröffentlichung des Ergebnisses. Die Turniersprache ist Englisch. Harold van der Heijden hat sich freundlicherweise bereit erklärt, die eingereichten Arbeiten auf Vorgänger zu prüfen. Seine Ergebnisse werden auf dieser Seite gezeigt. Nach dieser Prüfung werden die eingereichten Arbeiten bis zum 31. Mai 2006 den Teilnehmern in anonymisierter Form zur Beurteilung übersandt. Die einzelnen Teilnehmer

Tourney in memory of Attila Schneider

On the occasion of the anniversary of the death of the International Master Attila Schneider, who passed away on July 7th 2003 shortly after having introduced a new and cooperative method of assessing endgame studies into the tourney practice, we are initiating a new endgame study tourney in his remembrance. Only one study may be submitted by each participant in this tourney - competition entries may be written by a single person or in cooperation with another participant. The theme is free. Works have to be submitted to the tourney director Gerhard Josten (nc-jostenge@netcologne.de) by email until April 30th 2006 as pgn file. Questions and answers concerning the tourney will be published on this website anonymously. Later on the result of the tourney will be published there as well. The tourney language is English. Harold van der Heijden has kindly volunteered to examine the submitted studies for anticipations. His results will be shown on this website. After this examination the submitted studies will be sent to the participants in anonymous form until May 31th 2006 for their assessment. All participants will have to rate each of the studies submitted by the other participants along a scale of 1 – 20 points and to send their result until June

vergeben per Email an den
Turnierdirektor bis zum 30. Juni 2006 für
jede der eingereichten Studien der übrigen
Teilnehmer 1 – 20 Punkte. 20 Punkte sind
die Höchstbewertung. Komponistenteams
müssen sich auf eine gemeinsame
Beurteilung einigen. Alle Teilnehmer sind
ebenfalls aufgerufen, Vorwegnahmen für
eine Veröffentlichung zu melden.

Es gilt die strikte Regel, dass im
Durchschnitt genau 10 Punkte für alle
Studien zu vergeben sind. Beispiel: Bei 12
zu bewertenden Studien sind genau 120
Punkte zu vergeben. Erfolgt keine
zeitgerechte und exakte Punktvergabe,
wird die betreffende Studie und der Autor
ausgeschlossen.

Bei der Auswertung wird zunächst jeweils
die höchste und die niedrigste Bewertung
einer Studie gestrichen und dann ein
Mittelwert aller Bewertungen gebildet. Die
Studie mit der größten Punktzahl gewinnt
das Turnier. Bei einem Gleichstand hat die
zuerst eingereichte Studie den Vorrang.

Die Bekanntgabe des Ergebnisses erfolgt
am 7. Juli 2006 in Erinnerung an Attila
Schneider. Als Preise werden 100, 50 und
25 Euro ausgesetzt. Bei weniger als 10
Teilnehmern behalten wir uns eine
Reduzierung des Preisfonds vor.

Gerd Wilhelm Hörning und Gerhard
Josten

30th 2006 to the tourney director. 20
points are the maximum. Cooperating
teams have to come to an agreement
about their judgement. Other anticipations
may also be reported by the participants
for a publication.

There is the rigorous rule that an average of
exactly 10 points has to be distributed
among all studies. Example: If 12 studies
have to be assessed then exactly 120
points have to be divided. If a rating
doesn't occur in time or exactly, the
study concerned and the author will be
ostracized.

The evaluation starts with the deletion of
the highest and lowest rating of a study,
followed by a calculation of the average of
all remaining ratings. The study with the
maximum average rate of points wins the
tourney. In case of equivalence the study
submitted first takes precedence. The
publication of the final result will take
place on July 7th 2006 in memory of Attila
Schneider. We are putting prizes of 100,
50 and 25 Euro. In case of less than 10
participants we reserve the right to reduce
the prices.

Gerd Wilhelm Hörning and Gerhard
Josten

composers-judges try to find partial anticipations themselves and then do as they wish?

Answer:

There is no doubt that all entries are originals, as Harold van der Heijden wrote, if the opposite cannot be proven. So the participants don't need further information. Partial anticipations are unimportant because nearly all studies are partially anticipated.

Question:

Do you need points only, or is also textual commentary wanted / appreciated?


Answer:

Only points are wanted. However, a discussion following the final decision would be appreciated and published on this site. So far nobody has commented his judgement.

3. Final Result

3.1 The entries in chronological order

No. 1



Minski, Martin

White to move and draw

1. Bc2!

[1. Qxa3? Kb5--+]

1... Ka5!

[1... Kb5 2. Qd5 Kb6 3. Qd6]

2. Qxa3

[2. Qd5? Rb5! --+]

2... Kb5 3. Ba4!

[3. Kxd2? Nxb2! 4. Bd3 (4. Qf3 Nc4 5. Kc3 Nce3 6. Bf5 Rc4 7. Kd2 Nf2--+) 4... Nxd3 5. Qxd3 Ka4 6. Qc2 Rb3 7. Qc6 Ka3 8. Kc1 Kb4 9. Qb6 Kc4 10. Qc6 Kd4 11. Qd6 Ke4--+]

3... Rxa4 4. Qb3 Kc5!

[4... Rb4 5. Qd5 Ka6 6. Qd6 Rb6 7. Qa3 Kxb7 8. Qe7 Ka6 9. Qa3 Kb5 10. Qb3 Kc6 11. Qe6 Kc5 12. Qc4 Kd6 13. Ba3]

5. Ba3 Rxa3 6. Qxa3 Kd5!

[6... Kc6 7. Qa4 Kxb7 8. Qb5 Kc7 9. Qc5 Kd7 10. Qd5 Ke7 11. Qe4 Kf6 12. Qf4 Ke6
13. Qxg4 ; 6... Kb6 7. Qb4]

7. Qa2!

[7. Qb3? Ke5! 8. Kxd2 (8. Qb5 Kf4 9. Qc4 Kg5 10. Qc5 Kh4 11. Qe7 Kh3! 12. Qh7
Kg2! 13. Qe4 Kg3 14. Kxd2 Ndf2 15. Qe7 h1=Q 16. Qc7 Kg2 17. Qxb8 Qd1-+) 8...
h1=Q 9. Qg3 Kd5! 10. Qb3 (10. Qxb8 Qg2! 11. Kc1 Qb2! 12. Kxd1 Nf2! 13. Ke1 Nd3
14. Kd1 Qc1 15. Ke2 Nf4 16. Kf2 Qd2 17. Kf3 Qg2! 18. Ke3 Qe2 19. Kxf4 Qh2-+) 10...
Kd6 11. Qb4 Ke5 12. Qe7 Kf4 13. Qd6 Ne5 14. Qxb8 Qd5 15. Kc1 Ke4-+;
7. Qa5? Ke6! 8. Qb6 Kf5! 9. Qa5 Kg6 10. Qb6 Nf6-+;
7. Kxd2? h1=Q 8. Qb3 Kd6 9. Qb4 Ke5 10. Qe7 Kf4 11. Qd6 Ne5 12. Qxb8 Qd5 13.
Kc1 Ke4-+]

7... Ke5

[7... Kc6 8. Qc4 Kxb7 9. Qb4 Kc7 10. Qc4 Kd8 11. Qd4 Ke7 12. Qe4 Kf6 13. Qf4 ;
7... Kd6 8. Qa7! (8. Qa8? Ne5 9. Kxd2 (9. Kc2 Kc7 10. Qa5 Kc6 11. Qxe5 Ne3 12. Qxe3
d1=Q 13. Kxd1 h1=Q-+) 9... Nc4 10. Kd3 Kc7 11. Kxc4 Ne3 12. Kc5 h1=Q 13. Qa5
Kd7-+) 8... Ndf2 (8... Ne5 9. Kxd2 Nc4 10. Kc1 Kc7 11. Qc5 Kxb7 12. Qb4 Nb6 13.
Qe7) 9. Kxd2 Kc7 (9... Ne4 10. Ke2 Kc7 11. Qa5 Kc6 12. Qa4 Kd5 13. Qa2 Ke5 14.
Qa8) 10. Qc5 Kxb7 11. Qb5 Kc7 12. Qc5 Kd7 13. Qa7 Ke6 14. Qxb8 h1=Q 15. Qe8
draw EGTB]

8. Qa8!

[8. Qa5? Ke6-+;
8. Qa7? Rd8! -+]

8... Ndf2

[8... Ngf2 9. Kc2! (9. Kxd2? Rxa8 10. bxa8=Q Ne4 11. Kc2 h1=Q) 9... h1=Q 10. Qxb8
Ke4 11. Qe8 Kf3 12. b8=Q Ne3 13. Kxd2 Ne4 14. Qxe4!draw;
8... h1=Q? 9. Qxb8]

9. Kxd2 Ne4 10. Ke2!

[10. Kc2? Rxb7 11. Qxb7 Ne3 12. Kb2 h1=Q -+ EGTB]

10... Rxb7main

[10... Rxa8 11. bxa8=Q h1=Q 12. Qe8! (12. Qb8? Nd6! -+ EGTB; 12. Qa5? Ke6!-+
EGTB) 12... Kf4 13. Qb8 Kg5 14. Qg8 Kf4 15. Qb8 Ne5 16. Qf8 Kg5 17. Qf4! Kxf4
stalemate (17... Kg6 18. Qxe5)]

11. Qxb7 h1=Q 12. Qe7!


[12. Qc7? Nd6! -+ EGTB;
12. Qb5? Kf6! 13. Qc6 Kg5! -+ EGTB]

12... Kf4 13. Qc7 Kg5 14. Qg7 Kf5

[14... Kh5 15. Qf7 Kh4 16. Qh7]

15. Qd7 Kf4 16. Qc7 Ne5 17. Qc1! Qxc1 stalemate [½:½]

No. 2



Becker, Richard

White to move and draw

1. h6

[1. Rf4? Kb5 (Ka5) 2. h6 Be2 (Bd1) –+]

1... Be4 2. Kb2

[2. Rf4? Rc1 3. Kb2 (3. Ka2 Rc4 4. h7 Bxh7 5. Rxc4 Bg8–+) 3... Rb1 4. Ka2 b3 5. Ka3 Bd5 6. Rh4 Ra1 7. Kb2 Ra2 8. Kc3 Rc2–+]

2... Ka5

[2... Rc4 3. Kb3 Bd5 4. Rf5 (4. Rd8? Bf7–+) 4... Rd4 (4... Be6 5. Rf6=; 4... Bg8 5. h7 Bxh7 6. Kxc4=) 5. Ka4 (5. Kb2? Bg8 (Bc4) 6. Rg5 Bh7 7. Rg7 Bf5–+) 5... Bc6 6. Kb3 Bd5 (6... Rh4 7. h7=) 7. Ka4 b3 8. Ka3 Rd1 9. h7 Ra1 10. Kb2 Ra2 11. Kc3=; 2... Kb5 3. h7 Rc2 (3... Bxh7 4. Rb8 Ka5 5. Ra8 Kb6 6. Rb8 Kc5 7. Rc8 Kd4 8. Rd8=) 4. Kb3 Rh2 5. Rb8 Kc5 6. Rc8 Kb5 7. Rb8 Ka5 8. Kc4 Rc2 9. Kb3 Rc3 10. Kb2 Rc2 11. Kb3 Rh2 12. Kc4 Rxh7 13. Rb5=]

3. Re8

[3. h7? Rc2 4. Kb3 Rh2 5. Kc4 (5. h8=Q Bd5#) 5... Rxh7–+]

3... Rc2

[3... Re3 4. h7 Re2 5. Ka1 Re1 6. Kb2 Rb1 7. Ka2 transposes; 3... Bh7 4. Ra8 Kb5 5. Rb8 Kc4 6. Rc8=]

4. Kb3 Rc3 5. Kb2 Rc4 6. Kb3 Rd4

[6... Bd5 7. Re5 Rd4 8. Kb2 (8. Kc2? Ka4 9. h7 Bb3–+) 8... Ka4 9. h7 Rd2 10. Kc1=]

7. h7

[7. Re5? Kb6 (Ka6) 8. Rh5 Bh7 9. Rh3 Rf4 10. Rh5 Kc6 11. Rh3 Kc5 (Kb5) 12. Rh5 Rf5–+]

7... Rd3

[7... Bxh7 8. Ra8 Kb6 9. Rb8 Kc5 10. Rc8=]

8. Kb2

[8. Ka2 Bxh7 9. Ra8 Kb5 10. Rb8 Kc4 (Kc5) 11. Rc8 Kd4 12. Rb8 Kc3 13. Rc8 Kd2–+; 8. Kc4 Rc3 9. Kd4 Bxh7 10. Ra8 Kb5 11. Rb8 Ka4 12. Ra8 Kb3–+]

8... Rd2

[8... Bxh7 9. Ra8 Kb5 10. Rb8 Kc4 11. Rc8=]

9. Ka1

[9. Kc1 Rc2 10. Kd1 Bxh7 11. Ra8 Kb5 12. Rb8 Ka4 (Kc4) 13. Ra8 Kb3–+]

9... Rd1 Thematic variation

[9... Bxh7 10. Ra8 Kb5 11. Rb8 Kc4 (Ka4) 12. Rxb4 (12. Rc8? Kb3 13. Rc3 Ka4 14. Ra3 Kb5 15. Ra5 Kc4 16. Rc5 Kd3 17. Rd5 Ke3–+) 12... Kxb4 stalemate]

10. Kb2

[10. Ka2? Bxh7 11. Ra8 Kb5 12. Rb8 Kc4 13. Rc8 Kd3 14. Rd8 Kc2 15. Rxd1 Bg8–+]

10... Rb1

[10... Bxh7 11. Ra8 Kb5 12. Rb8 Kc4 13. Rc8=]

11. Ka2 Bxh7 Thematic variation

[11... b3 12. Ka3 Bxh7 13. Re5 (13. Ra8? Kb5 14. Rb8 Kc4-+) 13... Ka6 14. Ra5 Kb6 15. Rb5 Kxb5 stalemate]

12. Re5 Ka6 13. Ra5

[13. Re6? Kb5 14. Rb6 (14. Re5 Kc4 15. Re4 Kc3 16. Re3 Kd4-+) 14... Kc4 15. Rc6 Kd4 16. Rd6 Kc3 (Ke3) 17. Rc6 Kd2 18. Rd6 Bd3-+]

13... Kb6 14. Rb5 Kc6 15. Rc5 Kd6 16. Rd5


[16. Rb5? Be4-+]

16... Ke6 17. Re5

[17. Rb5? Kf6zz]

17... Kf6 18. Rb5zz Bd3 19. Rf5 Ke6 20. Re5 Kd6 21. Rd5 Kxd5 stalemate [1/2:1/2]

No. 3



Hornecker, Siegfried

White to move and win

1. Bb8!

[1. Nc3? Kc2 ;

1. Na4? a2 2. Nac3 Kc2 3. Bxc5 a1=Q-+;

1. Nb4? cxb4 2. Nc4 b2 3. Bd4 Kc2-+;

1. Nc4? a2 2. Nc3 Kc2 3. Na3 Kxc3 4. Bb8 Kd4 5. Nb5 Kd5 6. Nc3 Ke6-+;

1. Kg4? a2-+]

1... a2! 2. Be5!

[2. Nc3? Kc2 3. Nxa2 bxa2 4. Be5 e3 5. Nc4 e2 6. Ne3 Kd3 7. Ng2 Ke4 8. Bb2 Kf3 9.

Ne1 Kg3 10. Kg5 Kxh3 11. Kf4 Kh2 12. Ke3 Kg1 13. Kxe2 h3]

2... b2

[2... a1=Q 3. Bxa1-+]

3. Na4!

[3. Bxb2? Kxb2 4. Nc4 Kc1 5. Na5 c4-+;

3. Nc4? a1=Q 4. Kxh4 Qa6 5. Nde3 Qg6]

3... a1=Q 4. Bxb2

[4. Nxb2? Qa8-+;

4. Ndc3? Kc2-+]

4... Qxa4


[4... Qxb2 5. Nxb2 Kxb2 6. Kxh4+- c4 7. Kg4 c3 8. Nf4 Kc2 9. Kf5 e3 10. Ke4 Kd2 11.

Kf3 c2 12. Ne2+-]

5. Nc3 Kxb2 6. Nxa4 Kc2 7. Nxc5

[7. Kg4? e3 8. Kf3 Kd2 9. Nxc5 e2 10. Ne4 Kd3 11. Nf2 Kd2 12. Ne4 Kd3]
7... e3 8. Ne6! e2 9. Nd4 Kd3 10. Nxe2 Kxe2 11. Kxh4 Kf3 12. Kg5
 [12. Kh5? Kf4! 13. h4 (13. Kg6 Kg3 14. Kg5 Kxh3) 13... Kf5 14. Kh6 Kf6 15. h5 Kf7!]
12... Kg3 13. h4+- [1:0]

No. 4



Akobias, Iuri

White to move and draw

1. Nf4

[1. Re1!? Kf2 2. Nf4 Rxc3 3. Re2 Kf3 (Kg3) 4. Rxa2 h4 (Kg4) 5. Ng6 Kg3 6. Rb2 Rxe3 7. Nxb4 Kxh4+-;

1. e4!? Nxc3 2. Nf4 Ke3 3. Nxb5 Rxb5 4. Rxb5 Bxe4 5. Ka7 b5+-;

1. Bd4!? Bxg2 2. Rh2 Rg5 3. Bf6 Rg8 4. Kc7 b5+-;

1. Rh2!? Nxc3 (Rxc3) 2. Nf4 Kxe3 3. Nxb5 Rxb5 4. Rxb5 Be4+-]

1... Kxe3

[1... Kf2 2. Rh2 Kxe3 3. Bd2 Ke4 4. Nxb5]

2. Bd4!

[2. Bd2!? Kxd2 3. Rh2 Kc3+-;

2. Rh3!? Kxf4 3. Bd4 Nb4 4. Bxc5 Na6 5. Ka7 Kg4+-;

2. Re1!? Kxf4 3. Bd2 Kg4+-;

2. Nd5!? Bxd5 3. Rh3 Bf3+-]

2... Kxd4 3. Ne6 Ke5Main

[3... Kc4 4. Rh4 Kb5 5. Nxc5 Kxc5 6. Rxb5 Kc4 7. Rh4 Kc5 8. Rh5 Kb6 9. Rh7 Nb4 10. Rxb7 Bxb7 stalemate]

4. Rxb5 Kxe6 5. Rxc5 Kd6 6. Rc2 Nb4 7. Rc1

[7. Rc4!? Nd5+-]

7... Na2main


[7... Nd5 8. Ka7 Kc7 9. Rb1 Ne7 10. Rxb7 Bxb7 stalemate]

8. Rc2 Nb4 9. Rc1 Na6 10. Ka7 Nc5 11. Rc4!zz

[11. Rb1!? Kc7+-]

11... Nd7 12. Rb4 b5 13. Ka6 Kc5 14. Ka5 Ne5 15. Rxb5 Bxb5 stalemate [1/2:1/2]

No. 5



Gonzalez, Luis M.

White to move and draw

1. Nb6!

[1. Nd6? Kd7 2. Ne4 Qxd5 3. Nxf6 Kd6 4. Nxd5 b2 wins]

1... Kc7 2. Na8 Kc8 3. Nb6 Kc7 4. Na8 Qxa8 5. Kxa8 Bxf3 6. Rxf3 c1=R!

[6... c1=Q 7. Rc3 Qxc3 8. Rc5 Qxc5 stalemate;

6... Kc6 7. Rdd3 b2 8. Rxf6 Kc5 9. Rc3 draw]

7. Ra5 b2

[7... Kb6 8. Rxb3 Kxa5 9. Rf3 Rc6 10. Kb7 draw]

8. Rxf6!


[8. Ra7? Kd8! 9. Rb7 (9. Rb3 b1=Q 10. Rxb1 Rxb1 11. Rf7 Rb6 12. Ka7 Ke8 13. Rc7 Rb1 wins) 9... Ra1 10. Kb8 b1=Q 11. Rxf6 (11. Rh3 Qxb7 12. Kxb7 Kd7 13. Kb6 Rc1 wins) 11... Ra8 12. Kxa8 Qa1 wins]

8... Ra1! 9. Rf7 Kd6 10. Rf6!

[10. Rb7? Rxa5 11. Kb8 Ra2 12. Rb5 Kc6 wins]

10... Kc7 11. Rf7 Kc8 12. Rf8 Kd7 13. Rf7 Ke6 14. Rb7 Rxa5 15. Kb8 Ra2 16. Rb5! Kd6 17. Kb7 [1/2:1/2]

No. 6



Essen, Martin v.

White to move and draw


1. Rfxh3

[1. Rhxh3 Kg1 Black has a decisive advantage]

1... Kg1

- [1... Kg2 2. Nf4 Kg1 3. Rg4 Kf1 4. Rh1 Kf2 5. Rh2 Kf1 (5... Ke3 6. Ng2 Kxe2 7. Nxe1 Kd1 8. Nd3 a1=Q 9. Kb6 With the white rook on g4 the mate threat on g1 decides.) 6. Rh1 With perpetual check]
- 2. Rh1 Kg2 3. Nf4 Kf2 4. R1h2 Kf1 5. Rh1 Kf2 6. R1h2 Ke3 7. Ng2**
[7. R2h3 Ke4 8. Bxc2 Ke5 Black's king will escape. Black has a decisive advantage.]
- 7... Kxe2 8. Nxe1 Kd1 9. Nxc2**
[9. Nd3 a1=Q 10. Kb6 Qa8 With White's rook on h4 instead of g4, there is no mate threat so that Black has time for this move, which defends against perpetual check. Black has a decisive advantage. (10... b1=Q 11. Rh1 Ke2 12. R1h2 Kxd3 13. R2h3 With perpetual check);
9. Nf3 a1=Q 10. Kb6 b1=N White has no draw here. (10... b1=Q 11. Rxd2 Kc1 12. Rh1 Kb2 13. Rxb1 Kxb1 14. Bxc2 Ka2 15. Bg6 Ka3 16. Bxf7 Qf6 17. Kxc5 Qxf7 18. Rd3 Nalimov draw)]
- 9... Bxb3 10. Na1**
[10. Na3 Kc1;
10. Ne3 Kc1 11. Rc4 Kb1 12. Rh1 d1=Q 13. Nxd1 a1=Q 14. Kb6 Qa8 15. Nc3 Kc2 16. Rh2 Kd3 17. Rxc5 Qb8 18. Ka5 Qxh2]
- 10... bxa1=Q**
[10... b1=Q 11. Rh1 Ke2 12. R1h2 Kd3 13. R2h3 draw]
- 11. Rh1 Kc2 12. Rxa1 Kb2**
[12... d1=Q 13. Rxd1 (13. Rh2 Qd2 14. Rxd2 Kxd2 15. Kb5 c4 16. Kb4 Kc2 17. Ka3 c3 18. Re1 Kd2 19. Rf1 Black cannot make progress, for c3-c2 allows Ka3-b2=.) 13... Kxd1 14. Rh1 Kc2 15. Kb5 c4 16. Kb4 Kb2 17. Rh2 Bc2 18. Rh1 Bb1 19. Rh2 Kc1 20. Rxa2 Bxa2]
- 13. Rhh1 c4**
[13... d1=Q 14. Rhxd1 Bxd1 15. Rxa2 Kxa2 16. Kb5]
- 14. Kb4 c3 15. Rhd1** reciprocal zugzwang, Black to move (=) **15... Be6**
[15... Bxd1 16. Rxa2 Kxa2 17. Kxc3;
15... c2 16. Rxa2 Bxa2 17. Rxd2]
- 16. Kc5**
[16. Ka4 Bc4 17. Kb4 (17. Ka5 Ka3 followed by Bb3 or c2 (-+)) (17... Kb3 18. Rxa2 Kxa2 19. Kb4 Kb2 20. Kxc4 draw)) 17... Bb3 reciprocal zugzwang, white to move (-+)
18. Rh1 (18. Kc5 Bxd1) 18... c2]
- 16... Bf7 17. Kd4**
[17. Kb4 Bb3 reciprocal zugzwang, White to move (-+)]
- 17... Bb3 18. Kd3 Bc2 19. Kc4**
[19. Kd4 Bb1 Second reciprocal zugzwang, White to move (-+) 20. Kc4 c2 21. Rxa2 Bxa2 With CHECK]
- 19... Bb1 20. Kd4** Second reciprocal zugzwang, Black to move (=)
[20. Kb4 Kc2 21. Rh1 Kd3 White has a few checks but no remedy against c3-c2 (-+)]
- 20... Kxa1** Black's king has traveled from corner to corner.
[20... c2 21. Rxa2 Bxa2 No check. 22. Rxd2;
20... Kc2 21. Rg1 Kb2 22. Rd1 Position is repeated 22... Kb3 23. Rdx1 axb1=Q 24. Rxb1 Kc2 25. Rh1]
- 21. Kxc3** Black is stalemated. [½:½]
-

No. 7



Gyarmati, Péter

Black to move and draw

1... Rc5

[1... f2? 2. Rxe4 Kd1 3. Rd4 Kc2 4. Nb4]

2. Ka6 f2 3. Rxe4 Kd1 4. Rd4 Kc2 5. Rd2 Kxd2 6. Ne4 Ke1 7. Nxf2 Kxf2 8. g7

[8. Kb7? Nf6 9. g7 (9. Kb6 Nd7) 9... Rg5-+; 8. d7? Rc6 9. Kb5 Rd6 10. g7 Ne7! -+]

8... Nf6

[8... Rc8 9. Kb7! (9. d7? Rb8! 10. Ka7 Rd8 11. Kb7 Rxd7 12. Kc6 Rd8 13. g8=N-+) 9... Rd8 (9... Rg8 10. d7 (10. Kc6)) 10. Kc6 Nf6 11. d7]

9. d7!


[9. g8=Q? Nxc8 10. Nb4 Rc4 11. Kb5 Rd4 12. Kc5 Rd1 (12... Rd2) 13. Nd5 Nh6 14. d7 Nf7-+]

9... Rd5 10. Nc3 Rd6 11. Kb5 Kf3! 12. Nd5!! Rxd5

[12... Ng8 13. Nb6 Ke4 14. Ka6 (14. Kc5) 14... Ke5 15. Kb7]

13. Kc6 Ke4 14. g8=Q Nxc8 15. Kc7 draw. g8=Q Nxc8 Kc7 [1/2:1/2]

No. 8



Didukh, Sergiy

White to move and win

1. Kb5! h4 2. Bd4 Kf5 3. Nf7 h3 4. Nd6 Kf4 5. Nc4 f2!

[5... h2 6. Be5 Ke4 7. Bxh2 f2 8. Nd2 win.]

6. Nd2!

[6. Bxf2? h2]


6... h2 7. Be5! Kxe5

[7... Ke3 8. Nf1]

8. Nf3 Ke4 Had White played 1.Ka5? and Black could draw 8...Kd5! 9.Nxh2 Kc4. 9. Nxh2 Kd3

10. c4 That's why not 1.Kc6? [1:0]

No. 9



Gurgenidze, David

White to move and draw

1. Qa6 Kg5 2. Nh3

[2. Ne6!? Kg4--+]

2... Kg4 3. Qc4 Nf4 4. Qxf7

[4. Nxf4!? Ne5--+]

4... Qe1 5. Ng1

[5. Kh2!? Qg3--+]


5... Qh4 6. Nh3 Nxh3 7. gxh3 Kxh3 8. Qb3!

[8. Kg1!? Qe1#;

8. Qxf5!? Kg3 9. Kg1 Qd4 10. Kf1 Qd1#]

8... Qg3 9. Qe3! Qxe3 stalemate [½:½]

No. 10



Rusz, Arpad

White to move and win

1. bxa7

[1. Nd6? Ke6]

- 1... **Nb6!** 2. **cxb6**
 [2. Nd6? Ke6 3. Nxc4 Bxc5]
- 2... **Bxb6** 3. **Kc8!** Thematical try:
 [3. Kd7? Bb5! 4. Kc8 (4. Kd6 Bxa7) 4... Ke7! (4... Bc6? 5. a8=N! Bf2 6. Nd8+–5. a8=Q Bc6! 6. Kb8 Kd7 7. Nc5 Bxc5)]
- 3... **Ke7**
 [3... Bxa7 4. Nd6 Ke6 5. Nxc4 Kd5 6. Kb7! Bf2 7. Nb6+–]
4. **a8=Q Bd5!**
 [4... Be6 5. Kb8 Bd5 6. Na5! Bxa8 7. Kxa8 Kd6 (7... Bxa5 8. Kb7+–) 8. Kb7 Kc5 9. Nc4!+–]
5. **Kb8**
 [5. Qb8?? Be6#]
- 5... **Ke6!**
 [5... Kd7 6. Nc5+–]
6. **Nd8**
 [6. Nc5? Bxc5]
- 6... **Kd6** 7. **Nf7 Ke6**
 [7... Kc5 8. Qb7! Bxb7 9. Kxb7 Kb5 10. Nd6 Ka5 11. Nc4+–]
8. **Ng5 Ke5**
 [8... Kd6 9. Ne4]
9. **Qb7!**
 [9. Nf3? Kd6 10. Qb7 Bxb7 11. Kxb7 Be3! (11... Kc5? 12. Nd4!+–) ; 11... Bf2? 12. Ne1! Kd5 13. Nd3 Bd4 14. Nb2!+–] 12. Ne1 Kd5 13. Nd3 Kc4]
- 9... **Bxb7** 10. **Kxb7 Be3** 11. **Kc6!** [1:0]
-

3.2 The Judgement

Study Nr.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Sum
Composer 1		11	8	12	11	13	11	9	8	7	90
Composer 2	13		3	18	12	13	6	5	7	13	90
Composer 3	10	14		10	10	9	15	10	11	1	90
Composer 4	9	15	7		9	12	10	7	14	7	90
Composer 5	12	15	8	6		10	13	11	8	7	90
Composer 6	12	17	8	8	9		14	8	7	7	90
Composer 7	13	12	8	10	12	10		6	18	1	90
Composer 8	7	19	7	11	9	8	15		11	3	90
Composer 9	8	12	8	15	11	9	10	7		10	90
Composer 10	5	14	5	15	12	13	11	5	10		90
Sum	89	129	62	105	95	97	105	68	94	56	900
-max -min	71	99	51	81	74	76	84	52	69	42	
Rank	6.	1.	9.	3.	5.	4.	2.	8.	7.	10.	

3.3 The Prizes

1. **Prize: Richard Becker (99 points)**
2. **Prize: Péter Gyarmati (84 points)**
3. **Prize: Iuri Akobia (81 points)**

The organizers have to thank all participants for their high qualified contributions and their friendly cooperation. A discussion and comments are welcome as well.

4. Discussions and comments

4.1 Information of the competitors by email

Friday, Juli 7th, 2006

Dear chess friends,

First of all let us thank you very much for your participation in the Memorial Tourney Attila Schneider. It was a new experience for us to start this experiment and perhaps also for some of you to judge yourself and to be judged by all competitors.

Hereby you receive all original entries and the preliminary result as attachment. Objections are possible until July 31th 2006. The final result will be immediately published in the Internet (<http://www.mynetcologne.de/~nc-jostenge/Schneider1.htm>) and in one of the next issues of the chess magazine Rochade Europa, but there only in German.

Discussions and comments are welcome as well. They will be published on the above mentioned website if they are sent by email to the tourney director Gerhard Josten, who is in holidays at this moment.

Best regards

Gerd Wilhelm Hörning

4.2 Iuri Akobia

Saturday, July 8th 2006

Thanks for the information. I think that this method award not bad. It can be put into practice. I have the some remarks.

1. It was impossible to delete author's comments to studies. The judge always should know author's plan. Format PGN does not allow to indicate some different thematic lines if not specify as "Main". One main line is allocated with black letters only. There is an opportunity to count all other lines as accompanying (analysis), not thematic.
2. I am assured, that some participants have put very low estimations to an study 4 (and some others too) as have not seen three thematic echo stalemates. If they have seen it then it is not necessary to discuss anything....
3. The publication of studies in magazine "Rochade Europa" (or other) in such kind as they tributes in your file PDF it is not admissible. For economy of a place it is possible to remove accompanying variants (analysis), but it is impossible to remove thematic variants and thematic tries..

Best wishes,

Iuri Akobia

4.3 Arpad Rusz

Sunday, July 9th 2006

Dear chessfriends,

First of all I congratulate all the winners: I have enjoyed their works. I have some comments regarding my study as it seems that many of judges considered that it is severly or even fully anticipated.

Somebody already cited Attila Korányi's words. Those are from an article which has appeared in EG126 under the title 'What is the difference?'. Let's see how he has argued that apparent paradox: "I am always annoyed when I read, after the solution of a study, a laconic comment like: 'This is well known' or 'All this has already been shown by...'.

I think that these remarks are irresponsible: today, the question should be: 'In this study, what is new in comparison with precedent studies?' or 'What does it add to these ones?' With such a mind, we could see, beyond the apparent contradiction, that the more a study is partially anticipated, the more it is original!" Later, after presenting a study, he writes: "[The judge] estimated that the novelties contained in the study were at least as important than the similarities: a lot of judges would have criticized these similarities only...[But] the most important lies in the difference(s)."

I think these words can be very well applied to my study too. After I have find cookies in Joita's study, I have tried to find a correction. That was possible changing the colors and transforming it into a win study. The first cook prevents a longer introduction - without adding material - but the study is saved and it is still a miniature. This is naturally only a 'Joita(corrected by A.Rusz)' study, with very little merit of mine. Should we stop here? I think no, we shouldn't! I have developed the study further to have a modern structure: a thematical try (with Bc6 instead of Bd5), more thematical lines(4...Be6), many BP/N-lines, many knight-sacrifices(e.g. 6.Na5!), forks(with Nd6 and Nd8) and even a knight promotion with an unusual motivation! Using the Nd6 fork, the capture of the a7 Pawn is prevented, and black plays 3...Ke7!! with his interesting couterplay. The wQ also moves(Qb8?,Qa7?,Qb7!), the wK voluntarily blockes(Kc8!) the future Quenn's escaping path and the positional draw avoidance it is generally considered as of greater value than a simple positional draw. The play became an intense struggle, instead of having only forced moves. These features are all novelties and major developments. Adding the fact that the original Joita study is incorrect, I think even the '(after Joita)' comment is not needed. Joita had his chance to find the best form of his interesting idea but he didn't do it.


That should be in every composers mind, when creates. With all this, I consider that the last place is unreal for my study, its value is much higher!

Any other opinion is welcomed!

4.4 Arpad Rusz

Sunday, July 9th 2006

The pgn file with Joita's study, my correction and my study is attached to this email:



<p>Joita, P. Romanian champ, 1965 Draw</p> <p>1.Bd5 Ne2 2.Kc2 Nf4 3.Be4 Ng2 but [3...Kg1! 4.Bg3 h1Q 5.Bxh1 Nh5! 6.Bd5 (6.Be5 Kxh1 -) 6...Nxb3 7.Kd3 Kf2 -] 4.Bg3 h1Q 5.Kd2 Kg1 [5...Qg1? 6.Bd3+] 6.Kd3! Kf1 [6...Qh2 7.Bxh2+ Kxh2 8.Bf5 =] 7.Kd2 Kg1 8.Kd3 Ne1+ 9.Ke3 Nc2+ 10.Kd3 Nb4+ 11.Kd4 Nc6+ but [11...Qg2! 12.Bxg2 Kxg2 13.Bd6 Kf3!-] [11...Nc2+ 12.Kd3 positional draw - perpetual threat of capturing the Q] 12.Ke3 Qg2 13.Bxg2 Kxg2 14.Bd6! [14.Kf4? Ne5 -] [14.Bc7? Nd8 15.Ke4 Ne6 16.Be5 Ng7 -] 14...Nd8 15.Ke4 Ne6 16.Kf5</p>	<p>Joita, P. My correction Win</p> <p>1.Nb7 Bb6 2.a8Q Ke7 3.Kb8 [3.Qb8? Be6+] 3...Ke6 [3...Kd7 4.Nc5+ +-] 4.Nd8+! [4.Nc5+? Bxc5 =] [4.Qa7? Bxa7+ 5.Kxa7 Bc4 =] 4...Kd6 5.Nf7+ Ke6 [5...Kc5 6.Qb7! Bxb7 7.Kxb7 Kb5 8.Nd6+ Ka5 9.Nc4+ +-] 6.Ng5+ Ke5 [6...Kd6 7.Ne4+ +-] 7.Qb7! [7.Nf3+? Kd6 8.Qb7 Bxb7 9.Kxb7 Be3! (9...Kc5? 10.Nd4! +-; 9...Bf2? 10.Ne1! Kd5 11.Nd3 Bd4 12.Nb2! +-) 10.Ne1 Kd5 11.Nd3 Kc4 =] 7...Bxb7 8.Kxb7 Be3 9.Kc6</p>	<p>Rusz, Arpad MT Schneider , 2006 Win</p> <p>1.bxa7 [1.Nd6+? Ke6 =] 1...Nb6! 2.cxb6 [2.Nd6+? Ke6 3.Nxc4 Bxc5 =] 2...Bxb6+ 3.Kc8! Thematical try: [3.Kd7? Bb5+! 4.Kc8 (4.Kd6 Bxa7 =) 4...Ke7! (4...Bc6? 5.a8N! Bf2 6.Nd8+ +-) 5.a8Q Bc6! 6.Kb8 Kd7 7.Nc5+ Bxc5 =] 3...Ke7!! [3...Bxa7 4.Nd6+ Ke6 5.Nxc4 Kd5 6.Kb7! Bf2 7.Nb6+ +-] 4.a8Q Bd5! [4...Be6+ 5.Kb8 Bd5 6.Na5! Bxa8 7.Kxa8 Kd6 (7...Bxa5 8.Kb7 +-) 8.Kb7 Kc5 9.Nc4! +-] 5.Kb8 [5.Qb8?? Be6+] 5...Ke6! [5...Kd7 6.Nc5+ +-] 6.Nd8+! [6.Nc5+? Bxc5 =] [6.Qa7? Bxa7+ 7.Kxa7 Bc4 =] 6...Kd6 7.Nf7+ Ke6 [7...Kc5 8.Qb7! Bxb7 9.Kxb7 Kb5 10.Nd6+ Ka5 11.Nc4+ +-] 8.Ng5+ Ke5 [8...Kd6 9.Ne4+ +-] 9.Qb7! [9.Nf3+? Kd6 10.Qb7 Bxb7 11.Kxb7 Be3! (11...Kc5? 12.Nd4! +-; 11...Bf2? 12.Ne1! Kd5 13.Nd3 Bd4 14.Nb2! +-) 12.Ne1 Kd5 13.Nd3 Kc4 =] 9...Bxb7 10.Kxb7 Be3 1.Kc6!</p>
--	---	---

4.5 Martin Minski

Thursday, July 13th 2006

The Schneider tourney was an interesting experience to me both as composer and judge. I thank Gerhard Josten and Gerd Wilhelm Hörning for the good organization. Altogether I regard the level of the entries very high. I liked to analyse all studies and enjoyed them with great fun. There was not one study which I would talk negatively about. Richard Becker is congratulated by me for his victory. The following points caught my eye:

Just theoretically it seems to be possible, that participants manipulate the result during the tourney by mutual information on their contributions and distributing „friend points“. Perhaps there are proposals to prevent this way.

I was astonished about that the views of the judges on the individual studies differed considerably. Among many studies the enormous deviations of points was striking. I assumed that among the famous presence at least the well known composers would agree in their

judgement. This was definitely not the case. So in the studies 4, 7, 9 and 10 we got differences of more than 10 points.

In my opinion we should develop objective criteria in order to avoid such extreme deviations as they were noticeable in this tourney. In this point - at least in the principles - the experts should settle on an understandable system. Some experts (so Michael Roxlau and Gerhard Josten) have already developed such systems which should be discussed. I'm preferring more transparency in this section.

In this tourney there was no obligation to justify one's ranking and theoretically one could have used just the dice. (This is a calculated provocation and by no means an allegation.) I myself would be interested to know how the other composers came to their ranking. Therefore I propose that in future all competitors have to judge also with verbal arguments which lay the foundations for their points. These skilled comments could be added to the publication of the studies.

4.6 Sergiy Didukh

Tuesday, July 25th 2006

First of all, I want to thank the organizers of this tourney. Unfortunately, it didn't gather many participants. But the overall level of entries was neither too bad nor too good.

It's not surprising that judges' verdicts differed. The bad thing is we have this big divergence in points not because of the different methods of study evaluation or else because of our different experience in judging tourneys. The true reason is rather depressive – composers understand classic (established in the course of the history of chess composition) artistic standards in their own way. To my mind, the obvious violation/ignorance of some basic artistic criteria took place. Blinded by the sunny side of the study some judges didn't care much for bugs in the butter. This tourney let us all witness the sad reality. Most studies double up material that is necessary for the main idea. It's a slap in the face of economy. Some others have long or analytical side-variations, and the clarity of the main idea fades.

I hardly refrain myself from giving advices (you see I was born in the «country of advices» /in Russian «СОВЕТЫ» 1. soviet power, 2. advice./) but, please, when judging or composing do weigh pluses against artistic flaws.

4.7 Richard Becker

Monday, July 31st 2006

I am delighted my study finished first in the Attila Schneider MT. The tourney went smoothly and is a success. I think the additional period in which participants were allowed to correct their studies should be standard procedure in this internet age. John Nunn did the same in his recent 50 Jubilee Ty. In that tourney, I was one of the composers who benefited from the chance to make a correction. I have already sent my one suggestion: That some uniform system of notations be devised to help the participants digest each other's studies more easily.