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LESSON 1
Chaturanga and shatranj
When the king has not castled
Can a schoolboy win against a grandmaster?

Everyone knows that chess originated in India. But does everyone know how long, and by what stages, it took chess to reach its modern form?

This unfamiliar position is called chaturanga (four-part army); this is what ancient chess looked like.

The aim of the game was not to checkmate the king, but to eliminate all the forces of one of the opponents, who made moves in turn depending on the throw of a dice. Thus if the number 2 came up, the rook was moved, if 3 – the knight, if 4 – the bishop, and so on. Chaturanga arose in Northern India not later than the 5th century.

Between the 6th and 7th centuries chaturanga changed into shatranj (or chatrang) – a game for two players which was outwardly similar to modern-day chess, but had different rules.

In shatranj there was no castling: a pawn could move only one square and could be promoted only to a queen. The queen itself was a weak piece and moved only to one of the adjacent diagonal squares. The bishop did not yet possess its long range, and moved only two squares, with the ability to jump over a piece standing in its path. Only the king, rook and knight had the same moves as in modern chess. In shatranj not only checkmate, but also stalemate, was regarded as a win. In addition, a player could win by capturing all his opponent’s men, even if at this point he himself had only one piece or pawn remaining. By the 9th century there was even some specialist literature on the theory of shatranj.
Lesson One

Among the many problems in chess, one of the most central is the attack on the king, for which there exists a whole series of typical procedures. If the opponent has castled, certain attacking methods are employed; if he has not castled, others come into force.

Our two examples show pupils from special chess schools demonstrating the art of attacking the uncastled king.

This position arose in a junior tournament (Savchenko-Altman, 1979). Black is pawn up, but he has acquired it at a high price – his king has not managed to castle. Strictly speaking, it was to detain the opponent’s king in the centre that White sacrificed a pawn. His pieces are fully mobilized, and they now begin a direct attack on the king.

1 ñe5!

The knight cannot be taken, since Black is catastrophically weak at his d8 square: 1 ... ñxe5 2 ñxb5 ab 3 ñd8 mate.

1 ... ñc7
2 ñxf7!

The leap by the knight from f3 to f7 decides the game.

2 ... ñxf7

The knight has to be taken: 2 ... 0-0 3 ñxh7+ ñxh7 4 ñf6 mate, or 3 ... ñxf7 4 ñd6+ and 5 ñg6 mate.

3 ñh1+ ñe8

If 3 ... ñg8, then 4 ñxc5 ñxc5 (4 ... ñxc5 5 ñf2) 5 ñe4 ñc6 6 ñf4.

4 ñh5+ g6
5 ñd6+ ñxd6
6 ñxg6+ Resigns

This example displays fairly graphically the methods of conducting an attack on the uncastled king. At the cost of a pawn or even a piece, the attacker normally creates a large superiority in force in the central battle sector. He then strikes a blow, exposing the opponent’s king or eliminating its defenders.

Piskov-Panchenko
Baku 1981
Sicilian Defence

This was judged to be the best game played in the USSR Team Tournament of Pioneers Palaces. In a simultaneous display with clocks, seven Muscovites were tested by the Chelyabinsk grandmaster Panchenko (while alongside, Chelyabinsk pupils battled against
the Moscow captain, grandmaster Yusupov).

1 e4 c5
2 \( \text{\&}f3 \) e6
3 d4 c6
4 \( \text{\&} \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \)
5 \( \text{\&}c3 \) d6
6 \( \text{\&}e3 \) a6
7 g4

In the given position this move is rarely played, and indeed it looks rather too forceful. The grandmaster decides to punish his schoolboy opponent for his excessive activity, and ... falls into a well-masked trap. It turns out that Yuri Piskov had analysed this entire variation at a training session before the tournament.

7 ... e5

Black falls in with his opponent’s plans. 7 ... \( \text{\&}c6 \) or 7 ... h6 was better.

8 \( \text{\&}f5 \) g6
9 g5!

This is the point of White’s idea – he begins a battle for the d5 square.

9 ... gf
9 ... \( \text{\&} \text{xe}4 \) 10 \( \text{\&} \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{\&}xf5 \) is bad due to 11 \( \text{\&} \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 12 \( \text{\&} \text{d}5+ \) \( \text{\&}e8 \) 13 \( \text{\&}b6 \).

10 ef!

The main continuation of the variation. Black would have met 10 gf with 10 ... f4.

10 ... d5
10 ... \( \text{\&}d7 \) is very strongly met by 11 \( \text{\&}h5 \) with the threats of 12 g6 and 12 \( \text{\&}c4 \).

11 \( \text{\&}f3 \) d4

For the moment all is going according to White’s plan. One of the games played with this variation (Perenyi-Schneider, 1978) went 11 ... \( \text{\&} \text{e}4 \) 12 \( \text{\&} \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{\&} \text{d}5+ \) 15 0-0-0 \( \text{\&}c7 \) 16 \( \text{\&} \text{e}1 \) \( f6 \) (better 16 ... 0-0-0 17 \( \text{\&} \text{x}7 \) \( \text{\&} \text{x}7 \) 18 \( \text{\&} \text{d}6 \) 19 \( \text{\&} \text{e}6 \) \( \text{\&} \text{c}7 \) 20 f7+ \( \text{\&}d8 \) 21 \( \text{\&} \text{d}1 \) \( \text{\&} \text{c}8 \) 22 \( \text{\&} \text{xe}5 \) and Black resigned in view of 22 ... \( \text{\&} \text{xe}5 \) 23 \( \text{\&} \text{g}5+ \) \( \text{\&} \text{e}7 \) 24 \( \text{\&} \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{\&} \text{c}7 \) 25 \( \text{\&} \text{xe}7 \). This game was known to Piskov, who therefore had something to guide him, whereas Panchenko was meeting this variation for the first time.

12 0-0-0! \( \text{\&}a5 \)
13 gf \( \text{dc} \)
14 \( \text{\&} \text{c}4! \) (3)

Here the grandmaster thought for half an hour, but was simply unable to find a defence. 14 ... \( \text{\&}b4 \), for example, would have
been met by 15 $\text{xf7}+ \text{xf7} 16 $\text{h5+ xf6} 17 $\text{g5+ g7} 18 f6+ $\text{g8} 19 $\text{dgl! xb2+} 20 \text{d1 b1+} 21 c1+

14 ... $\text{c7}$
15 $\text{d5 c6}$
15 ... $\text{xf5}$ is decisively met by
16 $\text{b6 d7} 17 $\text{xf7+ xf7} 18 $\text{d8}$ mate.
16 $\text{b6} \text{d7}$
17 $\text{g2 d6}$

Black cannot play either 17 ...

... $\text{xf5} 18 \text{xc6+ bc} 19 \text{d8}$ mate, or 17 ...

$\text{h6+} 18 \text{b1 d2} 19 \text{g7 f8} 20 \text{c5}$.

18 $\text{xd6! xd6}$
19 $\text{xf7+ d7}$
20 $\text{e6+ e8}$
21 f7+

and in view of the variation 21 ...

$\text{e7} 22 \text{g5+ f8} 23 \text{g8+}$ Black resigned.
LESSON 2
An assertion by shatranj theorists
The “double mujannah”
How to prepare an attack

Shatranj enjoyed great popularity in the East, in spite of the leisurely development of the play.

“In shatranj the opening was uninteresting”, wrote the English historian Harold Murray, “since for a long time each side could vary its move order, without coming into contact with the opponent. The development of the opening phase usually lasted between 8 and 20 moves”.

In the course of time a curious solution was found. The shatranj masters worked out a number of prepared opening positions – ta’bi’at – with roughly equal chances for both sides. It was with these ta’bi’at that the game began. The medieval shatranj ta’bi’at which have survived to this day are gathered together in Murray’s fundamental research work A History of Chess. Altogether there are thirty-one of these ta’bi’at.

Diagram 4 shows the “double mujannah” ta’bi’a, which arises after 12 moves. The opening was developed by the prominent shatranj theorist Abu’l-Faraj al-Lajlaj (who died about 970). In his opinion the best strategy for White was the advance of his g- and h-pawns. It is curious that the “double mujannah” was studied in 1911 by Grandmaster Mieses, who played a number of games by the rules of shatranj. Mieses considered that the plan suggested by al-Lajlaj was simply splendid.

This ta’bi’a was called “ta’barija”. The shatranj theorists asserted...
that here the player to move would win. It would be interesting to check this opinion of the medieval players!

Thus a ta'bi'a was a prepared opening system, with which a game would begin in the shatranj era. Now too the use of this term is in many cases logical. Indeed, opening set-ups such as the Chigorin Variation of the Spanish Game, or a number of formations in the Nimzo-Indian Defence and the Queen's Gambit have become modern-day ta'bi'at.

Let us return to the attack on the uncastled king.

This position (Mayet-Anderssen, 1855) allows us to follow a famous attacker's train of thought.

11 ... \textit{\textbf{\textit{a6!!}}}

Keep the king in the centre at any price, and then assail it with all the remaining forces – this idea, an advanced one for its time, was Adolf Anderssen's credo.

12 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xa8}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{xa8}}}
13 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f3}}}

In this way White parries the threat of ... \textit{\textbf{\textit{d4}}, but now the black knight gains the opportunity to reach \textit{\textbf{\textit{d3}} with gain of tempo.}

13 ... \textit{\textbf{\textit{d7}}}
14 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{e5}}}
15 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xd5}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{d3+}}}
16 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d1}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{c8}}}

The black queen moves into an attacking position. Prosaic variations such as 16 ... \textit{\textbf{\textit{xd5}}} 17 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xd5}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{xf2+}} did not interest Anderssen.

17 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{d8}}}
18 \textit{\textbf{\textit{wh5}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{f4!}}}

Resigns

In view of the variation 19 \textit{\textbf{\textit{ef}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{d3+}}} 20 \textit{\textbf{\textit{b3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{e6+}}} 21 \textit{\textbf{\textit{a4}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{c4+}}} 22 \textit{\textbf{\textit{b4}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{c2+}}} 23 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xa5}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b8}}}

mate.

Just how did Anderssen manage to prepare his attack so well? This question also contains the answer. The rapid mobilization of his forces, the safety of his own king, and a striving for the initiative – these were the basic principles by which Anderssen was guided in his game with Mayet: 1 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d4}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{d5}}} 2 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c4}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{e6}}} 3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{a3}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{c5}}} 4 dc \textit{\textbf{\textit{xc5}}} 5 \textit{\textbf{\textit{f3}}} a5 6 e3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d6}}} 7 cd ed 8 \textit{\textbf{\textit{b5}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{d6}}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e5}}} 0-0 10 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xc6}}} bc 11 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xc6}}, and we reach the position in diagram 6.}

We should not reproach White for his anti-positional moves such as 3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{a3}} and 11 \textit{\textbf{\textit{xc6}}. The correct}
recommendations of modern opening theory are in many respects indebted to such mistakes. That which Anderssen did intuitively is nowadays regarded as universally accepted.

Kakabadze-Zhadrin

Sicilian Defence

This game was played by two 13-year-old first category players, competing in the 13th USSR Tournament for Pioneer Teams (1981).

1 e4 c5
2 Qf3 d6
3 d4 cd
4 Qxd4 Qf6
5 Qc3 a6
6 Qc4 e6
7 0-0 b5

Black chooses a very complicated system of defence, in which the slightest mistake can lead to defeat.

8 Qb3 b4?

Chasing after the pawn is too risky; 8 ... Qc7 is safer.

9 Qa4 Qxe4
10 f4 Qc5

Black tries to repair his catastrophic lack of development. Both 10 ... g6 11 f5 gf 12 Qxf5 Qg8 13 Qd5 Qa7 14 Qxe4 (Fischer-Tal, 1959) and 10 ... Qf6 11 Wf3 d5 12 f5 e5 13 h1e4 14 Wg3 leave Black on the verge of defeat. Incidentally, this last variation contains a trap:

14 ... Qd6!? 15 Wxg7! Qh2+ 16 Qxh2 Qg8 17 Qxe4+!

But subsequently an analysis by Lepyoshkin was published, according to which Black gets good play in the variation 10 ... g6 11 f5 gf 12 Qxf5 Qb7! (instead of 12 ... Qg8) 13 Qh6 Qxh6 14 Wh5 We7 15 Qxe6 Qg8 16 g3 Qd7 17 ael Qg6 followed by ... f5 (Zak).

11 Qxc5 dc
12 Wf3 Qa7 (7)

13 f5?!

Rather than the prosaic 13 Qe2, White prefers a move in the style of Anderssen. A bold decision, although it cannot be said that the sacrifice is fully correct.

13 ... Wxd4+

The natural move, yet 13 ... cd was better, avoiding the opening of the d-file. After 14 fe Qxe6 15 Qxe6 fe 16 Wh5+ Qd7 17 h7+ Qe7 18 Qg5 Be8 Black would have had good chances of beating off the attack.
14  \( \text{g}e3 \)  \( \text{w}f6 \)
14 ... \( \text{g}b7 \) is stronger, and if 15 \( \text{w}h3 \) \( \text{e}4 \), to meet 16 \( f \)e 17 \( \text{g}x e6 \) with 17 ... \( \text{w}x g2+! \) 18 \( \text{w}x g2 \) \( \text{g}x g2 \) 19 \( \text{g}x g2 \)  \( \text{e}7 \).
15  \( \text{w}g3 \) \( \text{d}7? \)
And this is a blunder. 15 ... e5 was essential, although even here White has a wide choice of attacking possibilities after 16 \( \text{g}g5 \) \( \text{w}b6 \) 17 \( \text{w}x e5+ \) \( \text{e}7 \). But now White's attack is irresistible.
16  \( f \)e  \( \text{w}g6 \)
17  e  \( \text{d}7 \)
18  \( \text{e}5+ \) \( \text{d}8 \)
19  \( \text{g}5+ \) \( f6 \)
Or 19 ... \( g \)e 20 \( x e7+ \)  \( x e7 \) 21 \( x d1+ \) \( x d7 \) 22 \( x d7+ \) \( x d7 \) 23 \( w b8+ \) \( c8 \) 24 \( x d1+ \) \( e7 \) 25 \( w c7+. \)
20  \( x f6! \)  \( g f \)

\begin{align*}
21 & \text{xf6+} & \text{g7} \\
22 & x e7+ & x e7 \\
23 & d 1+ & d 7 \\
24 & x h8+ & c 7 \\
25 & e 5+ & b 7 \\
26 & x d7+ & x d7 \\
27 & x c5 & g 4 \\
28 & d 5+ & \text{Resigns}
\end{align*}

As we see, the principles of conducting an attack, which in the middle of the last century were the domain of the chosen few, are known today to schoolchildren. And not only known, but employed by them in tournament games. And so, we can draw a general conclusion: the attack on an uncastled king proceeds more successfully when the player acts energetically and is not afraid to sacrifice.
LESSON 3
The confession of Caliph al-Ma'amun
The penetration of chess to Europe
The classic bishop sacrifice at h7

A pronouncement by one of the Arab rulers has reached us from the 9th century: "Strange that I, who rule the world from the Indus in the East to Andalusia in the West, cannot manage 32 chessmen". This confession by Caliph al-Ma'amun contains the solution to the mystery of how chess penetrated to Europe. After subjugating Spain and Southern Italy (in particular, Andalusia and Sicily), the Arab conquerors also brought with them shatranj, which very quickly spread across the European continent.

In Europe, shatranj underwent some marked changes. In particular, the game received a new name, and terms of European origin were introduced. During the Renaissance the game became more lively: the bishop gained the right to move the whole length of a diagonal; the queen, combining the moves of bishop and rook, was transformed into the strongest piece; on its first move a pawn could step forward two squares. Castling was introduced, and other rules were established, many of which have been retained to the present day. It is interesting to note that the new laws not only that the new laws were not accepted without a struggle. Thus right up the 19th century (!) Italian players used to advocate free castling, by which the king and rook could take up several different positions at the choice of the player (e.g. \( \text{g1-e1} \), or \( \text{h1-g1} \) etc). And although the modern rules had taken general shape by the 16th century, it is only the second half of the 19th century that is regarded as the concluding stage of chess reform.

This position opens a new topic:
we begin a study of methods of attacking the king when the two players have castled on the same side. Diagram 8 shows a typical position, where White has a standard way to carry out a winning attack:

1. \( \text{hxh7+} \) \( \text{gxh7} \)
2. \( \text{g5+} \)

Where should the black king go to? If 2 \( \ldots \) \( \text{g8} \), then 3 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 4 \( \text{xf7+} \) \( \text{xh8} \) 5 \( \text{h7+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 6 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{g7} \) mate. The king cannot go to h6 either: 2 \( \ldots \) \( \text{h6} \) 3 \( \text{xf7+} \), and White also wins after 2 \( \ldots \) \( \text{g6} \) 3 \( \text{h4}! \) (with the threat of 4 \( \text{h5+} \) \( \text{h6} \) 5 \( \text{xf7+} \)) 3 \( \ldots \) \( \text{h8} \) 4 \( \text{h5+} \) (nevertheless!) 4 \( \ldots \) \( \text{xf5} \) 5 \( \text{d3+} \) \( \text{f5} \) 6 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{xh5} \) 7 \( \text{f3+} \) \( \text{g4} \) 8 \( \text{h7+} \) \( \text{d6} \) 9 \( \text{xh5} \).

The attacking mechanism involving \( \text{hxh7+} \), \( \text{g5+} \) and \( \text{h5} \) has been named the classic bishop sacrifice. There are several variations on it.

1. \( \text{hxh7+} \) \( \text{xh7} \)
2. \( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{gxg5} \)
3. \( \ldots \) \( \text{g8} \) 3 \( \text{w5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 4 \( \text{h7+} \) and 5 \( \text{h8+} \) mate, or 2 \( \ldots \) \( \text{h6} \) 3 \( \text{xf7+} \).

Very often the rook is included in the attack along the third rank:

1. \( \text{hxh7+} \) \( \text{gxh7} \)
2. \( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{g8} \)
3. \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f5} \)
4. \( \text{xf7+} \) \( \text{h8} \)
5. \( \text{e3}! \)

And, finally, on the continuity of ideas. The motif of the bishop sacrifice at h7 often suggests the
idea of searching for other combinational blows. In particular, in diagram 11 the classic bishop sacrifice in its pure form does not work—the white knight cannot get to g5. But the features of the position suggest another solution, one which is highly elegant:

1. \( \text{Qxh7+ Rxf7} \)
2. \( \text{Qh3+ Kg8} \)
3. \( \text{Rh5} \)
4. \( \text{Qf5!} \)
5. \( \text{Qe7+ Kh7} \)
6. \( \text{Rxh5 mate} \)

There is no doubt that the classic bishop sacrifice is very appealing, but it should be borne in mind that it does not always work. Diagram 12, for example, shows a position where White has to reconcile himself to \( \text{Qe2} \), and, to avoid the worst, reject any idea of \( \text{Qxh7+} \), since in this case it is met by \( \text{Kh8}! \), and if \( \text{Qg5} (2 \text{Qxe2 Qxf3} 2 ... \text{Rxd1 3 Rxd1 g6!} \), when Black wins.

And now three examples from tournament games, in which the classic bishop sacrifice is a fairly frequent guest.

This position (Endt-Brenneisen, 1975) differs from the instructional positions given earlier, only in that the dark-squared bishop is operating along the a3-f8 diagonal; in addition, the e4 pawn is preventing the bishop at d3 from directing its fire at h7. Nevertheless, White reduces things to a familiar pattern by fairly obvious means:
Lesson Three

1 e5! de
2 ∆xh7+ ∆xh7
2 ... ∆h8 3 ∆e4 ∆b7 4 ∆d6.
3 ∆g5+ ∆g6
4 h5+! ∆xg5
4 ... ∆h6 5 ∆c1.
5 ∆c1+ ∆f6
6 ∆g4 g6
7 h6!
and Black resigned, since there is no defence against the mate at g5.

White's combination (Giffard-Nikolaic, 1979) makes a pleasing impression: it is not the mechanism itself of the classic bishop sacrifice which is of interest, so much as White's 5th move, which gives the attack fresh impetus; the final queen sacrifice is also rather curious.

1 ∆xh7+! ∆xh7
2 ∆g5+ ∆g8
3 ∆h5 ∆xg5
4 hg ∆f8
5 a4!!
A very important feature. Now the a3 square is vacated for the dark-squared bishop, which comes into play with decisive effect. This typical procedure is worth remembering!

5 ... ∆c7
6 ∆a3+ ∆c5
7 ∆h8+ ∆e7
8 ∆xg7 ∆g8
9 dc! ∆xg7
Or9 ... bc 10 ∆f6+ ∆e8 11 ∆cl.
10 c6+! Resigns

And here (Jokšić-Korgnati, 1979) we can observe a prolonged attack, to which the classic bishop sacrifice is merely a prelude.

1 ∆xh7+ ∆xh7
1 ... ∆h8 2 ∆xd4.
2 ∆g5+ ∆g6
2 ... ∆g8 3 ∆h5.
3 ∆d3+ f5
4 h4!
White's threat is obvious: after 5 h5+ ∆f6 6 ∆h7+ ∆e7 7 ∆xf5+ or 5 ... ∆xh5 6 ∆h3+ ∆g6 7 ∆h7+ ∆f6 8 ∆gf7 Black cannot avoid
loss of material. What’s more, he cannot block the h5 square, since 4 ... \texttt{h8} weakens his f5: 5 \texttt{xe6 }\texttt{xe6} 6 \texttt{xe6+ }\texttt{f6} 7 \texttt{xf5 mate. These variations demonstrate the role of the knight at d6, and so Black quite rightly decides to get rid of it.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \texttt{4 }... \texttt{c8}
\item \texttt{5 }h5+
\end{itemize}

5 \texttt{g3} looks tempting, but White is attracted by a clever trap.

\begin{itemize}
\item \texttt{5 }... \texttt{f6?}
\item Black falls for it. After 5 ... \texttt{xh5! 6 h3+ g6 7 h7+ f6 8 f3 xd6! he would have gained three minor pieces for the queen, and could have faced the future with confidence.}
\item \texttt{6 xf5+!!}
\item Indeed, such a move is easily overlooked. Black resigned, since there is no defence against mate (6 ... ef 7 h7 mate, or 6 ... e7 7 xe6+ xe6 8 xe6 mate).}
\end{itemize}
LESSON 4
When the kings have castled on the short side

We continue our study of methods of attacking the king when both players have castled on the same side.

This diagram (Vinogradov-Fedin, 1973) shows White reaping the fruits of his successful preparatory work:

1 \( \text{W}xh6+ \) \( \text{gh} \)
2 \( \text{Exh6}+ \) \( \text{g}g7 \)
3 \( \text{Eh7}+ \) \( \text{f}f8 \)
4 \( \text{Eh8}+ \) \( \text{g}g7 \)
5 \( \text{Eg8}+ \) \( \text{h}h6 \)
6 \( \text{g}5 \) mate

The co-ordination of all the different forces (queen, rook, bishop, knight and pawn), and the way they were directed at the opponent’s kingside, plus White’s vigorous action (queen sacrifice) led to a spectacular mating finish.

Such co-ordination is fairly often encountered; it is only the roles of the “soloists” that change, and the amount of material sacrificed need not be so substantial.

In this position (World Championship Match, 1981) Anatoly Karpov sacrificed his knight.

1 \( \text{Q}f6+! \)

Black declined the sacrifice, since after 1... \( \text{gf} \) 2 \( \text{eg} \) 3 \( \text{Ed5} \) he would have come under an irresistible attack, e.g. 3 ... \( \text{h}h8 \) 4 \( \text{Eh5} \) \( \text{g}g8 \) 5 \( \text{Exh7}+ \) \( \text{Exh7} \) 6 \( \text{Wh5} \) mate.

1 ... \( \text{xf6} \)
In this way Black avoids the immediate mating threats, but strategically his game is already lost.

2 ef \( \text{Wc8} \)
3 fg \( \text{Ed8} \)

Taking on g7 is very dangerous, since the white bishop gains command of the c3-h8 diagonal.

4 h4!

By this flank advance the World Champion consolidates his advantage.

4 \( \ldots \) c5
5 \( \text{Bac1} \) \( \text{We7} \)
6 h5 \( \text{We5} \)
7 h6

White has attained a winning position, and although Black put up a lengthy resistance, he was unable to avoid defeat. [This interesting game is annotated by Karpov in Learn from your Defeats (Batsford, 1985) and more fully in Chess at the Top (Pergamon, 1984) – tr.]

The search for a combination by White must be made in analogy with the previous example. After 1 \( \text{Qf6+!} \) (Mikhalschishin-Schmidt, 1981) Black's position was lost. Moving the king is pointless, while after 1 \( \ldots \) gf 2 \( \text{Qg4+} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 3 ef he cannot play 3 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) because of the pin 4 \( \text{Wh4!} \), with simultaneous attacks on f6 and h7.

We once again return to the coordination of all the forces in the attacking army. Here (Polgar-Spasov, 1981) White's advantage is undisputed: the opponent's queen and knight are not participating in the battle on the kingside, the black king's pawn screen has been weakened, and all White's pieces are directed towards the kingside. White played a typical combination:

1 \( \text{Qxh7!} \) \( \text{Qxh7} \)
2 \( \text{Bxf7+!} \) \( \text{Bxf7} \)
3 \( \text{Qxg6+} \) \( \text{Qh8} \)
4 \( \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{Qg8} \)
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5 \( \text{Be}3! \) \( \text{Bg}7 \)
6 \( \text{Bh}7+! \) \( \text{Bh}8 \)
6 ... \( \text{Exh}7 \) \( \text{Bg}3+ \) \( \text{Bh}8 \) 8 \( \text{Wh}6+ \).
7 \( \text{Gg}6+ \) \( \text{Gg}8 \)
8 \( \text{Gxe}8 \)

White has regained the sacrificed material with interest, and Black resigned within a few moves.

Even so, the main events in this game remained behind the scenes, since often the most difficult thing is not the decisive blow, but its preparation. As a rule, a piece attack will succeed only when the theme of the entire game is an offensive against the king.

Kupreichik-Romanishin
USSR Championship 1976
Scotch Game

1 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
2 \( \text{Gf}3 \) \( \text{Gc}6 \)
3 \( \text{d}4 \)

The heyday of the opening chosen by Grandmaster Kupreichik has long since passed, and today it normally occurs only in junior events. But from time to time the old open games occur in events at the highest level, and even the Italian Game was played in the 1981 World Championship Match!

3 ... \( \text{ed} \)
4 \( \text{Gxd}4 \) \( \text{Gc}5 \)
5 \( \text{Ge}3 \) \( \text{Wf}6 \)
6 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{Gge}7 \)
7 \( \text{Gb}5 \) 0-0
8 0-0 \( \text{d}6 \)

9 \( \text{Gxc}6 \) \( \text{bc} \)
10 \( \text{Gxc}5 \) \( \text{cb} \)
11 \( \text{Gd}4 \) \( \text{Wg}6 \) (20)

Up till now it has all proceeded as in the game Mieses-Tarrasch (1916). Black has equalised, and at his disposal is the plan of a piece-pawn offensive.

12 \( \text{Gd}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
13 \( \text{Ge}3 \) \( \text{f}5! \)
14 \( \text{Wf}3 \) \( \text{Gd}7 \)
15 \( \text{Fe}1 \) \( \text{Ge}8 \)

Black’s pieces are more actively placed, a fact which is apparent from a variation which, though not obligatory, is typical: 16 \( \text{Wg}3 \) \( \text{fe} \) 17 \( \text{Gxe}4 \) \( \text{Wxe}4 \) 18 \( \text{Gg}5 \) \( \text{Wxe}1! \) 19 \( \text{Exe}1 \) \( \text{Gf}5! \)

16 \( \text{ef} \) \( \text{Gxf}5 \)
17 \( \text{Gd}5+ \) \( \text{Ge}6 \)
18 \( \text{Gd}3 \) \( \text{c}4! \)
19 \( \text{Wf}1 \) \( \text{Gd}5 \)

Grandmaster Romanishin has succeeded in lining up his forces for an attack, against which White has practically no defence.
And now an example from a junior game. During preparations for the 7th USSR Tournament of Pioneers Palaces, young Muscovites played a simultaneous display with clocks on seven boards against Grandmaster Yuri Balashov. The first to finish her game was Tanya Saburova, a first category player. This game reveals some of the typical features in the play of young girls. Experienced first category players usually know tolerably well the theory of the opening variation employed, have some idea of the general strategic pattern of the middlegame, and are familiar with standard attacking schemes. The situation is worse in the endgame. And very many lady players are hindered by a definite dogmatism when solving various problems, both in the opening and the middlegame.

**Balashov-Saburova**

*Modern Benoni*

1. d4  e6
2. c4  c5

3. d5  e5
4. Qc3  ed
5. cd  d6
6. Qf3  g6
7. Qd2

The opening chosen is the modern version of the sharp Benoni Defence. The resulting asymmetric position leads to active play over the entire board, and demands the utmost intensity by both players. With 7 Qd2 White chooses one of the most popular continuations. His plan includes occupying c4 with his knight in combination with a pawn offensive (f4 and e5). Black in turn will prepare piece play along the e-file (the e5 square), and may also throw into the attack his queenside, and even his kingside, pawns.

7 ...  Qbd7
8. e4  Qg7
9. Qe2  0-0
10. 0-0  Be8
11. Wc2  a6

In the sensational Spassky-Fischer game (World Championship Match, 1972) by the paradoxical 11 ... Qh5 Black initiated counterplay on the kingside: 12 Qxh5 gh 13 Qc4 Qe5 14 Be3 Wb4 15 Qd2 Qg4 16 Qxg4 hg 17 Qf4 Wf6 etc.

12. a4  Wc7
13. Ha3

By transposition of moves, one
of the problem positions of this opening variation has been reached. The idea of the rook move to a3 belongs to Tigran Petrosian (Petrosian-Ljubojevic, Milan 1975). The point of it is that on the 3rd rank the rook can take part both in attack and in defence.

13 ... \( \text{Qe}_5 \)
14 \( \text{a}_5 \) \( \text{Eb}_8 \)

An inaccurate move, since now after 15 \( \text{f}_4 \) the black knight is driven away from the centre. The crucial continuation of any theoretical discussion would be 14 ... g5!?, which has often been employed in grandmaster games. To the question during analysis after the game “Why didn’t you play ... g5, since after all you knew this move?”, Tanya replied that she first wanted to set up everything according to a certain plan.

15 \( \text{f}_4 \) \( \text{De}_d7 \)

After 15 ... \( \text{Eg}_4 \) 16 \( \text{Cc}_4 \) Black’s counterplay on the kingside is no longer convincing, e.g. 16 ... \( \text{h}_5 \). 17 \( \text{Xg}_4 \) \( \text{Xg}_4 \) 18 f5! (Velimirovic).

16 \( \text{Cc}_4 \)

In view of the fact that Black has lost two tempi on knight moves, White could have immediately set about preparing e5, e.g. 16 \( \text{f}_3 \), and if 16 ... b5 17 ab \( \text{Xb}_6 \) (17 ... \( \text{Xb}_6 \) 18 \( \text{Xa}_6 \)) 18 \( \text{e}_1 \! \), when Black’s queenside counterplay reaches an impasse (18 ... \( \text{b}_4 \) is not possible due to the simple 19 \( \text{Xa}_6 \)), while after 17 ... \( \text{w}_b_6 \) White can calmly reply 18 \( \text{f}_1 \).

16 ... \( \text{b}_5 \)

Black has no other play.

17 \( \text{ab} \) \( \text{Xb}_6 \)
18 \( \text{h}_1 \)

A move which is typical of all players who give simultaneous displays. The king move is part of White’s overall piece arrangement, otherwise Black acquires additional tactical possibilities, often involving a pawn sacrifice (... c4 and then ... \( \text{w}_c_5 \)). Nevertheless, White also had two other alternatives: 18 \( \text{a}_5 \) and 18 \( \text{e}_1 \).

18 ... \( \text{Cc}_4 \)
19 \( \text{Xc}_4 \) \( \text{Cb}_4 \)

An important moment. Black provokes \( \text{b}_3 \), after which the white rook is shut off from the kingside. For the moment the weakness at a6 does not concern Black, since it is compensated by the attack on e4.

20 \( \text{b}_3 \)

On 20 \( \text{d}_3 \) there could have followed 20 ... c4 21 \( \text{e}_2 \) \( \text{c}_5 \).

20 ... \( \text{e}_7 \)

Between the 16th and 20th moves Black plays very confidently.

21 \( \text{d}_2 \)

Indirectly defending the e4 pawn.

21 ... \( \text{g}_4 \)
Over-hasty. It would have been better to remove the rook from attack (e.g. to b6), when the position would have remained double-edged. Attracted by a forcing variation, Black overlooks a strong rejoinder by the opponent on move 24.

22 \( \text{Qd1} \)

White defends against the threat of 22 ... \( \text{Qd4} \) and 23 ... \( \text{Qf2}+ \).

22 ... \( \text{Wh4} \)

23 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Qd4} \)

Black's attack follows a standard pattern.

24 \( \text{Wd3} \)

Careless. After 24 \( \text{Qel} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 25 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{cb} \) 26 \( \text{Qa2} \) Black's attack would have been parried.

24 ... \( \text{Qxe4!} \)

Tanya Saburova carries out her plan, begun on move 21. Now the rook at e4 cannot be taken because of mate: 25 \( \text{Wxe4} \) \( \text{Qg3} \) 26 \( \text{hg} \) \( \text{Wh4} \), while after 25 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) Black's threats are very dangerous.

25 \( \text{Wxe4?} \)

Of the two evils, White should have chosen the lesser (25 \( \text{Qxb4} \)), but the grandmaster blunders ... 25 ... \( \text{Wg3} \)

Resigns

This game once again shows how difficult it can be for a grandmaster giving a simultaneous display with clocks against well-prepared juniors.

A piece attack on the castled position is one of the basic procedures in the offensive against the king, and it can proceed either with the help of sacrifices, or by the systematic strengthening of the position. Very often the attack develops of its own accord, and the catalyst in the attacking process is provided by ... exchanges.

In this position from a King's Indian Defence (Karasev-Roshal, 1962), Black decided to regain his pawn and ease his defence somewhat by exchanges, but he failed to realize that, as a result, all his active pieces would disappear, and that White would acquire a decisive superiority in force on the kingside.

1 ... \( \text{Qxe5} \)

2 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \)

3 \( \text{Qxf8+}! \) \( \text{Qxf8} \)

4 \( \text{Qf1}! \)

A typical manoeuvre, bringing the rook into play with gain of
tempo.

4 ... \( \text{\textw{d8}} \)
5 \( \text{\textb{g5}} \)!

Into the attack!

5 ... \( \text{\textc{xg5}} \)
6 \( \text{\textw{xg5}} \) \( \text{\textd{d4+}} \)
7 \( \text{\texth{h1}} \) \( \text{\textc{xc5}} \)

The incorrect capture on e5 has led to the fact that now four white pieces open fire on the black king.

8 \( \text{\texth{4}} \) \( \text{\textb{b6}} \)
9 \( \text{\textc{xe7+}} \) \( \text{\textg{7}} \)
10 \( \text{\textw{f6+}} \) Resigns

There is no defence against mate: 10 ... \( \text{\texth{6}} \) 11 \( \text{\textf{5}} \) mate.

23 \( \text{\textc{xa5}} \)!

Black's position is significantly weakened, and so Kasparov boldly begins an attack. He succeeds in bringing all his pieces into the battle, whereas a number of Black's defenders are little more than spectators.

23 ... \( \text{\textg{h}} \)
24 \( \text{\textw{h5}} \)

Threatening 25 \( \text{\textf{6+}} \) \( \text{\textc{xf6}} \) 26 ef \( \text{\textc{xf6}} \) 27 \( \text{\textw{h7}} \) mate.

24 ... \( \text{\textf{5}} \)
25 \( \text{\textc{g5}} \) \( \text{\texte{7}} \)

After 25 ... \( \text{\textc{xe5}} \) 26 de \( \text{\textc{xe5}} \) 27 \( \text{\textc{b3}} \) \( \text{\textc{c4}} \) 28 \( \text{\textc{xc4}} \) \( \text{\textc{xc4}} \) 29 \( \text{\texte{1}} \) White's attack continues, but with material now equal.

26 \( \text{\textc{xf5}} \) \( \text{\textc{xf5}} \)
26 ... ef is met by 27 e6.

27 \( \text{\textc{xf5}} \) ef
28 \( \text{\textd{5}} \) \( \text{\texte{8}} \)
29 \( \text{\textw{h7+}} \) \( \text{\textf{8}} \)
30 \( \text{\textw{f5+}} \) \( \text{\textg{8}} \)
31 \( \text{\textw{h7+}} \) \( \text{\textf{8}} \)
32 \( \text{\texte{3}} \)!

In the given position this move is not hard to find. But Kasparov had to foresee the possibility of switching the rook to the 3rd rank back on move 23!

32 ... \( \text{\textc{8}} \)

Otherwise this rook could have been caught in a knight fork, e.g.

32 ... \( \text{\textg{6}} \) 33 \( \text{\textf{3+}} \) \( \text{\texte{8}} \) 34 \( \text{\textc{7}} \) etc.
33 \( \text{\textf{3+}} \) \( \text{\textf{6}} \)
34 \( \text{\texth{3}} \)

In conclusion let us examine a "performance" by Gary Kasparov. In the 1978 Elimination Tournament for the USSR Championship (run on the Swiss System) the 16-year-old schoolboy took sole first place, ahead of 63 highly experienced players. In the above position Kasparov's opponent was International Master Palatnik (Black), now a grandmaster.
The position is such that White is able to retain all his threats and at the same time to safeguard his king. 34 \( \Boxxf6 \) was premature due to 34 ... \( \Boxxe1+ \) 35 \( \Boxxf2 \) \( \Boxxf1+ \) 36 \( \Boxxg3 \) \( \Boxxf3+ \) 37 \( \Boxxe6 \) 38 \( \Boxxel+ \) 39 \( \Boxxh3 \) \( \Boxxc8+ \) 40 \( \Boxxg2 \) \( \Boxxd2+ \), when Black gains a draw. To avoid such variations, White prepares a shelter for his king in the event of the rook check.

- 34 \( ... \) \( \Boxwg6 \)
- 35 \( \Boxxf6+! \) \( \Boxxf6 \)
- 36 \( \Boxxe6+ \) \( \Boxxe8 \)
- 37 \( \Boxxf6+ \) Resigns

This attack by Kasparov is destined to find its way into the textbooks.
The first chess treatises, based on the reformed laws, appeared in Europe at the end of the 15th century. Today these first chess primers are called literary monuments, whereas at the time they reflected the most advanced views on chess.

An untitled and undated manuscript, written in Latin, was discovered in the University of Göttingen Library, and was named the Göttingen manuscript. Scientists established that it had been written in about 1490. The manuscript is in two parts, the first showing various openings, and the second – 30 problems.

Another ancient book is widely known – the treatise by the Spaniard Lucena. The manuscript itself is undated, but there is an indication that it was written for a Prince Juan, who died in 1497, from which it follows that the treatise was written not later than this. Lucena gives various opening variations, some artificially compiled endings, and 150 problems, many of the latter being borrowed from ancient shatranj manuscripts.

In 1512 a book in Italian by the Portuguese Damiano was published in Rome. It was divided into ten chapters, and in the one entitled “Sixteen subtleties, occurring in play, which are useful to know and which strengthen the gift of invention” examples of typical combinations are given in diagrams.

Here are some pieces of advice from Damiano: “no move should be made without an aim”, “you should not play quickly”, and “when you have a good move in mind, look to see if there isn’t a better one.”

Although many games and variations in Damiano’s book are to be found in Lucena’s treatise and in the Göttingen manuscript, the Portuguese player’s work enjoyed great success in the 16th and 17th centuries, and was reprinted several times in Italy, France and England.

The Göttingen manuscript and the works by Lucena and Damiano are rightly regarded as the forerunners of chess literature.
This position arose in a tournament at the Moscow Pioneers Palace in a game between 12-year-old Sasha Rodionov and 13-year-old Oleg Zhabinsky.

With his last move(... $\mathcal{W}h7$-$h5$?) Black offered the exchange of queens (... $\mathcal{W}e4$ would have been a more appropriate method of achieving this), but he failed to take into account all the features of the position.

White at once switched on the "queen and knight attacking mechanism":

1 $\mathcal{Q}c6+$!

Now Black is forced to give up the exchange, since the alternative leads to mate: 1 ... $\mathcal{W}e7$ 2 $\mathcal{Q}xe7$ $\mathcal{W}b7$+ 3 $\mathcal{W}d8$ mate.

A simple example, but a good illustration of the fact that many attacking procedures, when both players have castled long, in no way differ from those employed after castling short.

In this position (Kuzmichev-Terent'ev, 1980) Black carried out a typical diverting combination:

1 ... $\mathcal{Be}1$!

Now 2 $\mathcal{Q}xe1$ fails to 2 ... $\mathcal{W}xa3+$ 3 $\mathcal{Q}xa3$ $\mathcal{E}a7$ mate, while 2 $\mathcal{Ex}e1$ does not work because of 2 ... $\mathcal{W}b3+$. The attempt to lure Black into the trap 2 $\mathcal{B}b2$ $\mathcal{Q}xb2$ 3 $\mathcal{W}xe1$ $\mathcal{W}xc2$ 4 $\mathcal{W}e8+$, with perpetual check, fails to the simple 2 ... $\mathcal{Be}7$. Therefore White resigned.

In this position too (Saksis-Kaptsei, 1981) the winning combination is easily found:

1 $\mathcal{Q}xa6+$! Resigns
After 1 ... ∆xa6 2 ∆xa6 ♦c5 (2 ... ♦b7 3 ∆a8+!) White wins by 3 ♦b4.

Now let us consider some more complicated examples.

The Danish grandmaster Bent Larsen is a genuinely original player, but sometimes, in his striving for originality, he oversteps the mark, and from being the hunter he becomes the victim. It so happens that ex-world champion Boris Spassky is the one who most often "punishes" Larsen for taking liberties in the opening.

This is what happened between them in the “Tournament of Stars” (Montreal, 1979). With Black against Spassky, Larsen employed the half-forgotten Centre Game (Scandinavian), and played it so riskily that after only 8 moves he was forced totally onto the defensive.

1 e4 d5
2 ed ♦xd5
3 ∆c3 ♦a5
4 d4 ♦f6
5 ∆f3 ♦f5

Pinning the knight by 5 ... ♦g4 is considered almost obligatory for Black, but Larsen has his own opinion.

6 ∆d2 ♦bd7
7 ∆c4 c6
8 ♦e2! e6

8 ... ∆xc2 fails to 9 ∆e5 e6 10 ∆xf7; 8 ... ♦c7 was better, but all the same White has the advantage after 9 ∆e5.

9 d5! cd
10 ∆xd5 ♦c5
11 b4 ♦c8
12 ∆xf6+ gf
13 ∆d4 &g6
14 h4 h5
15 f4 ♦e7
16 ♦h3! ♦c7

After 16 ... 0-0 17 f5 ef 18 ♦g3! ♦h7 19 ∆xf5 White wins.

17 0-0-0 ♦b6
17 ... 0-0-0? 18 f5!
18 ♦el 0-0-0 (26)
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Black has managed to castle, but not to avoid all the dangers. The white pieces occupy ideal attacking positions.

19 ♦b5!

Against the threat of ♦f2 there is no defence.

19 ... ♦b8
20 ♦xd8+ ♦xd8

The only move.

21 ♦f2 ♦c6
22 ♦xa7 ♦d7
23 a3
White has both a material, and a positional advantage.

23 ... We4
24 $e3 $f5
25 $g3 $c6
26 $d4 $a4
27 $xf5 $xa3+
28 $xe4 $a1+$
29 $c1 $xb4
If 29 ... ef 30 $a3!
30 $b5 $b6
31 We4 $a5
32 $xb7 Resigns

It has to be said that castling long by both players occurs more rarely than castling short, the point being that castling long is more difficult to prepare. Nevertheless, even with both kings on the queenside, a player must be prepared to mount an attack. There are a number of opening systems which are based on such counter-action.

This position arose in a game

Kasparov-Sokolov (USSR Junior Championship, 1975) after 1 e4 c5 2 $f3 $c6 3 d4 cd 4 $xd4 $f6 5 $c3 $d6 6 $g5 $e6 7 $d2 a6 8 0-0-0 $d7 9 $f4 $b5 10 a3 $e7 11 $xf6 gf 12 $f5 $b6 13 fe $f1+ 14 $e2 $h5 15 $xc6 $xc6 16 $hf1 0-0-0.

Although White looks to stand better, Black can hope to open lines for his bishops, which would give him equal chances. Now both sides engage in some regrouping manoeuvres.

17 $f3 $c5
18 We2 $e5
19 $f2 $b7
20 $f1 $ec8

In such positions $d5 can be unpleasant for Black, and so it is important to retain the $e7 bishop, which in certain variations can go to $b6 via $d8.

21 g3 $h4
22 $d5!

Against quiet play Black could have gained the initiative, by intensifying the pressure on the g3 pawn. So White takes the bold decision to complicate matters.

22 ... $xd5
23 ed $g5+
24 $b1 e5

Otherwise White takes on e6 with his pawn, gaining the long diagonal for his bishop and d5 for his knight.

25 a4!

White’s initiative grows, and to
neutralize it Black does best to return the exchange.

25 ... hg
26 hg b4?

Black overlooks an important resource in the opponent's attack. After 26 ... hxg3 27 bxg3 d8 and ... b6 the game would have been roughly level.

27 a5!

This ensures the queen's invasion at b6. 27 ... d8 is not possible due to 28 e4 and 29 xxd6.

27 ... Hxc3

Too late.

28 w6+ c8
29 c6+ d8
30 w6+ c7
31 w8+ b8
32 e4 Resigns

Thus if the kings are castled on the same side (be it kingside or queenside), roughly the same methods of attack are employed, combining pawn and piece offensives.
One of the most popular of modern openings is rightly considered the Spanish Game. Many know that this name comes from that of the Spanish priest Ruy Lopez, who in his book (1561) analysed and insistently recommended the move 3 b5 (after 1 e4 e5 2 d4 d6). For many, this is the extent of their knowledge of Lopez and his book, but in fact the role of Lopez in the history of chess is considerable. His book is regarded as the first chess primer written by the strongest player of his time. The treatises of Lucena and Damiano and the Göttingen manuscript contained much chess material, and gave advice on how to play in this or that position (this is especially the case with Damiano), but it was Lopez who was the first to give not only the best moves, in his opinion, but also to try and justify them on general grounds.

In particular, it is with Lopez that we first encounter ideas of the role of the pawn centre. He illustrates his reasoning with the following variation: 1 e4 e5 2 c3 d6 3 b5 d5 4 c4 c6 5 e3 c4 6 d4 c5 7 dxc5 bxc5 8 b4+ c6 9 b5 0-0 10 c3, and rightly judges the resulting position to favour White. The book by Lopez was translated into Italian, French and German.

It was in approximately 1590 that a work in manuscript form by the Italian Giulio Polerio appeared (it was published in full only in 1873). This large work contains many games and opening recommendations, many of which have been retained even to this day. For example, following a game Polerio-Domenico, the Two Knights Defence still continues to be studied. Here is this game, played nearly four hundred years ago: 1 e4 e5 2 d4 f5 d5 c6 3 c4 f6 4 g5 d5 d6 5 dx5 cxd5 6 xf7 xf7 7 f3+ e6 8 d3 c7 9 d4 c6 10 g5 h6 11 xe7 xe7 12 0-0-0 f8 13 e4 fxd2+ 14 g5+ b1 g6 16 h4 xd1+ 17 xd1 xh4 18 xd5 ed 19 xd5 xg5 20 xd6++ xe7 21 xg6 Resigns.

Polerio gives many different combinations, unexpected tactical blows and typical attacking pro-
cedures. Thus his manuscript is the first to mention the mechanism $\text{h7+}$, $\text{g5+}$ and $\text{h5}$. Polerio also gives the winning method, known today as the “staircase” manoeuvre.

1 ... $\text{h5}$ 2 $\text{a4}$ $\text{h4}$ 3 $\text{a5}$ $\text{h3}$ 4 $\text{a6}$ $\text{h2}$ 5 $\text{a7}$ $\text{h1}$ $\text{W}$ 6 $\text{a8}$+$\text{g1}$ 7 $\text{a1}$+$\text{g2}$ 8 $\text{g7+}$ $\text{h3}$ 9 $\text{h6+}$ $\text{g2}$ 10 $\text{g5+}$ $\text{h3}$ 11 $\text{h5+}$ $\text{g2}$ 12 $\text{g4+}$ $\text{h2}$ 13 $\text{f2}$, and Black cannot avoid mate.

In the theme “attack on the king”, great interest is always provoked by the offensive methods when the kings are castled on opposite sides. In principle these methods differ little from those examined above (here we will again be talking about pawn storms and piece offensives, and in particular about their synthesis: the piece-pawn attack). But there are also differences. First, the position of the king two squares away from the corner after queenside castling creates additional combinational motifs. Second, when the kings are castled on opposite sides, the attacks are usually mutual: for example, White attacks on the kingside, and Black on the queenside. In this case the most important thing is to maintain a rapid tempo in the offensive, and to take decisive action before the opponent does. After all, situations often arise where both kings are threatened with mate, and everything is decided by a single tempo.

We will consider several types of piece attack against the castled position. The Hungarian player Sapi is known as a good tactician, but on this occasion (Pirisi-Sapi, 1980) he himself became the victim of tactics.

1 $\text{f5+}$

If 1 ... $\text{f8}$ 2 $\text{h8+}$ $\text{xh8}$ 3 $\text{d8+}$, or 1 ... $\text{g8}$ 2 $\text{h6+}$.

2 $\text{h7+}$!

A typical blow.

2 ... $\text{hxh7}$
3 \( \text{Wxf7+} \) \( \text{h6} \)
Or 3 ... \( \text{g7} \) 4 \( \text{h1+} \) \( \text{h6} \) 5 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{h6} \) 6 \( \text{h5} \) mate.
4 \( \text{h5+} \) \( \text{g7} \)
5 \( \text{d7+} \) \( \text{e7} \)
6 \( \text{xe7+} \) \( \text{f6} \)
7 \( \text{h4+} \) \( \text{g6} \)
8 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{xf5} \)
9 \( \text{d4+} \) \( \text{g6} \)
10 \( \text{h7+} \) \( \text{g5} \)
11 \( \text{f5+} \) \( \text{h4} \)
12 \( \text{h7+} \) \( \text{g3} \)
13 \( \text{xf3} \) mate

In White's combination the main role was played by the rooks, \( \text{h7+!} \) being particularly impressive. In fact, this idea is well worth remembering. Here is a similar type of attack.

\[ \text{Itc2+!} \]
\[ \text{Itxa2+} \]
\[ \text{Itb3+} \]
\[ \text{Itg2} \]

There is nothing that White can move.

5 ... \( \text{xe5+} \)
Resigns

If 6 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{f3+} \) 7 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xc3+} \).

It is difficult to give any clear-cut classification of attacking methods, but it is possible to pick out the typical signs by which the culminating points of an attack can be judged. One must first be familiar with the arsenal of means employed in attacking the castled position with the pawn formation intact.

The impression here (Piredda-Jokšić, 1980) is clearly that Black stands better. White has not managed to create any concrete threats, whereas almost all the black pieces are aimed at the queenside. Jokšić realizes his positional advantage by a typical rook sacrifice:

1 ... \( \text{c2+} \)
2 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{xa2+} \)
3 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xb3+} \)
4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g2} \)
5 \( \text{h4} \)

Black undoubtedly stands better, but finding the concluding blow is by no means simple (Moroz-Rozental, 1978). White's downfall is the undeveloped state of his
queenside.

1 ... \textbf{Wxg5}!!

The main variation runs 2 \textbf{Wxg5} \textit{Qxe2+ 3 }\textbf{hx1 Qxf2+ 4 }\textbf{xf2}\textit{d1+ 5 }\textbf{xf1 }\textbf{xf1 mate.}

White had to play 2 \textbf{Wxd4}, but after 2 ... \textbf{Wh5} 3 \textbf{Wf4 }\textbf{d6} he resigned.

The weakness of the back rank provides the motif of the combination: (Holtz-Müller, 1971).

1 \textbf{Wxb5!} \textit{cb 2 }\textbf{Wxc8+ }\textbf{e7 3 }\textbf{e6} \textit{(3 ... }\textbf{Wb7 4 }\textbf{f6, or 3 ... }\textbf{Qxe5 4 }\textbf{g6+ }\textbf{fg 5 }\textbf{fg+ }\textbf{h6 6 }\textbf{h8 mate)}

4 \textbf{g6+ }\textbf{fg} 5 \textbf{fg+ }\textbf{xg6} 6 \textbf{h8+} Resigns.

Here (Herb-Bellas, 1978) White combines the ideas of overloading and decoy:

1 \textbf{c6}!

A shock for Black: 1 ... \textbf{Wxc6} 2 \textbf{Qxa7+}, 1 ... \textbf{e7} 2 \textbf{Wxa7} mate, or 1 ... \textbf{d6} 2 \textbf{Wxa7+ }\textbf{e7} 3 \textbf{e7} mate. For this reason his reply was forced, but it too did not help.

1 ... \textbf{b7} 2 \textbf{bxa7+ }\textbf{e7} 3 \textbf{e5} \textbf{c6} 4 \textbf{Qxg7+ }\textbf{d6} 5 f3 Resigns

(5 ... \textbf{Qxd2} 6 \textbf{e7} mate).

We will now consider some positions in which there are defects in the defender's pawn structure.

There is no question about who has the advantage here (Osipov-Bichkov, 1965). It is clear that Black can survive for a matter of only a few moves: 1 \textbf{Qxg6+} (simple, but typical) 1 ... \textbf{Qb8} (1 ... \textbf{fg} 2 \textbf{c6+}) 2 \textbf{Qxg8+ }\textbf{Qxg8} 3 \textbf{h6} Resigns.
In the previous example the attacking forces broke into the opponent's position along a file, but here (Cohn-Kostich, 1911) the invasion takes place along a diagonal. After an excellent introduction: 1 $\text{Qd6+} \text{Qxc7} 2 \text{Re8}++! \text{Qb6} 3 \text{Qa4+} \text{Qa5} White failed to find the concluding blow, and lost after 4 b4+? $\text{Qxb4}$. He could have won by 4 $\text{Wc3}+$! $\text{xa4} (4 ... \text{Qb4} 5 \text{a3}) 5 $\text{Qd6}$ and 6 $\text{Wa3}$ mate. As we know, even in a winning position it is not easy to win.

And, finally, another type of position where the weakening of the king's pawn screen allows the opponent's pieces to land blows from afar. White's advantage here (Popovich-Podgorny, 1979) is determined not by his advantage of the exchange, but by the absence of defenders for the black king: 1 $\text{Qxf6!} \text{Qxe3} 2 \text{Qf8}++ \text{Qxf8} 3 \text{Qxf8}+ \text{Qh7} 4 \text{Qe4+} g6 5 \text{Qf7}! \text{Qd4} (5 ... h5 6 $\text{Qf7}+) 6 \text{Qf7+} \text{Qg7} 7 \text{h5! Resigns.}$

These fairly simple examples are quite sufficient to provide a successful guide in the search for concluding blows, when an attack is mounted with the kings castled on opposite sides.
We will consider some examples of preparing an attack with the kings castled on opposite sides.

Among the seven grandmasters who were formerly pupils at the Moscow Pioneers Palace, the one to achieve the greatest successes in recent times has been Artur Yusupov. He normally conducts his games in an active manoeuvring style, but in position 37 (Yusupov-Gorelov, 1981) things did not come to that. The game was decided as soon as Black voluntarily gave up his fianchettoed bishop.

\[ \begin{align*}
1 & \text{d4} & \text{\textit{f6}} \\
2 & \text{\textit{f3}} & g6 \\
3 & \text{g5} & \text{\textit{g7}} \\
4 & \text{\textit{bd2}} & c5?
\end{align*} \]

Is Black trying to be clever, or is this an oversight? In either case he is left either without his g7 bishop, or without his c-pawn.

\[ \begin{align*}
5 & \text{\textit{xf6}}! & \text{\textit{xf6}} \\
6 & \text{\textit{e4}}! & \text{\textit{xd4}} \\
7 & \text{\textit{d4}} & \text{cd} \\
8 & \text{\textit{xd4}} & 0-0 \\
9 & \text{\textit{d2}}
\end{align*} \]

White’s plan is perfectly clear: after castling long he will begin storming the kingside with his pawns and pieces. Black has no way of opposing this. Without his dark-squared bishop, neither attacking on the queenside nor defending on the kingside offers him any great chance of success.

\[ \begin{align*}
9 & \ldots & \text{\textit{c6}} \\
10 & \text{0-0-0} (37)
\end{align*} \]

The resulting position resembles one from the Dragon Variation of the Sicilian Defence, but with the difference that the dragon’s “sting” has already been removed.

\[ \begin{align*}
10 & \ldots & \text{\textit{a5}} \\
11 & \text{\textit{c3}} & d6 \\
12 & \text{h4} & \text{\textit{e6}} \\
13 & \text{\textit{b1}} & \text{\textit{ac8}} \\
14 & \text{e4} & f6
\end{align*} \]

In view of the inevitable opening of the h-file, Black prepares to defend his h-pawn by \ldots \text{\textit{f7}}.
15 f4 b5
16 h5
White has no intention of being diverted from his plan for the sake of the b5 pawn.
16 ... g5
17 fg Qe5
17 ... fg 18 wXg5+ th8 19 wXb5.
18 gf ef
19 Qd5
This move essentially concludes the game.
19 ... wXd2
20 Qxd2 Qxd5
21 Qxd5 f5
22 ef Qxf5
23 Qxb5 Qf2
24 Qc1 Qc5
25 c4 Qxg2
26 Qxd6 Qf7
and without waiting for his opponent’s move, Black resigned.
Regarding Black’s play in this game, ex-World Champion Mikhail Tal wittily remarked: “When a tram-driver seeks new paths, his tram goes off the rails”. Nevertheless, ingenuity and boldness in seeking original continuations can only be applauded. It is quite often that an unexpected strategic decision becomes the turning point of a game.

The following game was played in the 10th USSR “White rook” tournament; two fourteen-year-olds repeated a variation from

Shakmatny Bulletin . . .
Shifman-Sergienko
Beltsy 1978
Caro-Kann Defence
1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Qc3 de 4 Qxe4
Qf5 5 Qg3 Qg66 Qf3 Qd7 7 h4 h6
8 h5 Qh7 9 Qd3 Qxd3 10 wXd3
Qgf6 11 Qd2 wC7 12 wC2 e6 13 c4
Qd6 14 Qf5 (38)

The opening has been played according to the latest word in theory. Here the main continuation was considered to be 14 ... Qf4 15 Qxf4 Qxf4 16 Qe3 Qc7 17 0-0-0
b5 18 cb cb+ 19 Qb1 0-0, while 14 ... 0-0-0 15 Qxd6 wXd6 16 Qa5
Qde8 17 Qe5 Qc7 18 .Qc3 had also occurred, in both cases with slightly the better game for White.

But Seryozha Sergienko found a new path in this variation:
14 ... 0-0!
The first impression is that Black is taking a strategic risk: after castling long White will begin a swift attack on the kingside with pawns and pieces.
Nevertheless Black has good counter-chances.

15 \( \textit{dxd6} \) \( \textit{wx6} \)
16 0-0-0 b5!
17 \( \textit{e5} \) bc
18 \( \textit{dx7} \) \( \textit{wx7} \)
19 \( \textit{xc4} \) \( \textit{d8} \)
20 \( \textit{e3} \) \( \textit{d5}! \)

It is already obvious that a few uncertain moves by White have allowed his opponent to seize the initiative. Now he cannot play 21 \( \textit{txd5} \), since after 21 ... \( \textit{xd5} \) the h5 pawn is lost.

21 \( \textit{xa4} \) \( \textit{ab8} \)
22 \( \textit{f4} \) \( \textit{b5} \)

Black has acquired some real threats. The following is a curious variation: 23 a3 \( \textit{xa2} \) 24 \( \textit{d2} \) \( \textit{d5} \)
25 \( \textit{e3} \) \( \textit{c3} \) 26 \( \textit{c2} \) \( \textit{a1+} \) 27 \( \textit{b1} \)
\( \textit{b6} \) mate.

23 \( \textit{he1} \) \( \textit{a5} \)
24 \( \textit{c2} \) \( \textit{xa2} \)
25 \( \textit{b1} \) \( \textit{a6} \)
26 b3 \( \textit{a5} \)
27 \( \textit{c4} \) \( \textit{d5} \)
28 \( \textit{d2} \) \( \textit{a2+} \)
29 \( \textit{c1} \) \( \textit{b8} \)
30 \( \textit{c2} \) \( \textit{xb3} \)
31 \( \textit{xa2} \) \( \textit{xa2} \)

Resigns

The pawn storm is a characteristic feature of attacks with the king castled on oppositesides. But sometimes piece pressure proves better than an infantry offensive. Such a plan is seen in the following game by the 1975 World Junior Champion Valery Chekhov.

Chekhov-Inkiov
Polanica Zdroj 1981
Nimzo-Indian Defence

1 \( \textit{d4} \) d5
2 c4 e6
3 \( \textit{f3} \) \( \textit{f6} \)
4 \( \textit{c3} \) \( \textit{b4} \)
5 cd ed
6 \( \textit{g5} \) h6
7 \( \textit{h4} \) c5
8 e3 \( \textit{c6} \)
9 \( \textit{e2} \)

White offers his opponent a pawn, in return for a weakening of his kingside. Black agrees.

9 ... g5
10 \( \textit{g3} \) \( \textit{e4} \)
11 \( \textit{c1} \) \( \textit{a5} \)
12 0-0 \( \textit{xc3} \)
13 bc \( \textit{xc3} \)
14 \( \textit{e1} \) \( \textit{xe2+} \)
15 \( \textit{xe2} \) c4 (39)

Black blocks the queenside, in order to evacuate his king there. At the same time he threatens to advance his g- and h-pawns. But
White is better mobilized, and is the first to take active measures.

16 \( \text{Ke5!} \) \( \text{Kxe5} \)
17 \( \text{Kxe5} \) \( \text{Kg8} \)
18 \( \text{f4!} \) \( \text{gf} \)
19 \( \text{ef!} \)

Concrete threats have already appeared.

19 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Kg4} \)
20 \( \text{Ke3} \) \( 0-0-0 \)
21 \( \text{f5!} \)

White threatens the h-pawn, since the h8 square is controlled by his bishop; if necessary, he is ready to regroup (\( \text{Kg3}, \text{Ke5} \)).

21 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Kb6} \)
22 \( \text{Kb1} \) \( \text{Kc6} \)
23 \( \text{Kc3!} \)

It transpires that, even without a pawn storm, White is able to reach the opponent's king. Chekhov is essentially a piece up – the bishop at g4 is cut off from the battlefield.

23 \( \ldots \) \( \text{a6} \)
24 \( \text{Ka5} \)

The threats of \( \text{Kb6} \) and \( \text{Kc5}+ \) cannot be parried without loss of material.

24 \( \ldots \) \( \text{c3} \)
25 \( \text{Kb6} \) \( \text{Kc4} \)
26 \( \text{Kb4} \) \( \text{Kc6} \)
27 \( \text{Kb6} \) \( \text{Kc4} \)
28 \( \text{Kb4} \) \( \text{Kc6} \)

In time trouble both players repeat moves.

29 \( \text{Kb3} \) \( \text{Ke2} \)
30 \( \text{Kxc3} \) \( \text{Kc4} \)

31 \( \text{Kb1} \) \( \text{b5} \)
32 \( \text{Kf4!} \) \( \text{Kd7} \)
33 \( \text{Kb} \) \( \text{ab} \)
34 \( \text{Kw7+} \) \( \text{Ke8} \)
35 \( \text{Ke3} \) \( \text{Kf8} \)
36 \( \text{Kw3+} \) Resigns

An attack on the king with the kings castled on opposite sides does not always lead to a mating finish. Very often the first wave of the attack creates the preconditions for exploiting weaknesses acquired by the opponent. In the following game Misha Krasenkov, leader of the Moscow Pioneers Palace team, managed to parry an attack and at the same time to continue the offensive with his own forces.

Sorokin-Krasenkov
Samarkand 1979
Ponziani Opening

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e5} \)
2 \( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{Kc6} \)
3 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d6} \)
4 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{Kd7} \)
5 \( \text{Kc4} \) \( \text{Kc4} \)

The outline of the coming battle becomes clear: Black offers to create a position with castling on opposite sides and to begin mutual pawn storms.

6 \( 0-0 \) \( \text{h6} \)
7 \( \text{b3} \)

A poor move, hoping only for a trap. If now 7 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Kf6}8 \text{d3}, \) and 8 \( \ldots \) \( \text{de} \) is met by 9 \( \text{Ka3} \) \( \text{Kd8} \) 10 \( \text{Kxf8} \) with advantage to White.
The pawn could have gone to this square in one go.

10 ... g6
11 a4 f5
12 ef gf
13 b5 a5

Of course, opening the a-file would be unfavourable for Black.

14 b6 c6
15 ba3 f4
16 c1 d6
17 db5 dxc6
18 da7+ db8

After the capture on a7 the black rook would have been forced out of the game: 19 ... dxa7
20 ba cc7 21 c1a8 (21 ... e4? 22 wb3!) 22 wb3 dxa7 23 c3, and White's initiative becomes dangerous.

20 d5 we8
21 db3

White tries to provoke his opponent into 21 ... e4, which would be met by 22 wb5.

21 ... dxd5
22 wexd5 dxe7
23 we4 wg6
24 wxg6 dxg6

Here we can sum up the opening and the first phase of the middlegame. White has not managed to organize an effective attack on the king, and he has acquired weaknesses at b6 and c3. This factor, together with his superiority in the centre, makes Black's chances preferable.

25 dd2 d5
26 db3 d6
27 dx a5 dxb6
28 db5 d2
29 ce1 d3
30 cd2 dg8
31 dh1 dc5!

Black's advantage is now obvious.

32 f3 d2
33 ed1 e2
34 ce1

34 d 1 could have been met by 34 ... dh4, but now White loses material.

34 ... dx d1
35 dx f2 da6
36 edx1 dx a5
37 edx5 dx a4
38 h4 dl a1+
39 dh2 da2
40 dg1 h5
41 ed7

The final mistake. The rook should have been returned to d1, when 41 ... dh4 42 dxh4 d xg2+ 43 df1 dh2 is not possible due to 44 ed8 mate.

41 ... e4!
42 fe da1+
43 dh2 da5

Resigns

He is mated after 44 ... dg4+ and 45 ... dh1.
LESSON 8
The Early Italian School
What is meant by chess romanticism?
Basic principles of pawn endings

There exists in chess history the concept of a school as a creative tendency, characteristic of a certain era of chess development. The reform of the laws led to an enlivening of the game and to the flourishing of a romantic tendency, which received the name of the Early Italian School. In the late 16th and early 17th centuries, chess games had a predominance of sacrifices and attacks, combinational blows and cunning traps. More often than not these tactical operations were not positionally prepared, and spectacular victories were often the result of weak defence. This era can be called the heyday of gambits. At that time the non-acceptance of a gambit or of a sacrifice in the middlegame was regarded virtually as cowardice. The tone in this romantic chorus was set by the Italian masters, hence the name of the entire creative tendency. A long time was to pass before the cavalier attacks of the romantics gave way to the realistic views of the supporters of positional play. But the Early Italian School completely fulfilled its task in the history of chess. The sparkling combinations of Leonardo, Salvio, Domenico, Polerio and especially Greco revealed the dynamism of the chess pieces, demonstrated the existence of countless combinations, and taught the swiftness of mating attacks. And from the games of the masters of the 16th and 17th centuries, players from all subsequent generations have been able to judge as to the danger of unprepared attacks, of how fatal it can be to play merely for traps, and on the imperfections of defence.

Among representatives of the Early Italian School, a special place is held by Gioacchino Greco (1600-1634). From his memoirs, which looked like a collection of games annotated by the strongest player of the time, one can easily gain an impression about the first creative tendency in the history of chess - the Early Italian School.

Here is one of the fairly typical games given in Greco's manuscript: 1 e4 e5 2 d3 c6 3 c4 c5 4 c3 We7 5 0-0 d6 6 d4 b6 7 g5 f6
There is hardly any point, 350 years later, in criticizing any of Black’s individual moves. We will merely remark that in this game he several times misses the best defence. 9 \( \text{Q}x\text{g}5 \text{fg} 10 \text{wh}5+ \text{d}7 11 \text{Q}x\text{g}5 \text{wg}7 12 \text{Q}e6+ \text{xe}6 13 \text{we}8+ \text{ge}7 14 \text{d}5 \text{mate.} \\
Incidentally, one who was familiar with Greco’s analysis was the famous French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau. Evidence of this is provided by a game which has reached us between Rousseau and Prince Conti (1759), in which Black deviated from Greco’s path on the 10th move: 10 ... \( \text{Qf}8 11 \text{Q}x\text{g}5 \text{wg}7 12 \text{f}4! \text{ed} 13 \text{f}5! \text{dc}+ 14 \text{h}1 \text{cb} 15 \text{Q}x\text{g}8 \text{ba}+ 16 \text{f}6!, and in view of the colourful variation 16 ... \( \text{Q}x\text{g}8 17 \text{fg} \text{e}6 18 \text{gh}++ \text{wh}8 19 \text{f}6! \text{Black resigned.} \\
Pawn endings only at first sight seem simple. In fact, playing with pawns involves numerous subtleties.

In the diagram position (Smyslov-Averkin, 1979) White stands better: his pieces are more actively placed, and he has a queenside pawn majority. This latter factor appears so attractive that Smyslov decides to transpose into a pawn ending, intending to create an outside passed pawn. White also had another tempting alternative, involving taking his king to the queenside (\( \text{Qe}4-\text{d}3-\text{c}4-\text{b}5) to attack the weak pawn at b6.

1 \( \text{Qxe}7 \text{xe}7 \\
2 \text{d}5+ \text{d}6 \\
3 \text{xc}7 \text{xc}7 \\
4 \text{xc}7 \text{xc}7 \\
5 \text{e}4 \\
5 \text{h}4 is stronger (Zak). \\
5 ... \text{d}6 \\
6 \text{a}4 \\
The passed pawn must be created by the advance of the candidate pawn. After 6 \text{b}4? \text{b}5! fixes the the a3 pawn.

6 ... \text{f}5+ \\
7 \text{d}3 \text{c}5 \\
8 \text{c}3 \text{g}5! \\
An active plan of defence; in some cases Black may be able to make a breakthrough on the kingside.

9 \text{b}4+ \text{d}5 \\
10 \text{d}3 \text{g}4 \\
11 \text{c}3 \text{d}6! \\
The further advance of the pawns would have created a breach for the invasion of the
white king, e.g. 11 ... f4 12 a5 ba 13 ba e4 14 gf e3 15 d3! (15 fe?? h4!).

12 c4 c6
13 a5 b5+

Black continues his active plan of defence: his king will be inside the "square" of the a5 pawn, and will also support his e5 pawn.

14 d3 d6
15 e2 c6
16 f1 d6
17 g2 c6
18 f3 d6
19 fg hg
20 h4 gh+
21 xh3 d5
22 g4 fg+
23 xg4 c6
24 f3 d5
25 e3 c6
26 e4 d6

Draw agreed, since after 27 f5 d5 the e-pawn receives the green light. By accurate defence Black managed to save a position which looked rather dangerous for him.

But in this example (Sveshnikov-Kasparov, 1979) it is just the opposite: the pawn ending looks drawn . . .

White played 1 xc5 (it was essential to try to defend the inferior bishop ending), and after 1 ... xc5 2 d3 b4! 3 c2 a3 4 b1 a5 5 a1 a4 6 ba xa4!! Black had a reserve tempo which was decisive: 7 b1 a3 8 a1 b4 9 b1 b3 and White resigned.

After 10 ab xb3 11 c1 c3 12 d1 d3 13 eel e3 14 fl f3 he loses all his pawns.

It should be mentioned that after 7 b2 Black's only winning move would have been 7 ... b4!, whereas 7 ... b4 8 a3+ a4 9 a2 b4 10 ab xb4 11 b2 leaves White controlling the 3rd rank, on which the g3 pawn stands.

Thus there are many nuances when playing with pawns, so let us repeat the basic principles of pawn endings.
40 Lesson Eight

1 ... \( \text{\text{"e7}} \) 2 \( \text{\text{"c6}} \) 3 \( \text{\text{"d8}} \) 3 \( \text{\text{"d6}} \) 4 \( \text{\text{"e8}} \) 4 \( \text{\text{"c7}} \) and wins.

White's king steps into the "square" of the a5 pawn (a5-a1-e1-e5).

1 a4 \( \text{\text{"e5}} \) 2 ab cb 3 c4 bc+ 4 \( \text{\text{"xc4}} \) and wins.

1 b6 ab 2 c6 or 1 ... cb 2 a6 wins.

1 a4 \( \text{\text{"d5}} \) 2 b5 ab 3 ab \( \text{\text{"c5}} \) 4 \( \text{\text{"xe4}} \) \( \text{\text{"xb5}} \) 5 \( \text{\text{"f5}} \) and wins. In the event of 2 ... a5 White wins differently: 3 b6 \( \text{\text{"c6}} \) 4 \( \text{\text{"xe4}} \) \( \text{\text{"xb6}} \) 5 \( \text{\text{"d5}} \), and the pawn on a5 falls.
1 a5 b5 2 a6 d5 3 b4 c6 4 a5 c5 – stalemate.

1 fg e6 2 c4, and the black king is forced to move out of the “square”, since e7 is occupied.

1 g1! a7 2 b8+ xb8 3 a6! f3 4 f2 h3 5 g3 and wins.

1 e6 c3 2 d5! b4 3 c6 c4 4 b7 c5 5 xa7 c6 6 b8 and wins. But not 2 d6? which only leads to a draw: 2 ... d4 3 c6 e5 4 b7 d6 5 xa7 c7.
Lesson Eight

1  \( \texttt{d4! d8} \) 2  \( \texttt{c4! c8} \) 3  \( \texttt{d5} \).
White has given his opponent the move, and now the win is easy:
3 ...  \( \texttt{d8} \) 4  \( \texttt{d6 c8} \) 5  \( \texttt{c7} \).

1  \( \texttt{g4!} \) Black is tied to the a5 pawn, and White can calmly eliminate the fixed black pawns on the kingside.

1  \( \texttt{g6! a8} \) 2  \( \texttt{f5 h5} \) 3  \( \texttt{e6 h4} \) 4  \( \texttt{d7 b7} \) 5  \( \texttt{a8} \)+!  \( \texttt{xa8} \) 6  \( \texttt{c7} \) and wins.

1  \( \texttt{b7 a5} \) 2  \( \texttt{c6 a4} \) 3  \( \texttt{d5 a3} \)
(3 ...  \( \texttt{b2} \) 4  \( \texttt{c4} \)  \( \texttt{xa2} \) 5  \( \texttt{c3} \) 4  \( \texttt{e4} \)  \( \texttt{b2} \) 5  \( \texttt{d3} \)  \( \texttt{xa2} \) 6  \( \texttt{c2} \) and draws.)
Lesson Eight

Double threat

1. g7 h4 (1... b6 2 f6 h4 3 e5 h3 4 d6 h2 5 c7) 2 f6 h3
(2... b6 3 e5 xc6 4 f4)
3 e7! b6 4 d7, with a draw.

Pawn mobility

1. h4! f5 2 a5 g6 3 f4!
(otherwise 3... h5) 3... h54 f5!
h6 5 xa6 g7 6 h5! f6 7 h6!
f7 8 b6 f6 9 c6 f7 10 d7
e6 11 h7 g7 12 e7 and wins.

Undermining

1. h5!, and White wins the f5 and e4 pawns.

Spare tempo

1. d2 d8 2 e3 e7 3 e4 e6. Black has taken the opposition, but White has a pawn move in reserve: 4 e3! d6 5 f5! and wins. With the pawn at e3 in the initial position, the result is a draw.
LESSON 9
The deceptive simplicity of pawn endings

Any of the pawn ending stratagems listed in the previous lesson are likely to be met in practical endings.

If the white pawns can be deprived of their rooks' support, they will become easy booty for the black king (Barkovsky-Cherepkov, 1982). The well-known junior trainer, who for many years has worked in the Leningrad Pioneers Palace, adds to the list of textbook examples showing the transition into a won pawn ending:

1 ... $\text{Hh}+$!
2 $\text{Exf1} \text{Exf1}$
3 $\text{Exf1} \text{h1}+$!

and White resigned without waiting for 5 ... a5.

White has a won position (Belyavsky-Foisor, 1980), but there is one pitfall which he must avoid. The immediate 1 $\text{h3}\text{?}$ fails to 1 ... h5!, when Black blocks the rook's pawn, e.g. 2 g4 fg 3 $\text{xe3} \text{e6} 4 \text{d4} \text{e5} 5 \text{xe5} \text{e4} 6 \text{xe4} \text{xe4} 7 \text{xe4} \text{fxf4}$.

White played accurately: 1 h5! $\text{e6} 2 \text{h3} \text{xd6} 3 \text{g4} \text{e5} 4 \text{g5} \text{e4} 5 \text{f6} \text{h6} (5 ... \text{e3} 6 \text{e5} \text{xe5} $\text{h6} 7 \text{g6}$, but not 7 $\text{g6}\text{?} \text{f2} 8 \text{f5} \text{g3}!$ with a draw – Zak) 6 a4 a5 7 $\text{g6}$ Resigns.
Here (Dorfman-Holmov, 1981) White is at the cross-roads. What type of ending should he choose: pawn, rook or queen?

There would appear to be nothing simpler than transposing into a pawn ending, but it is here that a minor miracle occurs — the extra pawn fails to produce a win:

1 \textit{d}d4 \textit{x}d4 2 \textit{e}d7 3 \textit{d}5 \textit{e}7 4 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}7! 5 \textit{d}6 (5 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}6) 5 \textit{c}6!! (after 5 ... \textit{xd}6 6 \textit{d}4 Black loses the opposition) 6 \textit{d}3 \textit{d}7!, and Black eliminates the d6 pawn only when White goes to d4.

Grandmaster Holmov considers that White should have preferred to go into a queen ending: 3 \textit{g}2 (instead of 3 \textit{d}5) 3 ... \textit{e}6 4 \textit{h}3 \textit{d}5 5 \textit{h}4 \textit{xd}4 6 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}4 7 \textit{x}g6 \textit{xb}4 8 \textit{xf}5 \textit{c}4 9 \textit{g}5! (9 \textit{e}5 \textit{b}4 10 \textit{f}5 \textit{b}3 11 \textit{f}6 \textit{b}2 12 \textit{f}7 \textit{b}1 \textit{w} 13 \textit{f}8 \textit{w} \textit{e}l+ and 14 ... \textit{x}g3) 9 ... \textit{b}4 10 \textit{f}5 \textit{d}5! 11 \textit{f}6 \textit{e}6 12 \textit{g}6 \textit{b}3 13 \textit{f}7 \textit{b}2 14 \textit{f}8 \textit{w} \textit{b}1 \textit{w}+ 15 \textit{g}5! (15 \textit{g}7 \textit{b}2+ 16 \textit{g}8 \textit{w}f6!).

The game in fact went 1 \textit{g}4 \textit{f}g 2 \textit{d}d4 \textit{g}3+! 3 \textit{xf}3 (3 \textit{xf}3 \textit{g}2) 3 ... \textit{xe}3+ 4 \textit{g}4 \textit{b}3 5 \textit{f}5 \textit{f}7 6 \textit{f}4 \textit{gf} 7 \textit{xf}5 \textit{e}7 8 \textit{e}5 \textit{b}1 9 \textit{d}5 \textit{c}1 Draw Agreed.

Sometimes the idea of a pawn ending provides the basis of the strategic plan right from the opening.

\textbf{Dolmatov-Ivanov}
\textbf{Tashkent 1980}
\textbf{Sicilian Defence}

1 \textit{e}4 \textit{c}5
2 \textit{f}3 \textit{a}6
3 \textit{c}3
4 \textit{ed} \textit{xd}5
5 \textit{d}4 \textit{f}6
6 \textit{e}2 \textit{e}6
7 0-0 \textit{c}6
8 \textit{c}4 \textit{d}8
9 \textit{e}3 \textit{cd}
10 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4
11 \textit{xd}4

The position is a simple one, but White has a very comfortable game, e.g. 11 ... \textit{e}7 12 \textit{f}3 0-0 13 \textit{c}3. Black decides to complicate things somewhat.

11 ...
12 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}7
13 \textit{e}2!
Dolmatov does not fall in with his opponent: after 13. \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gf} \) 14 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 15 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{h2}+ \) 16 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{e5} \) Black has good counterplay.

13 ... \( \text{d6} \)
14 \( \text{g3} \) 0-0 (63)

15 \( \text{c5!} \)

By this thematic advance White gains a stable advantage on the queenside. The move is tactically justified by the variation 15 ... \( \text{b5} \) (15 ... \( \text{xc5} \) 16 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 17 \( \text{xb7} \) and 18 \( \text{xc6} \) 16 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xf1} \) 17 cd \( \text{c4} \) 18 \( \text{d2}! \)

15 ... \( \text{e7} \)
16 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c6} \)
17 \( \text{b4} \)

It becomes clear that any ending will now favour White, so Dolmatov aims for simplification, which Black finds difficult to avoid.

17 ... \( \text{xf3} \)
18 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d8} \)
19 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d5} \)

20 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
21 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{d8} \)
22 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
23 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{xd1} \)
23 ... \( \text{d7} \) 24 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 25 \( \text{xd5} \) ed fails to the pawn breakthrough 26 a4 \( \text{f8} \) 27 b5 ab 28 a5!

24 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{g6} \)
25 \( \text{d4} \)

Dolmatov later pointed out that this move is inaccurate. After 25 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 26 a4 \( \text{f6} \) 27 \( \text{b3} \) followed by b5 White would have had an obvious advantage. Dolmatov finds the correct arrangement of his forces a few moves later.

25 ... \( \text{c6} \)
26 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{f6} \)
27 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f7} \)
28 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{d5} \)

Otherwise White will set up a passed pawn with the queens on the board.

29 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{ed} \)
30 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e6} \)
31 \( \text{a4!} \)

This move cannot be postponed, since 31 ... \( \text{g2} \) is met by 31 ... \( \text{d7} \) 32 a4 \( \text{c6} \), when the b5 square is under Black's control.

31 ... \( \text{d8} \)
If 31 ... \( \text{d7} \) 32 b5.
32 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{h5} \)
33 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c7} \)
34 \( \text{b5} \) ab
35 ab \( \text{d8} \) (64)
While's advantage has become decisive. He obtains a protected passed pawn, since 36 ... bc 37 b6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{ \textit{W}d7}} 38 b7 \textcolor{red}{\textit{ \textit{W}c7}} loses to 39 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textit{W}b6+}}!

36 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b6}}
37 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{c7}}
38 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e3}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{hg}+}
39 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{toe'}}
40 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f4}}

Now White transposes into a won pawn ending.

40 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{e5}}
41 \textcolor{red}{\textit{xe5}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{fe}}
42 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f3}} Resigns

After 42 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{e6}} 43 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e3}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{d6}} 44 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{ef}+} (44 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{e4}} 45 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f5}!}) 45 \textcolor{red}{\textit{xf4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{e6}} 46 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{e7}} 47 \textcolor{red}{\textit{h5}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{gh}+} 48 \textcolor{red}{\textit{xb5}} the white king remains within the square of the d5 pawn. Then, by manoeuvring with his king, White drives Black away from the d5 pawn and wins it, e.g. 48 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{d6}} 49 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g5}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{e7}!} (49 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{e6}?} 50 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{d6}} 51 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f5}) 50 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g4}!} (50 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f5}?!} \textcolor{red}{\textit{d6}) 50 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e6}} 51 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f4}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{d6}} 52 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f5}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{e7}} 53 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e5}}.

Although from this position it is some time before a pawn ending is reached, the events which occur in it are highly instructive. The game was played in the USSR Junior Championship (Avetisian-Oll, 1983). It is interesting to follow how Black, after discovering the Achilles' heel of his opponent's formation, first neutralizes all the threats and then takes the game into a technically won ending.

1 \textcolor{red}{\textit{f4}}

A superficial plan; White should have begun with 1 h3.

1 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{g4}!}

Black lures his opponent into a trap.
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2  f5  ef
3  ♘xf5  ♘xe5
4  ♘xe5?

An outwardly pretty move, but incorrect.
4  ...  ♘f6!

This is the point of all Black's previous play: after the retreat of the rook, the g6 bishop's X-ray beam will reach c2.
5  ♘e2  ♘xd4+
6  cd  ♘xc2
7  ♘xc2  ♘xc2

Thus Black has won a pawn, but its realization is no easy matter. Lembit Oll, who had already achieved the master norm back home in Tallinn, takes the correct decision not to hang on to his extra pawn at all costs, but to achieve maximum activity for his pieces.
8  ♘e7  b6
9  ♘c1  ♘fe8
10  ♘e5

10  ♘d7 would have led to the same position: 10 ... f6 11  ♘xd5 ♘d3 etc.
10  ...  ♘d3
11  ♘xc8+  ♘xc8
12  ♘xd5  f6
13  ♘f2

The attempt to lure Black into the direct variation 13  ♘d7  ♘c2 14  ♘f3  ♘xb2 15  ♘xa7  ♘e4 16  a4

17  ♘f3  17  gf  ♘d2  18  ♘a6  ♘xd4 19  ♘xb6  ♘xa4 20  ♘g2, where White has good drawing chances, does not work due to 13 ... a5!, maintaining the threat of the rook's invasion at c2.
13  ...  ♘e8!
14  ♘f3  ♘e2
15  ♘b3  ♘e4+!

Black takes play into a won pawn ending.
16  ♘xe2  ♘xd5
17  g3  ♘xb3

Now, in addition to his weak pawn at d4, White also has weaknesses at b2 and b3. Black's plan is simple: while threatening to create an outside passed pawn on the kingside, he breaks through on the queenside.
18  ab  ♘f7
19  ♘d3  ♘e6
20  g4  f5
21  d5+

White cannot change the course of events, since after 21  gf+ ♘xf5 his position is lost.
21  ...  ♘xd5
22  gf  ♘e5
23  ♘c4  ♘xf5
24  ♘d5  g5
25  b4  g4
26  b5  h5
27  ♘c6  h4
28  ♘b7  g3

Resigns
Francois-Andre Danican Philidor was born on 7th September 1726 in a small town near Paris into a musical family. Philidor was not his surname, but a nickname which became his surname. His great-grandfather was a court oboist to King Ludwig XIII. On one occasion, wishing to praise his musician, the king called him Philidor in honour of an Italian virtuoso oboist Filidori. From then on Philidor's nickname began to be joined to his surname Danican.

Francois-Andre was just 6 years old when he was taken to Versailles and by family tradition joined the Chapel choir, where he also received a professional musical education. From the age of 14 Philidor earned his own living by transcribing music and giving music lessons. He settled in Paris and spent all his spare time playing chess in the Cafe de la Régence.

The cafe regulars cordially welcomed the young musician. The best player in France, Legal, began giving Philidor lessons. At first Legal gave Philidor the odds of a rook, then the odds were reduced, and soon they were playing on level terms. In the "Régence" Philidor became acquainted with the French Enlightenment philosophers, in particular Diderot and Rousseau. Several years passed in this way, and then in 1745 Philidor began a journey through Europe. He was already a strong player, and felt confident against any opponent. Philidor began giving chess lessons for payment; he would take bets, and play for stakes. Two years later he played a match with Stamma in London, and defeated him 8-2. By this time Philidor had developed a definite view on chess, and in 1749 he published a book entitled L'analyse du jeu des Echecs.

"My chief intention", wrote Philidor in the preface, "is to propose an innovation, namely the play of the pawns. Pawns are the soul of chess; it is they alone that create attack and defence, and victory or defeat depends
entirely upon how well or badly they are placed.” But Philidor drew attention not only to the pawns.

About this position Philidor writes: “When you find your game in the present situation, viz. two pawns on a front line, you must take care not to push either of them, before your adversary proposes to change one for the other; which you will then avoid, by advancing the attacked pawn.” [This and most of the subsequent quotes are taken from the translation by W.S.Kenny (1819) – tr.] After the following moves: 6 ćc3 0-0 7 ćge2 c6 8 ćd3 d5 9 e5 će8 10 će3 f6 Philidor explains:

“You should not take the pawn which is offered you, because your king’s pawn would then lose its column; whereas, leaving yours to be taken, you supply its place by the pawn of your queen, and afterwards sustain it with your king’s bishop’s pawn. These two pawns united will undoubtedly win the game.”

We will examine this game, and Philidor’s comments to it, right through to the end.

11 ćd2 fe
12 de će6
13 ćf4 će7
14 ćxb6

“It is always dangerous to let the adversary’s king’s bishop stand on the direct line, which attacks your king’s bishop’s pawn; and when your queen’s pawn cannot close that direction, it is necessary to oppose him with your queen’s bishop, and take his bishop, for any other piece, as soon as an occasion offers.”

14 ... ab
15 0-0 ćd7
16 ćxe6 ćxe6
17 f4 ćc7
18 ćae1 g6
19 h3 d4
20 će4 h6
21 b3 b5
22 g4 ćd5
23 ćg3 će3

“He plays this knight, to cut off the communication between your pieces, and break the strength of your pawns, which he would undoubtedly do, by pushing his king’s knight’s pawn; but you prevent his design, by sacrificing your castle.”

24 ćxe3 de
25 \( \text{w}xe3 \quad \text{a}xa2 \)
26 \( \text{h}e1 \quad \text{w}xb3 \)
27 \( \text{w}e4 \quad \text{w}e6 \)
28 \( f5 \quad gf \)
29 \( gf \quad \text{w}d5 \)
30 \( \text{w}xd5+ \quad \text{cd} \)
31 \( \text{a}xb5 \quad \text{b}b6 \)
32 \( f6 \)

"You are to observe, that when your bishop runs upon white squares, you must put your pawns upon black ones; or if your bishop runs upon the black, you must have your pawns upon the white; because then your bishop may prevent the adversary's pieces getting between your pawns. This rule is hardly ever to be dispensed with, in case you attack, and have some pawns advanced; but, in case of a defence, the rule must be reversed, and the pawns set on squares of the bishop's colour."

32 \( ... \quad \text{b}b2 \)
33 \( \text{d}d3 \quad \text{f}7 \)
34 \( \text{f}5 \quad \text{c}4 \)
35 \( \text{h}5 \quad \text{g}8+ \)
36 \( \text{g}4 \quad \text{d}2 \)
37 \( e6+ \quad \text{g}6 \)

"Or 37 \( ... \quad \text{f}8 \quad 38 \text{a}1 \text{x}b1+ 39 \text{x}b1 \text{x}b1 \quad 40 \text{h}2 \text{c}3 \text{f}4 \text{e}442 \text{c}x\text{d}5 \text{g}5 \text{e}7+ \text{f}744 \text{e}6+ \text{x}e645\text{e}8\text{w}+ \) and wins the game."

38 \( f7 \quad \text{f}8 \)
39 \( \text{f}4+ \quad \text{g}7 \)
40 \( \text{h}5 \)

"Black plays anywhere: the white pushes to queen."

Even today "variationless commentary" is regarded as the most difficult way of analysing a game. Yet Philidor began doing this nearly 240 years ago! His advice about facing an attack is highly instructive: "When the king finds himself behind two or three pawns, and that your adversary falls upon them in order to break them or make an irruption upon your king, you must take care to push none of these pawns till you are forced to do it." In another place Philidor warns: "Again, it being necessary to observe, as a general rule, that as it is often dangerous to attack the adversary too soon. here likewise you must be reminded not be too hasty in your attack, until your pawns are previously sustained by one another, and also by your pieces, otherwise these premature attacks will be unsuccessful."

Philidor also has quite general recommendations, such as "you must make yourself master of the openings [i.e. open files - *ir*], to bring the castles into play, especially at the latter end of the game", "having the advantage of a castle against a bishop, towards the end of a party, you will gain by exchanging queens", and so on.

The majority of Philidor's principles have withstood the test of
time. Of course, Philidor was wrong about some things. In particular, he overestimated the role of pawn chains; one of the opening systems recommended by him for Black (1 e4 e5 2 d4 d6 followed by ... f5) turned out to be bad. But in the ocean of variations Philidor laid the path of general principles. And so how proudly he stated: "I know players who have learned by heart everything by Greco and other authors, but, after making the first four or five moves, have not known what to do next. But I would assert that anyone who is able to use my rules will never find himself in a similar position."

Philidor's contemporaries did not understand the full depth of his theory, but subsequent generations of chess players have judged his legacy at its true worth. Philidor was "the greatest chess thinker who ever lived". Nowadays all chess players subscribe to these words of Richard Réti.

From positions with a wide choice of possibilities to standardized positions; from an abundance of attacking variations to the strict enumeration of endgame postulates – this will be the theme of the next few lessons.

And so, we move on to the endgame, or more accurately, certain of the most important endgame principles.

```
1. f7+ g8
2. e4!

The typical procedure of gaining a tempo.
```

```
2. ... f8
3. h7 e8
4. e5!

Another standard procedure. The trap will snap shut just in time to prevent the black king from escaping via d8, c7 and b6.
```

```
4. ... d8
4. ... f8 is weaker: 5 d7+ e8
```
6  \textit{\textit{d}6 d8 7 d6 e8 8 g6+ etc.}
5  \textit{\textit{e}6 c7}
6  \textit{\textit{d}7 c6}
7  \textit{\textit{d}3!}

Now the black king is securely locked in on the queenside.
7 ...  \textit{\textit{c}7}
8  \textit{\textit{e}4 d8}
9  \textit{\textit{e}6 e8}
10  \textit{\textit{g}6+ d8}
11  \textit{\textit{h}5!}

Once more gaining a tempo.
11 ...  \textit{\textit{c}8}
12  \textit{\textit{c}5!}

The familiar knight manoeuvre.
12 ...  \textit{\textit{d}8}
13  \textit{\textit{b}7+ c8}
14  \textit{\textit{c}6 b8}
15  \textit{\textit{g}4 a7}
16  \textit{\textit{c}7 a6}
17  \textit{\textit{c}2+ a7}
18  \textit{\textit{d}6!}

White regroups his forces for the decisive blow.
18 ...  \textit{\textit{a}8}
19  \textit{\textit{b}5!}

A tempo!
19 ...  \textit{\textit{a}7}
20  \textit{\textit{c}8+ a8}
21  \textit{\textit{c}6 mate!}

In an actual game the mating pattern might be slightly different, but the basic features remain the same: driving the king into the corner of the colour of the bishop, gaining a tempo with the bishop, the "triangular" knight manoeuvre (in this case \textit{\textit{f}7-e5-d7-c5-b7}), and the regrouping before the final blow.

This plan must be soundly known, otherwise one might see the repetition of an incident involving a well known chess master (!), who in a tournament game was unable to give this mate.

What happened was this. On being left with his "bare" king, at first the master's opponent wanted to resign, but then he nevertheless decided to play on - after all, he had nothing to lose. To the surprise of those watching, the master kept giving checks and was quite unable to drive the king into the required corner (the king kept escaping to freedom). At last the master "discovered" the method of pushing back the king, but . . . too late. To drive the king from corner to corner, some 20 moves are required, and more than 30 had already been used up. The chess laws mercilessly state that mate with bishop and knight must be given within 50 moves, and on the 51st a draw is recorded. It transpired that the unfortunate master had never in his life had to mate with bishop and knight, and he had also not studied this mechanism, since matters do not usually come down to such a mate.

The conclusion: gaps in chess education always tell, whether it be sooner or later.
Critics of the new theory
General Deschapelles plays at odds
Bishop in combat with pawns

Philidor’s contemporaries did not take well to his recommendations. His pawn chains, profound endgames and didactic instructions ran counter to the attacking impulses of the romantics, who aimed for clashes between the pieces, illuminated by the brilliance of combinations and the elegance of ideas.

It was Italian players from the town of Modena – del Rio, Lolli and Ponziani, who became the heralds of romanticism. Each published a book expounding his own views, and criticising Philidor. This gave grounds for chess historians to consider that the elemental romanticism of Greco (the Early Italian School) was replaced in the mid-18th century by a fundamental creative trend (the Italian School), which gradually acquired numerous supporters during the next 100 years.

The clash between the creative views of Philidor and the romantics led in the end to realism in chess. One of the first on this path was a retired French General, a favourite with Napoleon, Alexandre Deschapelles (1780-1847).

Cochrane-Deschapelles
Triangular Match-Tournament 1821

In this game White was all the time engaged in wishful thinking, whereas in Black’s moves one senses considerable skill in positional play.

Incidentally, General Deschapelles always played only at odds, and to Cochrane he gave the odds of f7 pawn and move.

1 e4 ...
2 d4 e6
3 f4 d5
4 e5 c5
5 c3 \textbullet c6
6 \textbullet f3 cd
7 cd \textbullet b6
8 \textbullet c3 \textbullet d7
9 a3 \textbullet h6
10 h3 \textbullet f5
11 \textbullet e2 \textbullet e7
12 g4 \textbullet h4+
13 \textbullet xh4 \textbullet xh4 (68)
The style of play of both adversaries is already pretty evident. White has no concrete aims in the opening, and his pawns are not supported by his pieces. Black has managed to hinder the development of his opponent’s queenside, he is ready to bring his rooks into play, and at the present moment he is threatening the combination 14 ... Qxd4 15 Qxd4 Wxd4 16 Wxd4 Qf3+. The initiative is with Black.

14 Qf2 0-0
15 Qg3 Qg6
16 b4

This move allows Black, by an excellent positional device, to emphasise White’s lack of development.

16 ... a5!
17 Qd2 ab
18 Qxb4 Qxb4
19 ab Wxb4
20 Qb1 Sa3+
21 Qh2 We7!

And now Black switches to the kingside, preparing a mating attack. Such thinking is possible only in an experienced positional player.

22 Qxb7 Qh4
23 Qxd7? Qf2+
24 Qg2 Qxh3+!
25 Qxh3 Qh4 mate

In chess history, Deschapelles was the link between the views of Philidor and the player who was to continue his ideas, La Bourdonnais.

The duel between bishop and pawns demands a knowledge of some basic theoretical positions and typical procedures. Usually a bishop can easily stop a lone pawn, but things are more difficult when there are two connected pawns.

The diagram shows a position from a study by Henneberger (1916). How are the pawns to be stopped? If 1 ... Qe5, then 2 a5 Qe6 3 a6 Qb8 4 Qc5 Qd7 5 Qb6 Qc8 6 a7, and White wins. A draw
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can be achieved only if Black succeeds in correctly assigning his duties: his king should attack the pawns from behind and tackle the rear pawn, while the more advanced pawn will be stopped by the bishop.

1 ... $\text{e}4$
2 $\text{c}5$ $\text{e}3+$
3 $\text{c}6$ $\text{d}4$!
4 $\text{b}5$ $\text{c}4$
5 a5
If 5 b6 $\text{b}4$ 6 b7 $\text{a}7$.
5 ... $\text{b}4$
6 a6 $\text{a}5$

White can play differently, but this does not affect the result: 2 a5 $\text{c}3$ 3 b5 $\text{e}5$ 4 b6 $\text{d}6$ 5 $\text{b}5$ $\text{d}7$ 6 $\text{a}6$ (6 a6 $\text{c}8$ 7 $\text{c}6$ $\text{xb}6$!) 6 ... $\text{c}6$ 7 $\text{a}7$ $\text{f}2$.

$\text{c}7$
$\text{d}4$
$\text{d}5$
$\text{d}4$
$\text{d}3$
$\text{g}4$+
$\text{xe}2$
$\text{f}1$
Stalemate

A study by Grigoriev (1927)

The draw is achieved by White in accordance with the principle of assigning duties. Therefore first the rear pawn must be immobilized.

1 $\text{e}6$!!
White loses after 1 $\text{c}7$ e5 2 $\text{d}6$ $\text{d}4$! (2 ... e4? 3 $\text{e}5$ $\text{f}3$ 4 $\text{f}1$ f2 5 $\text{g}2$) 3 $\text{e}6$ (if 3 $\text{a}6$ e4 4 $\text{e}6$ f3 5 $\text{f}5$ e3) 3 ... e4 4 $\text{g}4$ f3 5 $\text{e}6$
6 $\text{h}3$ e3 7 $\text{f}1$ $\text{c}3$! 8 $\text{e}5$ $\text{d}2$.

1 ... $\text{f}3$
2 $\text{c}7$ $\text{f}2$
3 $\text{h}3$
3 $\text{c}4$? e5 4 $\text{d}6$ e4 5 $\text{e}5$ $\text{f}3$
followed by ... e3.
3 ... $\text{f}3$!
If 3 ... e5 4 $\text{d}6$ $\text{d}4$, then 5 $\text{e}6$
4 $\text{c}6$! e5
5 $\text{d}5$ e4
6 $\text{d}4$ e3
7 $\text{d}3$ e2
8 $\text{g}4$+$! $\text{xg}4$
9 $\text{xe}2$ $\text{g}3$
10 $\text{f}1$ $\text{f}3$
Stalemate

Study by Selesniev (1917). Here too the principle of assigning
duties enables White to maintain the balance.

1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d6}}}}}! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d4}}}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c6}}}}}! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c3}}}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d5}}}}}! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e4}}}}}}

White has diverted the king and now heads for the h-pawn.

3 ... \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b3}}}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e4}}}}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a2}}}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b2}}}}} with a draw.

White would have lost after 1 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f4}}}} 2 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{g6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{g3}}}}} 3 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f5}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{h3}}}}} 4 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{h2}}}}}, since his own king prevents the bishop from occupying the h1-a8 diagonal.

A knowledge of typical procedures helps in the analysis of the following endings from tournament games.

So in Gavrikov-Chikovani, 1979, there followed . . .

1 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a5}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e5}}}}}!\textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b2}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a7}}}}}! \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{h3}}}}} 4 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{g7}}}}} 5 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d8}}}}} 6 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b5}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a7}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{h2}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{g3}}}}} 7 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a7}}}}}! \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a8}}}}}! \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e3}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f2}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d5}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f3}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a5}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e4}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{h2}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{g3}}}}} 8 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c5}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{a6}}}}} ! - stalemate.

Platonov-Doroshkevich, 1978. This ending is very similar to the previous one, and the correct allocation of functions between king and bishop allows White to draw.

If White plays 1 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c5}}}}}, Black draws easily by 1 ... \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f6}}}}} 2 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d1}}}}} 3 a5 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e2}}}}}! e.g. 4 b4 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f7}}}}} 5 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{e8}}}}} 6 b5 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{d8}}}}} 7 b6 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{c8}}}}} 8 b7+ \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b8}}}}} 9 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{b6}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{f3}}}}} 10 a6 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{\textsc{xb7}}}}} 11 ab - stalemate.
Here it was also possible to play 6 \( \text{c}\text{c}3 \text{h}4 \) 7 \( \text{c}\text{c}8! \) \( \text{h}3 \) 8 \( \text{d}\text{d}7 \text{h}2 \) 9 \( \text{c}\text{c}6 \text{h}3 \) 10 \( \text{f}\text{f}2 \), or 8 \( \text{xg}4 \text{xg}4 \) 9 \( \text{f}\text{f}2 \). But in this variation 7 \( \text{c}\text{c}2?? \) loses to 7 ... \( \text{h}2 \), when against the advance of the pawns (... \( \text{h}3 \), ... \( \text{g}3 \) and ... \( \text{g}2 \)) there is no defence.

\begin{align*}
6 & \quad \ldots \quad \text{h}4 \\
7 & \quad \text{c}\text{f}5 \quad \text{h}3 \\
8 & \quad \text{g}5 \quad \text{h}2 \\
9 & \quad \text{h}1 \quad \text{Drawn}
\end{align*}

The first impression is that Black has the better chances, but in Avni-Radashkovich, 1978, White gained a draw by accurate play.

\begin{align*}
1 & \quad \text{g}4 \quad \text{a}2! \\
2 & \quad \text{f}\text{f}4 \quad \text{d}5 \\
3 & \quad \text{f}5! \\
\text{Not} \quad 3 \text{d}3 \text{b}1+ \quad 4 \text{e}3 \text{c}4 \text{f}5 \text{b}3 \text{f}4 \text{x}a3 \text{g}5 \text{b}2. \\
3 & \quad \ldots \quad \text{c}4! \\
\text{After} \quad 3 \ldots \text{e}5 \text{White has an easy draw:} \quad 4 \text{d}3 \text{f}4 \text{d}4 \text{xg}4 \text{c}5 \text{c}4 \text{f}6. \\
4 & \quad \text{g}5 \quad \text{xc}3 \\
5 & \quad \text{g}6 \quad \text{b}1 \\
6 & \quad \text{f}4 \quad \text{d}4! \\
\text{The annoying pawns do not allow} \quad 6 \ldots \text{b}2 \text{, which is met by} \quad 7 \text{g}5 \text{ followed by the advance of the pawn to} \text{f}8.
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
7 & \quad \text{g}5 \quad \text{e}5 \\
8 & \quad \text{f}6 \quad \text{e}6 \\
9 & \quad \text{f}7 \quad \text{e}7 \\
10 & \quad \text{h}6 \quad \text{f}8 \\
11 & \quad \text{h}7 \quad \text{d}3 \\
12 & \quad \text{h}8! \\
\text{The final subtlety: in the event} \quad \text{of} \quad 12 \text{h}6?? \text{Black wins the pawn ending after} \quad 12 \ldots \text{c}4 \text{ and } 13 \ldots \text{x}f7. \text{But now} \quad 12 \ldots \text{x}g6 \text{gives stalemate, and so a draw was agreed.}
\end{align*}
LESSON 12
Can a knight cope with connected pawns?

In endings with a knight against a pawn one should be guided by basic drawn positions and typical procedures.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
75 \\
W
\end{array}
\]

This is the conclusion to a study by Grigoriev (1938), in which we meet the most frequently occurring ideas of this ending.

1 \( \text{Qc7}+! \)

White's problem is to achieve a drawn position; with the pawn at b2 his knight must be at a3, c3 or d2.

1 ... \( \text{Qc4} \)

Black must avoid dangerous squares: 1 ... \( \text{Qc5} \) fails to 2 \( \text{Qa6}+ \). Such barriers restrict the choice of routes available to the black king.

2 \( \text{Qe8}!! \)

White's play is based on gaining a tempo by means of a check. His knight will take the course c7-b5-a3 or f6-e4-d2.

2 ... \( \text{Qc5} \)

Black will have to advance his pawn, but for the moment he tries to deprive the knight of important squares. If 2 ... b3, then 3 \( \text{Qd6}+ \) \( \text{Qb4} \) (3 ... \( \text{Qd3} \) 4 \( \text{Qb5} \) and 5 \( \text{Qa3} \)) 4 \( \text{Qe4} \) and 5 \( \text{Qd2} \).

3 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qd4} \)

3 ... b3 is met by 4 \( \text{Qe4}+ \) and 5 \( \text{Qd2} \).

4 \( \text{Qe8}! \) \( \text{Qe5} \)

A last attempt to restrict the knight.

5 \( \text{Qc7}! \) \( \text{Qd6} \)

6 \( \text{Qe8}+! \)

The saving check; White loses after 6 \( \text{Qb5}+ \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 7 \( \text{Qc7} \) b3 8 \( \text{Qe6}+ \) \( \text{Qc4} \).

6 ... \( \text{Qc5} \)

7 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qd4} \)

8 \( \text{Qe8} \) b3

The black king's manoeuvres have not achieved anything.

9 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qc3} \)

10 \( \text{Qe4}+! \)

But not 10 \( \text{Qb5}+ \) \( \text{Qb4} \), when
the knight has no good square.
10 ...  
11  
12  
White has reached a drawn position. Now 12 ... b1  is met by 13  and 14  , and 12 ...  by 13  and 15  etc. Black cannot escape from the checks.

The knight finds it difficult to cope with a rook’s pawn, since the side of the board restricts its manoeuvrability. For example, a knight loses to a rook’s pawn which has reached the 7th rank, but if the king comes to its aid a draw is possible in a number of cases.

In this study by Grigoriev (1932) the white king succeeds in entering the drawing zone.
1  
2  
3  
Black is obliged to avoid the barriers (on the d3 and d4 squares), e.g. 3 ...  4  , and 4 ...  fails to 5  .
4  
But not 4  which deprives White of several barriers: 4 ...  5  6  and wins.
4  
5  
6  
7  
with a draw.

A knight can cope successfully with connected pawns only if they have not reached the 6th rank. In such positions the decisive role is played by the placing of the kings.

In this study by Chekhover (1955) White’s saving plan is to attack the pawns, forcing them to advance to a square which allows a knight fork.
1  
2  
If 2 ...  3  4  .
3  
4  

In this study by Chekhover (1955) White’s saving plan is to attack the pawns, forcing them to advance to a square which allows a knight fork.
If 4 ... f2 5 ♜xg4 f1♕ 6 ♜e3+.  
5 ♜e4!  g2  
6 ♜d2+  and  
7 ♜xf3  
reaching a basic drawn position with knight against pawn.

After 5 ♜b6? h4 6 ♜d5 ♜e4! the h-pawn queens.

5  
6 ♜b3!!  
Not 6 ♜d3? h3 7 ♜f2 h2 8 ♜xb4 ♦f4 9 ♜c4 ♦f3.

6  
7 ♜d2  h2  
The king is unable to help the pawn: 7 ... ♦f4 8 ♜f1 ♦f3 9 ♜h2+ ♜g3 10 ♜f1+ ♜g2 11 ♜e3+ ♦f2 12 ♜g4+ ♜g3 13 ♜e3 etc. A knight can cope with a rook’s pawn on the 6th rank.

8 ♜f1!  h1♕  
9 ♜g3+  
with a draw.

A knowledge of study ideas and typical procedures in the ending with knight against pawns is a great help in practical games.

Can White draw?

The course of the game Badalian-Kasparov, 1976, showed that a single inaccuracy is enough to distort the result.

After the correct 1 ♜a4+ ♜c4!
Lesson Twelve

(1 ... $b5 2 $b2 a5 3 $d5 a4 4 $d4) 2 $e5 (2 $d6? a5!) Black hastily played 2 ... $b3?, and after 3 $b2+! White succeeded in coordinating his knight and king. 3 ... $b4 (3 ... $c3 4 $a4+ $c2 5 $d5) 4 $d4! a5 5 $d3+!, and Black was obliged to agree a draw.

It was wrong to occupy b3 with the pawn: after 2 ... a5! 3 $b6+ (White loses after 3 $b2+ $b3 4 $d3 $c3, or 3 $e4 b3 4 $b2+ $c3 5 $a4+ $c2) 3 ... $b5! 4 $d5 $c5!! 5 $e4 a4 6 $c3 a3 7 $d3 a2 8 $c2 b3 and the pawns cannot be stopped. In this variation the action of the black king is heroic!

The most complicated positions are simple ones. Even Grandmaster Portisch was unable to convert his advantage faultlessly into a win (Portisch-Velimirović, 1979). A special feature here is that in certain variations the game transposes into a queen ending, which has its own rules.

The game concluded: 1 $e3 a5 2 f4 gf 3 g4 $c3 4 g5 $d4 5 $g4 $d5 6 $g3 $e6 7 $e3 and Black resigned.

But later the analysts were able to discover a number of inaccuracies in the moves of both players. In particular, the correct move order was 1 $d4!, e.g. 1 ... $c4 (1 ... a5 2 $c6+) 2 $c2 $b3 3 $a1+! (an old trick!) 3 ... $b2 4 $g3 $xal 5 $xg4 a5 6 f4 a4 7 f5 a3 8 f6 a2 9 f7 $b2 10 $f8 $a1 $g7, and after the exchange of queens White wins.

The position of the knight on e3 gave Black an additional tempo, which he could have exploited on the 4th move: 4 ... $d3! (the a1-h8 diagonal must remain clear!). Now a fantastic variation is possible: 5 $d5 a4 6 g6 a3 7 $g3 (7 g7 f2 8 $g2 a2!) 7 ... $c4! 8 $c3 $xc3 9 g7 a2 10 g8 $f2!! 11 $g7+ $c2 12 $a1 $f1 $a1 13 $xf1 $b2—draw. Interwoven with this variation are a number of other subvariations which are no less pretty.

Endings, which at first sight are simple, often turn out to be very profound, demanding great insight, and, of course, a knowledge of typical procedures.
LESSON 13
The rivalry between France and England
The La Bourdonnais-McDonnell match
An extra pawn in a bishop ending

At the start of the 19th century the Italian School was firmly established in the main chess centres – France and England. The Evans Gambit (which gained widespread popularity in the 1820s and 30s) and the Scotch Game with their rich combinational possibilities gave a new impulse to the romantic tendency. The Evans Gambit – the immortal invention of an English sea captain – became a dangerous attacking weapon. The Scotch Game, which is mentioned back in the books by the Modena trio, acquired its name in 1824 thanks to a correspondence game between the London and Edinburgh chess clubs. Incidentally, this was the first correspondence match in history.

By that time the strongest player in France was considered to be Louis de La Bourdonnais (1797-1840), a pupil of Deschapelles, and the best player in England was Alexander McDonnell (1798-1835). The battle between them for the right to be called the No. 1 player in Europe lasted two years (1834-35), and concluded in a convincing victory for La Bourdonnais by the score of +45 -27 =13.

McDonnell and La Bourdonnais were roughly on a par in tactical complications, but the latter had a much greater arsenal of positional techniques. In his games one can see operations for seizing the centre and play for an advantage in development and space; he creates strong points for his pieces, and masses his forces for the landing of a decisive blow. In general, La Bourdonnais conducted a logical strategic battle in which he both used lively piece play in the spirit of the Italian School, and employed the advancement of pawn chains à la Philidor.

McDonnell-La Bourdonnais
16th game of the fourth match

1 e4 c5
2 d4 e5
3 dxe5 d6
4 c4 cxd4
5 cxd4 e5

In modern games 4 ... e5 rarely occurs, and the usual sequel is 5 c5 b5 a6 d6+ xd6 7 zd6
64 Lesson Thirteen

\( \text{\textit{f6}}. \text{The resulting positions are complicated, but White has the freer game. But La Bourdonnais has in mind an attack on the centre.} \)

\begin{align*}
5 & \text{bxc6} & \text{bc} \\
6 & \text{c4} & \text{\textit{f6}} \\
7 & \text{g5} & \text{e7} \\
8 & \text{e2} & \text{d5} \\
\end{align*}

Black's idea begins to take shape: he plans a central pawn offensive.

\begin{align*}
9 & \text{xf6} & \text{xf6} \\
10 & \text{b3} & \text{0-0} \\
11 & \text{0-0} & \text{a5} \\
12 & \text{ed} & \text{cd} \\
13 & \text{d1} & \text{d4} \\
14 & \text{c4} & \\
\end{align*}

From the present-day viewpoint, 14 c3 or 14 d2 would be better. McDonnell hopes to stop the black pawns and to advance his c-pawn as far as possible, but this plan does not succeed.

\begin{align*}
14 & \ldots & \text{wb6} \\
15 & \text{c2} & \text{b7} \\
16 & \text{d2} & \text{ae8} \\
\end{align*}

The move of a far-sighted strategist! After 16 \ldots \text{xb2} 17 \text{d3} g6 18 \text{a1} e4 the game would have simplified, and probably ended in a draw. La Bourdonnais intends to bring his f-pawn into the battle.

\begin{align*}
17 & \text{e4} & \text{d8} \\
18 & \text{c5} & \text{w6} \\
19 & \text{f3} & \text{e7} \\
20 & \text{a1} & \text{f5} \\
21 & \text{w4} & \text{h8} \\
22 & \text{a4} & \\
\end{align*}

In making his 20th move, Black must have foreseen this exchange sacrifice.

\begin{align*}
22 & \ldots & \text{wh6} \\
23 & \text{x8} & \text{fe} \\
24 & \text{c6} & \text{ef} \\
\end{align*}

Black is ready for variations such as 25 cb \text{e3}+ 26 h1 fg+ 27 xg2 h2+ 28 gl e2+, or 25 gf \text{e3}+ 26 h1 xf3+ 27 gl f5.

\begin{align*}
25 & \text{c2} & \text{e3}+ \\
26 & \text{h1} & \text{c8} \\
27 & \text{d7} & \text{f2} \\
28 & \text{f1} & \text{d3} \\
29 & \text{c3} & \text{xd7} \\
30 & \text{cd} & \text{e4} \\
31 & \text{w8} & \text{d8} \\
32 & \text{w4} & \text{e1} \\
33 & \text{c1} & \text{d2} \\
34 & \text{w5} & \text{g8} \\
35 & \text{d1} & \text{e3} \\
36 & \text{w3} & \text{xd1} \\
37 & \text{xd1} & \text{e2} \\
\end{align*}

White resigns

The realisation of the extra pawn
in endings with bishop and pawn against bishop is based on a knowledge of typical procedures. First an example from practice:

```
82
B
```

In Karibishev-Lipiridi, 1982, Black easily achieved the required set-up: 1 ... $\text{a}f3$ 2 $\text{a}7$ $\text{c}c5$ 3 $\text{f}f1$ $\text{b}6$ 4 $\text{a}8$ $\text{xa}8$ 5 $\text{e}e2$ $\text{c}c5$ 6 $\text{xe}3$ $\text{b}4$ 7 $\text{d}4$ $\text{b}3$ 8 $\text{d}3$ $\text{b}7$ 9 $\text{d}2$ $\text{a}6$ 10 $\text{f}5$ 11 $\text{e}e1$ $\text{c}3$ 12 $\text{d}1$ $\text{c}4$ 13 $\text{e}1$ $\text{d}3$ 14 $\text{a}2$ (15 $\text{c}2$) 10 ... $\text{a}2$ 11 $\text{c}3$ $\text{c}8$ 12 $\text{e}4$ $\text{e}6$ 13 $\text{g}6$ $\text{a}1$ 14 $\text{b}4$ $\text{a}2$ 15 $\text{a}3$ $\text{b}1$ 16 $\text{f}7$ $\text{e}4$ 17 $\text{a}2$ $\text{f}5$ White resigns.

The winning method used by Lipiridi is well known to all experienced players.

Now let us turn to theory. There are three basic types of drawn position in endings with bishop and pawn against bishop.

A draw is achieved in positions where the weaker side's king occupies a square in front of the pawn which is inaccessible to the bishop.

```
83
W
```

With Black to move, his king immediately reaches d8 (1 ... $\text{e}e8$ and 2 ... $\text{d}8$), while with White to move, after 1 $\text{h}5$ $\text{h}3$ 2 $\text{g}6$ $\text{d}7$! 3 $\text{f}5$ $\text{e}8$ a drawn pawn ending arises. 2 ... $\text{d}7$ is the only move: after 2 ... $\text{g}4$? 3 $\text{f}5$ $\text{xf}5$ 4 $\text{xf}5$ $\text{f}7$ 5 $\text{e}5$ White gains the opposition.

In the initial position White can carry out a by-passing manoeuvre with his king to the queenside, and against passive defence by Black (moving only his bishop) can obtain the following position:

```
84
W
```
Here White wins by 1 \( \texttt{f3} \cdot \texttt{a4} \) 2 \( \texttt{c6} \), blocking the diagonal. It follows that Black must defend actively. He must bring his king to c5 at the moment when the white king reaches c7. Then White will be unable to drive the bishop off both diagonals: 1 \( \texttt{g4} \cdot \texttt{d7} \cdot \texttt{d1} \) 3 \( \texttt{c6} \cdot \texttt{g4} \) - draw.

A draw can be achieved in positions where the weaker side’s king can prevent the driving away of his bishop or the blocking of its diagonal.

In this position by Centurini (1847) the coordination of Black’s pieces is disrupted, since for manoeuvring by his bishop the a7-b8 diagonal is too short. If White’s bishop should reach a7, he will win after 1 \( \texttt{b8} \cdot \texttt{gl} \) 2 \( \texttt{b3} \cdot \texttt{a7} \cdot \texttt{f2} \), so Black tries to prevent this. 1 \( \texttt{h4} \cdot \texttt{h5} \) 2 \( \texttt{f2} \cdot \texttt{a6} \)

Now White can try to gain a tempo after 3 \( \texttt{e3} \) (or 3 \( \texttt{d4} \) 3 ... \( \texttt{g3} \) 4 \( \texttt{g5} \cdot \texttt{b5} \) (4 ... \( \texttt{h2} \) 5 \( \texttt{d8} \)

\( \texttt{b5} \) 6 \( \texttt{c7} \) 5 \( \texttt{d8} \cdot \texttt{c6} \) 6 \( \texttt{h4} \cdot \texttt{h2} \) 7 \( \texttt{f2} \). But if instead of 3 ... \( \texttt{g3} \) Black plays 3 ... \( \texttt{d6} \). White cannot achieve anything, since after 4 \( \texttt{g5} \cdot \texttt{b5} \) 5 \( \texttt{d8} \cdot \texttt{c6} \) 6 \( \texttt{e7} \) \( \texttt{h2} \) the black king controls c5.

The only way to win is by 3 \( \texttt{c5}! \cdot \texttt{f4} \) 4 \( \texttt{e7} \cdot \texttt{b5} \) 5 \( \texttt{d8} \cdot \texttt{c6} \) 6 \( \texttt{g5}! \cdot \texttt{h2} \) 7 \( \texttt{e3} \), when the white bishop penetrates to a7.

A draw can be achieved in positions where the driving away of the bishop or the blocking of its diagonal leads to a drawn pawn ending.

This position by Averbakh (1954) illustrates this rule. After 1 \( \texttt{d2} \cdot \texttt{f8} \) 2 \( \texttt{g5} \cdot \texttt{g8} \) 3 \( \texttt{f6} \) 4 \( \texttt{e5} \cdot \texttt{h4} \) 5 \( \texttt{f4} \cdot \texttt{e7} \) 6 \( \texttt{g5} \cdot \texttt{xe5} \) 7 \( \texttt{xe5} \cdot \texttt{f7} \) the draw is obvious.

A knowledge of typical procedures will help in the analysis of the following very interesting ending, from the game Schüssler-Westerinen (1978).
Play reduces to an ending with bishop and pawn against bishop.

1 ef \( \text{\square}xf4 \)

2 f3!

The first subtlety: 2 hg would have led to an easy draw.

2 ... gh+!

The second subtlety: 2 ... gf+? would have lost, e.g. 3 \( \text{\square}xf3 \text{\square}b8 \)

\( \text{\square}e1 \text{\square}d5 \text{\square}a4 \text{\square}c4 \text{\square}e4 \text{\square}b3 \)

a5 \text{\square}c4 8 \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}b5 9 \text{\square}g5 \text{\square}c7 10

\( \text{\square}xh5 \text{\square}d8 \text{\square}g4 \text{\square}a6 \text{\square}d2 \)

\( \text{\square}b5 \text{\square}g5 \text{\square}xa5 14 \text{\square}h4 \text{\square}c6 15 \)

\( \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}d7 16 \text{\square}g6 \text{\square}e8 17 \text{\square}h5 \text{\square}f8 \)

18 h6.

3 \( \text{\square}xh3 \text{\square}g5 \)

4 \( \text{\square}e1 \text{\square}d5 \)

5 \( \text{\square}h4 \text{\square}c1 \)

6 a4 \( \text{\square}c4 \)

7 \( \text{\square}d8 \text{\square}b4 \)

8 a5 \( \text{\square}b5 \)

9 \( \text{\square}h4 \text{\square}f4 \)

10 \( \text{\square}xh5 \text{\square}d2? \)

The third subtlety: Black misses the draw which he could have gained by 10 ... \( \text{\square}e5! \) 11 \( \text{\square}g4 \text{\square}a6 \)

12 \( \text{\square}h4 \text{\square}xa5 13 \text{\square}g3 \text{\square}c3 14 \text{\square}f4 \)

\( \text{\square}b5 15 \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}c6 16 \text{\square}g5 \text{\square}d5 17 \)

\( \text{\square}g6 \text{\square}e4 18 \text{\square}h4 \text{\square}f3! \) (18 ...

\( \text{\square}g7? \) 19 \( \text{\square}f6 \text{\square}f8 20 \text{\square}b2 \text{\square}e7 21 \text{\square}c1\) 19 \( \text{\square}f6 \text{\square}e1 20 \text{\square}b2 \text{\square}h4 21 \)

\( \text{\square}c1 \text{\square}g4. \)

11 \( \text{\square}g4? \)

The fourth subtlety: White chooses an incorrect plan. He could have won by 11 \( \text{\square}g5! \text{\square}xa5 \)

12 \( \text{\square}f4 \text{\square}c6 13 \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}c3 14 \text{\square}g6 \text{\square}d5 \)

15 \( \text{\square}f6 \text{\square}e1 16 \text{\square}b2 \text{\square}h4 17 \text{\square}c1 \text{\square}e4 18 \text{\square}g5. \) Moving the king to e8 does not change anything: 13 ...

\( \text{\square}d7 14 \text{\square}g6 \text{\square}e8 15 \text{\square}f6 \text{\square}b4 16 \text{\square}f7+ \)

\( \text{\square}d7 17 \text{\square}g7, \) followed by \( \text{\square}g8 \) and \( \text{\square}h6-f8-a3-b2-g7. \)

11 ... \( \text{\square}e3 \)

12 \( \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}d2 \)

13 \( \text{\square}e4 \text{\square}c1 \)

14 \( \text{\square}c7 \text{\square}g5 \)

15 \( \text{\square}f4 \text{\square}e7 \)

16 \( \text{\square}e5 \text{\square}g5 \)

The fifth subtlety: Black does not have time to take the pawn, e.g. 16 ...

\( \text{\square}xa5? 17 \text{\square}i4 \text{\square}b5! 18 \text{\square}d5! \text{\square}h4 19 \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}g5 20 \text{\square}e6 \text{\square}c4 \)

21 \( \text{\square}f6 \text{\square}h6 22 \text{\square}f7! \text{\square}d5 23 \text{\square}g6 \text{\square}e4 24 \text{\square}b2. \)

17 \( \text{\square}d4 \text{\square}xa5 \)

18 \( \text{\square}e3 \text{\square}h4 \)

19 \( \text{\square}f4 \text{\square}b4 \)

20 \( \text{\square}f3 \)

The sixth subtlety: White makes things difficult for his opponent. After 20 \( \text{\square}d5 \) Black would have attained a drawn position more quickly: 20 ...

\( \text{\square}c3 21 \text{\square}f5 \text{\square}d3 22 \text{\square}c5 \text{\square}g5 23 \text{\square}e6 \text{\square}e4. \)
In conclusion we will examine a position in which a curious incident occurred.

In this position (Capablanca-Janowski, 1916) Black resigned. Fifty years later Grandmaster Yuri Averbakh, the author of a fundamental study of the endgame, showed that Janowski had resigned in a drawn position. By a king manoeuvre (which appears paradoxical to the uninitiated, but is a typical one for experts) Black could have prevented his bishop being driven off the a5-d8 diagonal.

Here is Averbakh's analysis:

\[ ... \text{f}4!! 2 \text{d}4 (2 \text{e}5+ \text{e}3 3 \text{b}5 \text{c}3 4 \text{c}6 \text{c}4) 2 ... \text{f}3!! 3 \text{b}5 (3 \text{c}5 \text{e}2!! 4 \text{c}6 \text{d}3! 5 \text{d}7 \text{g}5 6 \text{b}5 \text{c}4) 3 ... \text{e}2!! 4 \text{c}6 \text{d}3 5 \text{b}6 \text{g}5 6 \text{b}7! (6 \text{c}7 \text{e}3 7 \text{d}6 \text{c}4) 6 ... \text{e}4 7 \text{c}6 \text{a}6 \text{b}3! 8 \text{l}2 \text{d}8 9 \text{e}1 \text{a}4!, \text{and the black king succeeds in taking control of a}5.\]
LESSON 14
Staunton’s style and the Orthodox School
Outward features in the assessment of a position
An extra pawn in a knight ending

In 1835 McDonnell died, followed five years later by La Bourdonnais, but the main rivalry in Europe continued to be only between French and English players. The pride of England, Howard Staunton (1810-1874), enjoyed the reputation for a comparatively short time of being the strongest player. After defeating Saini-Amant in a traditional match in 1843, within 10 years Staunton’s star was already on the decline. But Staunton’s merit is that his games laid part of the foundations for the future teachings of Steinitz.

The match between Staunton and Saint-Amant appeared outwardly to be very tedious. After the opening Staunton would switch to manoeuvring, and only when he had lulled his opponent’s vigilance would he begin an attack. When attacking he did not avoid exchanges and was quite happy to continue the battle in an endgame. Saint-Amant, in turn, did nothing to counter his opponent’s style of play.

Saint Amant-Staunton
Paris, 1843
Queen's Gambit Declined
1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 e3 c5 4 Qc3 Qf6 5 Qf3 le7 6 Qd3 b6 7 0-0 0-0 8 b3
8 b7 9 c3 ed 10 wc2 Qc6 11 a3 a6
12 Qd1 cd 13 ed Qe6 14 b4 Qd6 15
Qe1 b5 16 h3 Qc8 17 wb3 wc7 18
Qd2 wb6 19 Qe3 Qe7 20 Qacl
Qh5 21 wc1 Qf6.

How different all this ‘marking time’ is to the swift attacks and surprise combinations of the romantics! Staunton did not immediately begin professing such a style. At the start of his chess career, he, like everyone, would attack passionately, make combinations and sacrifice. It was only later, after much thinking about chess, that Staunton began to gravitate towards closed positions and develop his strategy: the gradual creation of preconditions for an offensive.

22 Qh4 Ac7 23 wd2 Qh7 24 wc2 Qf6 25 w1 Qe8 26 Qf5
Qxf5 27 Qxf5 a5 28 wb3 ab 29 ab
Ac4! (89)
Staunton has achieved his aim. He holds the initiative on the queenside (with the attack on b4), and, moreover, he is ready to sacrifice the exchange (his rook at c4 for the white-squared bishop).

30 \( \text{Qa2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
31 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Wc6} \)
33 \( \text{Wb2} \)

Not, of course, 32 \( \text{Qxc4} \) dc, with attacks on g2 and b3.

32 \( ... \) \( \text{Wd7} \)
33 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qh5} \)
34 \( \text{Wd2} \) f5!

A modern commentator would say that, after tying down his opponent on the queenside, Black switched to an attack on the kingside.

35 f4 \( \text{Qg3} \)
36 \( \text{Qxc4} \)

White cannot resist the temptation but now the bishop at b7 is activated.

36 \( ... \) dc
37 \( \text{Wb2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
38 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe4} \)

39 \( \text{He2} \) \( \text{Gg6} \)
40 \( \text{Ed1} \)

Saint-Amant later wrote that he had blundered away the exchange.

But how was he to defend against the impending threat of 40 ... \( \text{Qxc3} \) 41 \( \text{Wxc3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 42 \( \text{Hb2} \) \( \text{We4} \)
43 \( \text{Hcc2} \) \( \text{Hg3} \) 44 \( \text{He2} \) \( \text{xf4?} \)
40 \( ... \) \( \text{Qxc3} \)
41 \( \text{Wxc3} \) \( \text{Qf3} \)
42 \( \text{Hde1} \) \( \text{Qxe2} \)
43 \( \text{Hxe2} \) \( \text{Wc7} \)
44 \( \text{Wb2} \) \( \text{We6} \)
45 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{He4} \)

Staunton does not hurry to pick up the b4 pawn, but methodically strengthens his position.

46 \( \text{Wa2} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 47 g3 \( \text{Wb7} \) 48 \( \text{Wa3} \)
\( \text{He8} \) 49 \( \text{Wc3} \) \( \text{Wbl} \) 50 h4 g5! 51 \( \text{We1} \)
\( \text{Wh2+} \) 52 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Wh3+} \) 53 \( \text{Qgl} \) \( \text{Qg4} \)
54 hg \( \text{Qxf4} \) 55 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Wxe2} \) 56 \( \text{Wxe2} \) \( \text{Qxe2} \) 57 gh c3 White resigns.

In chess literature Staunton’s style of play was called the Orthodox Positional School, the essence of which was the assessment of a position on its outward features. In particular, Staunton’s favourite strategy - a flank attack with a stable centre - found many followers.

In the later years of his life Staunton retired from practical play, but his fervent organisational and literary activity left a profound mark in chess. It was Staunton’s idea to hold the first international chess tournament in 1851, for
many years he published a chess magazine, and he wrote several books on the game.

As in other endings, with knight and pawn against knight there is a whole series of typical procedures, the chief of which is the diversion of the knight.

This is how it looks in a practical game (Eingorn-Chiburdanidze, 1982):

1 ... \( \text{f}6! 2 \text{f}6 \text{c}33 \text{a}5 \text{d}8! 4 \text{f}5 (4 \text{e}5? \text{c}6+) 4 ... \text{e}6 5 \text{b}7 \text{d}4! 6 \text{d}6 b3 7 \text{b}5+ \text{d}3 8 \text{a}3 b2 9 \text{e}6 \text{d}4+ and White resigned since 10 \text{d}5 is met by 10 ... \text{b}5.

We will now examine a few theoretical positions.

Diagram 91 is a position by Averbakh (1980). Against a pawn on the 7th rank the weaker side can rarely draw. Were the white knight at a1, Black would have perpetual check: 1 ... \( \text{f}8+ 2 \text{d}8 \text{e}6+.

White's control over e6 enables him to win by a typical diverting manoeuvre:

1 ... \( \text{f}6+ 2 \text{d}8 \text{e}8

A king move is met by 3 \( \text{d}7.

3 \( \text{e}6! \text{d}6

Or 3 ... \( \text{f}6 4 \text{g}5+ and 5 \text{e}4!.

4 \( \text{d}7 \text{e}8

5 \text{g}5+!

If the previous position is moved one rank down the board, the manoeuvrability of the black knight is increased and a draw becomes possible: 1 ... \( \text{g}8 (or 1 ... \text{f}5+ 2 \text{d}7 \text{e}7 3 \text{e}5 \text{f}5 4 \text{g}4+ \text{g}7 5 \text{e}3 \text{xe}3 6 \text{e}7 \text{d}5) 2 \text{d}7 \text{g}7 3 \text{e}3 \text{f}8 4 \text{d}5 \text{g}7 5 \text{e}8 \text{h}6! with a draw, since 6 \text{e}7 leads to the loss of the pawn.

The closer the pawn to the side of the board, the more difficult it is to defend. In this theoretical position (from Chéron, 1952) White wins even if it is Black to move:
1 ... \( \text{h7} \) 2 \( \text{h8} \) \( \text{h6} \) 3 \( \text{g8} \) \( \text{g5} \) 4 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{f5} \) 5 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{g6} \) 6 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{g5} \) 7 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{f4} \) 8 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{g8} \) \( \text{f3} \) + and 10 \( \text{d4} \).

If in the initial position the black knight had been at \( \text{h6} \), it could not only have stopped the pawn, but also created a threat of perpetual check: 1 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{a8} \)! (if 1 ... \( \text{c5} \) 2 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{b5} \) 3 \( \text{d5} \)) 2 \( \text{d5} \) (but not 2 \( \text{xa8} \) with a draw) 2 ... \( \text{d7} \) 3 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{d8} \) 4 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{c7} \) 5 \( \text{c6} \).

If the initial position is moved one rank down the board, the win is easier: 1 \( \text{f5} \)! \( \text{b4} \) 2 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{c4} \) 3 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 4 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{e8} \) + 5 \( \text{e6} \). Averbakh also gives another way to win: 3 \( \text{e3} \) + \( \text{b4} \) 4 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c4} \) 5 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{d6} \) 6 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{c8} \) 7 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{d6} \) + 8 \( \text{b8} \).

The following positions are endings from tournament games:

The chances of the two sides appear to be equal (Vilela-Augustin, 1980), but White is able to assign the functions more quickly: his king supports his pawn, while his knight blocks the opponent's.

1 \( \text{c5} \! \)

1 \( \text{a5} \) throws away the win, since
after 1 ...  \( \text{\#d6} \) 2 a6 \( \text{\#e5} \) Black gains control over c6.

1 ...

But now the knight is too late: 1 ...

2 a5

3 a6

4 \( \text{\#c6!} \)

White cannot go into the queen ending, since Black is able to block the checks in the variation 4 a7 f2 5 a8\( \text{\#f} \) f1\( \text{\#f} \) 6 \( \text{\#e8}+ \) \( \text{\#f5} \) 7 \( \text{\#f8}+ \) \( \text{\#f6} \).

4 ...

5 \( \text{\#d2} \) \( \text{\#f6} \)

6 \( \text{\#c6!} \)

Otherwise 6 ...

7 \( \text{\#f1} \) Resigns

From this ending (Bellin-Padevsky, 1979) one can study the technique of realising the material advantage in such positions.

1 \( \text{\#d5}+ \) \( \text{\#e5} \) 2 \( \text{\#b4} \) \( \text{\#e4} \) 3 \( \text{\#c6} \)

4 \( \text{\#d8} \) \( \text{\#e5} \) 5 \( \text{\#f7}+ \) \( \text{\#e6} \) 6 \( \text{\#h6} \) \( \text{\#e7} \) 7 g7 \( \text{\#e5} \) 8 \( \text{\#g4}+ \) \( \text{\#f5} \) 9 \( \text{\#e3}+ \) \( \text{\#e6} \) 10 \( \text{\#g2}! \) \( \text{\#f7} \) (10 ...

\( \text{\#f5} \) 11 \( \text{\#h4}+ \) \( \text{\#f6} \) 12 \( \text{\#g6} \) 11 \( \text{\#f4} \) Resigns.

This ending (Podgayets-Tal, 1969) is annotated by Averbakh:

The black king is a long way from the pawn and the problem for White is to drive away the opponent’s knight. This could have been most simply achieved by the subtle 1 \( \text{\#d4!} \), e.g. 1 ...

4 \( \text{\#c8} \) (1 ...

2 \( \text{\#e6} \)+) 2 \( \text{\#f5} \) \( \text{\#h5} \) 3 \( \text{\#e2!} \) (threatening to win the knight) 3 ...

4 \( \text{\#g7}+ \) 4 \( \text{\#f6} \) \( \text{\#e8}+ \) 5 \( \text{\#g6} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) (5 ...

6 h5 \( \text{\#e7} \) 7 h6 \( \text{\#f6} \) 8 \( \text{\#f4} \) 6 \( \text{\#f4} \), and the pawn cannot be stopped. No better is 2 ...

3 \( \text{\#d5} \) 3 h5 \( \text{\#e7}+ \) 4 \( \text{\#e6} \) \( \text{\#g8} \) 5 \( \text{\#f5} \) when the knight is trapped.

But White incorrectly decided to force events:

1 \( \text{\#c5}+ \) \( \text{\#c6} \)

2 \( \text{\#d3} \) \( \text{\#h5}+! \)

It is not obligatory to capture the knight. It now transpires that the knight is badly placed at d3, and it has to adopt a new
approach in order to continue its battle with the enemy knight.

3 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{g3} \)
4 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d6} \)
5 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{e2}! \)
6 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f4} \)
7 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d7} \)

An inaccuracy which complicates Black's task. 7 ... \( \text{d5}+ \) was correct, e.g. 8 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{f4} \), when 9 \( \text{e2} \) can be met by 9 ... \( \text{xe2} \) 10 h5 \( \text{f4} \) 11 h6 \( \text{e6} \) with a draw, while if 8 \( \text{g5} \), then the black king comes into the action: 8 ... \( \text{e7} \) 9 h5 \( \text{f7} \) with a draw.

8 \( \text{f7} \)

Even so, White should have tried 8 \( \text{e2} \). Black would have had to continue 8 ... \( \text{d5}+ \) 9 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{e3} \)
10 h5 \( \text{g4} \) with the possible sequel
11 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e5}+ \) 12 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g4}+ \) 13 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 14 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{f4} \) 15 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{h6} \)
16 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{g4} \) when White has not achieved anything, or 15 ... \( \text{e8} \) 16 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{e7} \) 17 \( \text{f5}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{d4}+ \) \( \text{e7} \) 19 \( \text{c6}+ \) \( \text{e8} \) with a draw.

The game went:

8 ... \( \text{d6}! \)
9 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xe2} \)

Drawn
LESSON 15
Which is stronger in the endgame: knight or bishop?

We turn to an examination of positions in which the two minor pieces are battling against each other. All the typical ideas are classified from the viewpoint of realising an advantage (material or positional).

This position arose in one of Belyavsky’s games (1980). White did not immediately find the winning plan. His problem is to drive the knight away from active squares, which can be achieved after 1  ♖xf5  ♖xa4 2  ♖e4  ♖g2 (2 ... ♖f1? 3  ♖g6 ♖g34  ♖e3 ♖f1+5 ♖e2 ♖h2 6 ♖h5 and the knight is lost) 3 ♖d7+ ♖b4 4 f5 ♖h4 5 f6 ♖g6 6 ♖f5 ♖h8 7 ♖d5 ♖b5 8 ♖e6 ♖e5 9 ♖h7 ♖d4 10 ♖b1 ♖c5 11 ♖e7 ♖d5 12 ♖f8 ♖e5 13 ♖g7 ♖e6 14 ♖d3 ♖c5 15 ♖a6 ♖f5 16 ♖c8+ and then 17 ♖h3, when Black is in zugzwang.

The game went 1 ♖c6 ♖c2 2 ♖b5 ♖e3 3 ♖d7 ♖b4 4 ♖c6 ♖c2 5 ♖d5 ♖a5 6 ♖c4 ♖b4 7 ♖e8 ♖c8 8 ♖c3 ♖b4 9 ♖c4 ♖c2 10 ♖d3 ♖b4+ 11 ♖d4 ♖c2+ 12 ♖d5 ♖e3+ 13 ♖e6 ♖b4 14 ♖d7 ♖a5 15 ♖e5 ♖b4 16 ♖xf5! (White at last hits on the right path) 16 ... ♖xa4 17 ♖e4 ♖f1 (now White can catch the knight) 18 ♖g6 ♖b4 19 ♖d4 ♖g3 20 ♖e3 ♖f1+ 21 ♖e2 ♖h2 22 ♖h5 ♖c5 23 ♖l2 ♖d5 24 ♖e2 ♖d4 (24 ... ♖e4 25 ♖g3 ♖f5 26 ♖d3+) 25 ♖g2 ♖e3 26 f5 ♖xe2 27 ♖hx2 Resigns.
If the passed pawn is blockaded by
the knight, the stronger side
acquires greater freedom of action.

In this position by Arbakov, Black is threatening to play 1 ... h4, simultaneously solving two problems: the pawn moves off a white square, and creates a blockade against a possible breakthrough by the white king on the kingside. White's move is therefore clear:

1. h4

Now passive defence is hopeless for Black: 1 ... ♕c4 2 ♕e2 ♕b6 3 ♕e8, or 2 ... ♕f5 3 ♕d7+ ♕g6 4 ♕e8+ ♕h6 5 ♕c6 ♕d6 6 b6. The only alternative is a raid on the h4 pawn, but in this case White is able to drive the knight from b6.

1 ... ♕f5
2 ♕d2 ♕g4
3 ♕c3 ♕xh4
4 ♕d4 ♕g4!
4 ... ♕g3 5 ♕xe4 h4 6 ♕f5.
5 ♕xe4!

An important finesse: after 5 ♕xe4? h4 6 ♕e5 h3 Black gains a draw.

5 ... h4
6 ♕e5 ♕a4+
7 ♕e6 ♕g3
8 ♕d5
8 b6? ♕xb6 9 ♕xb6 ♕f2.
8 ... ♕f2
9 e4 ♕c3

There is nothing else, but the resulting queen ending is also lost for Black.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>b8♕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>♕f4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>♕c4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>♕d6+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

White's plan for realising his extra pawn (Palevich-Luznyak, 1981) is as follows: he ties the black king and bishop to the d8 square, and in the meantime his own king breaks through at f5.

1 ♕g1! ♕c5
2 ♕f3 ♕xf2
3 ♕d4 ♕g6

The pawn ending is lost for Black, but after 3 ... h5! (suggested by Zak) 4 gh g4 the diversion by the g-pawn makes White's winning chances problematic, e.g. 5 d6 g3 6 d7 ♕e7 7 h6 g2 8 ♕f3 ♕h4 9 ♕f5 ♕f2 10 h7 ♕d4 (10 ... gl♕ loses to 11 d8♕+ ♕xd8 12 h8♕+ and 13 ♕xg1) 11 ♕xd4 (the last chance) 11 ... gl♕ 12 d8♕+ ♕xd8 13
h8\text{\texttt{w}} + \text{\texttt{d}}7 14 \text{\texttt{w}}h7 + \text{\texttt{c}}8! (avoiding the trap 14 ... \text{\texttt{d}}6 15 \text{\texttt{h}}6 + \text{\texttt{c}}5 16 \text{\texttt{c}}6 + \text{\texttt{b}}4 17 \text{\texttt{b}}6 + \text{\texttt{c}}4 18 \text{\texttt{b}}5 + when the black queen is lost), and White has not achieved anything.

4 \text{\texttt{d}}6 \text{\texttt{g}}3
5 \text{\texttt{d}}7 \text{\texttt{c}}7
6 \text{\texttt{e}}6 \text{\texttt{a}}5
7 \text{\texttt{e}}5 \text{\texttt{f}}7

In the event of 7 ... h5 White would have won after 8 \text{\texttt{d}}6 hg 9 \text{\texttt{c}}7 \text{\texttt{b}}4 + 10 \text{\texttt{e}}6.

8 \text{\texttt{d}}6 \text{\texttt{b}}4 +
9 \text{\texttt{c}}5 \text{\texttt{a}}5
10 \text{\texttt{b}}7! \text{\texttt{b}}4 +

If 10 ... \text{\texttt{b}}6, then 11 \text{\texttt{c}}6 \text{\texttt{e}}7 12 \text{\texttt{d}}6 followed by 13 \text{\texttt{f}}5.

11 \text{\texttt{e}}5 \text{\texttt{e}}7
12 \text{\texttt{f}}5 Resigns

Black will have to give up his bishop for the d-pawn and he is unable to exchange his h-pawn for the g-pawn.

It is interesting to follow how in Sahović-Dordević, 1976, White transforms one type of advantage into another. The Achilles heel of Black’s position is his pawn at h6.

1 \text{\texttt{e}}5 \text{\texttt{f}}6
2 \text{\texttt{g}}4 + \text{\texttt{g}}7
3 \text{\texttt{f}}3

White’s plan is to penetrate with his king to g6.

3 ...
4 \text{\texttt{e}}4 \text{\texttt{d}}6
5 \text{\texttt{d}}5! \text{\texttt{e}}d +
6 \text{\texttt{x}}d5 \text{\texttt{b}}4
7 \text{\texttt{e}}6 \text{\texttt{e}}1
8 \text{\texttt{e}}3!

The knight switches to an ideal position.

8 ...
9 \text{\texttt{f}}5 + \text{\texttt{h}}7
10 \text{\texttt{g}}4

Now the superiority of the knight over the bishop becomes obvious.

10 ...
11 \text{\texttt{f}}7 \text{\texttt{c}}3
12 \text{\texttt{e}}7 \text{\texttt{b}}2
13 \text{\texttt{g}}8 \text{\texttt{h}}8
14 \text{\texttt{f}}6!

After 14 \text{\texttt{x}}h6 \text{\texttt{h}}7 15 \text{\texttt{g}}8 \text{\texttt{c}}3 16 \text{\texttt{f}}6 + \text{\texttt{h}}6 it is difficult to approach the g5 pawn.

14 ...
15 \text{\texttt{g}}6 \text{\texttt{e}}5
16 \text{\texttt{e}}4 \text{\texttt{g}}7
17 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{e}}5
18 \text{\texttt{f}}5 \text{\texttt{b}}2
19 \text{\texttt{x}}h6 \text{\texttt{c}}3
20 \text{\texttt{f}}7 + \text{\texttt{g}}8
21 \text{\texttt{h}}6 \text{\texttt{g}}7
Up till now we have been examining positions with a material advantage (an extra pawn with bishop against knight, or an extra pawn with knight against bishop). We will now turn to the realisation of a positional advantage.

At first sight here (Meduna-Rodriguez, 1980) it is hard to talk of any positional advantage. But in open positions a bishop is stronger than a knight. Black's plan is to create and fix weaknesses in the white pawns, restrict the mobility of the knight, and create invasion squares into the opponent's position.

1 ... e4!
2 h3 d5
3 h3 d6
4 e2 d7
5 f3

If the e-pawn is left in peace, Black will play ... f4 followed by ... 

f5, ... e3 and ... e4.
5 ... e5
6 gf d6
7 f1 e5+
8 f1 e5
9 d6 e4+
10 f1

If 10 d1 Black breaks through to the h3 pawn via e5-f6-g5-h4.
10 ... d2!

A strong move, severely restricting the knight's mobility.

11 g3

Any king move would have been met by 11 ... f4, when the knight has altogether no squares.

11 ... e4
12 g2 e5
13 h5+ e5
14 f1

The pawn ending is lost for White: 14 g3 xg3 15 xg3 h5!, when direct play for the creation of a passed pawn does not work:

16 h4 e4! 17 xh5 xf3 18 g5 f4 19 h4 e4! 20 h5 f3 21 h6 f2 22 h7 f1 23 h8 24 g6 f5+ 25 h6 h3+ 26 g7 xh8+ 27 xh8 d3 and Black wins. And after 16 f2 e4 Black wins thanks to his reserve tempi.

14 ... h4
15 e2 f4
16 d3

Here White could have made an attempt to break free – 16 g7 e7 17 e8 d4 18 c7.
Now 17 ... \( \text{\textit{f8}} \) is threatened.
17 \( \text{\textit{g7}} \) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \)
18 \( \text{\textit{c4}} \)

Passive tactics are fatal: 18 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) \( \text{\textit{f6}} \).
18 ...

The immediate 18 ... \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) does not work due to 19 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) \( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{e8}} \) and 21 \( \text{\textit{d6}} \).
19 \( \text{\textit{a4}} \)
20 \( \text{\textit{e8}} \) \( \text{\textit{b8}} \)
21 \( \text{\textit{a5}} \)

Otherwise the knight is trapped.
21 ...
22 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) \( \text{\textit{h6!}} \)

White is in zugzwang. He cannot simultaneously both save his knight and prevent the king from approaching the \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) pawn.
23 \( \text{\textit{b6}} \)

23 \( \text{\textit{g7}} \) would have been met by 23 ... \( \text{\textit{f6}} \) followed by ... \( \text{\textit{g5-h4}} \).
23 ...
24 \( \text{\textit{g7}} \) \( \text{\textit{e4}} \)
25 \( \text{\textit{f5}}+ \) \( \text{\textit{xf3}} \)
26 \( \text{\textit{h6}} \) \( \text{\textit{e5}} \)

26 ... \( \text{\textit{g3}} \) is more precise.
27 \( \text{\textit{xax5}} \) \( \text{\textit{g3}} \)
28 \( \text{\textit{f7}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf6}}! \)

Black avoids a trap: 28 ... \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) would have been answered not by 29 \( \text{\textit{xex5}}? \) \( \text{\textit{f2!}} \), but by 29 \( \text{\textit{g5}}! \) \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) 30 \( \text{\textit{e4}}+ \) and 31 \( \text{\textit{xf2}} \).
29 \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) \( \text{\textit{f3}} \)
30 \( \text{\textit{e4}}+ \) \( \text{\textit{xf4}} \)
31 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) \( \text{\textit{h4}}! \)

Accuracy to the end – after the careless 31 ... \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) 32 \( \text{\textit{h1}} \) it is impossible to win: 32 ... \( \text{\textit{g5}} \) 33 \( \text{\textit{g3}} \) \( \text{\textit{h4}} \) 34 \( \text{\textit{e4}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf3}} \) 35 \( \text{\textit{xa6}} \) \( \text{\textit{g4}} \) 36 \( \text{\textit{b5}} \) \( \text{\textit{f4}} \) 37 \( \text{\textit{d2}} \) \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) 38 \( \text{\textit{c4}} \) \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) 39 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \).
32 \( \text{\textit{h1}} \) \( \text{\textit{e3}} \)
33 \( \text{\textit{b4}} \) \( \text{\textit{e2}} \)
34 \( \text{\textit{c4}} \) \( \text{\textit{f1}} \)
35 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) \( \text{\textit{g2}} \)
36 \( \text{\textit{e4}} \) \( \text{\textit{g5}}! \)

Resigns

This position (from \textit{Ljubojević-Karpov}, 1981) is of a closed nature. The bishop is restricted by its own pawns, and so the knight becomes master of the position. Black’s plan is typical: he must create weaknesses in the white pawns, exchange queens, and then, exploiting the bishop’s lack of mobility, obtain a material advantage.

1 ...
2 \( \text{\textit{hg}} \)
3 \( \text{\textit{a3}} \)
4 \( \text{\textit{b3}} \)
5 \( \text{\textit{we4}} \)

\( \text{\textit{f5}} \)
Lesson Fifteen

6  ♖f2  ♔d7
7  a4  ♖c7
8  ♖c2

The invasion of the queen at a8 is incorrect, since as soon as the checks come to an end, White loses material: 8 ♔a8 ♔d3! 9 ♔a7+ ♖c8 10 ♔a8+ ♔d7 11 ♔b7+ ♖e8 12 ♔b8+ ♔f7 13 ♔b7+ ♔e7 and there is no defence against the check at f1 or the capture on b3.

8 ... ♔d8
9 ♖c1 g5!
10 fg

This exchange is in any event inevitable.

10 ... ♔xg5+
11 ♖c2 ♔e7
12 ♔b7 ♔d7
13 ♔e4 ♔f5!

After giving White a weak pawn at e5, Black exchanges queens.

14 ♔d3+ ♔c6

15 ♔xf5 ef!

Black takes with the pawn, to give his king access to e6.

16 ♔e3 ♔g6
17 e6

The pawn would all the same have been lost.

17 ... ♔d6
18 ♔g5 ♔xe6
19 ♔d3 f4!

By this elegant stroke Black forces the white king onto the h-file, whereas the decisive events will take place on the queenside.

20 gf h4 21 ♔e3 h3 22 ♔f3 ♔f5 23 ♔g3 ♔xf4! 24 ♔d8 ♔e2+ 25 ♔xh3 ♔d4 26 ♔xb6 ♔xb3 27 ♔d8 ♔e4 28 ♔g4 ♔d4 29 ♔f4 ♔xc4 30 ♔e4 ♔c3 31 ♔f6+ ♔c2 32 ♔e5 c4 33 ♔e3 c3 34 ♔f6 ♔c5 35 ♔e2 ♔b3 White resigns.

This concludes our acquaintance with certain ideas in minor piece endings.
LESSON 16
Rook against infantry
How to draw a pawn down in a rook ending

The concluding chapter in our endgame section is devoted to rook endings. We will first look at certain procedures in the battle between rook and pawns.

A rook rarely loses to a pawn, but here (from Troitsky, 1895) Black's king is blocking his rook's path to the 8th rank:

1 d7 e6+ 2 e5! (not 2 e7? e1+ and 4 ... d1+)
2 ... e5+ 3 e4 e4+ 4 e3 e3+ 5 d2 e2+ 6 c3, and the king proceeds to c7, where it escapes from the checks.

In such positions Euwe recommended using the rule of the "square", the side of the "square" being lengthened by the number of moves required by the black king to reach a point from which to control the pawn's queening square. In the given case two squares should be added to the "square" of the f5 pawn, and so the white king can step into the extended "square". But the direct 1 g7? does not win, since Black gains a tempo by attacking the rook (with the rook at a1 the win would be simple: 1 g7 f4 2 f6 f3
The correct method is to transfer the rook to the pawn’s queening square – then it will be supported by its own king.

1. \( \text{Ke1}+! \) \( \text{Kd3} \)

No better is 1... \( \text{Kf3} \) 2 \( \text{Kf1}+ \) \( \text{Kg4} \) 3 \( \text{Kg7} \) f4 4 \( \text{Kf6} \) f3 5 \( \text{Ke5} \) \( \text{Kg3} \) 6 \( \text{Ke4} \). when White approaches the pawn. Note the route taken by the white king – it must approach the pawn in such a way that the opponent’s king does not hinder it.

2. \( \text{Kf1} \) \( \text{Ke4} \)

White has gained an important tempo, and now his king can step into the extended “square”.

3. \( \text{Kg7} \) f4
4. \( \text{Kf6} \) f3
5. \( \text{Kg5} \) \( \text{Ke3} \)
6. \( \text{Kg4} \) f2
7. \( \text{Kg3} \) \( \text{Ke2} \)
8. \( \text{Kxf2}+ \)

The way to defend against two far-advanced connected pawns is by switching the rook to the rear of the leading pawn, and attacking the rear pawn with the king. Again the rule of the “square” can simplify the calculation: a draw can be achieved if the king enters the “square” of the rear pawn (the rook must already be attacking the queening square of the leading pawn). For the inattentive a trap lies in wait: the opponent may reverse the roles of the leading and rear pawns!

In this position by Maizelis (1939) Black has two ways to draw:

1. ("allocation of duties"): 1 ... \( \text{Kd1} \) 2 \( \text{g5} \) (2 \( \text{Kg2} \) \( \text{Kd6} \) 3 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{Kg6} \) etc) 2 ... \( \text{Khl} \) 3 \( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{Kb3} \) 4 \( \text{Kf4} \) \( \text{Ke4} \) 5 \( \text{Kf5} \) \( \text{Kd5} \) 6 \( \text{Kg6} \) (6 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{Khl5}+! \) ) 6 ... \( \text{Kle6} \) 7 \( \text{Kg7} \) \( \text{Kf5} \) 8 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{Kgl} \) 9 \( \text{h7} \) \( \text{Kxg6} \+)

2. ("cutting off the king"): 1 ... \( \text{Kd3}! \) 2 \( \text{g5} \) (2 \( \text{Kg2} \) \( \text{Kd6}! \) 3 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{Kg6} \) \( \text{Kf3} \) \( \text{Kxe5} \) 5 \( \text{Kf4} \) 4 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 3 \( \text{Ke4} \) 5 \( \text{gf5} \) \( \text{Kd5} \) 6 \( \text{g6} \) (6 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{Khl5}+! \) ) 6 ... \( \text{Kle6} \) 7 \( \text{Kg7} \) \( \text{Kf5} \) 8 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{Kgl} \) 9 \( \text{h7} \) \( \text{Kxg6} \+)

And now a similar example from tournament practice:
In Penrose-Perkins, 1972, White's problem was to allocate his duties correctly. The aimless 1 \( \text{c4? h3} 2 \text{d3 h2} 3 \text{c1 g3} \) leads to defeat. The rook must go the rear of the leading pawn:

1 \( \text{c8!} \)

Which pawn should be made the leading one? If 1 ... \( \text{h3} \), then 2 \( \text{h8 \text{f5} 3 \text{c4 \text{f4} 4 \text{d4 \text{f3}} \text{(4 ... g3 5 \text{h4+!) 5 \text{e5}, and White completes his regrouping.}} \)

The g-pawn gives Black more chances:

1 ... \( \text{g3} \)
2 \( \text{g8+ \text{f5}} \)
3 \( \text{c4 \text{f4}} \)
4 \( \text{d4! \text{f3}} \)

4 ... \( \text{h3} \) would have led to a position from a game Keres-Eliskases (1938), where Black ended up in a whirlpool: 5 \( \text{f8+ \text{e4} g2 7 \text{g8+ \text{h5 8 \text{h6} 9 \text{f6 \text{h7 10 \text{g3 h2 11 \text{h3+ \text{g8 12 \text{g3+ \text{f8 13 \text{a3 \text{c8 14 \text{e6 \text{d8 15 \text{d6 \text{c8 16 \text{c6 \text{b8 17 \text{b3+}, and White is ready to start all over again.}} \)

5 \( \text{h8+ \text{g2}} \)
6 \( \text{e3 \text{h3}} \)
7 \( \text{h8 \text{h2}} \)
7 ... \( \text{h2 8 \text{f4}} \).
8 \( \text{g8 \text{g2}} \)
9 \( \text{d2 \text{h1}} \)
10 \( \text{g7 \text{h2}} \)
11 \( \text{xe2} \)
Stalemate!

And now a few words about endings featuring rook and pawn against rook. The positions of Philidor and Lucena ("bridge-building") were studied in our earlier book, and so here we will examine some other theoretical positions.

The methods of play with a knight's pawn were studied in detail by Grigoriev in 1936. In particular, he considered positions in which the defender's king is cut off from the pawn. In this case the best defence is to keep the rook on the pawn’s queening square.

With the pawn at b5 (the position with the pawn at b6 and king at b5 is an easy win) Black loses even if it is him to move: 1 ... \( \text{d7} \text{(threatening to transpose into a drawn pawn ending after 2 ... \text{c8}) 2 \text{a5! \text{a8+ 3 \text{b6 \text{b8+ 4 \text{a6 \text{a8+ 5 \text{b7, and White promotes his pawn using the "bridge-building" procedure.}} \)

\[ 107 \]

With the pawn at b5 (the position with the pawn at b6 and king at b5 is an easy win) Black loses even if it is him to move: 1 ... \( \text{d7} \text{(threatening to transpose into a drawn pawn ending after 2 ... \text{c8}) 2 \text{a5! \text{a8+ 3 \text{b6 \text{b8+ 4 \text{a6 \text{a8+ 5 \text{b7, and White promotes his pawn using the "bridge-building" procedure.}} \)
If the kings and the pawn are moved one rank down the board, the position is now a draw: White is unable to ensure the advance of his pawn, e.g. 1 \texttt{a4} \texttt{a8}+ 2 \texttt{b5} \texttt{b8}+ 3 \texttt{a5} \texttt{a8}+ 4 \texttt{b6} \texttt{b8}+ 5 \texttt{a4} \texttt{a8}+ 6 \texttt{b5} \texttt{b8}+ 7 \texttt{a4} \texttt{a8}+ 8 \texttt{b3} \texttt{b8}, or 1 \texttt{c4} \texttt{d6} 2 \texttt{a4} \texttt{d5} 3 \texttt{c5+} 4 \texttt{d6} 4 \texttt{a5} \texttt{a8}+ 5 \texttt{b5} \texttt{b8}+ 6 \texttt{c4} \texttt{b7}, with the threat of answering 7 \texttt{b5} with 7 \ldots \texttt{c7}.

It should be noted that with the black king at \texttt{d4} (white pawn at \texttt{b4}) it is possible to cut off the king along the rank: 1 \texttt{c6}! \texttt{d5} 2 \texttt{a6} \texttt{d4} 3 \texttt{a4} \texttt{c4} 4 \texttt{c6+} \texttt{d5} 5 \texttt{b4}, and wins.

Cutting the king off on the e-file also does not lead to a win – 1 \texttt{d4} \texttt{e5} 2 \texttt{c3} (2 \texttt{d7} \texttt{e6} 3 \texttt{d4} \texttt{e5}) 2 \ldots \texttt{c8}+ 3 \texttt{c4} \texttt{b8} 4 \texttt{b6} \texttt{d5} 5 \texttt{a6} \texttt{c8}+ 6 \texttt{b3} \texttt{c6}! As in the previous example, if the black king is at \texttt{e4} it can be cut off along the rank – 1 \texttt{d6} \texttt{e5} 2 \texttt{a6} \texttt{d5} 3 \texttt{a4}, and the advance of the pawn is assured.

White has a guaranteed win if the black king has been driven onto any square on the f-file. There are two ways to win: 1 \texttt{e4} \texttt{f5} 2 \texttt{e7} \texttt{f6} 3 \texttt{a7} \texttt{e6} 4 \texttt{c4} \texttt{c8}+ 5 \texttt{b5} \texttt{b8}+ 6 \texttt{c5} \texttt{c8}+ 7 \texttt{b6} \texttt{b8}+ 8 \texttt{b7}, or 1 \texttt{c4} \texttt{c8}+ 2 \texttt{d5} \texttt{b8} 3 \texttt{c5} \texttt{c8}+ 4 \texttt{d6} \texttt{b8} 5 \texttt{b1} \texttt{f7} 6 \texttt{b5} \texttt{e8} 7 \texttt{b6} etc.

If a knight’s pawn is on the 3rd or 2nd rank, for a win the black king must be cut off on the f-file or g-file respectively.

Against a bishop’s pawn or central pawn, new possibilities appear, involving attacking the king with the rook from the side or the rear.

In this theoretical position by Averbakh (110), Black’s pieces are correctly placed for defence: his king is on the short side of the
pawn, and his rook on the long side. But a draw can be attained only if there are three files between the pawn and the rook. In the given case Black is able to regroup: 1 ... $b7+ 2 $d6 $b6+ 3 $d7 $b7+ 4 $d8 $b8+ 5 $c7 $b2 6 $f1 $a2! 7 $e7 $a7+, and White cannot escape from the side checks.

This is another theoretical position by Averbakh. Here Black defends by switching from the threat of rear checks to side checks: 1 ... $f6 2 $c6 $e2! 3 $d6 $e1 4 $d2 $a1!! 5 $f2+ $g7 6 $e7 $a7+. This combination of attacks from the rear and the side is highly effective, and is also applicable against a pawn on the 5th rank.

Against a pawn on the 4th rank the method of defending from the front is employed: 1 $c4 $c8+ 2 $b5 $d8 3 $c5 $c8+ 4 $b6 $d8! 5 $c5 $c8+ 6 $b4 $d8 7 $c4 $c8+ 8 $d3 $d8, and White cannot strengthen his position.

An important feature is that the black king should be at f5 or f6, so as not to allow the white rook to defend the pawn from e4.

In concluding this chapter, we should like to point out that rook endings occur more often than any others. Anyone who feels at home in them will become a confident endgame player. As an illustration of this, we will examine a practical ending from a junior event. Why from a junior event, and not a grandmaster one?
Because (we once again emphasize) in junior games one can find any required idea from the arsenal of modern theory.

Prokofiev-Gelin
Sports Schools Competition
Leningrad 1982
Sicilian Defence

1 e4 c5
2 d4 c6
3 d5 ed
4 dxe5 dx4
5 0-0 g6
6 0-0 f6
7 c4 d6
8 f3 wb6

The Dragon Variation is a frequent guest in junior tournaments. The tactical diversity, together with the strategical clarity of its ideas, make this system very popular, and the majority of young players try it out. In the present game Black chooses a rather rare continuation, and after prolonged thought White decides to avoid the recommendations of theory.

9 db5 wc7
10 dxe5 dx4
11 ed a6
12 dx6

Up till now all has gone in accordance with the recommendations of the Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings, which cites a game Bikhovsky-Stein (1965) where the continuation was 12 dx6 bc 13 dx6 db7 14 d4 dx4 15 wxd4 0-0 16 0-0-0 dx6 17 dc wxc6 with an equal game. Vasya Prokofiev, a 14-year-old Candidate Master from the Moscow Pioneers Palace, tries to find his own path.

12 ... ab
12 ... dxb2 is more critical, whereas now Black acquires a weakness at b5, which will subsequently tie him down.

13 wb4

White sets course for transposing into a technical ending.

13 ... 0-0

Black could have repaired his pawn chain, but in this case his king would have remained in the centre, e.g. 13 ... bc 14 xb7 ag8 15 dx6 bc5 160-0 followed by d4 and pressure down the e-file.

14 xc7 xc7 15 wxd4+ xg8 16 db4 wc4 17 c3!

An original and strong positional move. White voluntarily gives himself doubled pawns, but they will be difficult to get at, and the weakness at b5 will be a target for attack.

17 ... wd4
18 cd x5
19 e2 d8 20 xh5 c4

An incorrect decision. Up to this point White merely stood
better, but now he has an obvious advantage — the c4 pawn is doomed. Black should have played 20 ... \( \mathcal{b}f8 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
21 & \mathcal{B}xc4 & \mathcal{B}c \\
22 & \mathcal{B}c3 & \mathcal{B}c8 \\
23 & a4 & \mathcal{B}d7 \\
24 & \mathcal{B}c2 & \mathcal{B}f8 \\
25 & \mathcal{B}e3 & e6 \\
26 & a5 & \mathcal{B}b5 \\
27 & \mathcal{B}b4 & \mathcal{B}a6 \\
28 & \mathcal{B}c1 & ed \\
29 & \mathcal{B}xd5 & \mathcal{B}c6
\end{align*}
\]

After 29 ... \( \mathcal{B}d8 \) (to meet 30 \( \mathcal{B}b6 \) with 30 ... d5) White would have replied 30 \( \mathcal{B}e1 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
30 & \mathcal{B}b6 & \mathcal{B}e8 \\
31 & \mathcal{B}c3 & \mathcal{B}c7 \\
32 & \mathcal{B}xc4 & \mathcal{B}xc4 \\
33 & \mathcal{B}xc4 & \mathcal{B}c6
\end{align*}
\]

The rook ending is easily won for White.

\[
\begin{align*}
33 & \ldots & \mathcal{B}e7 \\
34 & \mathcal{B}c2 & \mathcal{B}d7
\end{align*}
\]

35 \( \mathcal{B}b5! \) \( \mathcal{B}e3 \)

36 \( \mathcal{B}b6 \) \( \mathcal{B}b3+ \)

37 \( \mathcal{B}a7 \) \( \mathcal{B}b5 \)

38 \( \mathcal{B}b8 \)

The raid by the white king is completed, and the b7 pawn falls.

\[
\begin{align*}
38 & \ldots & \mathcal{B}e6 \\
39 & \mathcal{B}c7 & \mathcal{B}xa5 \\
40 & \mathcal{B}xb7 & \mathcal{B}d5 \\
41 & \mathcal{B}c7 & \mathcal{B}xd4 \\
42 & \mathcal{B}xd6 & \mathcal{B}f5 \\
43 & b4 & \mathcal{B}e3 \\
44 & \mathcal{B}a7 & \mathcal{B}d5
\end{align*}
\]

If now 44 ... \( \mathcal{B}f2 \), White has a rook check followed by \( \mathcal{B}b2 \), while 44 ... \( \mathcal{B}b5 \) is most simply met by 45 \( \mathcal{B}a3+ \) and 46 \( \mathcal{B}b3 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
44 & \ldots & \mathcal{B}f2 \\
45 & \mathcal{B}a2+ & \mathcal{B}g1 \\
46 & h3 & \mathcal{B}b5 \\
47 & \mathcal{B}b2 & h5 \\
48 & g4 & \mathcal{B}b6+ \\
49 & \mathcal{B}e5 & \mathcal{B}e6 \\
50 & b5 & \text{Resigns}
\end{align*}
\]
LESSON 17
Kempelen’s invention – the chess automaton
A plan and its realization
Grandmaster Kotov’s formula

In the past one often heard stories about the unusual mechanised “Turk” which could play chess. The history of it goes back more than 200 years, but it still provokes admiration.

In the summer of 1769 the royal court in Vienna resembled an agitated beehive. All the courtiers could talk about nothing other than the chess automaton of Baron Kempelen. Before the eyes of the Austrian Empress, a clash had just taken place between the automaton and the best chess player at the court.

The automaton consisted of a wax figure of a Turk in colourful Eastern dress and with a turban on its head, seated at a large box-like table. On the table was an inlaid chess board, and the “Turk” moved the pieces with a mechanised arm. In addition, the “Turk” could nod its head (two nods signified a check, three signified mate) and smoke a pipe. The “Turk” had a clockwork mechanism, and after each twelve movements the inventor wound it up with a large key.

The Empress’s best player lost to the “Turk” fairly quickly. “It cannot be so! There is a man hidden in the box!”, was his wounded cry. At the demand of the Empress an examination took place. The doors of the box were opened, and the onlookers saw that the interior was filled with a complicated mechanism of rotating cogwheels, toothed gears and intricate levers and shafts.

Kempelen was richly rewarded by the Empress, and the fame of the chess automaton spread across the whole of Europe. For the next 35 years – right until his death in 1804 – Kempelen reaped the fruits of his invention. The mechanical “Turk” travelled all over Germany and visited Paris, London and Warsaw. Kempelen and his automaton were invited everywhere. Even the Russian Empress Catherine II from distant St Petersburg wanted to see the automaton for herself.

How was Kempelen able to fool the public for so long? After all,
no one was able to show that there was a man concealed in the box. One has to give Kempelen his due as a skilful constructor. The illusion of space inside the box was created by mirrors, arranged at appropriate angles, and also by special camouflaged partitions. The man hidden inside was therefore not visible, even when the doors of the box were opened.

The system for transmitting the moves of the hidden player was also very clever. Strong magnets were inserted in the pieces with which the game was played. Under all the squares of the chess board, metal spheres were threaded onto metal spokes. Each piece attracted the corresponding sphere.

Even after Kempelen's death the automaton enjoyed success. Maelzel became the owner of the "Turk", and there is a recorded account of the automaton having met Napoleon.

At a ceremonal reception in 1809 Napoleon played a game with the automaton. In an inferior position (in the box was concealed Johann Allgaier, the author of a famous book on chess theory) the Emperor decided to try to confuse the automaton, and made an illegal move. The "Turk" returned the piece to its square. Napoleon again repeated his mistake. The automaton corrected it a second time. But when the rules were broken for the third time, the "Turk" became angry, and with a movement of its arm threw the piece onto the floor. But Napoleon was very happy that he had managed to upset the mechanical miracle. Here is the game itself.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
1. e4 & e5 \\
2. \textit{\textit{W}}f3 & \textit{\textit{D}}c6 \\
3. \textit{\textit{A}}c4 & \textit{\textit{D}}f6 \\
4. \textit{\textit{D}}e2 & \textit{\textit{A}}c5 \\
5. a3 & d6 \\
6. 0-0 & \textit{\textit{A}}g4 \\
7. \textit{\textit{W}}d3 & \textit{\textit{D}}h5 \\
8. h3 & \textit{\textit{A}}xe2 \\
9. \textit{\textit{W}}xe2 & \textit{\textit{D}}f4 \\
10. \textit{\textit{W}}e1 & \textit{\textit{D}}d4 \\
11. \textit{\textit{D}}b3 & \textit{\textit{D}}xh3+ \\
12. \textit{\textit{D}}h2 & \textit{\textit{W}}h4 \\
\end{array}
\]

and White soon resigned.

The automaton's secret was revealed some twenty years later. Although many had already guessed that a man was concealed in the box, this was shown to be true only during a performance by the automaton in the American town of Philadelphia. When the "Turk" began playing against one of the spectators, a fire broke out in the hall. In fact the fire was fictitious, but the ensuing panic was genuine. The "Turk" also gave in to the panic. Despairing cries were heard.
from inside the box, and the automaton began to shake.

The secret of the mechanical chess player was exposed. The automaton was put in a museum, where in 1854 it was destroyed during a genuine fire. Thus closed a famous page in the history of chess.

We now turn to the question of planning, and we will first consider a plan involving active piece play.

This position arose in the game Bouaziz-Ribli (Leningrad Interzonal Tournament, 1979) after

1 e4 c5 2 d4 d6 3 d4 cd 4 d4 d6 5 d4 e6 6 dxe6 7 e7 8 f4 0-0 9 h1 h7 10 a4 c6 11 b3 b6 12 f3 b7 13 e1 b7 14 e3 e8 15 c1 (II/3)

White has played the opening passively, and Black has completed the mobilization of his forces without difficulty. But what plan should he now choose? Black decides to begin operations on the

15 ... d7

A flexible move; Black takes control of b6, c5 and e5, and in case of necessity his bishop can come out to f6.

16 g4?

The outcome of the game shows that this move is bad. Yet White has long been preparing it. All his preceding, rather passive, play has been involved with reinforcing his queenside, so as after the advance of the g-pawn to be fully ready to meet his opponent’s possible counterplay. But White has assessed the position incorrectly.

16 ... a5!

The changed situation on the board allows Black to switch from a somewhat abstract plan of play on the queenside to a fully concrete and deeply conceived operation in the centre. Its thematic basis is the position of the bishop at b7 vis-a-vis the white king. Black therefore takes energetic measures to open the a8-h1 diagonal. Here it is appropriate to cite grandmaster Kotov: “A unified plan in a game of chess is an aggregate of strategic operations, following one after another, each time fulfilling an independent idea stemming from the demands of the position on the board.”

17 a5 ba
While is manifestly inconsistent. He wishes to attack on the kingside and at the same time to defend on the queenside. With the bishop at e3 Black had the strong manoeuvre ... $\text{b6-c4}$. This can be prevented by moving the pawn to b3, but for this the knight at c3 has to be defended.

18 ... $\text{c5}$

But now Black masses his forces for an attack on e4.

19 $\text{b3}$

And White still continues the reinforcement of his queenside.

19 ... $\text{b8}$

A splendid queen manoeuvre, wouldn't you agree? The originator of such a regrouping was the Czech grandmaster Réti. Now there is a real threat to the e4 pawn: ... $\text{f6xc3}$.

21 $\text{g5}$ d5!

Black has carried out his plan; the opening of the long white-squared diagonal cannot be avoided.

22 ed

The variation 22 e5 d4 23 $\text{b1}$ d3! 24 cd $\text{xb3}$ favours Black.

22 ... ed

23 $\text{g2}$ $\text{e4!}$

Threatening 24 ... $\text{xd2}$ 25 $\text{xd2}$ d4, and White cannot play 24 $\text{xe4 de 25 g4 e3}$.

24 $\text{b1}$ $\text{xd2}$

25 $\text{xd2}$

The knight cannot take on d2, since after 25 ... $\text{a3}$ the c2 pawn falls.

25 ... $\text{b4}$

26 c3 d4!

This little combination crowns Black's efforts.

27 cb $\text{xf3+}$

28 $\text{g1}$ $\text{e2}$

29 $\text{xf3}$ $\text{xd2}$

30 $\text{xc8+}$ $\text{xc8}$

31 $\text{xd2}$ $\text{c1+}$

32 $\text{f1}$ ab

33 $\text{g2}$$\text{c2+}$

34 $\text{g3}$ $\text{f8}$

Resigns

In this game a weakening of the king's pawn screen (16 g4) and the passive play of the opponent allowed Black to plan a strategic operation aimed at opening the long white-squared diagonal. All his subsequent actions (queen manoeuvres, tactical blows) were aimed at carrying out this main plan. It is more difficult to choose a plan, and especially to carry it out, when the opponent does not make any obvious mistakes. But about this in the following lesson.
If today you ask anyone where you can play chess, you will be directed to the nearest chess club. But where was chess played 200-300 years ago, when there were no chess clubs?

The forerunner of modern chess clubs was the Café de la Régence. The famous philosopher and encyclopaedist Diderot wrote in 1762: “Paris is the place in the world, and the Café de la Régence the place in Paris, where this game (chess) is played best of all.”

Yes, it was in the Café de la Régence that the best chess players gathered. Among those to play there at various times were Philidor, Deschapelles, Saint-Amant, Staunton, La Bourdonnais, Anderssen, Morphy, Steinitz, Chigorin, Lasker, Capablanca and Alekhine. Visitors to the café, who came to watch the great players in action, included writers and public and political figures who were no less great. Among those to do battle at the chess tables of the Café de la Régence were Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Franklin, Danton, Robespierre, Napoleon, Turgenev and Kuprin.

A chess atmosphere pervaded the café. The ceiling was made in the form of a chess board, the walls were decorated with chess pieces, and the names of famous players were written in gold. The Café de la Régence was firmly established as part of the everyday life of Paris. Here is one of the curious stories associated with the first chess club.

“At the end of the last century the comic opera Defeat Philidor! by Adame Drotaque was staged in Paris. The action takes place in the Café de la Régence in 1777. A young musician Richard asks for the hand of the lovely Dorée, daughter of the café owner, Monsieur Budinot. Dorée agrees. But the intractable father makes a “small” condition: Richard has to defeat Philidor. The suitor is in despair – this is equivalent to a refusal. Philidor himself comes to his aid. He decides to save the lovers by losing to Richard. The game begins. The wretched Richard
has no suspicion of his formidable opponent’s intentions; he is terribly nervous and plays so badly that Philidor has to be careful that he doesn’t win the game by accident. Suddenly, from a neighbouring room, the sounds of a familiar song are heard. It is his, Philidor’s, music. The singer is Dorée. She is hoping to distract the great chess player, but things take an unforeseen turn. The composer listens, forgets his intentions and ... wins the game against the luckless suitor. The latter is inconsolable. Then the noble Philidor resorts to an extreme measure. He threatens to move to another café, if Budinot will not allow Dorée to marry Richard. The owner cannot afford such a loss, and, to general rejoicing, he is forced to give his agreement to the marriage.

Thus Philidor, one of the founders of French comic opera, a hundred years later became one of its heroes!" (From an article by Henkin in 64—Shakhmatnoye Obozrenie, 1980.)

During the era of stormy political passions which shook France in the later 18th and early 19th centuries, the Café de la Régence served as a release for many political figures. Robespierre, after becoming head of the Jacobin government, would call into the café to play chess. Incidentally, this factor saved the life of one of his political opponents. Once Robespierre lost to a pleasant-looking youth, and got out his purse in order to settle up—in those days they always played for a stake. But, in a voice shaking with emotion, the youth said: “You have lost, but my stake is a person’s life.” And with these words he handed Robespierre an order to free the Marquis de Méroury, who had been sentenced to death. “Who are you?”, Robespierre demanded threateningly. “His fiancée!” —and the young man removed his wig. Before Robespierre, dressed up as a man, sat a blonde, curly-haired girl. Robespierre signed the order.

With the passage of time, all the historic chess relics disappeared from the Café de la Régence, and after the two World Wars of the 20th century the café was turned into an ordinary restaurant. But the Café de la Régence will be remembered in chess for ever.

We turn to an examination of games in which neither player makes any obvious positional mistakes. This factor makes the choice of a strategic plan considerably more difficult. Usually in such situations the method of step-by-step planning is used (grandmaster Kotov’s formula).
This position was reached in the game Rubinstein-Duras (Carlsbad, 1911) after 1 c4 e5 2 ∆c3 ∆f6 3 g3 ∆b4 4 ∆g2 0-0 5 ∆f3 ∆e8 6 0-0 ∆c6 7 ∆d5 ∆f8 8 d3 h6 9 b3 d6 10 ∆b2 ∆xd5 11 cd ∆e7 12 e4 c5 13 dc ∆xc6 14 d4 ∆g4 15 d5 ∆e7. Today the English Opening is one of the most popular ways of beginning the game. In Rubinstein's time (and mainly thanks to him) the theory of this opening was only beginning to be developed. In the opening Black committed two inaccuracies. The exchange of knights on move 10 led to a spatial advantage for White on the queenside (10 ... g6 was better). And Black's last move was also a poor one, since the knight is passively placed at e7. A more suitable post for it would have been d7 (after ... ∆b8-d7). However, the drawbacks to Black's 15th move become clear only after Rubinstein's brilliant reply.

16 ∆d3!!

The start of a delicate strategic concept. White plans to transfer the knight via d2 to c4 (after first ensuring its safety by playing his pawn to a4), then double rooks on the c-file and post his bishop at a3, reckoning that on the queenside Black has less space and will be unable to parry his opponent's numerous threats. At the same time the queen move to d3 prevents possible counterplay by Black on the kingside. 15 ... ∆e7 was no doubt played with ... f5 in mind, but now this is impossible, since after 16 ... f5 17 ∆h4! Black has to exchange on e4 (17 ... f4 is impossible due to 18 gf ef 19 ∆d2 g5 20 ∆d4), which allows White to obtain a splendid attacking position. Therefore Black is doomed to passivity.

16 ... ∆d7
17 ∆d2 ∆h3
18 a4 ∆xg2
19 ∆xg2 ∆eb8

Black does not wish to die of suffocation, and so he does his utmost to hinder White's plan. But in view of the changed situation, Rubinstein too makes slight corrections to his actions.

20 ∆c4 b5
21 ab ∆xb5
22 ∆a3 ∆g6
23 ∆fa1 a6
24 ∆cl ∆b7
25 ∆e3 f6
Thus White has completely tied down his opponent. But how is he to realize his advantage? After all, Black is staunchly blocking all the points of invasion. Strokes of genius are always simple. Rubinstein establishes that Black’s defensive hero is his queen. It follows that, if it is exchanged, his opponent’s defences will collapse.

27 \textit{\textbf{N}}! \textbf{D}c8

28 \textbf{d}d2 \textbf{W}b4

The game is practically decided. Now comes the technical phase:

31 \textbf{xc}4 \textbf{xc}4
30 \textbf{xc}4 \textbf{ab}8
31 \textbf{d}d2

In this game Black did not make any vital mistakes. But his at first sight slight strategic omissions (10 \ldots \textbf{xd}5, 15 \ldots \textbf{e}7) allowed White to carry out a positional squeeze on the queenside.

But how do you form a plan when you cannot discern any either tactical or positional inaccuracies by the opponent? In this case too there are proven recommendations.
LESSON 19
A World Champion’s advice
Pressurizing in chess

This position arose in the game Karpov-Timman (“Tournament of Stars”, Montreal 1979) after
1 e4 d6 2 d4 d5 3 c3 g6 4 g3 g7 5 g2 0-0 6 e2 e5 7 0-0 a6 (116).

Before handing over to the World Champion, we will turn once again to Kalov’s formula, which states that “a unified plan in a game of chess is an aggregate of strategic operations, following one after another ...” In the games examined earlier, an obvious mistake (16 g4, Bouaziz-Ribli) and an imperceptible inaccuracy (10 ... d5, Rubinstein-Duras) disturbed the positional equilibrium on the board. Interesting in this respect is the strategic pattern of the Karpov-Timman game, in which Black does not make a single anti-positional move, but nevertheless loses both the opening and the middlegame battles.

Karpov adheres to the method of accumulating slight advantages. Each such slight advantage on its own does not prevent any danger to the opponent. But their aggregate leads to a big positional advantage. And so, over to Karpov:

“To all appearances, the knight move to a6 is not the best solution. Now any attempt to bring this knight into play will involve either giving up the centre (the exchange ... ed), or a considerable loss of time. For the moment these considerations may seem rather too general, and even abstract in nature. But as the middlegame approaches, and particularly in the middlegame itself, the scattered state of Black’s forces will cause him much inconvenience.

8 e1 c6
9 h3

A typical prophylactic move in
such situations. White restricts the opponent’s bishop, and at the same time creates on the kingside a “no-go area” also for the remaining minor pieces.

9 ... $e_8$

All Black’s hopes of obtaining counterplay are associated with pressure on the e4 pawn.

10 $e_5$

Again a typical device, which pursues the same aim – the accumulation of small advantages. Then all these imperceptible factors merge together to form that superiority of one set of pieces over another, which is customarily called a positional advantage. When Black has the given pawn formation in the centre, this bishop move is frequently played both in the King’s Indian Defence, and in the Pirc Defence. On the other hand, the pin on the knight is highly unpleasant, especially since by 11 $w_d2$ White threatens to enforce it for a long time, and in general restrain the development of Black’s entire kingside. And, on the other hand, Black has constantly to reckon with the possibility of $h_6$. It was evidently all these considerations which forced my opponent to make his next move.

10 ... h6

11 $e3$

Now for the mobilization of his forces White has economized on one tempo ($w_d2$ will involve an attack), and this will also play a certain role in the general offensive.

11 ... $c_7$

Black is quite unable to attend to the off-side position of his knight. Thus on 11 ... ed there follows 12 $x_d4$ c5 13 e5 $h_7$ 14 ed $w_xd6$ 15 b4 $a_6$ 16 b5 cb 17 $x_b5$ with clearly the better chances for White. One thing that is indisputable (with regard to the move ... $c_7$) is that that movement of this powerful piece always reflects markedly on the position, and therefore a post for it must be sought with particular care. If there is no necessity, as, for example, in the present case, this should in general not be hurried. It follows that Black should perhaps have restricted himself to the prophylactic 11 ... $h_7$ – since all the same this move will have to be made sooner or later!

12 $w_d2$ $h_7$

Now on 12 ... ed White would reply 13 $x_d4$, since all the same Black has to waste a tempo on the defence of his h6 pawn.

13 $a_d1$

Thus White has emerged from the opening with both a lead in development and a more expedient arrangement of his forces.

13 ... $d_7$ (117)
On the threshold of the middle-game it is always useful to weigh up the resources of both sides, and to make adjustments to one's initial plans. Here I sank into thought, and soon came to the conclusion that straightforward play in the centre would not get me anywhere. Now, with the aim of seizing fresh territory, the kingside pawns must be advanced. But I did not wish to play 14 f4 immediately. It would be illogical to increase the tension straight away – all the same White will subsequently have to play g4, so why not first utilize a resource for strengthening the position, such as g4 and \( \text{g}3 \)? At the same time, White also solves an important strategic problem – he reinforces his e4 pawn.

14 g4 \( \text{h}ad8 \)
15 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \)

The advance f4 can be radically prevented only by ... g5, but Black's position is not yet so bad for him to decide on such a desperate measure.

16 f4

While Black has been completing the mobilization of his forces, White has succeeded in carrying out in full his projected plan. Black has some highly unpleasant problems to solve. He can prevent the further advance of the kingside pawns only by opening the centre, but this will lead to a further increase of White's spatial advantage. In the end Timman made the move which I most expected of him in this situation.

16 ... b5

One of Timman's favourite moves, but here, since White is not yet weakened on the queenside, it is very easy for him to neutralize his opponent's threats.

17 a3 b4 ?!

Having lost the battle on the kingside, the Dutch grandmaster wishes at any price to initiate complications on the other parts of the board. All the same it would have been more sensible not to break up his pawns, but to stick to waiting tactics, since now White can advantageously transpose into any endgame. In the game, it is true, things do not come to that ...

18 ab \( \text{xb}4 \)
19 \( \text{d}ce2 \)

Black's idea was somehow to bring his pieces together, by
playing ... a5, ... a6, ... ed and ... c5, but this is a lengthy process.

19 ... ed

In the event of 19 ... a5 Black was justifiably afraid of the consolidating reply 20 c3. But his last move signifies something even more. By surrendering the centre, Black as though acknowledges that he has lost the opening battle. The strategic initiative is now totally on White's side. Also pretty cheerless was 19 ... c5 20 fe de (20 ... cd loses a piece) 21 d5.

20 sec4 a5

White's subsequent plan essentially reduces to preventing the opponent's pieces from coming into play.

21 c3 a6 (118)

22 wc2!

A subtle move, which, firstly, prevents the black knight from moving to c5 (in view of the reply b4!), and secondly, continues the previous strategic policy of strengthening the e4 pawn.

22 ... a7

Intending nevertheless to play ... dc5, for which the c6 pawn must be defended in advance (23 ... dc5 24 b4 cb 25 cb de6).

23 af3 e7

23 ... dc5 no longer works because of 24 e5. Perhaps Black should have decided on 23 ... c5, although it is true that in this case the knight at a6 has the appearance of a "living reproach".

24 af2

One of the last prophylactic moves. Prior to his decisive offensive, White places his pieces in the most harmonious way possible, and ... once again reinforces his forepost at e4!

24 wc2! wc7

In the event of 25 ... wc8 Black suffers heavy loss of material after 26 e5.

25 wc2!

Another subtle move, which essentially concludes the game. Black is unable to defend his queenside weaknesses, while 26 ... wb2 clearly fails to 27 eb1, trapping the queen.
26 ... $\triangle c7$
27 $\textit{e}xa5$ $\textit{e}dd7$
28 b4 $\triangle e6$
29 e3 c5
30 f5 $\triangle d8$
31 b5

For "complete happiness" it remains for White to play c4, to achieve domination over the whole board.

31 ... $\textit{e}h8$
32 $\textit{e}f2$ $\textit{c}c7$
33 $\textit{e}a4$ $\textit{b}b8$
34 c4

White's pieces have completed their great work. All that remains is for him to shoot gently, but accurately, at the goal.

34 ... $\textit{a}a7$
35 $\textit{e}xa7$ $\textit{e}xa7$
36 e5 de
37 $\triangle xe5$ $\textit{a}a2$
38 $\textit{a}xc5$ "Resigns"

Karpov conducted this entire game in one breath: the consistent restricting of the opponent's counterplay, the gradual seizure of space, and the preparation of active measures.

Let us sum up. In the Bouaziz-Ribli game there was a relatively simple strategic plan, the realization of which demanded purely technical measures. In the classic example of a complex strategic plan (Rubinstein-Duras) White's deep ideas were put into effect by outwardly harmless, but essentially crushing, far-sighted manoeuvres. And in our times, in a sharp clash, Karpov was able to create a model example of limiting the opponent's possibilities. The World Champion employed pressurizing over the entire board – the most modern, dynamic strategic plan, based on taking account of the most subtle tactical nuances in the position, and on a consistent realization of individual positional operations.

A variety of ideas, and a variety of ways of handling the middlegame. But these examples give a fairly clear impression of the complex art of planning. Learning to form a good plan is a difficult matter, and it is to this problem that the next few lessons will be devoted.
As is the case in other fields, chess has non-periodic and periodic literature. The non-periodic relates to books (games collections, opening guides, handbooks, studies of certain questions of theory, and so on). The periodic publications are chess magazines (usually monthly), of which there are now more than a hundred in the world. The first chess magazine appeared in 1836.

When at the height of his powers, La Bourdonnais took a great step towards chess immortality by becoming the founder and editor of the magazine *Le Palamède*. The magazine immediately became popular, and within a year it had 260 subscribers, which was very many for those times. The subscribers also included foreign chess enthusiasts, in particular the Russian masters Petroff and Jaenisch. The magazine was also read by Pushkin, and in his library the first issues of *Le Palamède* have been preserved.

The first chess magazine was published for three years - almost right up to the death of La Bourdonnais. But the idea of *Le Palamède* quickly found followers. In 1837 the *Philidorien* appeared in London, in the early 1840s Saint-Amant revived *Le Palamède*, and Staunton became editor of the *Chess Player's Chronicle*.

This time marks the start of chess journalism. And all top players regard it as a matter of honour, if not to edit a magazine or write a column for a newspaper, then at least to write articles for chess periodicals.

In the Soviet Union the main chess magazines are edited by World Champion Anatoly Karpov (*Shakhmatnoye Obozrenie*), Grandmaster Yuri Averbakh (*Shakhmaty v SSSR* and *Shakhmatny Bulletin*) and Grandmaster Aivar Gipslis (*Shakhmaty* - the organ of the Latvian Chess Federation).
This example (Hort-Dolezhal, 1962) is a fairly simple one. After 1 fe fe 2 \( \text{Wxf8} + \text{Exf8} \) 3 \( \text{Exf8} + \text{Qg8} \) 4 \( \text{Axe5} \) \( \text{Wg4} \) 5 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Wg5} \) 6 \( \text{Af4} \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 7 \( \text{Axd6} \) \( \text{Ad2} \) 8 \( \text{Exg8} + \) Black resigned. But it is with this game fragment that we begin our discussion on positional evaluation.

It was Wilhelm Steinitz who first developed a method for evaluating a position. He would first divide a position into elements, then compare the characteristic elements for White and for Black, and only after this form an opinion on the position, choose a plan, and begin searching for a specific move. Modern praxis has developed many features of the Steinitz theory, and today an evaluation of a position includes an analysis of the following basic elements: material balance; the existence of direct threats; placing of the kings, their safety; the centre, the existence of a spatial advantage; the control of open files, diagonals and ranks; active placing of the pieces; pawn structures, weak and strong squares.

As a result of a study of these elements, a player makes a static evaluation of the position, chooses a plan, and then starts calculating variations and searching for a specific move. From being static, the evaluation must be transformed into a dynamic one, taking account of all tactical nuances in the position.

In accordance with this method of positional evaluation, let us examine the position in diagram 119.

**Material balance**

The two sides have equal forces, only one exchange having taken place.

**The existence of direct threats**

Neither side appears to have any immediate threats, although the e5 square obviously draws one's attention.

**The placing of the kings, their safety**

It is obvious that the white king is not threatened in any way, whereas Black's has grounds for disquiet: the bishop at b2 is striking with an "X-ray" beam along the a1-h8 diagonal, which should have been parried by the
black bishop. But the latter has found itself on the extraneous square h6. The black king’s other defenders are also arranged rather awkwardly, and one senses a certain weakness of the back rank.

**The centre and space**

The pawn at d5 gives White not only an advantage in the centre, but also a certain gain of space. This latter factor eases White’s manoeuvring freedom, and restricts the manoeuvring possibilities of black pieces.

**Control of open files, diagonals and ranks**

The position is a closed one, and there are no open lines (apart from the black queen’s empty diagonals, which are of no importance).

**Active placing of the pieces.**

Here even a brief glance at the position is sufficient to determine White’s advantage. It is evident that his heavy pieces are contemplating operations along the f-file, the bishop at b2, as already mentioned, has long been threatening the black king, and the knight at d3 has the e5 and f4 squares under attack. One senses the general preparedness of the white pieces for active measures. At the same time the black pieces are positioned on their own, without mutual support. The bishop at h6 makes a particularly pitiful impression.

**Pawn structure, weak and strong squares**

The basic characteristic of this position is the existence of pawn chains. In themselves the pawn chains here are without defects – there are no weak (backward or doubled) pawns. It cannot be said that there are any weak points in the position. For example, White has concentrated three attacks on e5 (one pawn, two with pieces), but Black is holding e5 with two pawn defenders. Jumping ahead, we should say that the final evaluation of the position shows that Black’s e5 square is after all weak.

Let us sum up the first results of our acquaintance with the position. Our analysis of all the elements has shown that White has a spatial advantage, his pieces are ready for action along the f-file and the long diagonal, and the black king’s residence is weakened. In the remaining elements of the position one observes approximate equality. It follows that White’s plan should include opening up the position and attacking the king – in this case the defects in Black’s
position will tell.

From a static evaluation of the position, let us now turn to a dynamic one: to a search for a specific move and an assessment of the opponent's counterplay. Which move leads to an opening up of the position? Only $1\text{ fe}$.

Black replies $1\text{ ... fe}$ with an attack on the white queen. The queen has no retreat, there only remains $2\text{ wxf8+} \text{ xf8} 3\text{ hxf8+} \text{ g8}$. As a result White has two rooks for a queen. At the same time the black king looks tightly shut in at $\text{ h8}$, so that a smothered mate directly suggests itself. But a smothered mate is given by a knight: can a white knight reach $\text{ f7}$? It can! He must take on $\text{ e5}$ with his bishop, and after $\text{ ... de}$ play $\text{ dxe5}$ with a simultaneous attack on the queen at $\text{ d7}$ and the $\text{ f7}$ square (this is where the weakness of the $\text{ e5}$ square tells). Let us check whether Black has any deviations -- $1\text{ fe}$, but then $2\text{ dxe5 fe} 3\text{ wxf8+}$ etc.

This means that in the main variation Black cannot take on $\text{ e5}$; but all White's threats remain in force. $1\text{ fe}$ can be played!

Of course, in a tournament game such reasoning would be very much shortened. A good player would find $4\text{ dxe5}$ in a couple of minutes. But the thought process, the direction of search, and the switching from one element to another are all shown pretty clearly in this example.

In many positions there is no question of one side having a real advantage. The correct evaluation of a position more often leads to the conclusion that in the given situation White (for example) has a slight advantage in the placing of his pawns (there are the preconditions for the creation of a piece outpost), while in other respects the position is equal. Very well, for the forming of a plan it is quite sufficient to have a guide, such as the creation of a piece outpost. If this can be achieved, the advantage will be further increased, and the changed situation will suggest a new plan.

We will now turn to a study of the individual elements in the evaluation of a position.
Is it of any significance that White is a pawn down?

An easy question, with a quick answer. Black’s extra pawn is of no significance. After 1 ßxe4! ßxe4 2 ßg5 ßg6 White gave mate in Saunina-Chekhova, 1980, by 3 ßxh7+! ßxh7 4 ßxf7.

We will begin examining positions with unequal material. So as not to complicate the examples too much, we have chosen positions in which the difference in force does not exceed one pawn. But the methods of play in these positions are of a universal nature.

The evaluation of any position begins with a calculation of the material balance. If material is equal, the accent will be on the other elements of the position. But if the material balance has been disturbed, one must first answer the question: “Has the opponent any positional compensation for the missing pawn?”

This position arose in the first game of the 1937 Euwe-Alekhine match. Within a few moves White wins a pawn, for which Black does not gain any compensation. It is instructive to follow how Euwe realizes his extra pawn, suppressing the counterplay of his famous opponent. The annotations are by Max Euwe.

16 ... ba
A move which I did not even consider, since it breaks up Black's pawns. 16 ... b6 is correct, with the idea of gaining a good position after 17 cwd5 cwd5 18 cwd5 wxe5!, when 19 wxe6 is bad in view of 19 ... ec8 20 wa4 (20 wb7 ec7 and the queen is trapped) 20 ... ec4 etc. The best reply to 16 ... b6 would have been 17 cwd5 cwd5 18 wxe3, retaining a slight initiative.

17 cwd5 cwd5
18 wce5 wce5
18 ... wc8? 19 cwd5 and 20 wc4+.

19 wc5 g5

Black no longer has any satisfactory continuation. He wishes to unpin his knight, but in doing so he weakens his kingside. 19 ... wb6 came into consideration, although White could have won a pawn by 20 wxb6 ab 21 axa6.

20 wce3 wce5

To exchange one of the white bishops. It is true that Black loses a pawn, but this is already inevitable.

21 axa6 axg2
22 axg2 ef7
23 fa1 wd6
24 wxd6 fd6
25 axa7 axa7
26 axa7 dc4

Black has gained some counterplay, but it is insufficient to save the game.

27 wc5 we6
28 wd4 wxe2
29 wxf6 g4
30 df1!

Not 30 fc7+ fc8 31 exd5 wc3+ 32 df3 wxc4 33 wxe2 wxe6, when Black wins a piece.

30 ... ec2
31 fg7+ fg8
32 exd5 axb2
33 wb2

Played on the correct supposition that the resulting rook ending is won for White. Here there were also other good continuations, but simplification is correct in principle.

33 ... wxb2
34 wc4 wb6
35 we2 fe7
36 fh4 g6
37 fh4 fb3
38 wc4 wb6
39 we3 fe5
40 g4+ we6
41 f4 wd5
42 fd4+ we6
43 f5+ we7
44 we4+ fe7
45 h4 fb1
46 fe4 wc1
47 a4 h6
48 a7+ g8
49 g5 wc4+
50 we5 Resigns

In view of the threat of axd6, it is unlikely that Black could have
realized his material advantage by quiet methods in Demin-Skuya, 1981. Here the main feature in the evaluation of the position is not Black’s extra pawns, but the remoteness of the white pieces from their king and the weakness of the f1 square. The trial variation 1 ... $\text{Qe3+}$ 2 $\text{Wxe3?}$ $\text{Ef1+}$ 3 $\text{Wxf1}$ $\text{Wxf1}$ mate determines the course of Black’s searchings. The problem is solved by blows based on diversion and interference:

1 ... $\text{Eb3!}$

If now 2 $\text{Wxb3}$ $\text{Ec1!}$, and the way to the f1 square is cleared. In the event of 2 $\text{Ee6}$ $\text{Ec3}$. 3 $\text{Exf8}$ $\text{Ec4}$ Black wins a piece while maintaining his attack (4 $\text{Ec3}$ $\text{Ec1+}$ 5 $\text{Ec1}$ $\text{Ec1}$ 6 $\text{Ee1}$ $\text{Ec3+}$ 7 $\text{Eb1}$ $\text{Ee2}$), while 2 $\text{Wel}$ is met by 2 ... $\text{Ef3}$. 3 $\text{Ed1}$ $\text{Eg5}$. 4 $\text{Eg2}$ $\text{Eh2}$. Therefore White resigned. It is very important to be able to break away from the narrow-mindedness of material acquisition.

You do not have to be a great expert to decide here that White is rather ridiculed by his extra pawn (Romanishin-Lyebovich, 1968). His queen is attacked and the deadly 1 ... ba is threatened. But even in this critical situation Romanishin’s imagination finds a way to save the game.

1 $\text{Wd8+}!$

This is not a gesture of despair, but the prelude to an original combination.

1 ... $\text{Exd8}$

2 $\text{Exd8+}$ $\text{Ee8}$

3 $\text{Eg5!!}$

This is the point. The routine 3 $\text{Eh6}$ would have lost after 3 ... $\text{Ca8}$, but now 3 ... $\text{Ca8}$ does not work because of 4 $\text{Eg6}$. And only in the event of 3 ... $\text{Eg7}$ does there follow 4 $\text{Eh6+}$ $\text{Eh6}$. 5 $\text{Exf8}$ with a material advantage.

3 ... $\text{Ec7}$

Black hurries to close the 7th
rank, and also the a2-g8 diagonal in the event of $4 \text{\textit{\&e7? \&e6}}$. But now White is able to initiate perpetual motion.

$4 \text{\textit{\&h8+! \&xh8}}$

$5 \text{\textit{\&f8+ \&g7}}$

$6 \text{\textit{\&f7+ \&h8}}$

$7 \text{\textit{\&f8+ Drawn}}$

The material equality in this position (A.Petrosian-Hazai, 1971) is only temporary: Black’s a5 pawn is very weak, and in time White can eliminate it. After $\text{\textit{\&d2, \&b3, \&c3, \&a4, \&a2, \&c1, and \&b3 he picks up the a5 pawn at his own convenience}}$. Black is not able to prevent this, so one can understand him playing the trappy

$1 \text{\textit{... \&b6}}$

with the hope of setting up a fortress after $2 \text{\textit{\&xb6?}}$. And can you imagine Black’s joy when his opponent’s ‘grasping instinct’ operated:

$2 \text{\textit{\&xb6?? \textit{\&xb6}}}$

Instead of continuing with his initial plan, White imagined that his queen would be able somehow to break through the pawn barrier.

$2 \text{\textit{... cb}}$

$3 \text{\textit{h4}}$

White’s hope of opening the h3 square for his queen is unrealizable.

$3 \text{\textit{... gh}}$

$4 \text{\textit{\&d2 h3!}}$

$5 \text{\textit{gh h4!}}$

A unique fortress has been set up. Drawn.

Thus, when the opponent has no compensation for his missing pawn (Euwe-Alekhine), the plan involves gradual simplification. Quiet ways of realizing an extra pawn are not always possible, and sometimes it is best to continue an attack on the king (Demin-Skuya). Situations often arise where a pawn (plus or minus) is of no significance. The situation on the board may force a player to burn his boats in the search for a last chance of escape (Romanishin-Lybovich and A.Petrosian-Hazai). In general, material equality (or inequality) is an important factor in the evaluation of a position, but by no means the only one.
LESSON 22
From Bilguer's Handbuch to the Encyclopaedia
The Berlin Chess School
The second evaluation principle: "What is threatening me?"

From the early 19th century chess life in Germany began developing rapidly, and this became especially marked after the 1830s. Chess Codex (1813-14), a work by Johann Koch, became very popular, and in 1832 a book by Julius Mendheim, Problems for Chess Players, was published. The problems resembled positions by Stamma: the win involved forcing combinations.

After Mendheim’s death in 1836, the leader of the Berlin Chess School became Ludwig Bledow (1795-1846). It is with his name that the first victories by German masters in international tournaments are associated. Bledow won matches against both Jaenisch and Mongredien, and held his own with Löwenthal. Not long before his death Bledow founded the magazine Schachzeitung. Here is an example of play by the leader of the Berlin chess players.

Horwitz-Bledow
Berlin 1837
Italian Game

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 c4 c5 4 c3 Nc6 5 d5 e5 6 dxe5 d6 7 Bb5+ Bd7 8 Bxc6+ bxc6 9 Bxd7+ Kxd7 10 Be2

After the introductory 1 Qxc8, Mendheim wanted Black to play 1 ... Wxf6? (1 ... Wxc8 is correct), when he gives a pretty combination: 2 Wxa7+! Kxa7 3 Qb6+ Kb8 4 Qxd7+ Qc7 5 Qxf6 and 6 Qxh5. Among later generations, the best known of the Berlin Pleiades was another of its members, Paul von Bilguer (1815-1840). He began work on a theoretical reference book on the opening and endgame, which became something of an
encyclopedia of chess knowledge. Bilguer’s reference book consisted of tables with opening variations, and the additional lists, explanatory games and evaluations of variations made the work very popular. Incidentally, Bilguer’s method was used as the basis in compiling the five-volume *Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings* — the widely published reference work of the 1980s. Bilguer’s premature death cut short his work on the *Handbuch* (as the book became known), and it was completed by von der Lasa in 1843. The *Handbuch* was the chess player’s reference work for almost a hundred years. The last, revised edition of the *Handbuch* was produced by Hans Kmoch in 1930.

The name of Tassilo von der Lasa (1818–1899) is also remembered with gratitude by his successors. Thanks to his efforts, chess players were able to see the works of Lucena, Damiano and Greco. Von der Lasa compiled an extensive chess library, numbering more than two thousand titles, and in 1897 his book *The History and Literature of Chess* was published.

Apart from Bledow, Bilguer and von der Lasa, the rest of the seven Pleiades were Horwitz, Hanstein, Mayet and Schorn. Their chess activity and practical successes led to the centre of European chess life gradually shifting to Germany.

We will now talk about positions containing veiled threats. The second question that a player usually asks himself when starting to evaluate a position is roughly: “What is threatening me?”

\[
\text{In Sandrin-Dragun, 1980, Black's three extra pawns led him to lose his vigilance; otherwise, instead of attacking the queen, he would have thought about reinforcing his kingside. His blunder was immediately punished:}
\]

\[
1 \text{ } \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}xg6+!}
\]

The roles are reversed, and Black resigned, since after \(1 \ldots fg\) he is mated by \(2 \text{ \textit{\textbf{R}}f8+ \textit{\textbf{g}}7 \text{ \textit{\textbf{H}}f7+ \textit{\textbf{h}}6 \text{ \textit{\textbf{H}}h8+ \textit{\textbf{g}}5 \text{ }5 \text{ }h4.}\]

The next position (from Karpov-Korchnoi, 1981) is well known to many chess enthusiasts. It arose after White’s 34th move in the second game of the match for the World Championship. The World Champion has gained a decisive
positional advantage. The weak points at a7, c6 and d4 require constant defending, and White is now threatening 35 We5 followed by 36 Cc5, when 36 ... Cxc5 37 Wxc5 Ea8 is met by 38 De5, winning the d-pawn. The only way for Black to prolong his resistance was by 34 ... Ea8, but he hurried to take control of the transition square e5, overlooking that the advance of the f-pawn took away the defence from the apex of the c8-e6-g8 triangle.

34 ... f6?

Karpov immediately carries out a little diverting combination.

35 Exa7!

Now 35 ... Exa7 fails to 36 Wxe6+ and 37 Wxc8. Although Black continued to resist for a further 20 moves, he was unable to change the course of the game: 35 ... Wd5 36 Ea5 Wd7 37 Ea7 Wd5 38 Ea5 Wd7 39 We4 f7 40 Wf5 Re8 41 Eh2 Wb7 42 a3 Ed8 43 h4 h5 44 Ef2 Wd7 45 Ea6 We8 46 Wxa5 Eg6 47 Cd3 Eh7 48 Wb6 Ec8 49 a4 Ef5 50 a5 c5 51 bc Exd3 52 cd Wxc5 53 Ea7 Wg6 54 Ec7 Wxc7 55 Wxd3 56 Wxd4 De5 57 Exe5 Resigns.

Fairly often the most ‘correct’ strategic plans are refuted by tactical means. In Borloy-Karsa, 1979, White decided to capture the pawn on d6. His pieces are lined up as though on parade. White’s plan of 1 ed! Wxd6 2 Exc5 Wc6 3 De4! Exel 4 Exel Ef7 5 Wxc3 followed by d5 and Eb2 would have been above all praise, had it not been for a slight nuance. Black is by no means obliged to fall in with his opponent’s wishes.

1 ed We3!!

The order on parade is disrupted. After the unanticipated, but now forced, 2 Exe3 fc 3 Wd3 ef 4 Ef1 (4 dc Eh1 5 Ef1 Eh3)4 ... Eh3 5 f4 Ef1 6 Wxf1 Eh1 White resigned.

What, one might ask, prevented White from playing Ef4 on his first move?
In Miles-Schneider, 1980, we meet another variety of veiled threat. Black ended up in a trap at the end of a forcing variation.

1 \textit{\bigcirc}xf8+! \textit{\bigcirc}xf8
2 \textit{\bigtriangleup}e7+ \textit{\bigtriangleup}h7
3 \textit{\bigtriangleup}xf8 b2

It is here that the secret is revealed.

4 \textit{\bigtriangleup}g6!

Mate is threatened, and in the event of 4 ... fg Black loses his rook. He therefore resigned. To be fair, it should be mentioned that earlier too Black was unable to avert the mating threats. For example: 3 ... \textit{\bigheartsuit}e1 4 \textit{\bigheartsuit}f5! b2 5 \textit{\bigheartsuit}g6 fg+ 6 hg mate, or 4 ... g6+ 5 \textit{\bigheartsuit}e5! b2 (5 ... gh 6 \textit{\bigheartsuit}xf7+ \textit{\bigheartsuit}h8 7 \textit{\bigheartsuit}f6 \textit{\bigheartsuit}f1+ 8 \textit{\bigheartsuit}f5 b2 9 \textit{\bigheartsuit}g6) 6 \textit{\bigheartsuit}xf7+ \textit{\bigheartsuit}h8 7 hg \textit{\bigheartsuit}xe4+ 8 \textit{\bigheartsuit}f6!.

Let us sum up. In all four examples the underestimation (or overlooking) of the opponent’s threats had serious consequences. A player should not for a second forget about possible threats, and even in the apparently most quiet positions, with the most natural continuations, before finally deciding on his move he should once again ask himself: “What is threatening me?”
LESSON 23
The first international chess tournament
The third evaluation principle: king safety

In our day the number of tournaments is so great that at times many of them are simply not known to chess enthusiasts. Every year in the world some two hundred international tournaments are held, not counting those involving ladies or juniors, as well as team events and various national championships. But in the long list of the most imposing chess tournaments, one stands apart. This is the first international tournament, from which the enumeration of all the others begins.

It was in the mid-19th century. The matches between France and England, the victories of representatives of the Berlin Pleiades, and the appearance on the chess horizon of strong players from other countries gave rise to the idea of holding an international tournament. Back in 1843 Ludwig Bledow had suggested arranging such a tournament in Trier: the interest in a meeting of the best players from various countries was extraordinarily strong.

It was during the International Industrial Exhibition in London from 26 May to 15 July 1851 that the tournament took place. The initiator and organizer of it was Howard Staunton, and the arrangements for it were undertaken by the St George Chess Club. Funds for the tournament were collected by subscription, and in addition each participant paid a substantial fee. The battle began with sixteen players: Anderssen, Horwitz, and Mayet from Germany, Löwenthal and Szen from Hungary, Kieseritzky from France, and Staunton, Wyvill, Williams, Captain Kennedy, Bird, Newham, Lowe, McLeod, Brady and E.Kennedy from England (the last two were included in place of the Russian players Jaenisch and Schumov, who failed to arrive). For various reasons von der Lasa, Saint-Amant and Petroff were absent.

The tournament was conducted under a curious system. The pairings for the first round were drawn by lots. The opponents played three games against each other, draws were replayed, and the time
for thought was not restricted, but in one day a game was not to last more than eight hours. Then the pairings for the second round were drawn by lots (winners met winners and losers met losers). On this occasion the 'mini-match' consisted of seven games. Continuing on the knock-out system, the semi-finalists and then the winner of the tournament were determined. Subsequent international tournaments were played on the all-play-all system, since the experience of London showed that random pairings distorted the final results. Thus in the very first round the tournament winner knocked out Kieseritzky, one of the strongest players. Incidentally, the increase in the number of games in the second round very much helped Anderssen - he began his quarter-final match with two defeats (against Szen), but then won four games in a row.

Anderssen's reports in the *Deutsche Schachzeitung* make interesting reading: "Battle commenced on 27 May at 11 o'clock in the morning. Things are not particularly comfortable. The tables and chairs are small and low. The sides of the large boards stick out on both sides of the tables. There is no place for the players to record their moves. And there is nowhere to lean one's elbows on the table. However, these discomforts do not bother the English. Straight as a candle the Englishman sits, both thumbs in his waistcoat pockets, and there he sits, immobile, sometimes for half an hour, staring at the board, as he considers his move. Sometimes his opponent will have sighed a hundred times, when suddenly, with a quick and decisive movement, the Englishman makes his move."

Anderssen met Staunton - his main opponent - in the semi-final, and defeated him 5-1. He wrote very benevolently about Staunton: "Defeats did not affect in any way the calm, cheerfulness and courtesy of my opponent. I never noticed in him the slightest trace of vexation - a sign of a great player. If Staunton did not display his former strength in the tournament, this was solely because he had rather got out of the habit of playing on equal terms, since for many years he had been dealing with opponents to whom he always gave odds."

It cannot be said that Anderssen particularly distinguished himself above his opponents. In the final he met Wyvill, who did not number among the best players of his time. After six games the score was 3-2 in favour of Anderssen (with one game drawn). Here is the decisive game, which brought Anderssen the glory of winning the first international chess tournament.
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Anderssen-Wyvill
Sicilian Defence

1  e4  c5
2  d4  a6
3  a4  d6
4  d3  e6
5  ge2  g6
6  0-0  ge7
7  f4  0-0
8  d2  d5
9  0-0  c4
10  d3  d4
11  d4  d4+

This position resembles one from the Closed Variation of the Sicilian Defence. Here the capture with the pawn (11 ... cd) looks more promising.

12  h1  d7
13  ed  xc3?

And this is a positional blunder. The black-squared bishop — here the most important piece — should not have been exchanged.

14  xc3  ed
15  f6!

Anderssen immediately discovers the weak link in Black’s position.

15 ...  e8
15  ...  c6 is adequately met by 16 eel e8 17 w2 followed by 18 xc7. The move played allows White to carry out a fine combination.

16  f5!  xf5
17  xfx5!  gf
18  Wh5

There is no satisfactory defence against the threat of 19 g5.
18  ...  d6
19  Wh6  xf6
20  xg6  Resigns

This tournament began the ascendancy of Anderssen’s star.

We will now examine several positions, the chief factor in the evaluation of which will be the dangerous position of one of the kings.

In the Russian Federation Boys’ Championship (lagunov-Khrenov, 1981) White’s concluding attack drew widespread attention for its instructional nature: 1 xg7+! xg7 2 h8+! xh8 (2 ... f7 3 f8 mate) 3 Wh6+ g8 (3 ... h7 4 Wh8 mate) 4 xh6+, and in view of 4 ... f7 5 xg7 mate Black resigned.

Was it difficult to find this pretty combination? Not particularly, since the evaluation of the position should directly suggest the idea of searching for a concluding blow.
This is the approximate course of reasoning.

In the material sense the two sides are equal. Black is directly threatening the white queen, which cannot move away from c1; White is threatening to win the exchange by $\text{Qxf6+} \text{xf6}$, $\text{xf6}$. The white king is relatively safe, whereas Black’s is being attacked by five or six white pieces. In the centre White’s position is better, and he has more space on the kingside. White controls the important open lines running in the direction of the black king (the g- and h-files, and the c1-h6 diagonal). White’s pieces are much more actively placed, especially his knights and rooks. The pawn formation has allowed White to create knight outposts at d5 and e6, which are much more important than Black’s outpost at c4. Thus White has an obvious advantage, and he is all prepared for an offensive. It is evident that Black’s defences are holding together at g7 – this is a weak point in his position. Therefore White’s searches are directed in the first instance towards destroying the fortress ($1 \text{Qxg7+}$), after which he uses the conventional device of ‘invasion’ ($2 \text{h8+} \text{h6+}$) and brings into play his ‘ambush’ force ($4 \text{Qxf6+}$).

In the concluding position White has an enormous advantage in the vital sector: a queen and two knights against rook and king.

How the black rook reached f2 is hard to imagine, but this factor gives Black a won position (Ghinda-Gogolya, 1981) – the white king comes under the simultaneous fire of five black pieces. $1 ... \text{Qxf3} 2 \text{gf} \text{xh2+! 3 c1xh2} \text{g3++;+!}$ White resigns.

Here too the chief factor in the evaluation of the position – the uneasy situation of the white king – allowed Black to seek a mating combination.
This position (Plyasova-Vilimane, 1981) is rather more difficult to evaluate. At first sight there seems to be equality, which Black can disturb by winning a pawn (1 ... cxd1+ 2 cxd1 dxc2). But in this case Black would be letting his opponent off too lightly. He has available a combination based on the fact that the rook at b4 is not protecting the first rank. 1 ... c3! 2 bc (2 ed8 el+) 2 ... cxd1+ 3 f1 d3. The ability to spot such nuances comes with practice.

In Idesis-Bolshunov, 1980, Black has an undisputed positional advantage: all the elements of the position point to this. But how is he to realize his advantage? He could of course play 1 ... b6 followed by ... b4, expanding his territorial gains on the queenside. But the quickest way to win is via an attack on the king, exploiting the paralysed state of the white pieces. 1 ... f3! (the prelude to a queen sacrifice) 2 d4 gf! 3 x3 ef 4 ed2 (4 ee1 xel 5 xel fe) 4 ... xd2 5 xd2 fe 6 d1 (6 fe f2+ 7 xf2 el+) 6 ... ed 7 xd2 ec2, and White resigned.

In Kaiszauri-Roten, 1981, there is no doubt about which side has a positional advantage. The f6 square acts like a magnet to White: if his e4 knight reaches there, it will fork the black queen and rook. 1 fg5+! fg (1 ... dg8 2 xf6+) 2 f3+ g8 3 fg6+ xf6 4 xf6 Resigns (4 ... xe3 5 xe3).
LESSON 24
Creator of combinations
The Immortal Game of Adolf Anderssen
Victories in chess tournaments

The rapid development of chess thinking in the mid-19th century gave birth to its heroes. The most striking and undoubtedly the strongest European player between the 1850s and 1870s was the unsurpassed master of combinations Adolf Anderssen (1818-1879).

Anderssen's merit is not only that he gave a countless number of combinational solutions in the most varied positions. He not only raised the tactical weapon to new heights, but also began creating the preconditions for positionally based combinations. It was on the games of Anderssen, and in his meetings with him, that Steinitz developed his mastery, and they provided food for thought about his new theory.

Anderssen's combinational play was incomparable. His games have a sense of impetus, inspiration, and all-conquering energy. Anderssen's opponents only had to fall behind in development, delay castling, be diverted by pawn-grabbing and so on, when sacrifices would follow, clearing a way for the pieces to attack the king.

### Rosanes-Anderssen

**Breslau 1860s**

**King's Gambit**

1. e4       e5
2. f4       d5
3. ed       e4
4. \( \text{b5}+ \)       c6
5. dc       \( \text{xc6} \)
6. \( \text{c3} \)       \( \text{f6} \)
7. \( \text{e2} \)       \( \text{c5} \)

Black sacrifices a second pawn, but brings into play all his reserves - this is how Anderssen always played.

8. \( \text{xe4} \)       0-0
9. \( \text{xc6} \)       bc
10. d3       \( \text{e8} \)
11. \( \text{d2} \)

Rosanes intends to castle long, but there too he comes under the fire of the black pieces. 11 \( \text{f3} \) could have been met by 11 ... \( \text{a6} \)

12. \( \text{e5} \)       \( \text{xe4} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{d6} \) with the threat of 14 ... f6.

11. ...       \( \text{xe4} \)
12. de       \( \text{f5} \)
13. e5       \( \text{b6} \)
14. 0-0-0       \( \text{d4} \)
Having skilfully provoked a weakening of the enemy king's pawn screen, Black prepares the decisive blow. Now 17 cd is not possible because of 17 ... \textit{\textbf{W}}xd4, with mate at a1.

17 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{W}}xb3!
18 ab \textit{\textbf{W}}xb3
19 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e3+!

\textbf{White resigns}

Almost all the games played by Anderssen are known. They number about eight hundred, but the most famous have become his clashes with Kieseritzky and Dufresne.

\textbf{Anderssen-Kieseritzky}
\textbf{London 1851}
\textbf{King's Gambit}

1 e4 e5 2 f4 ef 3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c4 \textit{\textbf{W}}h4+ 4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f1 b5 5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 6 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{W}}h6 7 d3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}h5 8 \textit{\textbf{Q}}h4 \textit{\textbf{W}}g5 9 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f5 c6 10 g4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 11 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g1! cb 12 h4 \textit{\textbf{W}}g6 13 h5 \textit{\textbf{W}}g5 14 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g8 15 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xf4 \textit{\textbf{W}}f6 16 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c5 17 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d5! \textit{\textbf{W}}xb2 18 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d6! \textit{\textbf{Q}}xg1 19 e5! \textit{\textbf{W}}xal+ 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a6 21 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xg7+ \textit{\textbf{Q}}d8 22 \textit{\textbf{W}}f6+! \textit{\textbf{Q}}xf6 23 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e7 mate.

Hundreds of pages have been devoted to this game in chess books and magazines. We will mention only that, firstly, it was one of a series of friendly games played in the foyer of the London tournament. And secondly, it is typical of Anderssen's style of play. All the time Kieseritzky set little traps, whereas Anderssen tried at any cost to obtain a lead in development and thus create the preconditions for combinations. His contemporaries called this the "Immortal Game".

\textbf{Anderssen-Dufresne}
\textbf{Berlin 1852}
\textbf{Evans Gambit}

1 e4 e5 2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c6 3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c5 4 b4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb4 5 c3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a5 6 d4 ed 7 0-0 d3 8 \textit{\textbf{W}}b3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g6 10 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g7 11 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a3 b5 12 \textit{\textbf{W}}xb5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb8 13 \textit{\textbf{W}}a4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b6 14 \textit{\textbf{Q}}bd2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b7 (14 ... 0-0 is more consistent) 15 \textit{\textbf{Q}}e4 \textit{\textbf{W}}f5 16 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd3 \textit{\textbf{W}}h5 17 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6+!gf 18 ef \textit{\textbf{Q}}g8 19 \textit{\textbf{Q}}ad1 \textit{\textbf{W}}xf3 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe7+! \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe7 21 \textit{\textbf{W}}xd7+! \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd7 22 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f5++! \textit{\textbf{Q}}e8 23 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d7+ \textit{\textbf{Q}}f8 24 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe7 mate.

Steinitz regarded this game as "an evergreen in the laurel wreath of famous German masters", while Chigorin judged Anderssen's concluding combination to be "one of the most brilliant combinations that has ever occurred in the practical games of famous players".

It was by no means always that Anderssen succeeded with such splendid attacks. On some occasions he himself became the victim of unexpected combinations. He got carried away in his search for spectacular solutions, at times took unjustified risks, and initiated complications in positions which were
insufficiently ripe for this. In addition, he did not like defending, and felt less confident when playing Black.

Zukertort—Anderssen
Berlin 1865
King's Gambit

1 e4 e5 2 f4 ef 3 Qf3 g5 4 Qc4 g4
5 0-0 We7 6 Qc3 gf 7 d4 d6 8 Qd5
w7d 7 9 Wxf3 c6 10 Wxf4 Qd8
11 Wg3 (Zukertort sets a trap, into which Anderssen falls) 11 ... c6?
(11 ... Qe6 was correct) 12 Wxg8!
xg8 13 Qf6+ We7 14 Wxg8+
xg8 15 Qf6+ Qe7 16 Qx7 Qxd7 Qxd7
17 Qg5+ Resigns.

The life of Adolf Anderssen was notable for its methodicalness. He was born and grew up in a poor family in Breslau. In 1836 he finished school and entered the local university. His university education allowed Anderssen to teach mathematics and German in a Breslau school. Teaching work became the main feature of his life, and in time he was awarded the title of professor. Anderssen learned to play chess at the relatively early age of nine, but until the 1840s he did not gain any notable success. In 1845-46 he began to take an intense interest in chess. He analysed the games of the old masters, studied books and sought out strong opponents. Fairly soon Anderssen became recognized as a player of striking, combinational style, and the Berlin Chess Society recommended him as one of their delegates to the first international tournament. Anderssen took an exceptionally serious attitude to his participation in the London tournament.

In the Spring of 1851 he broke off his teaching work, and moved to Berlin to prepare for the tournament.

After his success in London, Anderssen won many more chess tournaments, and in particular he was winner of the prestigious 2nd international tournament (London 1862). In the subsequent years Anderssen played several matches (against Morphy, Kolisch, Zukertort, Paulsen and Steinitz), and took first place in the strong international tournament in Baden-Baden (1870). In 1877 Anderssen's 50th chess jubilee was celebrated. A special congress was held in Leipzig, and chess enthusiasts came from various German towns.

Anderssen has gone down in history as an outstanding representative of the combinational school. His fame was eclipsed only by that of Morphy. It has to be said that in Anderssen's games (especially those of later years) one can see a striving for unity, a blend of combinational and positional methods. A striking example is provided by the following clash.
Anderssen—Paulsen
Vienna 1873

Spanish Game

1 e4 e5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 ed 4 xf4 d6 5 h5 d7 6 xc6 xc6 7 g5 f6 8 c3 e7 9 0·0·0·0
10 be1 e8.

This position is not unknown in modern tournament practice.

11 d7 (135)

The commentators unanimously condemned this move. 11 ... d7 was better. Now Anderssen, an acknowledged master of attack, gives his opponent an isolated pawn, and conducts the game by purely positional methods!

Not 14 ... de because of 15 xe7+ xe7 16 xe5!, when the bishop is lost, but significantly better was 14 ... c6 15 xe7+ xe7! 16 ed xd6 17 xd6 cd, with sufficient counterchances. White would probably have answered 14 ... c6 with 15 c4, threatening 16 xc7, but here too Black could have clarified the situation by 15 ... de 16 xe5 f6 17 xc6 xd4 18 xd8 xe1 19 xe1 xd8 20 xc7 xf2.

15 ed cd
15 ... xd6 16 xc7!

White has assured his outpost at d5, and he now launches an offensive on the kingside, while at the same time suppressing Black’s activity on the queenside.

19 ... d7 20 a3 f7 21 h3 a6
22 g4 e8 23 f4 e6 24 g5 b5 25 h4 e8 26 d3 b8 27 h5 a5 28 b4! ab 29 ab xf5 30 xf5 f7 31 d3 d7 32 e4 f5 33 h1 e8 34 ef6+!

White’s excellent positional play is crowned by a combination.

34 ... gf 35 xf6+ h7 36 xe7+ g7 37 xg7+! xg7 38 xe8+ b8 39 xf5+ xf5 40 xd6, and White won on the 54th move.

Anderssen was admired by his contemporaries. And more than a hundred years later we too, as chess descendants of Anderssen, never tire of enjoying his combinations. Wilhelm Steinitz wrote about him: “This was the greatest master of all times”, words which have been confirmed by the passage of time.
LESSON 25
The fourth evaluation principle: the centre
Grandmaster Razuvayev’s thesis

Any element in the evaluation of a position influences the choice of plan. But one of the most universal plans is centralization, based on seizing the central squares with pawns and pieces.

This position arose in the game Razuvayev-Plachetka (1981) after the opening moves

1  d4  d5
2  c4  c6
3  Qc3  Qf6
4  Qf3  Qc
5  a4  Qa6
6  e4

The line of the Slav Defence chosen by Black leads to the surrender of the centre, but in return for this he hopes to complete his development without hindrance. In choosing his plan, White decided that initially he must do everything possible to strengthen his position in the centre. Later he would be able to choose more specific operations. It is interesting to follow how White’s centralization strategy leads to success.

6  ...  Qg4
7  Qxc4  e6
8  0-0  Qb4
9  Qe3  Qe7
10  Qe2

This is by no means a loss of time, but the start of a three-move manoeuvre, the aim of which is to centralize the knight.

10  ...  0-0
11  h3  Qh5
12  Qe5!  Qxe2
13  Qxe2  Qd7
14  Qc4

It stands to reason that White will not exchange his strong knight, and he prepares to invade with it at d6.

14  ...  Qc7
15  Qa1  Qad8
White's last four moves have been typical of centralization strategy: his rooks have occupied the main files, and his bishop has secured control of the g3-b8 diagonal.

The triumph of White's centralization strategy. He has complete control of things in the centre of the board, and the advance of the d-pawn enables him to cramp the black pieces still further and to begin a direct attack on the king.

In the event of 31 ... \( \text{fxd6} \) the knight at e4 completes an almost round-the-world journey: 32 \( \text{fxd6} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 33 \( \text{xf7+} \) \( \text{h7} \) 34 \( \text{xg5+} \) and 35 \( \text{xf3} \).

This move completes the strategy of centralization. Against the threat of 33 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 34 \( \text{h4+} \) gh 35
Leuon Twenty-Five

... mate there is practically no defence.

... Resigns

The situation in the centre can decisively affect the overall evaluation of a position, and can accordingly dictate the plan of play not only in the opening or middlegame, but also deep into the endgame.

In this position material is level (Spassky-Ljubojevic, 1979), there appear to be no direct threats, and the kings are completely safe. Nevertheless White has a decisive positional advantage, thanks to his complete control over the central squares, and by means of a little combination he wins by force:

1. \textit{Bxe6!}

Now Black cannot cope with the avalanche of white pawns; after 1... \textit{Bxe6} 2 \textit{Aa6+} \textit{Bd7} 3 \textit{Bxf5} the pawns cannot be stopped. In the game Black did not take the rook, but this too failed to save him.

1. ... \textit{Bxc5} 2 \textit{Bxf5} \textit{Bxc3} 3 \textit{Bxd6+} \textit{Bb6} 5 \textit{Bxb7+} \textit{Bxb7} 6 e6 \textit{Bc7} 7 \textit{Ba7+} \textit{Bb6} 8 \textit{Ba8} Resigns.

In the evaluation of a position, the centre plays a highly important role. The different varieties of pawn and piece placings in the centre, and the plans following from them, must be studied in great detail.

The concept of the ‘centre’ is closely linked to the concept of ‘space’. The player who controls more territory usually has an advantage.

In the game Polugayevsky-Torre (Moscow 1981) for the sake of the gains provided by an advantage in space White has sacrificed a rook(!). The play developed as follows:

1. ... \textit{Cxe5} 2 \textit{Axc4} \textit{Bxe4} 3 \textit{Axe7} 4 \textit{Bf6} \textit{Bf8} 5 \textit{Bf3} \textit{Bf4} 6 \textit{Bxe6} \textit{Bd8} 7 \textit{Bf6} \textit{Bd6} 8 \textit{Bf4} \textit{Bxd4} 9 \textit{Bd3} 10 \textit{Bd5+} \textit{Bd6} 11 \textit{Bxd4} cd 12 \textit{Bb3} \textit{Bc2} 13 \textit{Bxe4} \textit{Bxd5} 14 \textit{Bb3+} \textit{Be5} 15 \textit{g4} \textit{Bf4}.
This is a mistake, caused by time trouble. 15 ... d3 16 d2 d4 was correct, with possibilities of a defence.

16 g6! e3 17 g7 c8 18 f1 d3 19 g2 f4 20 h6 Resigns.

Often an advantage in the centre and an advantage in space complement one another.

White obviously stands better (Gurgenidze-Novopashin, 1981). He has an advantage in the centre and on the queenside, his pieces are covering the important files and diagonals, and in addition the black king is far from safe. All this allows White to obtain an absolute positional superiority by combinational means.

1 d5! gh
2 d6! hg+
3 xf3 e2
4 xf2 xc4

If 4 ... xf1 5 xf1, and there is not time for 5 ... d8 because of 6 xf6 xf6 7 xf6+ e8 8 xe6

\[ \text{\textit{Lesson Twenty-Five}} \]

\[ 5 \text{ xf6} \]
\[ 6 \text{ xf6+} \]
\[ 7 \text{ xc4} \]
\[ 8 \text{ xg7} \]
\[ 9 \text{ xa4} \]
\[ 10 \text{ a7} \]

Resigns

An advantage in space is provided not only by pawn chains, dividing the chess board into two unequal parts. Occupation of the central lines and the seizure of territory on one of the flanks can also give a spatial advantage, and a fairly considerable one.

In Gligorić-Yusupov (1981) it is interesting to follow how, by a series of technical procedures, Black transforms his positional advantage into a decisive attack on the king.

1 ... dxf4! 2 xf4 xf4 3 g3 g5! 4 e1 db4! 5 f2 e7! 6 a3 wc5 7 d2 df5 8 w3 g4 9 wb5 db8.

Having gained a decisive advantage, Black makes an inaccurate
move. After 9 ... gf 10 \textit{\texttt{w}}e8+ \textit{\texttt{c}}c7
11 \textit{\texttt{d}}d8+ \textit{\texttt{c}}c6 12 \textit{\texttt{ed}}d1 fg+ the

game would have concluded.
10 \textit{\texttt{h}}h4 \textit{\texttt{wx}}xe5 11 \textit{\texttt{w}}e8+ \textit{\texttt{a}}a7 12
\textit{\texttt{dd}}d1 \textit{\texttt{e}}e4 13 \textit{\texttt{xe}}xe4 \textit{\texttt{w}}xe4 14 \textit{\texttt{w}}f8
\textit{\texttt{w}}c6 15 \textit{\texttt{d}}d2 c3! 16 bc \textit{\texttt{w}}xc3 17
\textit{\texttt{dd}}d1 \textit{\texttt{c}}c2 18 \textit{\texttt{w}}d8 \textit{\texttt{f}}f2 White resigns.

Thus the centre and a spatial
advantage are very important ele­
ments in the evaluation of a position.
A plan can often be based on them,
leading to the seizure of the central
squares or to an increase in terri­
torial gains.
LESSON 26
Paul Morphy – the uncrowned World Champion
The match with Anderssen
Morphy in the eyes of his successors

We once again return to the history
of chess, or more precisely to the
last century, to the 1860s.
It is impossible to talk about
Morphy without admiration and
sympathy. He staggered the world
by literally within a few months
becoming invincible, and then sud-
denly declining any further chess
battles. The fate of the uncrowned
champion, who soon after his tri-
umph fell ill with a nervous dis-
order, provokes genuine sympathy
even today, more than a hundred
years after the death of this chess
genius.

Paul Morphy was born on 22nd
July 1837 in New Orleans. His
father was a member of the supreme
court in the State of Louisiana.
Morphy followed in his father’s
footsteps – he became a lawyer,
but he was unsuccessful in this
profession, although he possessed
a remarkable memory and capa-
bilities. In particular, it was said
that he knew by heart all the laws
of the State of Louisiana (more
than a thousand articles of the civic
code). It is also known that Morphy
was fluent in four languages. Young
Paul learned chess at roughly the
age of ten. A few of his early games
have been retained, played against
adult opponents – guests of his
father.

**Morphy-Rousseau**
New Orleans 1849
**Latvian Gambit**

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 c4 f5 4 d3
5 f4 0-0 6 d6 f6 7 d5 ed 8 dxc6
9 

10 ... fe.

On 10 ... h6 Morphy wanted to
sacrifice his queen: 11 wh5+ g6
12 xd5 gh 13 df6 mate.

**11 Wh7+ ed7 12 Wh6+Wh7 13
Wxe5+ Wd6 14 Wxd6+ Wxd6 15
Wf7+ We6 16 Wh8 ed 17 cd Wh6
18 b4 We6 19 We1 Wh8 20 Wh2+
Wg5 21 Wh5+ Wh6 22 Wc1+ g5
23 Whg5, and White won.**
The next eight years were spent on the completion of his education (college and then university), and during this time Morphy became firmly established as the best chess player in New Orleans. In 1857 the first American chess congress was held, with the strongest masters competing. Morphy's victory in the tournament made him champion of America. He was so confident in his powers that he was ready to play a match against any member of the New York Chess Club giving the odds of pawn and move. That Morphy had grounds for this is shown by the following game.

**Schulten-Morphy**  
*King's Gambit*

1 e4 e5  
2 f4 d5  
3 ed e4  
4 d3 f6  
5 d3 b4  
6 d2 e3!

This move by Morphy has gone into all opening recommendations on the Falkbeer Counter-Gambit. Now White falls behind in development, and he is required to defend accurately.

7 d3  
8 d2 xc3  
9 bc e8+  
10 e2 g4  
11 c4?

Schulten defends weakly: this attempt to hold on to the pawn leads to his downfall. The correct move was 11 \( f2 \).

11 ...  
12 dc xc6  
13 f1 xe2!

After obtaining a great advantage Morphy embarks on the concluding attack.

14 xxe2  
15 bl xe2+  
16 f2 g4+  
17 gl f3+  
18 gf d4+  
19 g2 f2+  
20 h3 xf3+  
21 b4 e3  
22 g1 f5+  
23 g5 h5 mate

Morphy's style had already taken shape, and he would mercilessly punish his opponents for the slightest positional mistakes. Of interest in this connection is Alekhine's opinion: "... Morphy sometimes played 'brilliantly' (if what one understands by this is the creation of cheap effects, such as the sacrifice of the queen involving a calculation of 2-3 moves, and so on), but in the main he managed to do this only when playing against opponents who had a very remote impression of the necessity for normal piece development ... But when he met players of his own class, it wasn't
with such trivia that he gained his victories; his strength (and it is in this strength that there is genuine brilliancy) lay in his deeply conceived positional play, which was mainly aggressive in nature (cf., for example, his matches with Anderssen and Harrwitz) . . .

The 20-year old Paul Morphy was eager for strong opponents. In America he had no equals, and in June 1858 he set off for Europe in the hope of playing a match with the strongest player of the Old World, Staunton. But Morphy’s hopes were not destined to be realized. Staunton probably anticipated that he would lose, and so under various pretexts he avoided the encounter. It was then that Morphy began a series of matches with the best European players. In London he overcame all the English masters, and then, after moving on to Paris, he also easily defeated the French.

On hearing about this extraordinary American, Anderssen hastened to Paris and in December 1858 a match between them took place. Morphy won by the score of +7 -2 =2. The entire clash lasted only seven days – Anderssen had only two weeks’ leave. They played without any time control. The shortest game lasted 30 minutes, and the longest eight hours. The best game of the match is considered to be the seventh.

### Morphy-Anderssen
#### Paris 1858

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Game of the Match</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 e4 d5</td>
<td>2 ed wxd5</td>
<td>3 c3 w5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 d4 e5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Today the opening is not played this way. 4 . . . . . is correct.

5 de wxe5+

After this move Black falls behind in development. 5 ... b4 6 f3 g4 is better.

6 e2 b4
7 f3+! xc3+
8 bc xc3+
9 d2 c5
10 b1 c6
11 0-0 f6
12 . f4 0-0!

Anderssen makes the correct decision. Sensing that he is about to come under an attack, he returns the pawn and exchanges one of his opponent’s bishops.

13 xc7 d4
14 wxd4 xc7
15 d3 g4

It later transpires that Black would have done better to make the prophylactic move 15 ... h6.

16 g5! ffd8
17 wxb4

Threatening both 18 xh7 xh7 19 xg4, and 18 xb7. A modern
player would agree to the second variation and defend in the endgame a pawn down. Anderssen decides against this.

17... c8
18 b1e1 a5
19 w7! xxe7
20 xxe7 d5
21 xh7+ h8
22 xf7 c3
23 e1 xal
24 ef4 a6
25 d3 Resigns

Thus Europe was conquered, and Morphy set off on the return journey. A grand reception awaited him in New York. There were congratulations, presents and banquets – Morphy became a national hero in America, and a great future seemed to lie before him.

Alas, fate dealt differently with this chess genius. Morphy categorically rejected any idea of continuing his chess career, since he considered that “chess should be nothing else than a means of relaxation... it should remain simply a game, a way of refreshing one’s thinking after serious professional work”.

But Morphy did not succeed as a lawyer. Nervy and impressionable from birth, he began more and more often to suffer from severe headaches; he became depressed, and developed a persecution complex.

To chess he was completely indifferent, although he would occasionally play friendly games in his home circle. On 10th June 1884 Morphy died.

Why do we say that Morphy made an enormous contribution to the development of chess theory?

“To this day Morphy remains the unsurpassed master of open games. The greatness of his importance is seen from the fact that, since Morphy, nothing significantly new has been achieved in this field” – these are the words of Mikhail Botvinnik.

Morphy was no better than Anderssen in making combinations (here they were equal), but he was better than Anderssen in preparing a combination (and in this respect Morphy’s superiority was undisputed). The principle of rapid development was known before Morphy’s time, but he never deviated from it, since he considered the chief demand of the opening to be the mobilization of the forces and a lead in development. Morphy would never lose tempi! To the centre – to this basis of strategy – Morphy devoted unswerving attention. After gaining a lead in development or a spatial advantage, Morphy would use line-opening pawn breaks and sacrifices to begin an attack. Even before Morphy many players used to sacrifice
pawns for the sake of opening lines, but (unlike the majority) Morphy did not do this as an end in itself, but would do it only when he was certain that he could secure an advantage in force on the given sector of the battlefield. Many of Morphy’s opening sacrifices (such as 6 ... e3 in the game with Schulten) were of a positional and intuitive nature, and so were difficult to foresee. Morphy’s combinations merely crowned his skilful positional play, and he was always ready to go into an endgame, in which he displayed great mastery.

Morphy was not understood by his contemporaries, who behind the brilliance of his combinations were unable to discern the essence of his deep positional play. But subsequent generations have come to regard Morphy as the finest strategist in open positions.

“It is customary to call Morphy the greatest chess genius of all times . . . If the distinguishing feature of a genius is the fact that he is far ahead in comparison with his era, then Morphy was a chess genius in its most complete manifestation . . . On every account, even had he been transported to a much later era, he would have retained his reputation as a chess genius.”

With these words of Max Euwe we should like to conclude our account of the most striking chess player of the last century.
In 1951 the International Chess Federation decided to establish a competition for determining the World Junior Champion. At first the tournaments were organized once every two years, but beginning with the 8th Championship (Manila 1974) they became yearly. The first Championship was held in the English city of Birmingham and ended in a victory for Borislav Ivkov (Yugoslavia). Two years later the strongest player proved to be the Argentinian Oscar Panno.

Belgium 1955. For the first time in the World Junior Championship there is a participant from the USSR. 18-year old International Master Boris Spassky from Leningrad again and again scrutinizes the tournament table. There are very few familiar names. Some totally unknown players have arrived for the World Championship: Portisch, Tringov, Mednis, Keller . . .

But the first few rounds brought assurance. Three out of three at the start, the best result in the semifinals, and one round before the end of the tournament the question of first place was already decided. Here is one of the wins by the first Soviet Junior World Champion.

Schweber-Spassky
Nimzo-Indian Defence
1 d4 €f6 2 c4 e6 3 d3 b4 4 e3 c5 5 c3 d6 6 f3 0-0 7 0-0 d5
8 a3 xc3 9 bc dc 10 xc4 cc7 11 d3 e5 12 cc2 g4 13 xe5 dx e5 14 de cc5.

This tabia of the Nimzo-Indian Defence was an established part of Spassky’s opening repertoire. In particular, it occurred in another World Championship, this time for men, in the 20th game of the 1966 Petrosian-Spassky match.

15 $e1 $ad8
16 f3 d7
17 a4 cc6
18 e4 $d5!

Black takes the opportunity to make a successful regrouping of his pieces.

19 b2 f4
20 f1 fe8
21 g3 g6
22 c4 e7
23 cc3 f6
Here the Argentinian player carries out an incorrect manoeuvre.

24 $\text{d}3$ $\text{e}5$
25 $\text{c}2$

Black's reply unexpectedly leaves his opponent in a critical position.

25 ... $\text{d}2$!
26 $\text{f}1$ $\text{e}d8$
27 $\text{a}3$
27 ... $\text{h}8$
28 $\text{c}1$ $\text{d}4$
29 $\text{f}4$

and within a few moves White resigned.

After this victory Spassky began his long way to the top. The entire chess world followed with admiration his successes in the 1965 and 1968 Candidates matches, when he defeated such renowned tournament fighters as Keres, Geller, Tal, Larsen and Korchnoi ... In 1969 Spassky became Champion of the World.

His path began in the Leningrad Pioneers Palace, where as a 9-year old he attended lessons by the trainer Vladimir Zak. For eight whole years he was the youngest attainer of various chess titles. At 10 he was the only First Category player of that age in the country, and then he became a Candidate Master. At 16 he was the youngest International Master in the world, and within two years the youngest grandmaster. And this is how the future World Champion played at the age of 12

Spassky-Avtonomov
Leningrad Junior Ch 1949
Queen's Gambit Accepted

1 $\text{d}4$ $\text{d}5$ 2 $\text{c}4$ $\text{c}6$ 3 $\text{f}3$ $\text{f}6$ 4 $\text{e}3$ $\text{c}5$
5 $\text{xc}4$ $\text{e}6$ 6 0-0 $\text{a}6$ 7 $\text{e}2$ $\text{b}5$ 8 $\text{b}3$
$\text{c}6$ 9 $\text{c}3$ $\text{cd}$ 10 $\text{d}1$ $\text{b}7$ 11 $\text{ed}$

$\text{b}4$ (142)

12 $\text{d}5$!

It is unlikely that 17-year old Avtonomov expected such a bold decision from his young opponent. But by that time Spassky was already used to playing against older boys. The pawn sacrifice enables White to carry out a winning attack.

12 ... $\text{b}xd5$ 13 $\text{g}5$ $\text{e}7$ 14 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{gf}$ 15 $\text{xd}5$ $\text{xd}5$ 16 $\text{xd}5$
ed 17 $\text{d}4$! $\text{f}8$ (17 ... 0-0 18 $\text{f}5$
$\text{d}6$ 19 $\text{g}4+$) 18 $\text{f}5$ $\text{h}5$ 19 $\text{xd}5$
$\text{xd}5$ 20 $\text{x}e7+$ $\text{g}8$ 21 $\text{xf}6$
Resigns.

We will now make the acquaintance of the next principle in the
evaluation of a position. The question is one of diagonals, files and ranks, control over which (all other things being equal) usually leads to the better game.

In the 16th USSR Young Masters Championship, Z. Sturua from Tbilisi shared first place, demonstrating versatile and technically competent play. The game Malanyuk-Sturua, 1982, took the following course:

1 e4 c5 2 b3 ©c6 3 b2 d6 4 ©f3 e5 5 b5 ©e7 6 a4 g6 7 b4 cb 8 d4 a6 9 ©d3 ©g4 10 ©c4 ©c8 11 de ©g7 12 ©xd6 ©xf3 13 gf 0-0 14 ©d2 ©d8 15 ©c5 ©xe5 16 ©xc8 ©xc8 17 ©b3 (143)

White's opening experiments have not brought him any advantage. His pawn structure is weakened, and his king is still in the centre. Black exploits his lead in development and his control of the c- and d-files in the best way possible.

17 ... ©d3+!

This is stronger than 17 ... ©xf3+ 18 ©xf3 ©xb2 19 ©bl ©c3+ 20 ©e2, when the bishop at b3 is still alive.

18 cd ©xb2
19 ©b1 ©c3
20 ©e2 ©d2!
21 ©xd2 ©c3!
22 ©c2 ©c6!
23 ©hc1 a5
24 ©b3

Otherwise simply 24 ... ©d4, 25 ... ©xc2 and 26 ... ©dxd3.

24 ... ©dxd3+!
25 ©xd3 ©xb3
26 ©c5 ©a3
27 ©b5 ©d4
28 ©d5

28 ©xb7 would not have affected the result.

28 ... ©c6
29 ©b5 ©xa4
30 f4 ©a2+
31 ©e3 ©a3
32 ©d2 ©d4
33 ©xb7 ©b3+
34 ©d1 ©a1+
35 ©c2 ©c5
36 ©b8+ ©g7
37 ©b2 ©h1
38 ©c2 ©xh2

White resigns

The women's World Champion, Maya Chiburdanidze, took part in the same Young Masters Championship. In the next position (Chiburdanidze-Malanyuk, 1982)
White controls most of the open lines. By the sacrifice of two exchanges Chiburdanidze clears the main diagonals, and creates irresistible threats.

1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x b 6 ! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{ab}}}
2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} c 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}6}}
3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x e 6 ! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{fe}}}
4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} f 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}d}7}

Or 4 ... \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} f 8 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} x f 8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x f 8 6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x e 6 + \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} g 7 7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} f 7.
5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} b 5 ! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Resigns}}}

There is no argument over the evaluation of this position (Idess-Semkov, 1980). Black is on the verge of winning. His pieces have created dangerous threats against the enemy king, the domination of the b-file by his rooks being especially impressive.

1 ... \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} d 4 !

With the simple threat of 2 ... \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x a 5 3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x a 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} c 2 mate.
2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} d 7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} x d 4 + !
3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x d 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} x f 1 +
5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}} d 1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} b 1 + !

White resigns

We will examine several more positions in which the stronger side's advantage lies in his complete control of an important line (either file, diagonal or rank).

In Vasyukov-Vladimirov, 1981, White has the advantage: he controls the central squares and his pieces are more actively placed, but the main thing is that Black has no way of countering the operations of the white pieces along the a1-h8 diagonal. White carries out the typical manoeuvre \textit{\textcolor{red}{Q}}g 4-f6 after the short prelude – the sac-
rifice of a pawn to bring his queen’s rook into play.

1 d6! wxd6
2 hbd1 wc7
3 g4 e8
Or 3 ... f6 4 h6.
4 d6+ h8
Black cannot exchange on f6 — then the white queen will give mate at g7.
5 e5! w7
6 c3!
White regroups for the concluding blow; winning the exchange does not interest him.

6 ... g8
7 xh7! Resigns
On 7 ... xe5 there follows 8 xe5 xh7 9 h5+ h6 10 d2.

How is White to realize his advantage in Hort-Miles, 1982? The search for a combination does not lead to anything, but the position can be solved by purely technical means. White clears the way for his rooks to invade the 7th rank.

1 b4! cb
2 ab a5
Black creates a passed pawn, to have the possibility of using it to divert the opponent’s forces. But the possibility does not in fact arise . . .
3 ba ba
4 Rf7 h5

The direct 4 ... a4 loses to 5 Qxe5 Qxe5 6 f4 Qg6 7 Qf7 Qg8 8 Qd7, when Black has no defence against the threat of Qd6 and Qf7 mate.

5 h3 g5

Again 5 ... a4 does not work because of 6 Qxe5 Qxe5 7 f4 Qg6 8 Qf5.

6 Qxe5 Qxe5
7 f4 gf
8 ef Qg6
9 Qf5 Qxf4
10 Bd6

And now White drives the opponent's king into a trap.

10 ... Qg8
11 Qxf6+ Qe8
12 Qd6+ Qd8
13 Qf7 Qg2+

and after giving this 'spite' check Black resigned.

In Pinter-Horvath, 1980, White’s domination of the 7th rank suggests the idea of searching for a combination. And the search proves successful:

1 Qxf7! Qxf5

If 1 ... Qxf7, then not 2 Qe6, but

2 Ra8+ De8 3 Qe6! Qf5 4 Qxf5 and 5 Qxe8 mate.

2 Qxc8+ Qh8
3 Qb7! Qh5
4 Qe7! Resigns

4 ... We8 or 4 ... Wc5 is met by 5 Qg8+!

From the above examples it will be apparent that control over open lines (diagonals, files and ranks) can strongly affect the evaluation of a position. The control of only one line, if it is the main one, can decide the outcome of a game, or can provide the basis of a combination. Hence the prevalence of strategic plans based on the seizure of the long diagonal, control of the c-file, the invasion of the 7th rank, and so on.
LESSON 28
The sixth evaluation principle: active pieces

The next principle in the evaluation of a position is associated with the efficiency of the pieces. The active placing of the pieces is of very great importance. What do we understand by the activity of the pieces? If a piece is able to intervene energetically in the events taking place on the board, such a piece is said to be active. For the sake of activity a player may sacrifice a pawn in the opening or middlegame, or transpose into an ending a pawn down. A characteristic feature of an attack is an aggregate of active pieces.

(Black) had aimed for this position from afar, rightly assuming that the activity of the black pieces and the presence of opposite-coloured bishops would fully compensate for being a pawn down.

```
1 ... g6
2 ∇f3 ∇g7
3 ∇e1 ∇d7
4 ∇f4 ∇e7!
```

If Black can exchange rooks, his position will become absolutely safe.

```
5 ∇xe7
5 ∇d1 could have been met by 5 ... ∇e5 6 ∇d2 ∇xg3 7 d6 ∇e6
8 d7 ∇d6 9 ∇b2+ ∇g8 10 ∇xd6 ∇xd6 11 ∇xb7 ∇c7.
```

```
5 ... ∇xe7
6 ∇g2 a5
7 h4 h5
```

Black has set up a drawing fortress.

```
8 ∇e2 ∇c5
9 ∇c4 ∇f6
10 ∇d2 b6
11 a4 ∇e5
12 ∇d3 ∇f6
13 ∇d2 ∇e5
14 ∇e2 ∇e4+
```

This is a position from the 15th game of the World Championship match in Merano (1981). Karpov
The strength of active pieces is most evident in simple positions. A classic example of exploiting this kind of advantage is provided by Nimzowitsch-Tarrasch, 1925. We hand over commentary to Aron Nimzowitsch:

"Black's position still makes an impression which inspires confidence in it, and this at a moment when it carries the seeds of death within itself. The next two moves of White reduce Black's d-file to passivity, that is to say they take away from it any potential attacking value.

1 f4! Hhd8
2 Qd4 f6
Black intends ... e5. Is this a threat?
3 a4!
White does not fear ... e5 in the least, for after 3 ... e5 4 fe fe 5 Qf3

Black's e-pawn would be weak. The more energetic 3 b4 was, however, also to be considered, but would have been less advantageous because of the reply 3 ... b5. Now, though, this move (b4) threatens to confine Black within still narrower limits.

3 ... e5

In a cramped position the attempt to hit out is explicable on psychological grounds, even if it be not always equally justified if viewed dispassionately. So, too, here. It is true that in any case Black stands badly."

14 fe fe 5 Qf3 Qe6 b4 b6 7 Ac2! h6 8 h4! Qd6 9 h5 Qd5 10 Qg4 Qd5 11 Qc6+ Qd6 12 Qg6+ Qe7 13 Qxg7+ Qf8 14 Qxd6 Qxd6 15 Qxa7 Qxb4 16 Qxe5.

By combining operations aimed at increasing the activity of his pieces and restricting the activity of the opponent's pieces, White has in the end gained a decisive material advantage.

16 ... Qe6 17 Qg6+ Qg8 18 Qe7+ Qf8 19 Qf5 Qd5 20 g4 Qf4+ 21 Qf3 Qd3 22 Qa8+ Qf7 23 Qh8 Qc5 24 Qh7+ Qg8 25 Qxh6 Qxh6 26 Qxh6+ Qf8 27 Qf5 Qxa4 28 h6 Qg8 29 g5 Qh7 30 Qg4 Qc5 31 Qh5 Qe6 32 g6+ Qg8 33 h7+ Qh8 34 Qh6 Resigns.

Here the difference in the activity of the pieces is obvious (Stefanov-
Lyubishavlevich, 1981); the position is simply asking for a combination.

1 \textit{f7+!}

Now 1 ... \textit{gxf7} is not possible because of 2 \textit{e4+} \textit{g7} (2 ... \textit{g8}
3 \textit{xg8+} and 4 \textit{x.d6+) 3 \textit{g6}.

2 \textit{e5!}

Simple, but pretty.

2 ... \textit{x.d3}
3 \textit{g6}+ \textit{h7}
4 \textit{x.f8+} \textit{h8}
5 \textit{g6}+ \textit{h7}
6 \textit{g8}

Black made a few more moves –
6 ... \textit{d7}
7 \textit{f7} \textit{xd2}
8 \textit{g4}

– and then resigned.

This position (Dobots-Yanak, 1981) is rather more complicated than the previous one, but here too there can be only one evaluation. The concentration of the white pieces, and the fact that they are directed against the weakened position of the black king, provide ample grounds for searching for a combination. White first gets rid of the active knight at c6.

1 \textit{xc6} \textit{xc6}

Now comes a typical blow:

2 \textit{e6} \textit{d7}

2 ... \textit{e} is not possible because of
3 \textit{xe6+} \textit{f7} and then 4 \textit{xd5}, since 4 ... \textit{d5} loses the queen.

3 \textit{xd5} \textit{xe6}

In conclusion White switches to a mating attack.

4 \textit{f4!} \textit{xd5}
4 ... \textit{g5} or 4 ... \textit{h7} would have been met by 5 \textit{f6+}.

5 \textit{xe6} f6
6 \textit{xe6+} \textit{h8}
7 \textit{g5!} Resigns

To conclude this discussion
about the activity of pieces, we will examine a rather complicated example (Ljubojević-Miles, 1980). We will first give an evaluation of the position. Material is level. White is attacking the h6 pawn, while Black has no direct threats. White's king is completely safe, whereas Black's is beginning to be threatened – this is shown by the concentration of white pieces on the right side of the board. In control of the centre, space and open lines we observe approximate equality. But the activity of the white pieces is slightly greater. All this allows us to conclude that in the coming struggle White has the preferable chances.

What should Black play? 1 ... \( \text{Wh7} \) loses immediately to 2 \( \text{Lef1} \) \( \text{Wc6} \) (2 ... \( \text{Ee6} \) 3 \( \text{Gg5} \)+) 3 \( \text{Axh6} \) \( \text{Axh6} \) 4 \( \text{Axf6} \) \( \text{Axf6} \) 5 \( \text{Axh6} \) \( \text{c7} \) 6 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{g7} \) 7 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{Axh8} \) 8 \( \text{Gf2} \). After 1 ... \( \text{g5} \) White would no doubt have sacrificed his knight – 2 \( \text{Axg5} \) with a strong attack. If 1 ... \( \text{h5} \), then 2 \( \text{Af2} \) followed by \( \text{g4} \) and White has a threatening initiative. Black therefore decides to sacrifice a pawn, but in return to activate his pieces to the maximum.

1 ... \( \text{Gh5}! \)
2 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Af4} \)
3 \( \text{Axf4} \) \( \text{ef} \)
4 \( \text{Axf4} \) \( \text{Ge5} \)

How sharply the position has changed! The black pieces have suddenly acquired great energy: the bishops have become long-range pieces, the knight and the rook at e8 are active, and the advance of the g- and f-pawns is threatened. White has to play very accurately, and for some time is forced to switch from attack to defence.

5 \( \text{Kh3} \) \( \text{g5}! \)
6 \( \text{Axe5} \)

Not 6 \( \text{Axg5} \) because of 6 ... \( \text{Gg6} \)
7 \( \text{Wf5} \) \( \text{Ee5}! \).

6 ... \( \text{Ee5} \)
7 \( \text{Wg3} \) \( \text{Wc5} \)

With the threat of regaining the pawn by 8 ... \( \text{Wb4} \).
8 \( \text{Wg1} \) \( \text{Wb4} \)
9 \( \text{Ebl} \)

A significant omission. White should have played 9 \( \text{Ef3} \) \( \text{Wxb2} \) 10 \( \text{Eh5} \), and if 10 ... \( \text{Axh5} \) then not 11 ed? \( \text{Axh5} \) when Black is a pawn up, but 11 \( \text{Ab1} \) forcing a draw: 11 ... \( \text{Wb1} \) 12 \( \text{Ea1} \) \( \text{Wb2} \) 13 \( \text{Ab1} \), since 13 ... \( \text{Wxa3(c3)} \) 14 ed \( \text{Wxe5} \) is not possible because of 15 \( \text{Gf4}! \). After rejecting this variation White ends up in an inferior position.

9 ... \( \text{ef}! \)
10 \( \text{Ab1} \) \( \text{Ee5xh5} \)
11 \( \text{Wb1} \) \( \text{Wc5} \)
12 \( \text{Ee3} \) \( \text{Ef2} \)

The roles have been reversed, and the attacker is now Black, whose pieces have become much more active. Thus, for example,
White is unable to challenge the black rook’s control of the 2nd rank: 13 \( \text{B}e2 \text{.d}4 14 \text{B}xf2 \text{B}xf2 15 \text{C}d1 \text{B}xc2! 16 \text{B}xc2 \text{B}xc2 17 \text{C}c3 \text{B}xc3 18 \text{B}c5 \text{B}xe4+. \\
13 \text{B}g3 \text{d}4 \\
14 \text{C}d5 \text{d}6 \\
Threatening 15 ... \text{B}xh2+ 16 \text{B}xh2 \text{B}f2.

15 \text{B}e3 \text{B}g6! \\
Black avoids a very clever trap: 15 ... \text{B}e5 16 \text{C}c4 \text{B}xh2+ 17 \text{B}xh2 \text{B}xg3+, and if 18 \text{B}xg3 \text{B}f2+! 19 \text{B}h3 \text{B}c8+ 20 \text{B}g4 \text{B}h2 mate. But the unexpected 18 \text{B}g2!! leaves Black a piece down.

16 \text{B}g2 \text{B}h5 \\
17 \text{B}d1 \\
Otherwise 17 ... \text{B}e5.

17 ... \text{B}xd1+ \\
18 \text{B}xd1 \text{B}xe4! \\
The bishop cannot be taken because of mate at f1.

19 \text{h}4 \text{B}e5! \\
This move concludes the battle of ideas.

20 \text{B}xe4 \text{B}xg3 \\
21 \text{B}e3 \text{B}h2+ \\
22 \text{B}g1 \text{B}xb4 \\
23 \text{B}d5+ \text{B}g7 \\
24 \text{B}g2 \text{B}f2 \\
White resigns

In this game the English grandmaster made full use of the positional idea of sacrificing a pawn for active piece play.

We can conclude that the activity of the pieces and the initiative are more important than material gain. In evaluating a position the efficiency of all the fighting units must be carefully observed. And the activity of the pieces will often suggest the direction in which to search when choosing a specific move.
LESSON 29
Anatoly Karpov’s Stockholm triumph
The World Champion’s progress chart
The seventh evaluation principle:
pawn structure defects

For 14 long years Soviet juniors were unable to repeat Spassky’s success in the World Junior Championship. Even an international title did not guarantee victory in the tournament. During this period the best results achieved by our boys were by Alexande Kuindzhi (3rd place, The Hague 1961) and Vladimir Tukmakov (2nd place, Barcelona 1965). The Junior World Champions in these years were William Lombardy (USA), Carlos Bielicki (Argentina), Bruno Parma (Yugoslavia), Florian Gheorghiu (Romania), Bojan Kurajica (Yugoslavia) and Julio Kaplan (Puerto Rico). One can therefore understand the decision of the USSR Chess Federation, a few months before the start of the 1969 tournament, to assign the Soviet participant, Anatoly Karpov, a personal trainer of the highest standing—the highly experienced grandmaster Furman.

The collaboration of Karpov and Furman proved to be amazingly fruitful. Karpov’s preparations for the Championship were planned literally by the day. Everything was taken into consideration: the improvement of his physical condition, the expanding of his opening repertoire and the analysis of middlegame positions. Finally, tournament tactics were worked out, and various ways of ensuring Karpov’s psychological stability were provided for.

Soon after the start of the Stockholm tournament it transpired that Karpov was the most likely contender for first place.

Castro-Karpov
King’s Gambit

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>e4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>f4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>c4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>c3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black employs one of the variations he had prepared for the tournament.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>e5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>b5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>fg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>e2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>xb5+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 $\textit{Wxb7}$

White's pieces are undeveloped, and this is the main factor in the evaluation of the position. Within a few moves Black's threats become decisive.

11 ... $\textit{Ec8}$ 12 $\textit{Qf3}$ $\textit{Exg7}$ 13 0-0 $\textit{Ah3}$ 14 $\textit{Be1+}$ $\textit{Af8}$ 15 $\textit{Be2}$ $\textit{Ag4}$! 16 $\textit{Axh}2$ $\textit{Ac5}$ 17 d4 $\textit{Axd4}$ 18 $\textit{Axd4}$ $\textit{Axd4}$ 19 $\textit{Axh4}$ $\textit{Axh2+}$ 20 $\textit{Qxf2}$ $\textit{Afg6}$! 21 $\textit{Qg1}$ d4 22 $\textit{Ff1}$ $\textit{Wd7}$ 23 $\textit{Wb4+}$ $\textit{Ag8}$ 24 $\textit{Qe4}$ $\textit{Wd5}$ 25 $\textit{Wf7}$ $\textit{We6}$ 26 $\textit{Wb7}$ $\textit{Ae2}$ 27 $\textit{Ff1}$ $\textit{Ec2}$ 28 $\textit{Qg5}$ $\textit{Wf5}$ 29 $\textit{Qe5}$ $\textit{Exg5}$ 30 h4 $\textit{Wxe5}$ White resigns.

In the games with his main rivals Karpov chose the most reliable positions, not allowing his opponents to provoke unclear tactical complications.

Karpov-Andersson

\textit{Spanish Game}

1 e4 e5 2 $\textit{Qf3}$ $\textit{Cc6}$ 3 $\textit{Qb5}$ a6 4 $\textit{Qa4}$ $\textit{Af6}$ 5 0-0 $\textit{Ec7}$ 6 $\textit{Ec1}$ b5 7 $\textit{Qb3}$ 0-0 8 c3 d6 9 h3 $\textit{Qa5}$ 10 $\textit{Qc2}$ c5 11 d4 $\textit{Wc7}$ 12 $\textit{Qbd2}$ $\textit{Ab7}$ 13 d5.

The Soviet master has played his favourite opening, one with which he is well familiar and with which he always feels confident.

13 ... $\textit{Ac8}$ 14 $\textit{Df1}$ $\textit{Ad7}$ 15 b3 $\textit{Qb7}$ 16 c4 $\textit{Dhb8}$ 17 $\textit{Ec3}$ $\textit{Qf3}$ 18 $\textit{Qf5}$ $\textit{Dd8}$.

Experience shows that it is unfavourable for Black to exchange on f5.

19 $\textit{Qh2}$ $\textit{Qe8}$ 20 h4 f6 21 h5 $\textit{Qf7}$ 22 $\textit{Ec3}$ $\textit{Qg5}$ 23 $\textit{Qh4}$ $\textit{Wd8}$ 24 $\textit{Qg3}$ $\textit{Qc7}$ 25 $\textit{Qf3}$ h6.

The point of White's subsequent manoeuvres is to exchange the white-squared bishops and to prepare the advance of the f- and g-pawns.

26 $\textit{Qg6}$ a5 27 a4 bc 28 bc $\textit{Qa6}$ 29 $\textit{Wf2}$ $\textit{Ec7}$ 30 $\textit{Qd2}$ $\textit{Qab7}$ 31 $\textit{Qc3}$ $\textit{Qb4}$ $\textit{Qd1}$.

White securely defends all the invasion squares on the queenside.

32 ... $\textit{Qa6}$ 33 $\textit{Qd2}$ $\textit{Qb4}$ 34 $\textit{Ec3}$ e8 35 $\textit{Df1}$ $\textit{Wc8}$ 36 $\textit{Qg3}$ $\textit{Qd7}$ 37 $\textit{Wd2}$ $\textit{Ah7}$ 38 $\textit{Qe2}$ $\textit{Df7}$ 39 $\textit{Wad1}$ $\textit{Qe7}$ 40 $\textit{Df1}$ $\textit{Dd8}$ 41 $\textit{Qh2}$ $\textit{Qg8}$ 42 $\textit{Qg4}$ $\textit{Qg5}$ 43 $\textit{Qxd7}$ $\textit{Wxd7}$ 44 $\textit{Df1}$.

If this knight should reach f5, Black will have no counterplay at all. Therefore Andersson goes in for tactical complications, but White is better prepared for these.

44 ... f5 45 ef $\textit{Wxf5}$ 46 $\textit{Qg3}$ $\textit{Wf7}$ 47 $\textit{Wf2}$ $\textit{Af6}$ 48 $\textit{Df1}$ $\textit{Wd7}$ 49 $\textit{Qf4}$ $\textit{Qxc3}$ 51 $\textit{Qxc3}$ $\textit{Qe8}$ 52 $\textit{Ec3}$ $\textit{Dbb8}$ 53 $\textit{Qf2}$ $\textit{Ah7}$ 54 $\textit{Qf5}$.

White's knight has nevertheless reached the desired square.

54 ... $\textit{Dxe3}$ 55 $\textit{Wxe3}$ $\textit{Qf6}$ 56 $\textit{Qge7+}$ $\textit{Qh8}$ 57 $\textit{Qxh6}$ $\textit{Qe8}$ 58 $\textit{Qf7+}$ $\textit{Qh7}$ 59 $\textit{Qe4}$ $\textit{Qxe7}$ 60 $\textit{Qxe7}$ Resigns.

Twelve wins, five draws, and not a single defeat - this was Anatoly Karpov's result in the tournament. The Soviet Champion aroused universal admiration. This is what the Swedish newspapers...
wrote: “If in the World Championship in Stockholm a special prize had been awarded for modesty and a serious attitude to chess, this prize would have been won, along with the Champion’s Cup, by Anatoly. For three weeks he sat calmly at the chess board with the appearance of a business-like person, and gained one win after another.”

Later Semion Furman had this to say about his protégé: “Nature endowed Anatoly Karpov with a very rare chess talent and a strong will, as well as modesty and a love for hard work. When I began collaborating with Karpov, I immediately realized that he was a very gifted player with an enormous future.”

Chess journalists noted that, up to a certain point, Karpov’s path was very similar to that of Spassky. At the age of 9 Karpov became a first category player, at 15 a master, and at 18 World Junior Champion. But here their paths diverge. While it took Spassky a further fourteen years (1955-69) to become the men’s World Champion, Karpov covered this ‘route’ in 6 years (1969-75).

It is always interesting to observe how champions played in their youth. Here is a game by 9-year-old Tolya Karpov played in the Championship of his home town of Zlatoust.

---

**Karpov-Kalashnikov**

**1961**

**Spanish Game**

1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 d5 a6 4 dxe5.

Opening systems with the accent on the endgame are very rarely seen in the games of young boys. However, Spassky at the same age also had a leaning towards positional play.

4 ... bc 5 d4 ed 6 oxd4 c5 7 d5.

Black does not choose the best plan, and White gains the chance to transpose into a minor piece ending.

10 e5 dx6 11 dx6+ bx6 12 bx7 + bx7 16 dx7 17 g5 eae8 17 0-0 0 d5 18 c6 0 c6 19 d1+ c7 20 d2 d6 21 c4 22 c8 23 c1 24 c6 25 e5 26 d2 (155)

In this position there is still the prospect of a complicated struggle, in which White has slightly the
better chances since Black is restricted by the defects in his pawn structure. But Karpov's opponent commits a number of inaccuracies, creating additional weaknesses in his game, and ends up in a lost position.

25 ... d4? 26 e4 c4 27 c3! xf5
28 cd+ xd4 29 c3 d3 30 g3 g5
31 a3 h5 32 d1 f1 33 e3 d3
34 d1 g6 35 c3 d3 36 d1 h7 37 c3 g8.

Black avoids the repetition of moves, and thereby facilitates White's plan of realizing his advantage.

38 e2+ e5 39 e3 d5 40 c3+ e5 41 e4 f5 42 c5 e5 43 xa6 d5 44 b4+ c5
45 a2 c3 46 xc3 c4 47 a4 b3
48 a5 c4 49 f4 gf+ 50 gf b4 51 f5 xa5 52 d4 b4 53 e4 a2
54 f6 f7 55 c5 d5 56 h4 f7
57 d3+ Resigns.

In time Karpov began playing more dynamic variations, but his love for the endgame and his precision in technical positions have remained with him for ever. A few years later he was to say about himself: "I aim to play correct chess, often employing technical methods." And today Anatoly Karpov has no equals in this skill.

We will now examine a number of positions, the main feature in the evaluation of which will be the pawn structure, and the presence of weak or strong squares.

![Chessboard Diagram](image)

Here (Timman-Portisch, 1981) White has an obvious positional advantage. Black's queenside pawn formation is hopelessly spoiled, and it is on an attack on these weaknesses that White bases his plan.

1 e5 e6
2 e3 b5
3 d7 d8
4 c5 Re8

The exchange on e3 would merely reinforce the d4 pawn.

5 f3 f6

Otherwise White would, in the end, play his knight to e5, obtaining another knight outpost. Incidentally, it should be pointed out that White has three pawn islands, whereas Black has four, which means that it is more difficult for Black to defend his weaknesses.

6 Rae1 f7
7 g4!
With the inevitable threat of h4-h5, while if 7... h5, then after 8 g5 White drives away the knight from b5 and occupies e5 with his knight, e.g. 8... fg 9 Qxg5+ with numerous threats. Therefore Black goes in for a forcing operation with the sacrifice of a pawn, but in return he hopes to activate his pieces.

7 ... Qe4
8 Qxe4 de
9 Qxe4 Qe4
10 Qxe4 Qc3
11 Bxe1 Qa2
12 Ra1 Qc3
13 Bxa7 Qb5
14 Ba4 Qe6
15 Bc4 Qd6

Black has achieved his aim, but he is not able to equalize the game.

16 Qh4 Qg8
17 Qf5+ Qd7
18 f3 h5
19 h3 hg
20 fg

It is usual to capture towards the centre, but here it is more important to create a passed pawn on the h-file.

20 ... Qd6
21 Qxd6 cd
22 Qh2 f5

If Black were to exchange on g4, his drawing chances would be improved, but Timman finds a fine way to maintain his advantage.

23 gf Qf3
24 d5!

Now Black is unable to exchange on f5.

24 ... cd
25 Qf4 Qe7
26 f6! A check from a position of strength! Black cannot go into the pawn ending.

26 ... Qf7
27 Qg3 Qb8
28 b4 d4
29 Qxd4 Qxf6

Black has achieved the maximum possible, but he is unable to cope with both the b- and h-pawns.

30 h4 Qe5
31 Qg4 d5
32 h5 d4
33 h6 d5
34 h7 Qh8
35 Qg7 Qc4
36 Qb7 d3
37 Qd2 Ke8
38 Qd7 Qc3
39 Qe7 Qd8
40 Qe1 Qxb4
41 Qc7 Qb5
42 Qd2 Qb6
43 Qg7 Resigns

Timman demonstrated very fine technique in realizing his advantage.

In certain openings the pawn structure determines the direction of the strategic plans from the very first moves. Instructive in this respect is the game Chandler-
Romanishin, played in the semi-final match of the 2nd chess Tele-Olympiad (1982).

The diagram position arose after the opening moves 1 e4 e5 2 d4 c6 3 b5 a6 4 a4 d5 5 0-0 e7 6 Be1 d6 7 axc6+ bc 8 d4 ed 9 axd4 Ad7.

The opening played is the Steinitz Defence Deferred in the Spanish Game. Black voluntarily gives himself weaknesses on the queenside, reckoning that his control of the b-file and of the central squares, and the activating (in the future) of his king's bishop will give him good play.

10 Af3 0-0
11 Ac3 Ab8
12 b3 Ae8
13 h3 Af8
14 Ag5 h6
15 Ah4!

The exchange on f6 looks more natural, but White's plan involves the e5 break, which is more dangerous for Black.

15 ... g5
16 Ag3 Ag7
17 e5!

Now 17 ... de is obviously bad because of 18 Axe5, while 17 ... Ah7 is adequately met by 18 Axc6.

17 ... Ad5
18 Axd5 de
18 ... cd loses a pawn.

19 Axc7 Bh7
20 Axf5

The opening battle has concluded in White's favour, his opponent being doomed to a gruelling defence of his numerous weaknesses.

20 ... Axf5
21 Wxf5 Abd8
22 Ad1 Wa5
23 Bh2 Bd5
25 c4

Now control of the d-file passes to White, and he begins an attack with his heavy pieces.

24 ... Bd2

In the event of 24 ... Axd1 White would have continued the attack with 25 Axd1 Wxa2 26 Wd7 followed by 27 Bd3.

25 Axd2 Wxd2
26 Ae3 Wxa2
27 Wd7 Ae6
28 Wd8+ Bh7
29 Af3! Ag6

If 29 ... Ag6 30 Wg8! Be7 31 Axe5 Axe5 32 Axf7.

30 Axf7 g4
31 Axe5 gh
32 Wd3
and Black overstepped the time limit.

A superficial glance at this position (Gavrikov-Kaplun, 1981) may give an incorrect evaluation. The position is not equal, as a careful analysis of its elements reveals: material is level and there are no direct threats, but whereas the white king is completely safe, Black's is only relatively so – its pawn screen is weakened, and the rook at c1 and knight at e4 are menacingly observing the queenside. In the centre White has the advantage (the e5 pawn!), he has more open lines (in particular the c-file), and in addition his pieces are more actively placed (for example, the bishop at b2 is stronger than the one at f8, and the knight at d7 has altogether no moves, while the position of the black king and queen on the same diagonal makes one suspicious). Black would appear to have no defects in his pawn structure, but a well-trained eye can discern other weaknesses in his position. Black has nothing with which to defend his f7, although how to attack it is another matter. It is here that tactics come to White's aid. If his e4 knight moves to the weak square d6 (threatening f7!), Black will have to take it with his bishop. And then after ed w xd6 (otherwise the d6 pawn will cause great unpleasantness) comes the opening of lines for the bishop at b2 by dc – this is where the diagonal placing of the black king and queen tells. Thus by attacking Black's weaknesses (d6 and f7) White achieves a favourable opening up of the position. The game went:

1 d6! xd6
2 ed w xd6
3 dc bc
Not 3 ... xc5 4 e5.
4 e5! h8
5 xc6 w xc6
6 xg7

To his positional gains White also adds a pawn.

6 ... g8
7 xh6 c8
8 e3! gd8
9 h5 f6
10 ed1 e5
11 xc5 Resigns

Whereas in the previous example Gavrikov accurately exploited the
weak squares in his opponent’s position, in Kasparov-Gavrikov, 1982, he himself allowed the creation of a weak square, and was punished for it. Black has just played ... b5 (... b5 was better) and his knight at c6 has become a live target. The c6 square, which is a weak one for Black, is transformed by Kasparov into a strong point for his pieces.

1 d6! E\text{xd}6
2 E\text{xc}6 E\text{d}8
3 E\text{c}2 E\text{e}8
Or 3 ... b7 4 c7 xg2 5 c6 a5
4 c1 a5
5 d5!

White has won control of the c-file, and he now begins an attack on f7. The natural 5 b7 is met by 6 xf7+ h7 7 c7+ e7 8 b3+ h8 (8 ... f6 9 c6+! xxc6 10 c6+) 9 e6+
5 ... b6
6 b3 E\text{e}7
7 f3!

The method of a skilful fencer:

d5 is freed for the knight, and the bishop prepares to attack f7 from the other side.

7 ... Ee5

Black was dissatisfied with the unpromising 7 ... b7 8 d5 xc6 9 xe7+ xxe7 10 xc6, but the move played allows White to demonstrate his ability to sacrifice pieces.

8 g5 g6
9 xg6! h7
10 xg6+ b8
11 h6 e7
11 ... g7 would have been met by the standard 12 h7+!.
12 c6!

One rarely sees both rooks attacking along the sixth rank. In this game the c6 square has served Kasparov well.

12 ... e5
13 g6+ was threatened.
13 f3 c7
14 e4+ e5
15 g6+! f8
16 h7+ f8
17 xg6 Resigns

In the evaluation of a position a far from minor role is played by the pawn configuration, as well as by strong and correspondingly weak squares. Of course, it is by no means simple to exploit all this, but then that is what tournaments exist for, to gain experience and improve one’s mastery.
LESSON 30
A competition on evaluations
Five minutes per position
Who can score 25 points?

Our acquaintance with the basic principles of evaluating a position is complete. These principles will provide a good guide, both in the choice of plan, and in the search for a specific move. And now you are going to test your knowledge.

You will be given nine positions from tournament games. In the first six you have to give an evaluation, discover the most important feature, choose a plan, find a specific move and calculate variations. You should try to do all this on your own, and only then look at the answers. For the solving of the first six positions you are allowed an average of five minutes. For correct replies you score points. The last three positions (166-168) are of a higher standard, and are intended for those who quickly score 25 points.

In Yusupov-Romanishin, 1982, Black’s extra pawn should not mislead you when evaluating the position, the main feature of which is the lack of space for the bishop. After...

1... $e8$ $g5$
2 $h4$

... the bishop was lost, and the game concluded 2... $xh4$ 3 $b$ $h5$ 4 $e4$ f5 5 $f6+$ $h6$ 6 $e4$ $ab3$ 7 $x4xc5$ Resigns. (3 points)

Greenfeld, the most likely winner of the 1982 European Junior Championship, could not stand the tension of the last round (Greenfeld-Salov). White has just played $c4-a6???$, and thereby shut the trap on his own queen. After 1... $c4$! 2 $f4$
the game was essentially decided, and White resigned a few moves later. (7 points)

1 i.xf3! and White resigned, since after 2 i.xf3 g.h5 he loses a piece. (2 points)

The striking feature here is not White's extra pawn, but the undefended position of his bishop (Hübner-Tal, 1982). The 'X-ray' attack of the rook at f8 easily penetrates through f6:

1 ... i.xf3! and White resigned, since after 2 i.xf3 g.h5 he loses a piece. (2 points)

The winning move in such positions is easily found. The preconditions are: the yawning weakness at g6, the awkward position of the rook at h8, which is unable to guard the back rank, and White's total domination of the b-file, which leads to the winning of the b8 square.

1 w.g6+

and after the forced 1 ... h.xg6 2 h.g+ g.g8 3 b.b8+ Black is mated. Amazingly enough, in Ziediny-Auzinya, 1980, White overlooked this possibility (3 points).

Here (Psakhis-Gavrikov, 1982) it is immediately apparent that the black king's pawn screen is weakened. After a brief introduction, the attacking mechanism of queen + knight goes into operation:

1 e.h6!

The rook cannot be taken, since the loss of control over f6 leads to mate — 1 ... e.xh6? 2 g.f6+ g.g7 3 h.h7+ f.xf6 4 e.e4 mate. Black preferred to remain a pawn down,
but he was no longer able to change the result of the game.

1 ... \( g6 \) 2 \( h5 \) \( w5 \) 3 \( wxe5 \) \( xe5 \) 4 \( b1 \) g4 5 f4 gf 6 gf f5 7 \( g5 \) \( e7 \) 8 f4 \( h8 \) 9 \( e6 \) \( fc8 \) 10 e4 a5 11 ef \( xd5 \) 12 \( e4 \) c3 13 \( bh1 \) \( f6 \) 14 \( xf6+ \) Resigns. (5 points)

It might be thought that this position (Timman-Hübner, 1982) was specially created to illustrate the theme of 'overloading'. One would very much like to divert the black queen away from \( f8 \), so that the white knight can announce mate from there, but 1 \( wxe4+ \) does not work because of the symmetric 1 ... \( wxe4+ \)!. The solution is as though taken from a book for beginners:

1 \( e6! \)

The themes of 'interference' and 'overloading' complement each other. A curious fact is that Timman struck this deadly blow with his last move before the time control. (5 points)

The following three positions give examples of more complicated evaluations and playing methods.

In Balashov-Ree, 1982, White has a great advantage. Participating in a direct attack on the black king are his queen, two rooks and bishop, with the knight ready at any moment to join them. The only piece with which Black has been able to oppose this white armada is his knight, his remaining pieces being mere spectators. The conclusion to the game is of a text-book nature.

1 \( xf6! \) gf 2 \( wb4 \) f5 3 \( w6+ \) \( g8 \) 4 \( xf5 \) \( xf5 \) 5 \( xf5 \) \( fd8 \) 6 \( g5+ \) \( f8 \) 7 \( w7+ \) \( e8 \) 8 \( e5+ \) \( d7 \) 9 \( g4+ \) Resigns. (10 points)
This time we have a complicated example of positional play. In Tukmakov-Kantsler, 1981, White’s advantage is undisputed; he has a protected passed pawn, and his centralized pieces contrast with Black’s undeveloped and passive pieces. But what specific plan and move order should he choose? There appear to be no preconditions for a combination, which means that the search should be along the lines of a positional solution. The attack on c6 looks tempting – 1 b4 \( \text{d7} \) 2 b5, and 2 ... c5 fails to 3 \( \text{b3} \), but after 2 ... cb 3 \( \text{xb7} \) b5 4 \( \text{d5} \) bc Black activates his game. Therefore Grandmaster Tukmakov does not hurry to force events, but employs a typical strategic procedure – the creation of additional weaknesses in the opponent’s position.

1 h4!

After the inevitable opening of the h-file, White will gain control of this important highway.

1 ... \( \text{b8} \)
2 b4 \( \text{f8} \)
3 \( \text{c3} \) a6
4 a4

White mounts a combined offensive on both wings.

4 ... \( \text{g8} \)
5 h5! \( \text{e7} \)
6 hg hg
7 \( \text{h1} \)

White has carried out his plan:

7 ... \( \text{f8} \)
8 \( \text{h8} \) a5
9 b5 c5
10 \( \text{d5} ! \)

The position is ripe for a combination.

10 ... cd+
11 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
12 cd \( \text{d7} \)
13 e6 \( \text{e8} \)
14 \( \text{dh1} \)

14 \( \text{xe8}+ \) and 15 \( \text{h1} \) was also possible.

14 ... \( \text{c8}+ \)
15 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c5} \)
16 \( \text{xe8}+ \) Resigns

(10 points)

What is the best way for White to realize his positional advantage?

In the previous example Grandmaster Tukmakov carried out a positional attack in excellent style.
In this position (from Tukmakov-Kuzmin, 1982) he succeeds with an attack on the king. White can now win a pawn by 1 \( \text{Qd7+} \text{g8} \) 2 \( \text{Qxb6} \), but after 2 ... \( \text{dh8} \) Black has counterplay. For example, 3 ... \( \text{Qxf4} \) is possible. White therefore takes the wisest decision – he himself gives up a pawn, but he lures the black king into the centre, where it comes under an attack.

1 \( \text{Qc4!} \) \( \text{Wxb4} \)
2 \( \text{Qd7+} \) \( \text{e7} \)

Not 2 ... \( \text{g8} \) 3 \( \text{Qxe6+} \), winning the queen.

3 \( \text{Qxb6} \) \( \text{f8} \)

Not 3 ... \( \text{Qxf4} \) 4 \( \text{Wxf4} \) \( \text{Wxb6} \) 5 \( \text{Wg5+} \) \( \text{f8} \) 6 \( \text{Qd7} \).

4 \( \text{Qd2!} \)
The decisive rook manoeuvre.

4 ...
5 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{e1} \)
6 \( \text{Qc8+!} \) Resigns

Black is mated after either 6 ...

\( \text{Qxc8} \) 7 \( \text{Qb7+} \) \( \text{e8} \) 8 \( \text{b5+} \), or 6 ...

\( \text{Qf7} \) 7 \( \text{Qd6+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 8 \( \text{Qxe8} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 9 \( \text{b7} \). (5 points)
No one will be surprised to learn that there are very many grandmasters in Moscow (more than 20), but which Soviet towns come next after the capital? It turns out that Tbilisi is in second place with eight grandmasters, in third place is Lvov (five), and then come Odessa, Riga and Leningrad (three each), followed by Krasnoyarsk, Kiev, Minsk, Krasnodar, Alma-Ata etc. [Written in 1983, this data may now be slightly out of date – translator’s note]

Chess centres do not arise spontaneously. If in a town there are good organizers, there will normally develop around them a number of strong players, trainers and ordinary enthusiasts. This is what happened in Lvov, the chess fame of which is mainly associated with the name of V. Kart, an Honoured Trainer of the Soviet Union.

The best known of Kart’s pupils are Oleg Romanishin and Alexander Belyavsky.

Already at the age of 10 Belyavsky became a first category player, and he quickly developed into one of the strongest Ukrainian juniors. He was a constant and successful member of the Republic’s school-boys team, and in 1969 he became USSR Junior Champion.

This position arose in the game Gofstein-Belyavsky (USSR Junior Championship, 1969) after the following opening moves:

1 c4 e6 2 d3 e6 3 g3 c5 4 g2 c6 5 0-0 d5 6 b3 e7 7 e3 0-0 8 b2 d4 9 ed cd 10 e1 e8 11 d3 e5 12 a3 a5 13 bd2 h6 14 de5 de5 15 xe5 wc7 16 dl d6 17 e1 e5 18 ad2 ag4 19 wc2 ad8 20 ab1 af5 21 bd1 c5 22 de4 xe4 23 xe4 xe4 24 xe4 wd6 25 ed1 (169).
From an early age Belyavsky's style displayed a striving for logical action. In the present game he has managed, right from the opening stage, to restrict his opponent. He now embarks on the decisive attack.

25 ... f5 26 a4 e2 e4 27 w cl w c6 28 w d2 e3 29 f e de 30 w c2 f 4 31 g 5 w f 3 32 d4 a x d 4 33 a x d 4 a x d 4 34 e f 1 w g 4+ 35 a g 2 w d 7 36 f 5 a d 2 37 a x d 2 e d 38 f 6 e 1 White resigns.

In 1973 the USSR Chess Federation was faced with a difficult, but pleasant choice: contending for the one place in the World Junior Championship in England were several strong players. It was decided to hold an elimination tournament. The opponents were worthy of one another: it is sufficient to say that all of them have since become grandmasters. This is the order in which they finished: Belyavsky, Makarichev, A. Petrosian, Panchenko, Kochiev.

Belyavsky spent six months preparing for the Junior World Championship. Karpov's experience, and the failure of Vaganian (when participating in the 1971 Championship Vaganian was already a grandmaster, but he nevertheless ceded first place to the Swiss player Hug) - all was taken into account. During the course of the tournament Belyavsky was able to display his best qualities. Thus, for example, behind Belyavsky were future grandmasters, in the form of Miles of England (the 1974 World Junior Champion) and the American Christiansen.

Here is one of the games by the winner.

**Belyavsky-Cooper**

**Sicilian Defence**

1 e 4 c 5 2 d f 3 e 6 3 d 4 c d 4 o x d 4 a c 6 5 d b 5 d 6 6 c 4 d f 6 7 a c 3 a 6 8 a a 3 a e 7 9 a e 2 0-0 10 0-0 b 6 11 a e 3.

In this popular variation there are many different continuations. At one time 11 f 4 used to be played, after which a game Spassky-Suetin went 11 ... a b 7 12 a f 3 a c 8 13 a e 3 a a 5 14 w d 3 w c 7 15 a a 1 a d 7 16 w d 2 a f 8 17 a d 5 e d 18 c d w b 8 19 b 4 a c 6 20 d c a x c 6, with equal play.

11 a c 2 has also been tried - 11 ... a b 7 12 a e 3 w c 7 13 a d 2 a d 4 14 a d 3 a c 6 15 f 3 b 5 16 a c 1 b c 17 a x c 4 w a 7 18 a h 1 a b 8 19 b 3 a f 8 20 a d 5! - Zagorovsky-Arnold, 1978). The move played, 11 a e 3, leads to a complicated struggle.

11 ... a b 7
12 a e 1
12 w b 3 or 12 a c 1 sets Black more problems.
12 ... a c 8
13 a f 1 a e 8?

A mistake. 13 ... a e 5 was correct. Now White strikes at the b 6 point and gains an obvious positional
advantage.

14 \( \text{e}a4 \) \( \text{e}d7 \)

15 \( \text{e}xb6! \)

With this elegant combination White gains an appreciable positional advantage.

15 \( \ldots \) \( \text{e}xb6 \)

16 \( \text{b}b3 \) \( \text{c}xc4 \)

17 \( \text{c}xc4 \) \( \text{b}b8 \)

18 \( \text{e}ed1 \) \( \text{d}5 \)

It is difficult to get by without this move, since the opposition of queen and rook creates various threats against the \( \text{d}6 \) pawn.

19 \( \text{e}d \) \( \text{ed} \)

20 \( \text{w}a4 \) \( \text{d}4 \)

21 \( \text{f}f4 \) \( \text{e}c8 \)

22 \( \text{e}e5 \) \( \text{c}5 \)

And now comes a little combination which wins a pawn.

23 \( \text{e}xf7 \) \( \text{w}f6 \)

24 \( \text{d}d6 \) \( \text{c}xd6 \)

25 \( \text{c}xd6 \) \( \text{c}xd6 \)

26 \( \text{b}b3+ \) \( \text{h}h8 \)

27 \( \text{w}xb7 \) \( \text{c}e5 \)

28 \( \text{e}xa6 \)

and White won.

After his victory in the World Junior Championship Belyavsky was personally invited to the USSR Championship Premier League, where he shared first place with none other than Tal. And in subsequent tournaments the Lvov player’s successes have continued to grow. He has become one of the strongest Soviet grandmasters, and has twice been USSR Champion.

Belyavsky has since led the USSR team to victory in the 1984 Olympiad, and has twice been a Candidate for the World Championship – translator’s note].

No, this is not going to be a lecture on the Italian Game! The diagram position is only required for the purposes of starting a discussion on the centre.

The problem of the centre concerned players back in pre-Greco times. It was initially thought that, whoever could seize the central squares (\( \text{e}4 \), \( \text{d}4 \) or \( \text{e}5 \), \( \text{d}5 \)) with pawns should then be able to seek a forced way to win. But defence gradually began to balance attack, and this simplified view on the centre no longer has any followers.

And indeed, few are happy to play the Möller Attack from the diagram position: 7 \( \ldots \) \( \text{e}xe4 \) 8 0-0 \( \text{a}xc3 \) 9 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 10 \( \text{e}e1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 11 \( \text{e}xe4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{xg5} \) 13 \( \text{xg5} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{xh7} \) 15 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{g}8 \)
At the end of the last century games began occurring in which the strategy of opposing pawns with pawns in the centre was replaced by other ideas. In particular, in the Chigorin Defence Black allows the formation of a white pawn centre, but then attacks it with his pieces and pawns. Here, for example, is the opening of the game Pillsbury-Chigorin (St Petersburg 1895):

1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 g4 cd 4 d3 d6 5 dc g4 6 g4 e6 7 e4 d5 8 f5 e5 a7 d6 10 e5 d7 11 d5 b4 12 a4+ c6 13 d3 wb6 with advantage to Black.*

Similar ideas followed: in 1913 Nimzowitsch wrote that pieces deployed in the centre can successfully replace pawns. The Réti Opening, the Grünfeld Defence and Alekhine’s Defence all made their appearance.

Modern-day views on the centre comprise one of the main problems of theory. The majority of books pick out the following types of centre:

* The game continued 14 c2 a6 15 d1 c4 16 f4 0-0-0 17 e3 d5 18 d2 b6 19 wc2 xd4 20 cl d3 21 wb3 c4 22 f2 xd2, and Black was a piece up.

Mobile centre. Characterized by one player having a pawn pair in the centre. Often arises from the Open Games, the Grünfeld Defence and Alekhine’s Defence.

Immobile centre. The main feature is pawn chains in the centre. May be obtained from the King’s Indian and French Defences or from the Spanish Game.

Open centre. Here there are no pawns on the central squares. A variety of openings can lead to this.

Static centre. Formed after the fixing of the central pawns. May arise out of virtually any opening system.

Dynamic centre. Receives its name from the unclear, ‘tense’ position of pawns in the centre. Typical of the Sicilian Defence.

We will now turn to a more detailed examination of the different types of centre.

Yusupov-Tukmakov
USSR Zonal, Yerevan 1982

Grünfeld Defence

1 d4 c6 2 c4 g6 3 d5 cd 4 xd5 g4 5 cd a6 6 bc

A typical mobile pawn centre has arisen – the oldest pawn structure, and one which has been well
tested in Open Games. The active side must normally act energetically and mount a rapid offensive with his pawns. It is not always necessary to aim for mate: if the opponent can be severely restricted, the attack can then be switched to one of the flanks. The defending side usually tries to blockade or even eliminate the opponent’s mobile pawn centre. Other plans (such as a counter-attack on one of the flanks) rarely prove effective.

6 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{g} \)\text{g}7} \\
7 \text{\( \mathcal{d} \)f3} \text{c5}

The main idea of the Grünfeld Defence is to break up White’s pawn centre with undermining pawn moves and long-range piece fire.

8 \text{\( \mathbb{b} \)b1} \text{0-0} \\
9 \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)e2} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)a5} \\
10 \text{0-0} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)xa2}

Pawn-grabbing has always been punished. Taking on c3 is totally bad: 10 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)xc3} 11 \text{\( \mathcal{d} \)d2} \text{\( \mathcal{a} \)a3} 12 \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c2}, and the threat of trapping the queen (13 \text{\( \mathbb{b} \)b3} and 14 \text{\( \mathcal{b} \)b5}) forces Black to give back the pawn – 12 \( \ldots \) a6 13 dc \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)e6} (otherwise 14 \text{\( \mathcal{b} \)b4}) 14 \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)xb7}.

After 10 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)xc3} White can also choose a more complicated path: 11 d5 \text{\( \mathcal{a} \)a5} 12 \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)e3} \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c7} 13 \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)cl} \text{\( \mathcal{d} \)d7} 14 \text{\( \mathcal{d} \)d4}. As for the capture on a2, the motives of the move are clear – Black does not wish to allow his opponent to deploy his pieces ‘for free’ in attacking positions. In one game Black maintained the balance by this method, when White answered 9 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)a5} with 10 \text{\( \mathbb{b} \)b5}, and the sequel was 10 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)xc3}+ 11 \text{\( \mathcal{d} \)d2} \text{\( \mathcal{a} \)a3} 12 \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c5} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)xa2} 13 0-0 with very complicated play. But subsequently Tukmakov underestimates the attacking possibilities of White’s pawn centre.

11 \text{\( \mathcal{g} \)g5} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)e6}

Instead of this, the unusual idea of advancing the pawn to f6 followed by \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)f7} would have enabled Black to take prophylactic measures against the advance of the white pawns.

12 e5! \text{\( \mathcal{d} \)d8} \\
13 \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)a4} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)c6} \\
13 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c6} looks more natural, but after 14 d5 Black cannot play 14 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)xd5} because of 15 \text{\( \mathbb{b} \)bd1} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)e6} 16 \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)d8+} \text{\( \mathcal{g} \)xd8} 17 \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)e8+} \text{\( \mathcal{f} \)f8} 18 \text{\( \mathcal{h} \)h6}, while after 14 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{e} \)xd5} 15 \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c4} the complications favour White.

14 \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)b3}

The weakness of the b7 and e7 pawns prevents Black from coordinating his pieces.

14 \( \ldots \) \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)c7} \\
15 \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c4} \text{\( \mathcal{f} \)f8} \\
16 e6!

The mobile pawn centre justifies its name!

16 \( \ldots \) \text{f6} \\
17 \text{\( \mathcal{b} \)b4} \text{\( \mathcal{c} \)c6} \\
18 \text{\( \mathcal{g} \)g3} \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)d8} \\
19 \text{\( \mathcal{w} \)a2} \text{cd}
20 cd b6
20 ... Qxd4? opens a further line for the white pieces: 21 Bd1 Qxf3+ 22 gf Qe8 23 Qb5.
21 d5 Qe5
22 Bd1 Qh8
23 Qxe5 fe (171)

24 d6!
Now loss of material is inevitable for Black.
24 ... ed

25 Qd5 Qxe6
The bishop sacrifice is forced, but Black gains no compensation.
26 Qxe6 Qe7
27 Bc1 Qae8
28 Qd5 Qc8
29 Qc6 Qxc6
30 Qxc6 Qh5
31 wQa4 Qh6
32 wQe4 Qh7
33 Qa4 wQf4
34 Qc2 wQe6
35 Qh4 wQg7
36 g3 Qh6
37 Qe7 Resigns

In this game White was able to realize the basic strategic idea of a mobile pawn centre. Philidor once said that pawns are the soul of chess. By analogy it can be asserted that the centre is the soul of the opening.
Blocked pawn chains are the basic feature of an immobile centre.

This position arose from a Nimzo-Indian Defence after the opening moves 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e6 3 Qc3 b4 4 e3 c5 5 d3 Qf6 6 c3+ b6 7 bc d6 8 e4 e5 9 h3 h6 10 Qe3 b6 11 0-0 Qc7 12 d5 Qe7 (Portisch-Timman, 1982).

The position in the centre determines the typical plans for the two sides. Usually the active side will undertake a pawn offensive on one of the flanks, not necessarily against the castled position. Sometimes a minority pawn attack against weaknesses on the queenside will succeed more quickly. As for the defender’s actions, here the most important thing is not to engage in passive defence, but to counter-attack on the opposite flank. Sometimes a piece sacrifice can be used to blow open the centre and seize the initiative. But in every case it should be remembered that, with the centre closed, the switching of the attack from wing to wing is possible.

13 Qh4?

White’s plan in this position is very natural. He intends to play f4, and he needs to clear the way for his pawn. After 13 ... 0-0 14 f4 Black cannot win a piece by 14 ... ef 15 Qxf4 g5, since he comes under a murderous attack: 16 Qxg5 hg 17 Qxf6 gh 18 e5. But Black is not obliged to go in for these variations. His king has not yet castled, and the stable position in the centre makes its present residence perfectly safe. And at the same time the knight at h4 gives Black a highly important tempo for the surprising decision to launch an attack on the king.

13 ... g5!

Portisch did not expect this reply,
otherwise he would have played 13 \( \text{Qd2} \). Now the knight cannot return to f3, since 14 ... g4 then forces the opening of the g-file, with a familiar type of attack. The knight also cannot go to f5 on account of the loss of a pawn: 14 \( \text{Qf5} \text{Qxf5} \) 15 efe4 and 16 ... \( \text{xf5} \). That only leaves the move played.

14 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{gfg8}! \)

In this original way Black begins a battle for the e4 square.

15 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \)
16 ef \( \text{Qf6} \)
17 g4

Otherwise Black brings his rook from a8 to g8 and begins opening lines.

17 ... \( \text{a6}! \)

Timman makes excellent use of the possibilities in the position. In certain variations the e5 and c4 pawns are exchanged, and his white-squared bishop becomes active.

18 \( \text{Wd1} \) e4!
19 \( \text{Wa4}+ \) \( \text{Qf8} \)
20 \( \text{Wxa6} \)
20 \( \text{exe4} \text{exe4} \) 21 \( \text{Wxa6} \text{e7} \) 22 \( \text{a6} \) is dangerous because of 22 ... \( \text{We5} \) followed by ... h5.

20 ... \( \text{ed} \)
21 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{He8} \)
22 \( \text{a6} \)

The course of the game shows that this rook would have come in more useful on the b-file.

22 ... \( \text{Wb7} \)

Black steals up on the d5 pawn (the threat is ... b5).

23 \( \text{Wd1} \) b5
24 \( \text{Wb1} \)

Possibly White should have relieved the tension and gone into an inferior ending after 24 \( \text{Wxd3} \) bc 25 \( \text{Wxc4} \text{Wxd5} \). But in this event (the 'Clarín' Tournament in Mar del Plata) Timman succeeded with absolutely everything: he took first place by a margin of one and a half points, even defeating the World Champion Karpov.

24 ... \( \text{He4} \)
25 \( \text{Wxd3} \) \( \text{xc4} \)
26 \( \text{Id1} \) \( \text{g7} \)
27 f3

White prevents the knight from going to e4, but instead Black prepares to transfer his queen to e5.

27 ... \( \text{We7} \)
28 f4

It is no longer possible to defend all the important points.

28 ... \( \text{He8} \)
29 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{We2} \)

The simplest and the strongest.

30 fg \( \text{hg} \)
31 \( \text{Wg3} \)

On 31 \( \text{exe5} \) Black has 31 ... \( \text{exe5}+! \) 32 \( \text{hg} \text{exe4+} \) 33 \( \text{f2} \text{exe4+} \) 34 \( \text{exe1} \text{exe5} \) etc.

31 ... \( \text{exe4} \)
32 f6+ \( \text{g6} \)
33 \( \text{Wg2} \) \( \text{xc3} \)
34 \( \text{Id2} \) \( \text{Wg2}+ \)
35 \( \text{exe2} \) \( \text{Resigns} \)
This is one of Timman's best games, in which he demonstrates the typical plans with an immobile pawn centre.

Positions with a closed centre frequently occur, but equally common are positions with an open centre.

This is a typical position with an open centre, where the two sides' plans are typified by piece play. The active side manoeuvres, and attacks with his pieces on one of the flanks with the aim of provoking weaknesses there. If he succeeds in this, he then begins an attack on these weaknesses. Pawn storms are not usually favourable. The main method of defence lies in driving away the opponent's pieces from the central squares and lines, and pawn weaknesses should be avoided. It is interesting to follow how the position in diagram 173 arose.

Kupreichik-P. Littlewood
Hastings 1982-3
Spanish Game

1 e4 e5
2 f3 d6
3 b5 a6
4 a4 f6
5 0-0 e7
6 Ne1 b5
7 Nb3 0-0

This move heralds the Marshall Attack, or invites White to engage in another fashionable opening debate.

8 a4

The choice is made. White attacks the b-pawn, provoking its advance to b4, and in time he will try to eliminate it. In return Black gains a lead in development.

8 ... N b7
9 d3 d6
10 Nd2 b4

Now White's queen's knight is shut in, and numerous games have shown that after 11 c3 Black has nothing to fear.

11 a5

White's idea becomes clear - the b4 pawn is cut off.

11 ... d5

As a counteraction, Black begins active play in the centre.

12 Ng5 de
13 de N xe4

A little bit of tactics, based on the weakness of the first rank.
However, there is nothing original here – this variation has occurred fairly often.

14 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xe7} \)  
15 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xe5} (173) \)

The diagram position has been reached, and the game enters its decisive phase. If White can complete his development and repel the activity of the opponent’s pieces, his opening plan will have been justified.

15 ... \( \text{\text{\text{\text{g}}}} \text{g6} \)
16 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xd8} \)  
17 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d3!} \)

This is much stronger than the mechanical exchange: 17 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xg6} \) \( \text{hg} \)  
18 f3 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c5} \)  
19 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c4} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{d4} \), with a very active position for Black.

How is Black now going to defend his b4 pawn? If 17 ... c5, then  
18 f3 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c8} \) 19 fe \( \text{c4} \) 20 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d2!} \) cb (20 ... cd 21 cd \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{e5} \) 22 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e3} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{d8} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c4} \) 21 cb \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{d8} \) 22 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e3} \) followed by 23 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c4} \).

In a game Kuzmin-Psakhis (49th USSR Championship, 1981) Black managed to hold the position after 17 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d3} \), by a spot of tightrope-walking by his pieces: 17 ... \( \text{\text{\text{\text{g}}}} \text{g5} \) 18 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d2} \) (avoiding the trap 18 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xb4?} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{h}}}} \text{h4!} \) 19 f3 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xf3+} \) 20 gf \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xf3+} \) 21 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{f2} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xel} \) 22 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xel} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e8+} \) 23 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{h}}}} \text{f2} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d1} \) 18 ... \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d4} \) 19 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e3} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{d8} \) 20 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xel} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{f8} \) 21 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{a}}}} \text{a4} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e6} \) 22 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{b3} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{g}}}} \text{g4} \) 23 f3 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{g}}}} \text{g5} \) 24 g3 c6 (the b4 pawn is still immune) 25 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{f2} \) h5 26 f4 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{f5} \) 27 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e5} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{xe5} \), and a draw was soon agreed.

The English player Littlewood chooses a different path, but does not succeed in maintaining the balance.

17 ... \( \text{\text{\text{\text{x}}}} \text{d4} \)
18 f3 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{g}}}} \text{g5} \)
19 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{d}}}} \text{d2} \) h6?

An incorrect deployment of the forces. It is obvious that White will double rooks on the e-file and threaten to exchange rooks. Black could have prevented this by 19 ... \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{d8} \) 20 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e2} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{f8}! \), but he is attracted by another idea.

20 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{h}}}} \text{e2} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{d8} \)
21 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{a}}}} \text{ael} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{h}}}} \text{7} \)
22 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{e}}}} \text{e8} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{b}}}} \text{d6} \)

The exchange cannot be allowed, since then the defender of the b4 pawn is removed.

23 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{b}}}} \text{b8} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c6} \)
24 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{c}}}} \text{c4} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{f6} \)
25 \( \text{\text{\text{\text{b}}}} \text{xb4} \) \( \text{\text{\text{\text{f}}}} \text{xf3} (174) \)

This move was probably the basis of Black's entire plan. Now
26 gf is not possible because of 26...
... $\text{Qxf3}+ 27 \text{Qf2} (27 \text{Qg2} \text{Qxe1+}
28 \text{Qxe1} \text{Qg4+} 29 \text{Qh3} h5) 27 ...
\text{Qxe1}+ 28 \text{Qxe1} \text{Qh4}, when Black
has everything in order. But there
is no need for White to go in for
unfavourable complications.

\begin{align*}
26 & \text{Qce5!} \quad \text{Qxb4} \\
27 & \text{Qxb4} \quad \text{Qe4} \\
\text{Other moves also lose a pawn.} \\
28 & \text{Qxf7} \quad \text{Qxf7} \\
29 & \text{Qxe4} \quad \text{Qd6} \\
30 & \text{Qe6} \quad \text{Qf5} \\
31 & \text{Qd5} \quad \text{Qf4} \\
32 & \text{Qxf4} \\
\text{White easily realizes his advan-} \\
\text{tage.} \\
32 & \ldots \quad \text{Qxf4}
\end{align*}

33 \text{c3} \quad \text{Qf8} \\
34 \text{Qe7} \quad \text{Qb8} \\
35 \text{Qc2+} \quad \text{Qg8} \\
36 \text{Qxc7} \quad \text{Qxb2} \\
37 \text{Qg6} \quad \text{Qf8} \\
38 \text{Qd7} \quad \text{Qd2} \\
39 \text{h4} \quad \text{Qc4} \\
40 \text{Qf7+} \quad \text{Qg8} \\
41 \text{Qc7} \quad \text{Qd6} \\
42 \text{c4} \quad \text{Qf8} \\
43 \text{h5} \quad \text{Qd1+} \\
44 \text{Qh2} \quad \text{Qc1} \\
45 \text{Qd7} \quad \text{Resigns}

Positions with an open centre
are among the most complicated,
and their correct handling requires
great skill and experience.
LESSON 33
The uncompromising Valery Chekhov
Transformation of the centre
Nona Gaprindashvili

1975 arrived. FIDE had held the World Junior Championship fourteen times, but on only three occasions had it been won by representatives of the USSR. In 1974 in the Philippines, for example, our delegate Alexander Kochiev (a future grandmaster!) did not even finish in the first three, and the Championship was won by the Englishman Tony Miles.

And again an elimination tournament for the most worthy contenders was held, this time in Sochi, in which first place was shared by Zaid and Chekhov. The USSR Chess Federation’s Youth Committee had to decide which of the winners to entrust with the honoured, but very responsible right to take part in the World Championship. Their choice fell on Valery Chekhov, but not because he was stronger than Leonid Zaid. As a chessplayer Valery was noted for his competitive nature, with the ability to put everything into a tournament, and he was also in very good physical shape. All this gave hope that, in the severe conditions of a swiss system tournament, Chekhov would be able to give of his best.

The Championship was held in the Yugoslav town of Tjentiste. Chekhov did not take part in the initial rush – he was paired against strong opponents – and draws left him some way behind the leaders. But he knew the laws of the swiss system, and he realized that everything would be decided not by the start, but by the finish, and he felt that his staying-power would not let him down (there was a round every day, as well as the resumption of adjourned games). Incidentally, Chekhov had adapted to heavy tournament pressure back in the Moscow Pioneers Palace. On one occasion, changes in the calendar of events forced him to play tournament games every other day for almost six months. Such a thing is not advisable, of course, but the fact remains that Chekhov could endure severe pressure very well.

In the seventh round of the Championship the Soviet player moved into first place and thereafter did not concede it to anyone. Seven wins, six draws, and not a single defeat – this was Valery Chekhov’s result. He demonstrated
all-round preparation in the endgame, played confidently in the middlegame, and successfully solved problems in the opening.

Nurmi-Chekhov
Sicilian Defence

1 e4 c5 2 \f3 \c6 3 d4 cd 4 \xd4 \f6 5 \c3 e5 6 \db5 d6 7 \g5 a6 8 \xf6 gf9 \a3 b5 9 e5 \d5 f5 11 ef \xf5 12 \d3 e4.

In preparing for his game with the Canadian player, Chekhov decided to employ his favourite weapon – the Chelyabinsk Variation of the Sicilian Defence. Moreover, on the 12th move he uses a recommendation by the chief specialist on this variation – grandmaster Sveshnikov. Chekhov’s second related how the impact of the opening preparation was such that Nurmi thought over his 13th move for almost an hour.

21 cd

In his confusion, White misses 21 \ac2, after which he could still have battled on. Now Black wins.

21 ... \exe3
22 \h1 \c8+

Resigns

Chekhov learned chess at roughly the age of nine. He joined a group at the Moscow Pioneers Palace run by the senior teacher E.Penchko, and studied there for 2½ years. Then he suddenly gave up chess and switched to a football school. He spent a whole year there, but his attraction towards chess proved stronger. However, football has remained Chekhov’s favourite game after chess.

Chekhov later studied under the Honoured Trainer of the USSR G.Ravinsky, and after entering the Chess Department of the Central Physical Culture Institute he collaborated with Mark Dvoretsky. He is now an international grandmaster and he completes successfully in various events.

Matulović-Rajković. 1975, continued 18 \g4 h5 19 \h3 \g5+ 20 \e3 \f6 21 \d2 \e2+ 22 \dl \f4 23 \d5 \xb2 with advantage to Black.

18 ... \g5+
19 \e3 \f6!
20 c3 \xf2
This is a position from one of the most topical variations of the Sicilian Defence: 1 e4 c5 2 d4 d6 3 d4 cd 4 Qxd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 e2 e5 7 b3 e7 00 09 e3 e6.

The basic feature of this position is the presence of a static (fixed) pawn centre (pawn at e4 for White, pawn at e5 for Black). This is perhaps one of the most common types of centre, and one which often transforms into a closed or a mobile structure. With a static centre the plans for the two sides involve manoeuvring around the central squares. Usually each side aims for centralization, and only then switches to action on the flank. Possible here is either a piece, or a piece-down attack on the opposing king, or else an attack on queenside pawn weaknesses. All these actions must be combined with measures to decentralize the opponent's pieces. Such a diversity of plans leads to highly interesting play, which may be of a strategical or tactical nature. As an example we will examine one of the typical games played by the then World Champion in the 1982 London Tournament (Karpov-Portisch).

Usually in the diagram position White would play 10 f4, which after 10 ... ef 11 Qxf4 Qc6 followed by ... d5 leads to a complicated struggle with chances for both sides. Karpov employs a new plan, at the basis of which is an offensive not on the kingside but the queenside.

10 Qd2! Qbd7

After 10 ... d5 11 ed Qxd5 12 Qxd5 Qxd5 13 fdl Qc6 14 Qxd8 Qxd8 15 Qa5 Qe4 16 f3 Qxd1+ 17 Qxd1 xc2 18 Qc1 Qf5 19 Qxb7 White has a slight but persistent advantage.

11 a4

White begins operations aimed at establishing a queenside bind.

11 ... Lc8
12 a5 Qc7
13 Lfc1 Qc6
14 Qf3 Qc4
15 Qa4!

By this fresh, original manoeuvre White intensifies the pressure on b6 and b7.

15 ... Zfd8
16 Zb4 Qc7
17 Qd5

This move completes White’s centralization. If this knight is left at d5, sooner or later it will cause Black great unpleasantness. Therefore its exchange is forced, and White further increases his spatial advantage on the queenside.

17 ... Qxd5
18 ed f5
19 Qg4 was threatened.
19 Qe2 Qxb3
20 Qxb3 f4

The advance of the black pawns has no support.
The white bishop is significantly stronger than its opponent.

The pawn phalanx begins its advance. Strategically Black is already outplayed.

This breakthrough leads to the formation of connected passed pawns.

The structure characterizing this position is a dynamic centre. The pawns are not yet fixed, and this means that a transformation is possible into any of the types of centre listed above. The play is very complicated. Usually the two sides try to clarify the position in the centre and to saddle the opponent with an unfavourable pawn formation. Flank attacks in such positions are possible, but when preparing them one has to reckon with counterplay in the centre.

The diagram position is taken from a game by the former World Women's Champion Gaprindashvili (White) against the Soviet master Yermolinsky (Karseladze Memorial Tournament, Tskhaltubo 1981). For not the first time Nona Gaprindashvili defeats a male opponent. She has long been playing on equal terms with masters, and she was the first woman in the world to achieve the grandmaster norm in a male event.
The opening in this game was the Leningrad Variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defence: 1 d4 əf6 2 c4 e6 3 əf3 əb4+ 4 əc3 0-0 5 əg5 h6 6 əh4 c5 7 e3 əxc3+ 8 bc d6 9 əd2 əbd7 10 əd3 əe7 11 0-0 e5 (177).

White has played the opening very solidly, preferring quiet operations in the centre to the main continuation (7 d5). After a certain amount of preparation she wishes to set in motion her piece-pawn mass on the d- and e-files. For the moment Black does not reveal his plans.

12 əe1 b6
13 əb1 əb7
14 əe1 əfe8
15 f3

If immediately 15 f4, then after 15 ... ef 16 ef əf8 17 əc2 əxe1+ 18 əxe1 əe8 Black obtains a position which, though passive, is fairly solid. Therefore White does not hurry.

15 ... əf8

The transference of the knight to g6 proves unsuccessful. White manages to seize the initiative in the centre and to weaken the opponent’s kingside. It would have been better to maintain the tension by 15 ... əad8.

16 f4!

Now the capture on f4 is no longer possible, since after 16 ... ef 17 ef əd8 18 əxe8 əxe8 19 əxf6 the black king’s pawn screen is broken up.

16 ... əg6
17 əxf6

By eliminating this knight White obtains the excellent transit point e4 and clear prospects of an attack on the kingside.

17 ... əxf6
18 əe4 əe7

On 18 ... əxe4 White had prepared 19 əxe4 əd8 20 f5 əf8 21 de de 22 əg4, with the advantage.

19 f5 əf8

Four moves ago one could have said that the position on the board was one of dynamic balance, whereas now White has an obvious advantage. The tactical complications arising after 19 ... əxe4?! 20 əxe4 ed 21 ed əf4 end in favour of White: 22 əf3! d5 23 əg3 (pointed out by Zak).

20 f6! (178)
Black does not want to allow the knight to go to e4, but he is unable to avoid this. In the event of 21 ... \( \text{dx}e4 \) Gaprindashvili had in mind the following fine variation:

22 \( \text{dx}e4 \) \( \text{dd}7 \) 23 \( \text{gg}4+ \) \( \text{dh}8 \) 24 \( \text{wh}3 \) \( \text{dh}7 \) (24 ... \( \text{gg}7 \) 25 \( \text{dg}3 \) 25 \( \text{xd}7! \) \( \text{xd}7 \) 26 \( \text{xf}6+ \) \( \text{gg}7 \) 27 \( \text{xd}7 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 28 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{de} \) 29 \( \text{d}5 \) with a great advantage.

22 \( \text{tx}b7 \) \( \text{xb}7 \)
22 ... \( \text{xb}7 \) would have been met by 23 \( \text{de}4 \) \( \text{dh}7 \) 24 \( \text{gg}3+ \) and 25 \( \text{xd}6 \).

23 \( \text{de}4 \) f5
24 \( \text{xd}6 \)
White’s play is simple and convincing. Gaprindashvili handles the technical side impeccably.

24 ... \( \text{xd}6 \)
25 \( \text{xb}7 \) ed
26 ed \( \text{xe}1+ \)
27 \( \text{xe}1 \) cd
28 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \)
29 cd \( \text{xa}2 \)
30 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{d}2 \)
31 \( \text{h}1 \) f4
32 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
33 g3 \( \text{b}4 \)
34 gf \( \text{xc}4 \)
35 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{f}8 \)
36 \( \text{a}8+ \) \( \text{e}7 \)

37 f5 \( \text{h}4 \)
Black’s last hope is the trap 38 \( \text{e}4+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 39 \( \text{hx}4? \) \( \text{c}6+ \) with perpetual check.
38 \( \text{e}1+ \) \( \text{f}6 \)
39 \( \text{d}8+ \) Resigns

This game appears to be a simple one, seemingly without any especially pretty variations. But in fact the entire depth is concealed in the simplicity of the outward decisions. Black was completely outplayed, and this occurred somehow imperceptibly, between the 12th and 15th moves. The clash of the pawn formations of a dynamic centre always leads to positions abounding in tactics, and with deep (sometimes well-veiled) strategic plans.

This concludes our brief acquaintance with the strategic problems of the centre. A fluent understanding of these questions will facilitate the choice of correct plan in the transition from opening to middle-game. Moreover, often opening systems themselves are chosen under the influence of this or that type of centre. Therefore a player must constantly expand his knowledge and skill in the playing of typical positions.
LESSON 34
Artur Yusupov becomes a member of the USSR team
How to parry a flank attack
Innovations in an old variation

Late on a September evening in 1977 Zoya and Mayak Yusupov received a telephone call in their Moscow flat from the distant Austrian town of Innsbruck: their 17-year-old son Artur informed them that, irrespective of the outcome of the last round of the World Junior Championship, he had gained first place.

Six-year-old Artur was taken to the chess section of the Pioneers Palace by his brother. The lad did not particularly distinguish himself, but he tried not to miss any of the classes. At the age of 12 he became a first category player, and at 14 a candidate master. Artur was very serious, hard-working and modest. Here is an episode which is typical of him.

In 1972 the Pioneers Palace received some visitors from Copenhagen - members of the Danish Schools' Chess Union. A two-round match was played on fifty boards. The guests played weakly, and the overall score was 92½-7½ in our favour. This factor, together with the outward appearance of the guests (all the Danes had longhair, down to their shoulders) confused Artur. As he handed over his scoresheet to the arbiter, he mournfully sighed: "She didn't sign it". Artur thought that he had been playing a girl. Here is this amusing game.

Yusupov-Renne
French Defence
1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 cd2 c5 4 ed ed 5 c5 d7 7 xd7+ dbxd7 8 0-0 e7 9 b3 0-0 10 db2 b6 11 de5 exe5 12 de d7 13 f4 f5 14 df3 d4 15 c3 dc 16 wd5+ dh8 17 xc3 b5 18 ad1 db6 19 wb7 we8 20 dfe1 c4 21 bc ac5+ 22 ad4 ef7 23 wa6 xd4+ 24 xd4 bc 25 e6 ef7 26 wa5 wa5 27 wa4 28 dxa4 29 dxf5 ec7 29 e7 Resigns.

To be fair, it should be pointed out that the Danish team was opposed by a Pioneers Palace team headed by Chekhov, and several of the other players later became masters.

Soon Yusupov was invited to attend Botvinnik's chess school,
and since 1975 he has had Dvoretsky as his trainer. In his last year at school he became a master, and won the elimination tournament to the World Junior Championship.

In Innsbruck Yusupov played splendidly. According to Botvinnik, his victory was the most convincing since Karpov's in 1969. Of Artur's 13 games from the Championship, the most tense was his meeting with the Yugoslav Popović.

**Popović-Yusupov**

*King's Indian Attack*

1 g3 d5 2 g2 d5 3 d3 c6 4 c3 d4 5 g4 f6 6 g2 f6 7 e5 c5 8 e4 de 9 gxf6 hxg5 10 gxf6+ gxf6

After making this move Yusupov regretted that he had not played simply 9 ... gxf6. Now White gains the opportunity to complicate matters.

11 g4! g6
12 d4 0-0
13 g5! e7
14 de h5
15 e1

An inaccuracy. After the superior 15 h4! gxf3 16 xf3 xe5 17 g3 White could have counted on an advantage, whereas now the game becomes level.

15 ... fxg3
16 xf3 xg5
17 g3 xc1
18 axcl c5

19 cd1 wb6
20 b3 ad8
21 h2 xd1
22 xdl d8
23 Id6 e6
24 c3

Black was already threatening 24 ... xed6 25 ed wd4, with advantage.

24 ... g6
25 h4 g7
26 h3 e8
27 g4 h5
28 h3 c5
29 f4

Here White could have complicated matters by 29 e6?! fe 30 b4!.

29 ... a5
30 d4

By this point Popović was already short of time, a factor which Black skilfully exploits to activate his game.

30 ... wa3!
31 wd2 wc1
32 wbl
33 d7 f5
34 wd2 b5
35 g2 h6
36 g3?

A mistake in time trouble; the bishop should have been returned to h3.

36 ... g4
37 wd2 wg1
38 xd8 xxd8
39 xdl h7
40 wd4 wh2+
Lesson Thirty-Four

41 \( \textit{\&}_f3 \) \( \textit{\&}_xh4 \)
42 \( \textit{\&}_e2 \)
The sealed move.
42 ... \( \textit{\&}_h2 \)
43 \( \textit{\&}_f1 \) \( c5 \)
44 \( \textit{\&}_e4 \) \( \textit{\&}_g3 \)
45 \( \textit{\&}_e2 \) \( \textit{\&}_f2+ \)
46 \( \textit{\&}_d3 \) \( \textit{\&}_xa2 \)
47 \( \textit{\&}_h7 \) \( \textit{\&}_xh3 \)
Resigns

Yusupov’s first visit as World Junior Champion was to the Moscow Pioneers Palace, where he spent his chess childhood, and where two of his brothers attend.

Three years after the World Junior Championship, now a student in the Economics Faculty of Moscow University, Yusupov was firmly established as one of the leading Soviet grandmasters. He is now a member of the USSR Olympiad team, and recently he became a Candidate for the World Championship. “Characteristic of Yusupov’s play is his deep understanding of strategic problems and his ability to calculate variations deeply and accurately. He possesses excellent fighting qualities, and genuine competitive courage.” – this is how the young grandmaster was described in the magazine \textit{Shakhmaty v SSSR}.

The concluding lessons will be devoted to certain strategic procedures which can significantly influence the course of a game. We will first examine in more detail the counterblow in the centre in reply to a flank attack.

A theoretical innovation employed by Black (Kupreichik-Kasparov, USSR Cup 1982) cast doubts on a well-known variation of the Sicilian Defence: 1 \( e4 \) \( c5 \) 2 \( \textit{\&}_f3 \) \( e6 \) 3 \( d4 \) \( cd \) 4 \( \textit{\&}_xd4 \) \( \textit{\&}_c6 \) 5 \( \textit{\&}_c3 \) \( d6 \) 6 \( \textit{\&}_e3 \) 7 \( f4 \) 8 \( f4 \) 0-0 9 \( \textit{\&}_d2 \) \( e5 \) 10 \( \textit{\&}_f3 \) (179).

Instead of the move recommended in old opening guides (10 ... \( a6 \)), and the more recent advice in the first edition of the \textit{Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings} (10 ... \( e \)), Kasparov makes an unexpected reply:

10 ... \( \textit{\&}_g4 ! \)

Now White’s planned queenside castling does not work: 11 \( 0-0-0 \) \( e \) 12 \( \textit{\&}_xf4 \) \( \textit{\&}_f2 \), while if 12 \( \textit{\&}_gl \) \( \textit{\&}_f6 ! \) and after 11 \( 0-0 \), 11 \( \textit{\&}_e6 \) or 11 \( \textit{\&}_d5 \) Black has an excellent game. For example, 11 \( \textit{\&}_d5 \) \( \textit{\&}_xe3 \) 12 \( \textit{\&}_xe3 e \) 13 \( \textit{\&}_xf4 \) \( \textit{\&}_e6 \) with equal play.
(Kasparov). In an attempt to extract more from the position than is justified, Grandmaster Kupreichik exceeds the bounds of risk. He prepares a flank attack with his centre unstable and his king uncastled. By energetic moves Black refutes his opponent's plan.

11 f5? Qb4!

Threatening 12 ... Qxe3 and 13 ... Qxc2.

12 a3

After 12 0-0-0 d5 it is Black who has an attack, e.g. 13 a3 Qxe3 14 Wxe3 d4 15 Wf2 Qc7! with advantage (Kasparov). White was now probably expecting 12 ... d5 13 Qxd5 Qxd5 14 ed Qxd5, but Black is not satisfied with a small gain.

12 ... d5

13 Qxd5 Qxd5

14 ed e4!

Unexpectedly the battle is decided: Black wins a piece.

15 Qxe4 Qe8

16 0-0-0

16 h3 would have been met by 16 ... Qh4+, and 16 0-0 by 16 ... Qc6 17 h3 Qxe3 18 Wxe3 Qxf5 19 Qd2 Qc7! (Kasparov).

16 ... Qf6

17 Qg5

On 17 Qd3 Black had prepared 17 ... Qxe3 18 Wxe3 Qxf5 19 Qd2 Qg5.

17 ... Qxe4

White has no serious compensation for the piece, and Black easily realizes his advantage.

18 h3 Qe5 19 Qxf6 Wxf6 20 Qxe5 Wxe5 21 g4 Qd7 22 Qh1 Qe8 23 Qxe4 Wxe4 24 Wa5 Wc3+ 25 Qb1 Wh3 26 Wxa7 Wxg4 27 Qc1 Qxf5 28 Wxb7 h5 29 b3 Wd4 30 a4 Wc3 White resigns.

This is a good example of how to play against an unprepared flank attack, but it is not always, of course, that a counterblow in the centre will win the game. It is quite sufficient if it enables the player to equalize.

This position (from Ljubojević-Ribli, 1979) arose after the opening moves 1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 d6 3 d4 cd 4 Qxd4 Qf6 5 Qc6 a6 6 Qe2 e5 7 Qb3 Qe7 8 0-0 Qe6 9 f4 Wc7 10 Qh1 Qbd7 11 a4 0-0 12 f5 Qc4 13 Qg5 h6 14 Qh4 Qc8 15 Qd3 (180).

It is a matter of taste, but in this fairly popular variation White usually prevents ... d5 by playing 13 a5 b5 14 ab Qxb6 15 Qe3, and then doubles rooks on the a-file.
with pressure on the a6 pawn. Many games have been played on this theme. Ljubojević has preferred an unusual plan on his 13th move, but his idea cannot be regarded as successful. White is all ready for the advance of his g-pawn, but Black too is fully prepared.

15 ... d5!

As in the previous example, this move allows Black to take the initiative.

16 ed  ¿xd5
17  ¿xd5  ¿xd5
18  ¿xe7

The attempt to retain the two bishops fails due to the weakness of the c2 pawn: 18 ¿f2 ¿b4 19 ¿e4 ¿f6.

18 ...  ¿xe7
19  ¿f3

A direct attack such as 19 f6 ¿xf6 20 ¿xf6 gf 21 ¿g4+ ¿h8 22 ¿h4 ¿g8 23 ¿e4 ¿g7 does not work, but in the open piece play Black’s chances are roughly equal.

19 ... ¿f6
20 ¿d2 ¿ed5
21 ¿e4 ¿e8
22 ¿ael ¿ad8

Let us sum up. Black’s position is solid. His forces are harmoniously deployed, and are prepared for any tactical or manoeuvring operations. With correct play on both sides the game would probably have ended in a draw.

23 c4?

Evidently White just couldn’t reconcile himself to the idea that his opponent had successfully conducted the opening battle. The correct 23 c3 would have maintained equality, whereas the impulsive 23 c4 creates weaknesses in White’s position.

23 ...  ¿xe4
24  ¿xe4 ¿f6
25 ¿xb7?

This is a tactical oversight.

25 ... e4!
26 ¿xe4 ¿xc4?

Annotating this game in the tournament bulletin, Grandmaster Gufeld rightly remarked that in the heat of the battle even a top-class grandmaster sometimes does not see that which is clear to all the spectators: 26 ... ¿e5! 27  ¿d3 ¿xe1 28 ¿xe1 ¿xe1+ 29 ¿f1 ¿dd1, when Black is a knight up. The ‘counter-pin’ by White does not help: 27 ¿e2 ¿xe4 28 ¿f1 ¿d4 29 b3 ¿d6! 30 g3 ¿c6! 31 ¿g2 f6 followed by ... ¿e5, freeing the knight.

27 b3?

Regarding such grandmaster blunders, Tigran Petrosian expressed the opinion that, if a top-class player does not see a simple threat immediately, then, however much he continues to look at the position, he will not see it . . . At any rate, in Ljubojević’s case this proved correct. He was not in time
trouble, and he could have calmly moved his bishop out of the firing line, but he did not sense the danger.

27 ... \( \text{Wb4}! \)

At last Ribli ‘comes to his senses’, and White resigns.

If a flank attack is mounted with the central position unstable, a counterblow on the central squares may prove an effective measure. In preparing the counterblow, all the features of the position must be carefully considered. Sometimes a plan can be spoiled by seemingly insignificant details.

On general grounds (“a flank attack is best met by a break in the centre”), instead of 15 ... b5 16 a3 b4 17 ab \( \text{Wxb4} \), Black made a routine move in Vilner-Kochiev, 1978:

15 ... d5?

It turns out that this ‘strategic’ decision does not work tactically.

16 ed \( \text{Qxd5} \)
17 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \)
18 f6!

Zak, Vilner’s trainer, gives variations which his protégé had seen back on the 16th move: 18 ... \( \text{xf6} \) 19 b4!; 18 ... \( \text{f8} \) 19 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 20 fg \( \text{Xg7} \) 21 \( \text{f3} \); 18 ... \( \text{c5} \) 19 b4! \( \text{xb4} \) 20 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f8} \) 21 fg \( \text{c5} \) 22 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 23 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xe3}+ \) 24 \( \text{h1} \).

The game went 18 ... \( \text{gf} \) 19 b4 \( \text{xb4} \) 20 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 21 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Wxb4} \) 22 \( \text{g4}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) 23 \( \text{Wxb4} \), and a few moves later Black resigned.

Routine play in chess does not work!
LESSON 35
The formation of outposts

It is not hard to guess how the chess term ‘outpost’ arose. Of all the numerous analogies taken from warfare, this concept is one of the most apt. An outpost signifies an advanced, reinforced point.

This attempt to get rid of the dangerous rook does not work, since White is all ready to mount an attack.

28 $wa5+$ $c8
29 $e6$!

This rook cannot be captured:
29 ... $x$xe6 30 $x$xe6+$b$8 31 $d$7 and 32 $c$7+

Black’s position is already lost; there is nowhere for his king to hide.

34 f5 $a7
35 $x$xd7! $w$xd7
36 $b$6+$b$8
37 $g$8+$f$8
38 $x$xf8+ Resigns

After 38 ... $x$xf8 39 $f$4+$c$8 40 $e$6 Black is mated.

Outposts can be of various types: pawn, knight, bishop, rook and even queen, but the most common are knight and rook outposts. They also have the ability to
change; for example a pawn outpost may be transformed into a knight outpost, and then into a rook outpost.

How do outposts arise? Let us return to the Portisch-Seirawan game, and follow the formation of the outpost.

This position was reached after White's 15th move. White stands better. It is easier for him to complete his development, and he has a flexible pawn chain. Black, on the other hand, is experiencing difficulties over the development of his pieces, while his advanced pawns have weakened many squares and may themselves become targets for attack. And yet the main strategic battle would have been to come, had Black played 15 ... \(\text{d}6?\), exchanged the strong knight at \(f4\), and prepared queenside castling. Instead of this Black commits a positional blunder, after which the game passes into a technical phase.

15 ... \(\text{c}6?\)

White exploits the weakening of the \(d6\) square in classic style.

16 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}g6\)
17 \(\text{b}5!\)

By tactical means White creates a knight outpost at \(d6\).

17 ... \(\text{xf}4\)
18 \(\text{d}6+\) \(\text{d}8\)
19 ef \(\text{c}7\)
20 \(\text{e}3\)

White develops harmoniously and prepares to reinforce his outpost.

20 ... \(\text{e}7\)
21 0-0-0 \(\text{b}8\)

Black has no useful moves, 21 ... \(\text{b}8\) (with the idea of ... \(b6\)) being impossible because of the little combination 22 \(\text{e}8+!\) \(\text{xe}8\) 23 \(\text{b}6+\) ab 24 \text{cb} mate!

22 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}6\)
23 g3 \(\text{h}7\)
24 \(\text{xc}8\)

The time has come to change the knight outpost into a rook outpost.

24 ... \(\text{xc}8\)
25 \(\text{hd}1\) \(\text{e}7\)

This attempt to make way for the rook does not succeed.

26 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{e}8\)
27 \(\text{d}6\)

and we obtain the position in diagram 182.

Playing for the formation of an outpost is a very important posi-
tional method. As a rule, the creation of an outpost opens up the possibility of seizing control of an open file and of invading the 7th rank with the heavy pieces. When these three positional operations succeed, in the majority of cases this is sufficient to conclude the game.

This position (from Psakhis-Yudasin, 1982) is one of dynamic balance. Black begins playing for the formation of an outpost at c4.

18 ... \text{b}c8
19 \text{b}3 \text{a}6
20 \text{d}4 \text{g}4
21 \text{h}3

Now 21 ... \text{x}d3 is met by 22 \text{h}g, but Black plays more subtly.

21 ... \text{c}4
22 \text{b}4 \text{f}6
23 \text{g}4 \text{xd}4
24 \text{e}3

In time trouble White makes a mistake. 24 \text{b}3 \text{a}5 25 \text{e}1 \text{xd}3 26 \text{x}d3 was better. Now Black invades the 2nd rank and wins a pawn.

24 ... \text{f}6
25 \text{e}1 \text{xd}3
26 \text{c}2
27 \text{f}2 \text{f}2
28 \text{c}1 \text{c}1
29 \text{xc}1 \text{g}4

The rest is simple.

30 \text{d}2 \text{g}6
31 \text{e}4 \text{h}5
32 \text{d}4 \text{c}6
33 \text{c}3 \text{xc}3
34 \text{c} \text{c}8
35 \text{d}3 \text{c}4

and White overstepped the time limit.

This is another example on the same theme (Gipslis-Hazai, 1981). White's advantage is that he can set up an outpost at d5. His play contains the three basic components: the creation of an outpost, the occupation of the central file, and the invasion of the seventh rank.

1 \text{d}5! \text{g}8
Black cannot take on d5, since this loses his e-pawn.

2  \( \text{Ke}d1 \)

This is stronger than 2  \( \text{Q}xe5 \text{Q}xe5 \text{Q}xe5 \text{Q}xe5 \text{Q}d2! \), when Black activates his rook.

2  ...  \( \text{Ke}e8 \)

Black is forced to concede the file.

3  \( \text{Q}f1 \)

For several moves White manoeuvres, strengthening his position and awaiting the moment to begin decisive action.

3  ...  \( \text{Ke}6 \)

4  \( \text{h}4 \)  \( \text{a}6 \)

5  \( \text{Q}e2 \)  \( \text{Q}ae8 \)

6  \( \text{Q}d2 \)  \( \text{Q}d8 \)

7  \( \text{Q}b3 \)  \( \text{Q}b6 \)

8  \( \text{Q}f3 \)  \( \text{Q}f6+ \)

9  \( \text{Q}g2 \)  \( \text{Q}fe6 \)

10  \( \text{Q}e3 \)  \( \text{Q}f1 \)

11  \( \text{Q}d2 \)  \( \text{g}6 \)

12  \( \text{Q}f3 \)  \( \text{f}6 \)

13  \( \text{h}4! \)

By the threats of invading with his knights at c5 and f5, White has provoked a weakening of the opponent's pawn structure. Now he opens the h-file and seizes it with his rook, thus preparing the position for a combinational solution.

13  ...  \( \text{gh} \)

14  \( \text{Q}xh4 \)  \( \text{Q}f7 \)

15  \( \text{Q}h3 \)  \( \text{Q}g8 \)

16  \( \text{Q}g4 \)  \( \text{Q}h8 \)

17  \( \text{Q}d7+ \)

The invasion of the 7th rank takes place.

17  ...  \( \text{Q}e7 \)

18  \( \text{Q}g2 \)  \( \text{Q}c8 \)

19  \( \text{Q}h1! \)

Blows rain on the black king from both left and right.

19  ...  \( \text{Q}d6 \)

19  ...  \( \text{Q}b8 \) is met by 20  \( \text{Q}h6+ \text{Q}g7 \) 21  \( \text{Q}f5+ \), while after 19  ...  \( \text{Q}e8 \) Gipslis was preparing a curious manoeuvre to ensure the invasion of his knight at f5: 20  \( \text{Q}d1! \text{Q}f7 \) 21  \( \text{Q}h6+ \text{Q}g7 \) 22  \( \text{Q}d7! \text{Q}h8 \) (22  ...  \( \text{Q}xh6 \) 23  \( \text{Q}f5++ \text{Q}g5 \) 24  \( \text{Q}g7!) \) 23  \( \text{Q}g4 \)  \( \text{Q}c8 \) 24  \( \text{Q}e3 \) followed by  \( \text{Q}f5. \)

20  \( \text{Q}h6+ \)  \( \text{Q}g7 \)

21  \( \text{Q}f5+! \)

The long-awaited combination.

21  ...  \( \text{Q}f1 \)

22  \( \text{Q}xf5+ \)  \( \text{Q}f7 \)

23  \( \text{Q}h7+ \)  \( \text{Q}g8 \)

24  \( \text{Q}xh7 \)  \( \text{Q}xe7 \)

25  \( \text{Q}xd6 \)  \( \text{cd} \)

26  \( \text{Q}xe7 \)

The complications are at an end, and White is a pawn up with a won position.

26  ...  \( \text{a}5 \) 27  \( \text{b}a \) 28  \( \text{b}b7 \) a4 29  

\( \text{b}b6 \)  \( \text{Q}f7 \) 30  \( \text{Q}xd6 \) a3 31  \( \text{b}a \)  \( \text{Q}xc3 \)

32  \( \text{Q}a6 \)  \( \text{Q}c2 \) 33  a4  \( \text{Q}a2 \) 34  \( \text{Q}a8 \)

f5 35  ef e4 36  \( \text{Q}f1 \)  \( \text{Q}f6 \) 37  a5

Resigns.

How do you play against an outpost? It is best not to allow its formation, while sometimes the outpost’s foundations can be destroyed.
Geller-Vaganian, 1982. White has a very attractive position. A little more time, and his positional advantage will be transformed into a material one; for example, 2...\textit{$\text{W}$e4}! is threatened. But it is Black to move, and he makes an attempt by combinational means to destroy the basis of the outpost, and at the same time to transform White from the attacker into the defender.

\textbf{1}...\textit{$\text{W}$xe5}?! \\
\textbf{2} $\text{W}$xe5?!

Black's plan could have been refuted by a queen sacrifice – \textbf{2} $\text{Wxd8} \textsf{Qxf3}+ 3 \textsf{Wxf3}!!$, and White wins, but in time trouble he misses this possibility.

\textbf{2}... $\text{Wxd6}$ \\
\textbf{3} $\text{Wxd6} \textsf{Qd8}$ \\
\textbf{4} $\text{Wb6} \textsf{Qxf3}$

Not immediately \textbf{4}... $\text{W}d1+ 5 \textsf{W}h2 \textsf{Qxf3}$ because of the zwischenzug \textbf{6}...$\textsf{Q}c2$!.

\textbf{5} $\text{gf} \textsf{Qd1}+$ \\
\textbf{6} $\text{Qg2} \textsf{f5}$!

After \textbf{6}...$\text{Qxb1} 7 \textsf{Wxa6}$ Black is lost, but the pawn move creates mating threats against the white king (\textbf{6}...$\textsf{W}$g6+ is threatened).

\textbf{7} $\text{Qxf5}$

The only move.

\textbf{7}... $\text{ef}$ \\
\textbf{8} $\text{W}$c6

White still stands better, but not as well as 8 moves ago. After \textbf{8} $\text{Wxa6} \textsf{Wh5} 9 \textsf{Qc8}+ \textsf{Wh7} 10 \textsf{Wxf5}+ \textsf{Wxf5} 11 \textsf{Qxf5} \textsf{Qa1} 12 \textsf{Qxb5} \textsf{Qa3} 13 \textsf{h5}$ White wins easily, but on \textbf{8}...$\text{Qxa6}$ Black would have replied \textbf{8}...$\text{W}h7!$, with good prospects of perpetual check, e.g. \textbf{9} $\text{Qxf5} \textsf{W}e1$ etc. Therefore White has to play accurately.

\textbf{8}... $\text{W}f7$ \\
\textbf{9} $\text{Wxa6} \textsf{Wh7}$ \\
\textbf{10} $\text{W}c6$

Now \textbf{10}...$\text{W}h5$ is met by \textbf{11} $\text{Wxe6}$.

\textbf{10}... $\text{Qe1}$ \\
\textbf{11} $\text{Wd6}$

In severe time trouble Geller makes several mistakes. Here \textbf{11} $\text{Qxb5}$ was more correct, and if \textbf{11}...$\text{Qe6} 12 \text{Wd5} \textsf{Wg6}+ 13 \textsf{Qf1}$!.

\textbf{11}... $\text{Qe6}$ \\
\textbf{12} $\text{Wf4}$

Again not the strongest. The attack could have been repulsed by \textbf{12} $\text{Wd3} \textsf{Wg6}+ 13 \textsf{Qf1}$, when Black has no invasion squares.

\textbf{12}... $\text{Qg6}+$ \\
\textbf{13} $\text{Qh3}$

Now \textbf{13} $\textsf{Qf1}$ is met by \textbf{13}...$\text{W}b3$ followed by a check at d1 or d3.

\textbf{13}... $\text{W}a2$
14 h5
This is another time trouble mistake. Here it was essential to play 14 \( \text{We3} f4 \) 15 \( \text{We1} \text{Wb3} l6 \text{Ec3} \).

14 ... \( \text{Hg5} \)

15 \( \text{Hxf5} \) \( \text{We6!} \)
Resigns

This game extract is by no means faultless, but it is fairly typical for the methods of playing against an outpost.
LESSON 36
The persistence of Sergei Dolmatov
Heavy pieces on open files and ranks
Tactics defeat strategy

Misfortune struck unexpectedly and dashed all the hopes of Sergei Dolmatov, when, leading the elimination tournament for the 1977 World Junior Championship with two points out of two, he had to go into hospital suffering from inflammation of a facial nerve. There could be no question of him continuing the tournament.

In this situation Dolmatov did that which can be done only by a good colleague: he wished his friend Artur Yusupov success, and handed over to him all his ideas and theoretical preparations for the elimination tournament.

Yusupov took first place, and six months later became World Junior Champion. Dolmatov was faced with making a second attempt. He prepared thoroughly and put everything into each tournament he competed in. It is true that on the way he was again unlucky: in the European Junior Championship he shared first place, but had to concede the title on the tie-breaking system. Well, he would have to play in such a way as to take sole first place.

The USSR Chess Federation decided not to hold an elimination tournament for the 1978 World Junior Championship, since it was obvious who the candidates were. For the first time in the history of the World Junior Championships, a country not staging the event was allowed to send two representatives. Yusupov, as the previous year’s Champion, had a personal right to participate (he was only 18, and juniors up to the age of 20 were eligible); the second player was Dolmatov.

The World Championship was again held in Austria, only not in Innsbruck this time but in Graz. Dolmatov began the tournament confidently (three wins and one draw in the opening games), and maintained the tempo right to the finish. Hard on his heels followed Yusupov. In their crucial meeting in the middle of the tournament Yusupov held the advantage, but it nevertheless ended in a draw. Yusupov had absolutely no desire to give up his title, and he made
colossal efforts to reduce the small points gap. But Dolmatov steadfastly proceeded towards his goal – he sensed that this was 'his' tournament.

Dolmatov-Sisniega
French Defence

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3  d2  c6
4  g3  f6
5 e5  d7
6  e2  f6
7 ef  xf6
8  f1

This variation was well known to Dolmatov. White transfers his knight to e3, attacks the d5 pawn and hinders ... e5. If Black delays, he can end up in an inferior position, as for example in Dolmatov-Yurtayev, 1978: 8 ... d6 9 e3 0-0 10 0-0 b6 11 g4 g6 12 h3 e5 13 gxe5 xe5 14 de xh3 15 h4 e4 16 f4 d7 17 d3 with advantage to White. Therefore the ... e5 advance cannot be put off.

8  e5

This game was played in the last round. Dolmatov was half a point ahead of his nearest rival – Yusupov. And at this point the Mexican Sisniega offered a draw. Dolmatov hesitated for a long time: a draw would guarantee him a share of first place, whereas if he played on he either had to win a pawn and then parry an attack (9 de dxe5 10 xf6) or else sacrifice a piece (9 e3 e4 10 xd5). In the end Dolmatov took the more crucial decision.

9  e3! e4
10  xd5  xd6
11  c4

Up till now the game has followed Makarichev-Hübner, Amsterdam 1975, where White played 11 c4. Dolmatov prefers to go his own way.

11 ... ef
12  f4  g6
13  x7+  d8
14  xf3  b6

In the event of 14 ... xd4 White was intending 15 d5 xc2+ 16 d1 xa1 17 e6+ e8 18 d3 g4+ 19 f3 xg2 20 e1.

15  d3  g4
15 ... xd4 16 0-0-0.

16  g3  f5
17  xg6  h4
18  xa8  xa8
19  0-0-0  b6

The complications have ended in favour of White, whose material advantage is quite sufficient for a win.

20  g5+  c7
21  xf5  f6
22  h4  d6
23  he1  d7
24  c3  a6
25  c2  d5
26 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b5} \)  
27 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{b8} \)  
28 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a5} \)  
29 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e8} \)  
30 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e4} \)  
31 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{b4} \)  
32 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{b6} \)  
33 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{f6} \)  
34 \( \text{h5} \)  

At this point Yusupov’s game ended in a draw, so that the half point distance between him and Dolmatov was maintained. Therefore White promptly offered a draw, which was accepted.

Dolmatov was born in the small Siberian town of Kiselevsk into the family of a mining engineer. In Kiselevsk he obtained his first chess grades plus the experience of participating in youth tournaments, and just before going to college he achieved the norm of master of sport.

Dolmatov’s chess style has an attractive gentleness, resourcefulness and freshness. For instance, following his example the half-forgotten Italian Game suddenly began occurring in major tournaments, after he had installed into it a number of modern ideas.

Dolmatov is now a grandmaster, and it is to be hoped that his main successes still lie ahead.

The arsenal of an erudite chess player contains many strategic procedures. One of these, perhaps not the most important, but nevertheless sufficiently weighty, is the ability to handle the heavy pieces. It is a question not just of seizing open files, but of manoeuvres, tactical tricks and attacks on the king. Here are a few examples.
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In this position (Vaganian-Psakhis, 1982) White’s extra pawn lulled his vigilance, and he carelessly played 1 \( \text{d1} \)!. The reply, naturally, was 1 \( \text{d1} \)!, and White resigned. Just like all the other pieces, heavy pieces can be subjected to pins, diversion, overloading and so on. Here is another rather curious episode.
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Black appears to be doomed (Kudischevich-Kalinsky, 1971), especially since his last hope $1 \ldots \texttt{g7}$ is dashed by $2 \texttt{g5}$ followed by $3 \texttt{h6}$. And yet Black's heavy pieces can save the game by displaying enviable agility.

$$
1 \ldots \texttt{h4}! \\
2 \texttt{xh4} \texttt{a8+!} \\
3 \texttt{g2} \\
3 \texttt{g2} \texttt{d2+} \text{ leads to perpetual check.} \\
3 \ldots \texttt{w} \texttt{g2+!} \\
4 \texttt{xg2} \texttt{gh}
$$

The position has simplified, and after $5 \texttt{xh5} \texttt{d6}$ White himself has to force a draw by finding the accurate $6 \texttt{h6}!$.

But these were simple examples. It is much more interesting to observe fine play by the heavy pieces in unclear positions.

In the preceding play (Knaak-Möhring) White has achieved a great deal. For only a pawn he has significantly disrupted the co-ordination of the black pieces, and now with several energetic rook moves he decides the game in his favour.

$$
1 \texttt{d3!} \\
1 \ldots \texttt{h5} \\
2 \texttt{hd1} \texttt{g8} \\
2 \ldots \texttt{h6} \text{ fails to } 3 \texttt{d8+ xd8} \\
4 \texttt{xd8+ e7} 5 \texttt{c7+ e6} 6 \texttt{e8+ d5} 7 \texttt{c5 mate.} \\
3 \texttt{d5} \texttt{g6} \\
4 \texttt{d6} \texttt{f6} \\
5 \texttt{a1!} \\
\text{Prudently avoiding a pin.} \\
5 \ldots \texttt{h7} \\
6 \texttt{xf6!} \texttt{gf} \\
7 \texttt{d7+ g8} \\
8 \texttt{c4+ f8} \\
9 \texttt{c5+ g8} \\
10 \texttt{d5+ Resigns}
$$
The battle is at its height (Goldin-Yefimov, 1982) but White succeeds in disturbing the dynamic balance in his favour, by bringing his queen's rook into play.

1 a4! \( \Box d6 \)
2 ab \( \Box xb5 \)
3 \( \Box a6! \)

Only three moves have been played, and White's position has become overwhelming.

3 ... \( \Box xg5 \)
4 \( \Box xg5 \) \( wxd5 \)

Black urgently covers the h7 square, but the attack can no longer be halted.

5 \( \Box h6! \)

Not long ago this rook was standing at a1!

5 ... \( w d3 \)
6 \( w h7! \) f5
7 \( w g6 \)

The game is practically decided.

7 ... \( w d2 \)
8 \( w e6+ \) f7
9 \( w e8+ \) f8
10 \( \Box f6+ \) Resigns

Heavy pieces are more often used to achieve a strategic advantage (e.g. the seizure of an important line), but in doing so a player should not be carried away by purely positional solutions.

In Lukacs-Portisch, 1981, White holds the initiative; the fact that he is a pawn down in no way affects his prospects. After 1 \( \Box e3! \) followed by the switching of this rook to the kingside, White could have mounted a strong attack, but he preferred a positional solution.

1 \( \Box ed1 \)

This move seems perfectly good, but it allows the opponent to gain strong counterplay. It is true that Black's reply was very hard to foresee.

1 ... \( w b4 \)
2 \( \Box xd7 \) b5!!

Unexpectedly Black seizes the initiative.

3 \( \Box xb5 \)

3 \( \Box xb5 \) is crushingly met by 3 ... \( \Box d4 \).

3 ... \( \Box a8!! \)

Continuing the series of unexpected moves. Now 4 ... \( \Box xe5 \) is threatened, and in certain variations the rook at d7 or the knight at b5 come under attack. The white pieces have lost their co-ordination, and the doubled rooks have become ineffective.

4 b3 \( \Box d4 \)
5 \( \Box xd4 \) \( \Box xg2 \)
6 \( \text{c5} \)
6 \( \text{c}x\text{g}2 \) is met by 6 ... \( \text{w}g4+ \) and 7 ... \( \text{w}x\text{d}1 \).

- 6 ... \( \text{w}h3 \)
- 7 \( \text{d}1\text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}3 \)
- 8 \( \text{e}e3 \) \( \text{b}4 \)

**Resigns**

Any move by the queen is met by 9 ... \( \text{a}x\text{f}4 \) followed by 10 ... \( \text{g}4+ \) and 11 ... \( \text{g}2 \) mate.

In conclusion we will examine a short game in which Black's win is gained by his seizure of a central file. Although the game is one between little-known players, all the technical procedures in it are carried out impeccably.

**Kneller-Kikust**

12th Latvian Correspondence Championship, 1980-81

**Caro-Kann Defence**

1 \text{e}4 \text{c}6 2 \text{d}4 \text{d}5 3 \text{\text{c}c}3 \text{d}e 4 \text{\text{d}xe}4
\text{\text{f}f}5 5 \text{\text{g}g}3 \text{\text{g}g}6 6 \text{h}4 \text{\text{h}h}6 7 \text{\text{d}d}3 \text{d}7
8 \text{h}5 \text{\text{h}h}7 9 \text{\text{d}d}3 \text{\text{d}xd}3 10 \text{w}x\text{d}3
\text{w}c7 11 0-0.

Usually White prepares queenside castling.

11 ... \text{e}6
12 \text{c}4 \text{\text{d}d}5
13 \text{\text{d}d}1 \text{\text{b}b}4
14 \text{\text{e}e}2?

This careless move, weakening the first rank, gives Black the idea of seizing the d-file.

14 ... \text{\text{d}d}8
15 \text{d}5 0-0!

By sacrificing a pawn, Black gains the initiative.

16 \text{d}e \text{e}5
17 \text{f}f+ \text{\text{f}f}7
18 \text{w}b3 \text{\text{f}f}3+
19 \text{w}x\text{f}3 \text{\text{d}d}1+

Thus the file is won.

20 \text{\text{d}d}8!

And now Black's main forces surge into play along the opened lines. He threatens 21 ... \text{\text{d}d}1+, 22 ... \text{\text{f}f}1+ and 23 ... \text{w}x\text{e}1 mate.

21 \text{g}3 \text{\text{c}c}5
22 \text{w}f5 (192)

22 ... \text{\text{d}d}5!

Now that the heavy pieces are supported by the minor pieces, the position of the white king is smashed to smithereens.

23 \text{\text{e}e}5

23 \text{\text{w}x}c5 or 23 \text{\text{w}x}h5 is met by 23 ... \text{\text{d}d}1+, etc. [23 \text{\text{w}x}h5 \text{\text{d}d}1+ 24 \text{\text{d}d}1+ 25 \text{\text{g}g}2 \text{\text{f}f}2+! - translator]

23 ... \text{w}d3

Against Black's threats there is no defence. White gives up material
but this does not help.

24 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}e3} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xa1} \)
25 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}xc5} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d1} \)
Resigns

At this we could probably conclude our account of play with the heavy pieces, but before drawing the line we should like to answer the following question: in games by young players, do we see complex positional techniques being employed? Yes, we do. Here, for example, is one of the games from the 6th USSR Tournament of Pioneers Palaces (Baku 1981).

Rakhimov-Ruderfer
Four Knights Game

1 e4 e5
2 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}f3} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}c6} \)
3 d4 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}c3} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}f6} \)
4 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}xd4} \) ed
5 g3

A wily piece of opening play. White began with the Four Knights Game, then after 4 d4 ed 5 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}xd4} \) the Scotch Game was reached, and Black's reply 5 ... d6 could have led to the Steinitz Defence in the Spanish Game, e.g. 6 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}b5} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d7} \) 7 0-0 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}e7} \), and Black prepares the simplifying exchange ... \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}xd4} \) and ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xb5} \). In this case White has the freer game, but Black has no obvious weaknesses. Master of sport Ruderfer probably reckoned that in a simultaneous display he would be able to defeat a 13-year-old pioneer by technique. But White chooses a more complicated path.

6 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d7} \)
7 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}g2} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}e7} \)
8 0-0 0-0
9 b3 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd4} \)
10 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd4} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}c6} \)
11 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}b2} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}e8} \)

Black plays very directly for simplification, but such tactics suit White, since in any position he retains a slight positional advantage.

12 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}d5} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd5} \)
13 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd5} \) c6

With this move Black gives himself a strategic weakness at d6. 13 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}c8} \) was better, so as to meet 14 e5 not with 14 ... de? 15 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xb7} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xb7} \) 16 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}xb7} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}b8} \) 17 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}g2} \) f6 18 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}d5} \) with a positional advantage to White, but with 14 ... c6, capturing the e-pawn only after 15 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d3} \).

14 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d3} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}f6} \)
15 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}d4} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd4} \)
16 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd4} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}b6} \)
17 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}ad1} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd4} \)
18 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}xd4} \) f6

After this over-passive move Black goes downhill, whereas after 18 ... f5 19 ef \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}xf5} \) 20 c4 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d8} \) 21 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}d1} \) \( \textcolor{red}{\text{\&}f6} \) his defences are not easy to breach.

19 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}h3} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}f7} \)
20 c4 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{\&}e7} \)
21 $\text{d}f1$  $c5$?  
This activity comes at the most inappropriate moment. Black should have gone into an inferior minor piece ending after 21... $g6$ 22 $f4$ $d8$ (with the threat of disentangling himself by 23... $Dg7$) 23 $c5$ $f5$ 24 $c+d+ D6$ 25 $e5$ $e4$ 26 $x6$ etc.

22 $d3$  $d8$  
23 $f4$  $c7$  
24 $e5$  $e6$

25 $ed+$  $x7$  
26 $x6+$  $x6$  
27 $e3+$  $d7$  
28 $e7+$  $c6$  
29 $c7+$  $b6$  
30 $xg7$  $fe8$  
31 $e7$  $c6$  
32 $f2$  Resigns

As we see, Sasha Rakhimov has acquired a fair degree of skill in positional play.
LESSON 37
The invasion of the 7th rank with a rook
Fine technique sees Portisch defeat Andersson
Smyslov and Belyavsky show their mettle

This position opens our concluding theme involving play with the heavy pieces. We will be talking about a strategic element of positional play - the invasion of heavy pieces onto the 7th rank. We have already made the acquaintance of this theme in our study of 'outposts', but the invasion of the 7th rank can also have independent significance, and so we will consider it in more detail.

In the diagram (from Razuvayev-Mestrovic, 1981) material is level and there are few pieces left on the board. But one important factor gives White good winning chances. His rooks are much more active than his opponent’s, the role of the one at a7 being especially important. To defend against the mating threats Black is forced to give up the exchange.

1 ∅g5!

Threatening 2 ∅c8+ ∅f3 ∅xf8+ ∅xf8 4 ∅xh7+. If Black defends the pawn with his rook (1 ... ∅h6), there follows 2 ∅c8+ ∅f8 3 ∅c7 ∅g6 4 ∅e6, and 4 ... ∅xe6 is not possible because of mate in three moves.

1 ... h6
2 ∅c8+ ∅f8
3 ∅ac8!

An interesting point. White transfers his domination of the 7th rank to the 8th. Black’s reply is forced.

3 ... ∅d6
4 ∅h7!

Very elegant. On 4 ... ∅xc8 White interposes 5 ∅xf6+.

4 ... ∅xh7
5 ∅xf8 ∅b6

Black continues resisting for a few more moves.

6 ∅a7 ∅f4
7 ∅h2 ∅e6
8 ∅f5 ∅b5
This is of course a blunder, but in any case Black's position could not be defended. Without waiting for his opponent's reply (II lila6), Black resigned.

In this example (Karpov-Miles, 1982) White carries out a combination, the ultimate aim of which is to penetrate with his rook to the 7th rank to support the advance of his passed pawn.

1 \textit{Ex}d5! \textit{Ex}d5
2 \textit{E}c3 \textit{Ed}8

Black cannot exchange: 2 ... \textit{Ec}c3+ 3 \textit{Ec}c3 \textit{Ec}c5+ 4 \textit{Eb}b4, and against \textit{Ec}g2 followed by the advance of the a-pawn there is no defence.

3 \textit{Ec}7!

Now White intends to advance his pawn to a7 and play his rook first to b7, and then b8. Also, at any moment he can call on the aid of his bishop. Black is unable to forestall this plan.

3 ... \textit{Ed}1
4 \textit{E}xb5 \textit{e}5

Black also creates a passed pawn.

5 \textit{a}7 \textit{Ef}
6 \textit{Eb}7 \textit{Eb}1+
7 \textit{Ca}4 \textit{E}xb5

The only chance.

8 \textit{E}xb5

The most economical way to realize his advantage.

8 ... \textit{f}3
9 \textit{Eb}8 \textit{f}2
10 \textit{E}xd8+ Resigns

After 10 ... \textit{E}g7 11 \textit{a}8\textit{W} f1\textit{W} 12 \textit{E}g8+ \textit{Ef}6 13 \textit{W}d8+ further resistance is hopeless.

We now turn to some more complicated examples. By very subtle play White has gained an undisputed positional advantage (Portisch-Andersson, 1982). To realize it, the Hungarian grandmaster makes use of the procedure 'invading the 7th'.
White strengthens the placing of his pieces to the maximum, and the moment will soon come when Black will have simply nothing to move.

\[ \text{2 g4} \]

Such ‘quiet’ moves leave the opponent feeling ill at ease. Black is completely deprived of counterplay. Now \[ 3 \text{ ... gf} 4 \text{ xf3 xe4} \] is not possible because of \[ 5 \text{ xf7}. \]

\[ \text{3 h5} \]

\[ \text{4 e2 a5} \]

\[ \text{5 f2 a8} \]

\[ \text{6 e3 gf} \]

Otherwise the g4 pawn is lost.

\[ \text{7 xf3 f8} \]

\[ \text{8 c7 c8} \]

All the same the h5 pawn cannot be saved, but there is some hope if he can play \[ \text{ ... d7}. \]

\[ \text{9 e5!} \]

No chances for the opponent!

\[ \text{9 ... a5} \]

\[ \text{10 c6 Resigns} \]

Now the black-squared bishop will come into play, ensuring the advance of the b-pawn.

We will now see how to carry out the preparatory work for invading the 7th rank with a rook. From the opening Black has emerged with a good position (Portisch-Smyslov, 1981). He now sets about activating his pieces, and in the end he succeeds in seizing the d-file.

\[ \text{1 ... c4} \]

\[ \text{2 c1 e5} \]

\[ \text{3 de} \]

If \[ 3 \text{ d5 xc3}. \]

\[ \text{4 h1 xd3} \]

\[ \text{5 e2 e5} \]

\[ \text{6 e2 xd1} \]

\[ \text{7 xd1} \]

After \[ 7 \text{ xd1 b3 8 d2 fd8} \] White all the same cannot hold the file, and in addition his a4 pawn will all the time be under attack.

\[ \text{7 ... fd8} \]

\[ \text{8 f2 c4} \]

By exchanging the opponent’s active pieces, Black gains an obvious advantage on the queenside and on the central files.

\[ \text{9 xc4 xc4} \]

\[ \text{10 b3 d2} \]

\[ \text{11 xd2 xd2} \]

During Black’s last 11 moves, which have outwardly been fairly simple and not at all threatening,
Lesson Thirty-Seven

an amazing transformation in the position has occurred. White has not just conceded the d-file, there is virtually nothing he can move, e.g. 12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Ad1\textsc{Ad8} 13 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Gg1\textsc{Cc5+}\textsc{Ab1} (14 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Gg2\textsc{Exf2+})}}}}}}} 14 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Bb1}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Dd8}}) 14 \cdots \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Bb5}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Therefore}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{he}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{decides}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{give}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{up}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{a}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{pawn}}, \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{activate}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{his}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{knight}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{12 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{E5\textsc{Fe} 13 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{De4\textsc{Ed3} 14 \textsc{Ab1\textsc{Dd8} 15 \textsc{Gg2\textsc{Ge3}}}}}}}}}}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Threatening}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{double}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{rooks}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{along}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{3rd}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{rank}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{16 \textsc{Dfd1\textsc{Ed5}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{A}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{small}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{finesse}}. \textcolor{red}{\textsc{If}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{immediately}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{16 \cdots \textsc{Exd1 17 \textsc{Exd1\textsc{Xxb3}, then}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{18 \textsc{Ed8+\textsc{Ff7 19 \textsc{Ed7+}}}}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{and}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{20 \textsc{Xxb7.}}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{It}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{is}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{unfavourable}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{for}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{White}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{take}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{on}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{d5, but}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{he also}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{cannot}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{wait}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{for}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Black}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{further}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{strengthen}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{his}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{position}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{17 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Gf2\textsc{Exd1}}}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{But}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{now}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{b3}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{pawn}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{can}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{be}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{won, since}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{at}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{end}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{of}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{previous}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{variation}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Black}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{will}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{have}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{a}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{bishop}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{check}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{at}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{e1}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{18 \textsc{Exd1\textsc{Xxb3} 19 \textsc{Ed7\textsc{h6}}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{The}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{concluding}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{moves}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{are}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{fairly}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{obvious}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{20 \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Ge2\textsc{b5} 21 \textsc{ab\textsc{cb} 22 \textsc{f4\textsc{ef} 23 \textsc{gf\textsc{a4} 24 \textsc{f5\textsc{a3} 25 \textsc{Ha7\textsc{fh3}}}}}}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Resigns}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{An}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{excellent}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{achievement}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{by}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{ex-}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{World}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Champion}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Smyslov, especially}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{since}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{his}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{opponent}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{is}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{one}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{of}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{most}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{outstanding}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{modern}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{grandmasters}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{In}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{conclusion}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{we}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{will}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{examine}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{a}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{game}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{in}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{which}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{winner}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{exceled}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{with}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{splendid}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{technique}}. \textcolor{red}{\textsc{In}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{this}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{game}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{there}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{are}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{no}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{combinations}}; \textcolor{red}{\textsc{White}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{won}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{by}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{purely}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{positional}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{means}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Belyavsky-Kovačević\textcolor{red}{\textsc{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Sarajevo 1982}}}}}}}}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Catalan Opening}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{1  \textsc{d4\textsc{d5} 2 \textsc{c4\textsc{e6} 3 \textsc{Gf3\textsc{f5} 4 \textsc{g3\textsc{d6} 5 \textsc{Gg2\textsc{Cc6} 6 \textsc{Gd2\textsc{Ce7} 7 \textsc{Wc2\textsc{d7} 8 \textsc{Wxc4}}}}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{The}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{direct}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{attempt}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{hinder}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Black’s}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{queenside}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{development}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{by}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{8 \textsc{Ge5}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{meets}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{with}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{a}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{clever}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{refutation}}: 8 \cdots \textcolor{red}{\textsc{Cc6 9 \textsc{Xc6\textsc{Xc6} 10 \textsc{Xc6+ bc 11 \textsc{Wxc4\textsc{Wd5}}}}}}.\textcolor{red}{\textsc{8 \cdots\textcolor{red}{\textsc{Cc6} 9 \textsc{Cc3\textsc{Cc6} 10 \textsc{Xc3\textsc{Cc4} 11 \textsc{Xc3\textsc{Cc4} 12 \textsc{0-0\textsc{0-0} 13 \textsc{Gf5! (197)}}}}}}}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{In}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{this}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{way}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{White}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{wants}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{to}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{obtain}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{a}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{slight}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{but}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{persistent}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{positional}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{advantage}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{in}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{form}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{of}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{the}} \textcolor{red}{\textsc{d}}\textcolor{red}{\textsc{-file}.}}}
How important is this . . .?

13 ... $\text{axg2}$
14 $\text{gxg2}$ $\text{exe5}$
15 de $\text{we8}$
16 e4

Unless White is prevented, he will begin an attack with his f-pawn.
16 ... c5

Incidentally, 16 ... c6 would have allowed the formation of an outpost at d6.
17 $\text{wa4}$!

One can already talk about White having a definite advantage. The invasion of the 7th rank is not far off. Here 17 f4 would have been premature because of 17 ... $\text{wc6}$ followed by ... b5.
17 ... a6
18 $\text{wd7}$!

This move may have come as a surprise to Black, since he had defended against 18 $\text{ed7}$: 18 ... b5 19 $\text{wd1}$ $\text{ed8}$. Belyavsky's decision proves to be correct.
18 ... $\text{we8}$
19 f4 b5

20 $\text{a5}$!

Another positional move, depriving Black of the d8 square.
20 ... $\text{fb}$
21 $\text{xc8}$ $\text{exc8}$
22 $\text{zd7}$ (198)

White exploits the advantages of his position very confidently.
22 ... c4
23 $\text{f3}$ $\text{ab8}$
24 $\text{za7}$ $\text{cc5}$
25 $\text{zd7}$

After 25 $\text{xa6}$ $\text{a8}$ the a2 pawn is lost, so White would have done better to play a3 on his 24th move.
25 ... $\text{f8}$
26 f5 $\text{e7}$
27 a3 $\text{we8}$
28 $\text{zd1}$ h5

Later Kovačević wrote that it would have been better to play 28 ... $\text{zd8}$ 29 $\text{c3}$ (29 $\text{xd8}$ $\text{xd8}$ 30 fe fe 31 $\text{gg7}$ $\text{xd1}$ 32 $\text{gg8+}$ $\text{gd7}$
33 $\text{xb8}$ c3 34 bc $\text{bd3+}$) 29 ... a5
30 fe fe 31 $\text{gg7}$ b4 32 ab ab 33 $\text{el}$ c3 with compensation for the pawn.
Black could also have played 31 ... \textcolor{red}{\text{c6}} , but he probably did not want to go completely on to the defensive after 32 \textcolor{red}{\text{a8+ d7}} 33 \textcolor{red}{\text{g8}} . But 31 ... \textcolor{red}{\text{b4}} would have given better defensive chances.  

32 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}} \textcolor{red}{\text{c3}} \textcolor{red}{\text{x}} \textcolor{red}{\text{a3}}  
33 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}} \textcolor{red}{\text{a6}}  

Now White wins easily.  
33 ... \textcolor{red}{\text{c5}}  
34 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}} \textcolor{red}{\text{e}} \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}  
35 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}} \textcolor{red}{\text{x}} \textcolor{red}{\text{6+ d7}}  
36 \textcolor{red}{\text{g6}} \textcolor{red}{\text{f8+}}  
37 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}} \textcolor{red}{\text{e}} \textcolor{red}{\text{2+}}  
38 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}} \textcolor{red}{\text{d}} \textcolor{red}{\text{3+}}  
39 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}} \textcolor{red}{\text{c}} \textcolor{red}{\text{2}} \textcolor{red}{\text{b4}}  
40 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}} \textcolor{red}{\text{e}} \textcolor{red}{\text{6+ c7}}  
41 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}} \textcolor{red}{\text{g}} \textcolor{red}{\text{7 h4}}  

and Black resigned.  

In this game White exploited in classic style those advantages which are given by the seizure of a central file and the invasion of the 7th rank.
The chess world first heard of Gary Kasparov early in 1974. The second tournament ‘Grandmasters v. Pioneers’ was being held in Moscow, and Kasparov was playing for the Baku team. In a simultaneous display against Grandmaster Averbakh, the schoolboy adjourned a pawn up in a queen ending. Glancing briefly at the board, Averbakh concluded: draw, it would be difficult to realize the extra pawn. The chief arbiter, Grandmaster Kotov, agreed with him. But the 11-year old pioneer appealed against the adjudication result, and demonstrated with variations that he could queen his extra pawn. Here is this interesting game.

Kasparov-Averbakh

*Spanish Game*

1  e4    e5
2  d3    d5
3  d5    a6
4  dc  6

It is a fairly bold decision to play the Exchange Variation against an acknowledged expert in the endgame.

4  ...
5  0-0  d6
6  d3  f6
7  e3  c5
8  df2  e6
9  c4  d7
10  a4  0-0-0
11  c3  e7

The grandmaster sacrifices a pawn, reckoning that in the resulting complications the schoolboy would lose his way (very soon they stopped making such pawn sacrifices against Kasparov).

12  xc5  xc4
13  dc  c6 (199)

The play takes on a forcing nature.
The complications have come to an end, and White has retained his extra pawn.

19 \textit{h}3 \textit{d}4
20 \textit{e}ad1 \textit{f}6
21 \textit{x}d4 \textit{e}d
22 \textit{d}5 \textit{c}6
23 \textit{e}1 \textit{e}8
24 \textit{x}e8+ \textit{e}8
25 \textit{f}1

The schoolboy conducts the technical phase of the game very competently.

25 \textit{e}5 26 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}6 27 \textit{f}4 \textit{xf}4 28 \textit{xf}4 \textit{g}6 29 \textit{wd}2 \textit{h}4 30 \textit{g}3 \textit{hg} 31 \textit{hg} \textit{we}4 32 \textit{wd}3 \textit{we}5 33 \textit{f}4 \textit{wh}5 34 \textit{g}2 \textit{c}5 35 \textit{we}4 \textit{wd}1 36 \textit{wh}3 \textit{wh}5+ 37 \textit{g}2 \textit{wd}1 38 \textit{f}5 \textit{a}7 39 \textit{g}4 \textit{wh}6 40 \textit{g}3 \textit{wh}1+ 41 \textit{wh}3 \textit{wc}1 42 \textit{wh}4 \textit{wh}6+ 43 \textit{g}3 \textit{wc}1 44 \textit{wf}4 \textit{wg}1+ 45 \textit{wh}3 \textit{wh}1+ 46 \textit{wh}2 \textit{wf}3+ 47 \textit{wh}4 \textit{wc}6 48 \textit{wf}2 \textit{we}4.

Here the game was adjourned. Kasparov's variations - 49 f6 \textit{gf} 50 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{a}7 51 \textit{ff}5 with a gradual win - were considered convincing. White was awarded a win.

Three years passed. Everyone everywhere began talking about Kasparov - his chess successes were growing not by the day, but by the hour. He twice won the USSR Junior Championship, surpassing the master norm by three points, and he won an exceptionally difficult USSR Elimination Tournament on the swiss system. He also had isolated failures, it is true. Thus he failed to win the World Cadet Championship (juniors up to the age of 16) – he simply didn’t have sufficient physical strength. But Kasparov made his mark in the history of the World Junior Championship, easily taking first place in 1980.

That was in general a happy year for him. He won three gold medals: the first as a member of the USSR team which won the European Championship, the second for successfully completing his schooling, and the third for the World Junior Championship.

And yet Kasparov's main successes have been in grandmaster tournaments. He had some phenomenal achievements in 1981, scoring an excellent result in the Moscow grandmaster tournament, and sharing first place in the USSR Championship. Early in 1982 Kasparov convincingly won a grandmaster super-tournament in Yugoslavia; he now had the 2nd highest FIDE rating in the world. By a FIDE decision he was personally allowed into the Interzonal stage of the next world championship cycle. [Since then Kasparov has of course become World Champion – translator]
Kasparov often contributes to chess publications. He annotates his games thoroughly and interestingly, trying to evaluate objectively the events on the board.

Tempone–Kasparov

English Opening

Of his games from the 1980 World Junior Championship in Dortmund, Kasparov singles out his clash with the 1979 World Cadet Champion, Tempone of Argentina. This game was thoroughly analyzed by Kasparov in the magazine *Shakhmaty v SSSR.*

1 \( \text{d}f3 \) \( \text{d}f6 \)
2 \( g3 \) \( g6 \)
3 \( b3 \) \( \text{g}7 \)
4 \( \text{b}2 \)

In junior events I have quite often encountered this dangerous system. Although theory promises Black equality after 4 ... d6, and then at a convenient moment ... e5, practice has shown that all is not so simple. Therefore I began employing another system of development, which proved to be quite a good reply to the 'double fianchetto'.

4 ... c5
5 c4 d6
6 \( \text{g}2 \) e5

This seemingly undistinguished part of the game requires some explanation. 4 ... c5 was played with the intention of creating a strong centre after 5 ... d5. White prevented this by 5 c4. But the attempt also to prevent 6 ... e5, which restricts the bishop at b2, does not work: on 6 d4 Black has the very unpleasant 6 ... \( \text{d}e4 \)!

7 \( 0-0 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
8 \( \text{c}3 \) \( 0-0 \)

This position was reached in two other games of mine: Haritonov-Kasparov (Moscow, 1977) and Webb-Kasparov (Skara, 1980). The English player decided to advance d4 immediately, but after 9 e3 \( \text{f}5 \)

10 d4 (10 d3 is better) 10 ... e4! 11 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 12 dc dc 13 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \)!

Black obtained a promising position. Haritonov played more successfully: 9 d3 \( \text{d}e8 !? \) 10 \( \text{h}d2 \) \( \text{c}7 \)

11 \( \text{d}e1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( e3 \), but I think that even in this case Black has everything in order.

Tempone chooses a similar plan, but White is unable to occupy d5 just as he pleases.

9 d3 \( \text{e}8 ! \)

An important part of Black's plan. At c7 the knight is better placed than at f6: it frees the path of the f-pawn, while not losing control over d5.

10 \( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{c}7 \)
11 \( \text{e}3 ? \) \( \text{e}6 \)
12 \( \text{c}1 \)

As a result of his inaccuracy on the 11th move, White has had to resort to an artificial way of preventing ... d5. 12 \( \text{d}5 ? \) is not
possible because of 12 ... \( \text{dx} \text{d}5 \) 13 cd \( \text{Q} \text{b}4 \), winning a pawn. Therefore 11 a3 \( \text{Q} \text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) would have been preferable.

12 ... \( \text{Q} \text{d}7 \)
13 \( \text{Q} \text{e}1?! \)

White values his g2 bishop too highly! He should have been thinking about 13 \( \text{Q} \text{d}e4 \) h5 14 f4 or even the immediate 13 f4.

12 \( \text{Q} \text{d}7 \)
13 \( \text{Q} \text{d}8 \)
14 \( \text{Q} \text{d}e4 \)

White is already in some difficulties. The position after 14 a3 d5! 15 cd \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{e}4 \) b6 obviously could not satisfy him.

14 ... \( \text{h}6 \)
15 f4 \( \text{f}5 \)
16 \( \text{Q} \text{f}2 \) ef
17 \( \text{g}f \)

Now 17 ... d5 does not work because of 18 cd \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{a}2 \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{c}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 21 b4! \( \text{Q} \text{b}4 \) 22 \( \text{Q} \text{a}5! \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 23 \( \text{Q} \text{d}5+ \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 24 \( \text{Q} \text{c}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}3 \) 24 \( \text{Q} \text{c}3 \) g5!, or (18 \( \text{Q} \text{d}2 \) d5) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b}2 \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{b}2 \) d4! 21 e4 \( \text{Q} \text{d}8 \).

Underestimating my opponent's possibilities, I made a succession of routine, or more precisely, weak moves, after which the situation changed sharply.

17 ... \( \text{h}7?! \)

Beginning the preparation of ... g5, but in any case this move would have been better immediately. Hardly dangerous for Black is 17 ... g5 18 fg hg 19 \( \text{Q} \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) or 19 \( \text{Q} \text{h}5 \) g4.

18 \( \text{Q} \text{d}2 \) g5?
19 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2! \)

Holding the f4 point and exchanging the dark-squared bishops. Now the opening up of the game on the kingside threatens to rebound on Black: his king is less securely covered than its white opponent.

19 ... d5?

Not sensing the danger, Black follows a suicidal course. This move, another pseudo-active one, worsens his dubious position still further, and leaves him on the verge of defeat.

20 \( \text{Q} \text{x}g7 \) \( \text{w}xg7 \)
21 \( \text{Q} \text{h}1 \) (200)

Logically avoiding the complications arising after 21 cd \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \) 22 \( \text{Q} \text{c}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{g}2 \) 23 \( \text{Q} \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}5 \). But
instead of 21 \( \texttt{\$h1} \), more energetic was 21 \( \texttt{\$g3}! \), e.g. 21 ... \( \texttt{gf?} \) 22 \( \texttt{\$h5} \) \( \texttt{fe} \) 23 \( \texttt{\$xe3} \) with a formidable attack. Here at last I examined the situation critically, and drew some highly distressing conclusions. Black's badly placed pieces, and the vulnerability of his centre, force his position to be assessed as difficult.

After prolonged thought I decided that the course of events could be changed only by a radical improvement in the placing of my minor pieces, in particular the black cavalry. To carry out this plan I had to weaken my queenside and concede the centre, but I considered that the creation of chances on the kingside was the most important task.

21 ... \( \texttt{dc!} \)
22 \( \texttt{bc} \) \( \texttt{\$e8!} \)

From \( \texttt{f6} \) the knight will control the central squares and prevent the unpleasant manoeuvre \( \texttt{\$g3-h5} \).

23 \( \texttt{\$c3!} \) \( \texttt{\$f6} \)
24 \( \texttt{d4} \)

White too does not stand still, and energetic measures are required of Black to create counterplay.

24 ... \( \texttt{\$c8?!} \)

The correct idea, but incorrectly executed! 24 ... \( \texttt{\$e7!} \) should have been played, after which 25 \( \texttt{\$xb7?!} \) \( \texttt{\$ed5!} \) 26 \( \texttt{\$xd5} \) \( \texttt{\$xd5} \) 27 \( \texttt{cd} \) \( \texttt{\$xd5+} \) 28 \( \texttt{e4} \) \( \texttt{fe} \) is unfavourable for White, while after 25 \( \texttt{d5} \) \( \texttt{\$c8} \) 26 \( \texttt{\$a3} \) \( \texttt{\$g6} \) 27 \( \texttt{\$xc5} \) \( \texttt{\$h4} \) 28 \( \texttt{\$g1} \) \( \texttt{b6} \) 29 \( \texttt{\$d4} \) \( \texttt{b5!} \) or 29 \( \texttt{\$b4} \) \( \texttt{\$de8} \) Black obtains fair counterchances.

Now, however, 25 \( \texttt{dc!} \) would have given White an obvious advantage, e.g. 25 ... \( \texttt{\$e7} \) 26 \( \texttt{\$cd1} \) \( \texttt{\$g6} \) 27 \( \texttt{\$d6!} \) \( \texttt{\$h4} \) 28 \( \texttt{\$d5+} \) etc. But, not wishing to part with his fine centre, Tempone played:

25 \( \texttt{\$cd1?} \)

And here he unexpectedly offered a draw. The move played loses White the greater part of his advantage, but does not spoil his position to the extent that Black has any real grounds for playing for a win. But nevertheless I decided to risk playing on.

25 ... \( \texttt{cd} \)
26 \( \texttt{ed?} \)

It was on this natural move that Black was counting when he declined the draw. 26 \( \texttt{\$xd4} \) would have left White with the better chances. Tempone assumed that his pawn would advance to \( \texttt{d5} \), cramping Black, his knight would go to \( \texttt{d4} \), and Black's counterplay would not even make an appearance. But my opponent's pleasant thoughts were interrupted by Black's next move, which sharply changed the evaluation of the position.

26 ... \( \texttt{\$e7!} \)

It is obvious that the knight manoeuvre ... \( \texttt{\$g6-h4} \) may well be highly unpleasant for White. From
h4 the knight will be attacking g2—one of White's 'best' pieces. It was now time to think about defensive measures, but Tempone does not display any sign of concern.

27 d5 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g6
28 \( \mathcal{Q} \)d3

White limits himself to natural moves, still under the impression of the former power of his position. But his choice of continuation was already causing some difficulty. Thus he could not have been happy with 28 fg hg 29 \( \mathcal{Q} \)h3?! \( \mathcal{W} \)h6! 30 \( \mathcal{W} \)g3 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g4 with a strong attack, or 29 \( \mathcal{Q} \)d4 \( \mathcal{Q} \)f4! with advantage to Black, e.g. 30 \( \mathcal{W} \)gl \( \mathcal{Q} \)de8 31 \( \mathcal{Q} \)d3 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g4! etc. Of course, had White foreseen the coming events then undoubtedly he would have played 28 a4.

28 ... \( \mathcal{Q} \)h4
29 \( \mathcal{W} \)gl (201)

During the last six moves the position has changed sharply, and the black knights have taken up posts not far from the white king's residence, but to land the decisive blow Black still has to bring into play his last reserve—the bishop at c8.

29 ... b5!

The triumph of Black's plan. The white centre collapses, and Black's minor pieces, which earlier were huddled together at e6, c6 and c7, acquire terrible strength.

30 \( \mathcal{Q} \)e5 bc
31 \( \mathcal{W} \)xc4 \( \mathcal{Q} \)b7
32 d6+ \( \mathcal{Q} \)h7!

32 ... \( \mathcal{Q} \)h8 33 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{W} \)xb7+ 34 \( \mathcal{W} \)c6 \( \mathcal{Q} \)e4! was tempting, but after 35 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g6! the position remains unclear.

33 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{W} \)xb7+
34 \( \mathcal{W} \)c6

White has almost managed to defend, but...

34 ... \( \mathcal{W} \)xc6+
35 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{Q} \)e4!

By creating a mating threat of rare construction, Black picks up the dangerous pawn at d6.

36 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g1

36 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g1!? justifies itself after 36 ... \( \mathcal{Q} \)f2+ 37 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g1 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd1 38 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd1, but Black has no need to exchange his powerful knight for the passive white rook. He retains an obvious advantage after 36 ... \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd6 37 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd6 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd6 38 fg hg 39 \( \mathcal{Q} \)ed4 \( \mathcal{Q} \)e4 or 36 ... \( \mathcal{Q} \)c8! 37 d7 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 38 d8\( \mathcal{W} \) \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd8 39 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd8 \( \mathcal{Q} \)c2! with a decisive attack, e.g. 40 \( \mathcal{Q} \)d4 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g2! (less clear is 40 ... \( \mathcal{Q} \)f2+ 41 \( \mathcal{Q} \)g1 \( \mathcal{Q} \)h3+...
42 \( \textit{\text{Wh}} \textit{h1} \textit{\text{g2}} \textit{\text{d7}}+ \textit{\text{g6}} \) 44
\( \textit{\text{d6}}+ \textit{\text{Wh5}} \) 45 \( \textit{\text{Whh6+!}} \) 46 \( \textit{\text{Whh6+}} \) 41 \( \textit{\text{xe4 fe.}} \)

36 ... \( \textit{\text{xd6}} \)

Here 36 ... \( \textit{\text{Cc8}} \) does not have the same strength, in view of 37 \( \textit{\text{Уеd4!}} \), when 37 ... \( \textit{\text{xd6}} \) is not possible because of 38 \( \textit{\text{De6}}! \).

37 \( \textit{\text{xd6}} \) \( \textit{\text{xd6}} \)
38 \( \textit{\text{fg}} \) \( \textit{\text{hg}} \)
39 \( \textit{\text{дд1}} \)

Now the retreat of the knight would give White some chances, but Black does not even think of moving it, and continues his attack.

39 ... \( \textit{\text{ее8!}} \)
40 \( \textit{\text{Уеd4}} \) \( \textit{\text{еe3!}} \)

The final finesse, which makes further resistance by White a hopeless matter.

41 \( \textit{\text{дd1}} \) \( \textit{\text{еe4}} \)

The black pieces (especially the knights!) have taken up dominating posts, and have erected an unusual sort of cage for the white king. Now the win is achieved either by transferring the rook to the 2nd rank, or by advancing the f- and g-pawns.

42 \( \textit{\text{хb1}} \) \( \textit{\text{dd3}} \)
43 a4 \( \textit{\text{h2}} \)

"Resigns"

A brilliant commentary, wouldn't you agree? Botvinnik in his time said that a genuine master should submit his games to the judgement of readers, since only impartial evaluations and wide-ranging discussions will lead to true development in chess. Kasparov obviously assimilated well the lessons of his teacher, the first Soviet World Champion.
LESSON 39
How to play the opening
Plans, the initiative and pawns sacrifices in
the opening
Games by young players

From his very first steps a chess player encounters the problem of how to play the opening. At first he need concern himself only with the most elementary principles, and then (somewhere around the level of 3rd to 2nd category) he should already have an idea of the basic opening problems. From then on he begins the process of deepening his study and improving his play in the opening – and this is a process without end.

There are numerous theoretical articles and special monographs devoted to specific variations and opening systems. But here we should like to put the accent on general questions of opening preparation for players of average standard. We will first say something about opening principles.

It is well known that the main principle of opening play is the mobilization of the forces. By this is understood the rapid development of the pieces into active positions, castling, and the battle for the centre. At the same time a player should avoid permanent weaknesses in his pawn structure.

But for players of 3rd to 2nd category strength these postulates are insufficient. For them the chief problem in the opening is linking it with the middlegame. We are talking here about opening planning, linked to the development of active operations in the middlegame, for which a player must have a mastery of a whole set of technical procedures of middlegame play. We have in mind procedures such as the methods of play depending on different types of centre, the suppression of an unprepared flank attack by a counterblow in the centre, the formation of outposts, and the seizure of ranks and files by the heavy pieces. In addition, he should know how to attack the king when it is in the centre, when castling has taken place on the same side, and when on opposite sides.

If he has a more or less clear-cut impression of the schemes of play in the middlegame and he knows the basic ideas of the opening variation employed, a player of
average standard can plan his opening play at a sufficiently high level. Here, for example, is a game from a 2nd category tournament held at a summer school for young players from the Moscow Pioneers Palace. White was aged 13 and Black 12!

Alyosha Klimenok-Eldar Yusupov  
*Spanish Game*

1 e4 e5  
2 d4 exd4  
3 c3 c6

Black employs the classic Steinitz Defence, in which he is forced to concede the centre. As a theory lesson for the 2nd category study group, a game was shown which is important for understanding the point of the opening struggle – Tarrasch-Marco, Nuremberg 1882. In it Black tried to maintain his pawn at e5 – 4 d4 d7 5 c3 d6 6 0-0 e7 7 e1 0-0, but he lost by force: 8 c6 c6 9 de de 10 wxd8 xd8 (10 … fxd8 11 xe5 xe4 12 xe4 xe4 13 d3 f5 14 f3 c5+ 15 df1!) 11 xe5 xe4 12 xe4 xe4 13 d3 f5 14 f3 c5+ 15 xc5 xc5 16 g5! d5 17 e7, and Black resigned, since against the threat of c4 he has no defence.

From this example it is clear that Black must play 7 … ed 8 xd4 0-0, giving White a certain spatial advantage and greater mobilizing freedom. However, Black has no pawn weaknesses, and the mobilization of his pieces is almost complete. Practice shows that with accurate play Black can gradually equalize.

4 dc3  
5 d4 ed

5 … df6 would have led to the main variation, but Black incorrectly decides that the numerous exchanges will help him to equalize more quickly.

6 xd4 xd4  
7 xd7+ xd7  
8 xd4

The resulting position favours White: he has a lead in development, he has more space, and he can castle on either side, whereas Black still has many unsolved problems.

8 … df6  
9 de3 de7  
10 f3! (202)

White’s plan has taken shape. After castling long he will either
begin an attack on Black's kingside castled position, or (if Black should play ... b6 and then ... 0-0-0) will use purely positional means to exploit the weaknesses in his opponent's position.

10 ... a6

Black shows that he is ready to begin a pawn storm in the event of White castling queenside.

11 0-0-0 0-0

The opening battle has been won by White. A typical position has resulted with opposite-sided castling, in which White's chances are better, since he can direct more force against the opponent's kingside.

12 g4!

White has worked out well the plan of his attack with pawns and pieces.

12 ... $\text{f}d8?

In such situations very energetic action is required, aimed at opening lines as quickly as possible. This aim was met by 12 ... b5 followed by advancing the pawns further. The rook move is a poor one, since it does not fit in with either Black's preceding or his subsequent actions.

13 h4 c6

Black plays very passively, and so it is no surprise that he comes under a crushing attack.

15 g5 c5

16 $\text{d}2 $\text{e}8

17 g6!

A fairly simple and frequently-occurring procedure for opening lines.

17 ... $\text{f}6

18 gh+ $\text{xh7

18 ... $\text{h8 is somewhat stronger.

19 $\text{d}5 $\text{c}6

20 $\text{d}g1 $\text{e}6

21 $\text{x}e7+ $\text{x}e7

22 $\text{h}6

and White won.

This game is a fairly straightforward one, but from it we see that one 2nd category player conducted the opening and middlegame very competently, whereas the other made many mistakes. The player with White had been attending classes at junior sports schools for some time, whereas the player with Black had been there for a relatively short period (it is true that he has an older brother who is a grandmaster, and who himself attended the Pioneers Palace sports school). In general, if players of average standard are prepared for the basic problems of the middlegame and understand the ideas of the variation employed, they are perfectly capable of planning their actions correctly in the opening and in the transition to the middlegame.

And now a few words about the initiative in the opening. The modern approach to the opening
presupposes active play from the very first moves. Of course, a striving for the initiative should not contradict the basic opening principles, but their simple observance, without a guiding and energetically implemented opening idea, will not bring success today. Illustrations of this idea are provided by numerous games by masters and grandmasters, and among the most striking players, one who will immediately start battling for the initiative, is Kasparov.

Kasparov-Yurtayev
USSR Team Championship 1981
Nimzo-Indian Defence

1  d4  e6
2  c4  c5
3  e3  b4
4  e4  d5
5  d3  dxc4
6  e3  bxc3
7  Bbd2

White plays the opening very simply and at the same time very logically. His next few moves are aimed at creating a strong centre.

7 ...  Bbd7

This knight is more often developed at c6 after the preliminary 7 ... c5. Black was probably being guided by the plan employed in the Carlsbad Variation of the Queen's Gambit, in which the c-pawn goes to c6, the rook to e8, and the knight from b8 via d7 to f8.

8  0-0  c6
9  f3  c5

This also follows the 'Carlsbad pattern'. Back in the 22nd USSR Championship, Geller (with Black) successfully carried out this plan against the great Botvinnik: 1 c4  e6 2 d4 ed 3  c3  d5 4 cd ed 5  g5 c6 6 e3 h6 7  h4  f5 8  d3  xd3 9  xd3  e7 10  ge2  bd7 11 0-0 0-0 12 f3  e8 13  f2 c5! 14  dc  xc5 15  d1  e5 16  b5  b6 17  xb6  ab 18  b3  c6 19  f4  b4 20  d3  xa2 21  xa2  xa2 22  e1  d6, and Black was a pawn up. But in the present game the bishops are positioned differently, and this has a significant influence on the play.

10  a3  cd
10 ...  a5 is bad because of 11  dc  xc5 12  b1 or immediately 12  b4.

11  ed  e7
12  f4!

A strong, well-calculated move, which emphasizes White's opening advantage.

12 ...  b8 (203)

After 12 ...  b6 13  e1  e8 14  b3 it is hard for Black to find a good move. If 14 ...  f8, then 15  xe8  xe8 16  xd5  e6 17  xe6 fe, and White can choose between 18  e3  c7 (18 ...  xd4 19  xe6+ and 20  e4) 19  c2 or 18  xb6  xd4+ 19  f1  xb620
Wxb6 ab 21 f4. In the event of 12 ...
\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qb6} 13 \texttt{Qe1 d6} 14 \texttt{Wb3} \texttt{Qxf4}}
15 \texttt{Qxf4} it is difficult for Black to
defend against 16 \texttt{Qb5}. All the
same, the move played loses a
second tempo in the opening.

13 g4!

An excellent solution, developing
White’s initiative. The game enters
a phase of tactical complications,
for which White is better prepared.

13 ...
\texttt{Qd6}

Otherwise the d5 pawn is simply
lost.

14 \texttt{Qh1}

The pawn cannot be won imme-
diately because of the check at h2.

14 ...
\texttt{Qe8}

14 ...
\texttt{Qc6} looks more natural,
but at the board it was very hard
for Black to see his way through
mind-boggling variations such as
15 g5 \texttt{Qxf4} 16 gf \texttt{Qxcl} 17 f g \texttt{Qxb2}
18 \texttt{Qg1}, although it was possibly
here that Black’s chance lay (e.g.
18 ...
\texttt{Qe8} 19 \texttt{Wc2 f5}).

15 g5 \texttt{Qxf4}

16 \texttt{Qxf4} \texttt{Qh5}
17 \texttt{Qxb8}!

Simple and strong.

17 ...
\texttt{Qxb8}
18 f4 g6
19 \texttt{Wf3}

White’s play is notable for its
efficiency. He now regroups his
pieces, combining these actions
with threats against d5 and h5.
Against this, all that Black can do
is to parry the threats.

19 ...
\texttt{b6}

Black needs the b7 square to be
able to guard f7 (...
\texttt{Qb7}), rather
than to defend the pawn (20 \texttt{Wxd5}?
\texttt{Qb7}).

20 f5 \texttt{Qb7}
21 f6

Now the knight at h5 is doomed,
and the bishop at d3 is soon sent
off to win it.

21 ...
\texttt{Qe6}
22 \texttt{Qae1} \texttt{Qd6}
23 \texttt{Qe5} \texttt{Qd8}
24 \texttt{Qe3} \texttt{b5}

A desperate attempt to divert
White from his plan at the cost of
a pawn, but Kasparov simply pays
no attention to this counterplay.

25 \texttt{Qe2} \texttt{b4}
26 ab \texttt{Qxb4}
27 \texttt{Qxh5} gh
28 g6!

A little combination concludes
this excellently played game. The
way for White to the g7 square is
now open.
28 ... hg
29 \[x]e6 fe
30 \[w]h6

There is no defence against the mate. Black hastily played
30 ... \[b]b7
but then, without waiting for his opponent's reply, resigned.

In this game White seized the initiative by purposeful play from the very first moves, and transformed it into a winning attack.

Fairly often a pawn is sacrificed in the opening to obtain the initiative. The following rule exists: in open positions a pawn is equivalent to three tempi. Ex-World Champion Karpov once stated that "every player should be able to make use of such a subtle strategic weapon as a pawn sacrifice". There have already been many examples of pawn sacrifices for the initiative in the openings of grandmaster games. It is interesting to follow how this device is employed by a 13-year-old 1st category player.

Alyosha Trunov-Slava Bessonov
Moscow Pioneers Palace 1982
French Defence

\[e4 \ e6
\[d4 \ d5
\[e5

This old system does not enjoy great popularity, since Black can easily gain equal chances thanks to his queenside activity. However, Black has to play very accurately.

3 ... c5
4 c3 \[w]b6
5 \[d]f3 \[c]c6
6 \[d]d3

A gambit continuation. White offers a pawn sacrifice for a lead in development and the initiative. 6 \[d]e2 leads to quieter play.

6 ... \[d]d7
7 0-0 cd
8 cd \[d]xd4
9 \[d]xd4 \[w]xd4
10 \[d]c3 (204)

This position is well known to theory, and often occurs in practice. The usual continuation here is 10 ... a6 11 \[w]e2 \[b]b4 12 \[d]d1 with a complicated game. Tal-Stahlberg, 1961, went 10 ... \[w]b6 11 \[w]g4 h5 12 \[w]g5 g6 13 a4! \[h]h6 14 \[w]h4 a6 15 \[x]xh6 \[x]xh6 16 \[w]f6 \[f]f8 17 \[d]xd5 \[w]d8 18 \[w]f4 with advantage to White. But Black avoids both these paths and captures the second pawn.

10 ... \[w]xe5
Now White obtains a very strong attack.

11 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e1 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d6

12 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f3

Here 12 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}b5 is also possible, but White acts more straightforwardly.

12 ... \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}c6

13 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f4 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d7

14 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e5 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f6

15 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d4

Threatening 16 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f5, and if 15 ...

\textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e7 16 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}g4.

15 ... \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e5

It is quite obvious that, with the black pieces totally undeveloped, such a pawn advance is bound to be punished.

16 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f5 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f7

17 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}h3

And now the threat is 18 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e6 and 19 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}(\textit{\textit{\textbackslash}})xd5.

17 ... \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d7

18 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}xe5!

A piece sacrifice concludes this brief skirmish.

18 ... \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}xf5

19 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}f4+ \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e4

20 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}b5

Against White's numerous threats there is no defence.

20 ... \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d8

21 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}c7+ \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e7

22 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}a3+ \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d7

23 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}a4+ \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}e7

24 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}b4+ \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d7

25 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}xb7 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}d6

26 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}xd6 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}xd6

27 \textit{\textit{\textbackslash}}b5+ Resigns

As we see, young players are quite capable of employing such a complicated procedure as the sacrifice of a pawn for the initiative in the opening.
LESSON 40
A plan for improvement
Chess and life
A word of praise for the ancient game

Let us sum up. Modern chess teachers recommend the following improvement plan for players of average standard: the assimilation of material on the history of chess; a sound knowledge of basic endgame positions; a study of the diverse problems of the middlegame; development of the ability to plan the opening play on the basis of the middlegame knowledge available; creation of a striving for the initiative in general, and in the opening in particular; a knowledge of the ideas behind specific variations. For players of average standard, the range of openings should not be great, but they must have a clear-cut impression of the ideas behind each opening. It stands to reason that the technique of calculating variations must be improved, and, most important, that they should play in tournaments. Practice is the best teacher. And practice, supported by theoretical knowledge and by playing skill, brings competitive success. Experience has shown that this approach gives the best results in the preparation of young players of a reasonable standard.

In the preceding chapters we have given sufficient theoretical material on all the sections listed. It is now a matter of practice.

And in conclusion, here are a few thoughts on the connection between chess and life. It was Emanuel Lasker who emphasized that chess was a reflection of life. In his Philosophy of the Royal Game he wrote: "Chess teaches us how our life might have turned out, given equal opportunities and an absence of chance". Of the outstanding players of modern times, something similar has been expressed by Smyslov: "Chess gives a person an excellent lesson for life. Between chess and life there is a much deeper connection than may appear at first sight. Both life and chess consist of an endless chain of rises and falls, successes and failures. The experience gained jointly enriches both life and chess, and suggests the correct decision in a variety of situations."

Yes, chess has become firmly
established in our life. The ancient game not only combines elements of sport, science and art, not only develops in people will-power, memory, logical thinking and self-possession, but also creates grounds both for artistic creativity and for competitive achievements. Whether this passion for chess will become a decisive factor in a young person's choice of profession, or whether it will merely accompany him as a passion – in either case it will give him extensive opportunities for a wealth of diverse contacts with people, for a knowledge of the surrounding world, and for the disclosing of his creative powers.
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