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**Databases, Periodicals and Websites**

Stop me if you've heard this before...

One evening at the Marshall Chess Club in early 2008 while Yury Lapshun and I, Nick Conticello, were awaiting publication of our first book, *Play 1 b4!,* Yury came up to me and said: 'I have an idea for another book. It's all about piece sacrifices for White in the Open Sicilian. Want to write it with me?'

I gave the matter due deliberation, but this time I replied: 'You know, there's a pretty good old Batsford book called *Sacrifices in the Sicilian* by David Levy that had a similar idea. I don't want to do a rehash of that book.' I described Levy's book for Yury and he assured me that what we would do would be quite different. So I agreed...again.

Later, after the contracts were signed and the work well under way, someone told me about a book by GM Jacob Aagaard on combinations, and that every one was a Sicilian! I got hold of a copy of that book, and was relieved to discover that what we were doing was also far removed from Aagaard's approach. I'm sure, after reading this introductory essay or perusing this book, our readers will agree.

**Our aim**

First, let me clear up any possible misconceptions right at the start. This is not a repertoire book or a theoretical opening guide, although readers seeking guidance in those areas may well find useful items herein. It is certainly not an endgame book either, although a few thematic endings will be analysed. Moreover it is not intended to be encyclopaedic, nor is it a quiz or puzzle book. So what is it then?

This book is a collection of well-analysed games featuring thematic, active piece sacrifices by White in the Open Sicilian. Yury and I are firm believers in annotating complete games as thoroughly as possible. We under-
stand that most of our readers will be ambitious amateurs, who will not be aware of certain ideas and technical matters that professionals take for granted. Therefore we have spelled things out to an extent that might annoy strong players. We are sorry about that, but we ask those folks to remember that they are not our primary audience. (Of course, we believe strong players will find some useful information here, and we hope that coaches too will find this book helpful.)

We have analysed each game independently, aided by engines such as Fritz and Rybka. Of course, when our lines are identical with published commentary, we have credited the published sources as much as possible. Any lapses in this regard are chiefly my responsibility and are inadvertent. I apologize in advance for any such omissions.

Active Piece Sacrifices

What exactly do I mean by ‘active piece sacrifices’? I hope the following two examples will make this term clear.

Game 1
W.Browne-J.Kaplan
San Antonio 1972

1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 c6
5 e3 e6

Black’s move order is designed to avoid the Keres Attack against the Scheveningen.

6 g3 a6 7 g2 d7 8 0–0 e8 9 e1 d6
10 xc6 xc6

11 d5!

Here is a perfect illustration of an active sacrifice. It need not be accepted at once, but sooner or later this pesky knight must be dealt with, as its presence is intolerable. As Browne points out in his notes, the attempt to keep developing calmly with 11...e7 allows 12 xe7 xe7 13 b3 threatening 14 a3 with a nice advantage.

11...xd5 12 exd5 e5 13 f4 wc7 14 wc2! d7

The attack keeps rolling after 14...xc2 15 d2! xb2 16 ab1 (Browne).

15 h3 f6 16 e3 g6 17 e6 g7 18 ac1

Threatening to roll the queenside pawns.

18 wc4 19 g4 ec7 20 b3! wc3?

After 20...wb5 Browne analyses a long variation: 21 w7+! d8 22 we6 af8 23 wxd6! xf7 24 c4 a5 25 b4! (the point of this combination is that Black’s queen cannot stem the pawn advance with a dark-square blockade) 25...f8
26 \(\text{We}6 \text{ Qc}5\) 27 bxc5 \(\text{Ax}c5\) 28 d6 \(\text{Xd}7\)  
29 fxe5 \(\text{Ax}e3+\) 30 \(\text{Xxe}3\) \(\text{Wc}5\) 31 exf6, 
which he considers to be winning.

21 \(\text{Xd}7+ \text{Xd}7\) 22 \(\text{We}6+ \text{Xd}8\)

22...\(\text{Xe}7\) simply hangs the d-pawn.

23 \(\text{Xb}6+ \text{Cc}8\) 24 \(\text{He}4\) \(1-0\)

On the other hand, consider this bizarre idea in a standard Najdorf:

1 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 2 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 3 \(\text{d}4\) cxd4 4 \(\text{Xd}4\) \(\text{f}6\)

5 \(\text{Cc}3\) a6 6 \(\text{g}5\) e6 7 f4 \(\text{Xe}7\) 8 \(\text{Wf}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\)

9. 0-0-0 \(\text{Xbd}7\) 10 \(\text{Xd}3\) h6 11 h4!?

An idea first played by Velimirovic, I believe. I would categorize this as a passive sacrifice, as Black need not take the bishop, but can improve his position with, say, 11...\(\text{Cc}5\)! and then decide what to do. (Please also examine Minic-Fischer in the introduction to Chapter 4 for a similar example.)

**Which Sacrifices are Covered?**

The sacrifices we will examine in separate chapters are those involving \(\text{Xd}5\), \(\text{Xe}6\), \(\text{Xf}5\), \(\text{X}(x)b5\), and \(\text{X}(x)b5\). The seventh chapter will consider \(\text{Xd}5\), \(\text{Xf}6\) and other miscellaneous sacrifices, including queen ones. We did not, however, think it necessary to include any examples of a \(\text{Xh}5\) sacrifice, as this idea is now common in all sorts of openings, not just the Sicilian. (If you really want to see some examples of \(\text{Xh}5\), just curl up with a copy of Fischer's *My 60 Memorable Games* and study his victories over Larsen and Gligoric.)

Why devote an entire book to piece sacrifices in the Open Sicilian, you may ask. The reason is quite simple: *without a full understanding of these ideas you cannot win with White in this opening!* The Open Sicilian is virtually unique among responses to \(1\ \text{e}4\) in that Black acquires with no effort an extra centre pawn and a half-open file for his rooks. Therefore Black has a ready-made counterattack available on the queenside and/or in the centre. On the other hand, White has more space, a lead in development and the initiative. According to the teachings of Steinitz, White must use these advantages to attack or suffer unpleasant consequences. A complicating factor is that Black need not always castle quickly, thanks to his extra central pawn. Witness the following game, cited by Daniel King in his book *Winning with the Najdurf*. No comments are needed – just watch the master at work:

**Game 2**

**W.Ader-R.Fischer**

**Santiago 1959**

1 \(\text{e}4\) c5 2 \(\text{f}3\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\text{Xd}4\) \(\text{f}6\)**
Fischer’s structure let him keep central lines closed while he prepared his counterattack. Notably too his 14...h5! stonewalled White’s kingside play and once everything was rolling, he could safely castle on move 20 so his last rook could join the party. A model win for Black against uninspired White play.

Contrast that with what could have happened to Black in the following extract from a recent game at the Marshall Chess Club between two masters. (I’ll not give their names for reasons which will soon become obvious.)

White played 12...xb5? axb5 22 xb5 c4 23 b4 xb4 24 cxb4 f2 25 g3 xa3+ 26 b2 c4+ 27 b3 e3 28 d2 xh1 29 xh1 dxe4 30 g3 d5+ 31 a4 a8+ 32 b5 b8+ 33 c5 c8+ 34 d6 c4+ 35 d7 xd2 36 xc8 xc4 0-1

See what I mean? Ader did nothing outrageously bad, but he got crushed.
It's hard to play the Open Sicilian, and many players choose quieter approaches such as 2 \( \text{c3} \) or 2 \( \text{c3} \), but Yury and I feel that the Open is the way to go, and we have written this book to encourage people to take the plunge.

**A Note on Sources**

When a published source is cited in this text we will generally do so by the name of the writer and not the work. More specifically, 'Nunn' will refer to the book cited above unless otherwise stated, and 'Levy' will refer to *Sacrifices in the Sicilian* unless otherwise noted.

We wish to single out a book here which we found particularly useful: *The Najdorf Variation* by Geller, Gligoric, Kavalek and Spassky is the beau ideal of an opening book. It offers theory and game analysis by four top grandmasters, and a number of lines from this work are still quoted in opening books over thirty years later, often, sad to relate, without attribution. Here when one of those four names is cited in relation to the Najdorf, it is from this work. (The only exception is Gligoric-Bobotsov in Chapter 7.)

**Division of Labour**

Yury Lapshun selected all the games and is chiefly responsible for the analysis in Chapters 1-6. I wrote all the chapter introductions and am primarily responsible for the selection of games and commentary in Chapter 7.
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Chapter One

The Knight Sacrifice on d5

This opening chapter is concerned with the move \textit{\&}c3-d5, and it will be the longest chapter in the book. The reason is simply that many Open Sicilians, even sometimes the Dragon nowadays, feature a black pawn on e6. Despite this fact, White is often able to start a violent attack on the enemy king by the dramatic centralization of his queen’s knight.

We will not concern ourselves here with positions in which White regains at once this material after the sacrifice. We will deal mostly with examples in which \textit{\&}d5 is a real, positional sacrifice, as Rudolf Speelman put it. White’s ideas vary upon the placement of the enemy king, so we must divide the material accordingly.

1. The Uncastled King

When Black’s king is in the centre, the purpose of the \textit{\&}d5 sacrifice is to keep it there. Note that the attack generally fails if the monarch can flee to one flank or the other.

The sacrifice on d5 sets off a chain of events: White recaptures with a pawn, opening the e-file for the heavy pieces; the pawn on d5 creates a possible anchor for a knight on d4 to occupy e6; and the absence of a pawn from e6 clears the f5-square for that same knight, from which the squares e7 and g7 can be pressed. Moreover, when White has a bishop on g5, he can capture a knight on f6, perhaps rupturing the black pawns, but always making h5 a fore-post for the white queen.

(see following diagram)

The sacrifice will work if all or almost all of the effects listed above occur, and will fail if two or more are absent. Crucially all the white forces must gain in scope.
2. The Castled King

Here we will be dealing almost exclusively with Black's king castled short. A successful $\text{Qd}5$ sacrifice with the king already on the queenside is very rare, and when it does work White recoups his investment almost at once.

Usually White will have driven away Black's knight by the advance $g4-g5$ as a preliminary, and often the white queen will already stand on $h5$ aiming at $h7$. So when White plays $\text{Qd}5$ in this situation he opens the $b1-h7$ diagonal for his king's bishop and clears the $f5$-square for his knight on $d4$.

Occasionally White will have a bishop on $d4$ instead. Now the sacrifice deflects the enemy e-pawn from the square $e5$, from where it would inhibit both White clerics. A few times White will have his king's bishop on $b3$ or $c4$; in these cases White might well recapture on $d5$ with that bishop, often with gain of time, and dominate the diagonal leading to $f7$, which in turn will make possible a timely advance $g5-g6$.

In virtually all successful $\text{Qd}5$ attacks on a castled king, White must have spent some time earlier massing his forces on the kingside. Once the sacrifice is made, the momentum must be kept driving forward. Any hesitation will most likely be fatal. (The one notable exception to this is the famous game Tal-Larsen, 10th matchgame, Bled 1965. That said, after much research and analysis we think that Black was winning, but I would not be surprised to see later analysis refuting ours.)

Herewith are examples of both possible king positions.

**Game 3**

*N. Conticello-M. Paolozzi*

*New York City 1978*

1 $e4$ $c5$ 2 $\text{Qf}3$ $d6$ 3 $d4$ $\text{cxd}4$ 4 $\text{Qxd}4$ $\text{Qf}6$
5 $\text{Qc}3$ $a6$ 6 $\text{g}5$ $e6$ 7 $f4$ $\text{e}7$ 8 $\text{Wf}3$ $\text{Wc}7$
9 0-0-0 $\text{bd}7$ 10 $\text{Qd}3$

The most popular here, then and now. Note that 10 $\text{Qe}2$ will be discussed in Chapter Seven.

10...$b5$ 11 $\text{Qhe}1$ $\text{b}7$ 12 $\text{Wg}3$
The trappy 12 \textit{d5} will be discussed in the games Zaitsev-Anetbaev and Fluvia Poyatos-Gual Pascual later in this chapter.

12...\textbf{b4}

Most likely the best. 12...0-0-0 13 \textit{xb5!} was D.Velimirovic-R.Al Kazzaz, Nice Olympiad 1974, which will be annotated in the introduction to Chapter Six.

13 \textit{d5}

Nothing else merits any serious consideration.

13...\textbf{exd5} 14 \textbf{e6}!

This is the 'other' method of attack, as opposed to the traditional approach of 14 \textit{exd5}. The text was fashionable in those days, since it was analysed by Geller in the R.H.M. Najdorf book which had just come out. The attraction for me was that White could apparently keep a small plus with no great risk.

14...\textbf{dxe5} 15 \textbf{fxe5} \textit{h5} 16 \textbf{wh4}?

Both players were following Geller's analysis. It is known today that 16 \textit{e6}! is necessary. Nunn's main line continues 16...\textit{xg3} 17 \textit{xf7+} \textit{xf7} 18

\textit{xe7+} \textit{g8} 19 \textit{hxg3} \textit{wxc3} 20 \textit{xe6} \textit{we5} 21 \textit{xf1} \textit{g8} 22 \textit{c5} \textit{c8} 23 \textit{e8} \textit{xf7} 24 \\
\textit{xe7+} \textit{g8} 25 \textit{e8} with a draw by repetition.

16...\textit{xg5}+ 17 \textit{wxg5} \textit{g6} 18 \textit{e6} \textit{xf4}+?

Winning is the simple 18...\textit{df6}!, as later pointed out by Nunn. Both players are still in lockstep with Geller, and are playing at lightning speed to boot!

19 \textit{xf4} \textit{xf4} 20 \textit{exd7+} \textit{xd7} 21 \textit{f1}

Only now did the future Brazilian grandmaster pause for reflection for an entire hour (!) before acquiescing to march with Geller towards a draw with a very lucky booked-up fish, namely yours truly.

22 \textit{xd3} f5 23 \textit{g4}! \textit{af8} 24 \textit{df3} \textit{hg8} 25 \textit{gxfs} \textit{exfs} 26 \textit{sh3} \textit{g7}

Hereabouts I took a 45-minute catnap under the guise of trying to find a win. I have no idea what I could have been thinking about thirty years later.

27 \textit{xf5} \textit{xf5} 28 \textit{d4} \textit{d6} 29 \textit{d2} a5 \textit{f4-5}?

Nowadays I would keep playing, but I'm sure he would also. I decided not to push my luck.
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Game 4
A.Ostapenko-Yartsev
Correspondence 1969

1 e4 c5 2 d4 e5 3 d5 exd5 4 cxd5 c6 5 d4 c5 6 c3 e6 7 e3 d6 8 e7 d5 9 b3 Wd7 10 0-0 a6 11 hgx1 Necessary preparation since 11 g4 dxd4 forces the clumsy 12 dxd4, so that 12...e5 can be met by 13 c4.

11...b5 12 g4 b4 Nowadays 12...a5 is often preferred.

13 cxb6 c6 Instead 13...bxc3 14 dxe7+ Wxe7 15 d4 b7 16 f3 is given as good for White by Nunn in ECO.

14 d5! White has not had time to play g4-g5, so he sacrifices the knight first. Even though he never gets to capture the rook on a8, the possibility of doing so makes this attack work.

14...exd5 15 g5 dxe4?

As far as I know, the losing move. A much tougher defence is 15...dxe4! 16 dxe5 Wa4 17 dxe4 (17 dxe8 c3! 18 bxc3 d6 gives Black good counterplay) 17...e6 18 d4 g6, holding White to a small edge.

16 gxf6 xf6 17 dxe5 Wa4 18 Wh5! e6 18...h8 is met in the same way.

19 e7+!! xg7

And not 19...xg7? 20 Wh6+.

20 Wh1 xfc8

Perhaps hoping to answer 21 xxe4 with 21...f8! as suggested by Bolemslavsky.

21 dxe7+! xg7 22 Wh6+ g8 23 xg4 b3
Ostapenko in *Informator 8* prefers 23...e5!, but then he continues 24...d4 e5 25...xh7+ h8 26 f5+ g8 27...xe5 dxe5 28...h7+ f8 29...xe6 fxe6 30...h8+, picking off the a8-rook at last.

24...xh7+ h8 25 f5+ g8 26...h7+ f8 27...h6+ e8 28...g8+ e7 29...g5+ d7 30...xf7+ c8 31...xe6

31...b6

Boleslavsky thought that 31...e4 might hold, but White wins after 32...d7+ b6 33...xd6+ c6 34...d8+.

32 e3+ a5 33 xc8 xc8 34...f5+ c5 35 xc5 wb5 36 b4+ xb4 37 a3+ c4 38 xb5+ axb5 39 cb3+ d3 40 d1 1-0

An important game for the theory of this opening.

Now it's time to hand over to Yury:

We begin our more detailed coverage with an important theoretical game between two legends. In this game Leonid Stein, three times USSR champion, demonstrated many interesting ideas which follow an 11...d5 sacrifice. Semen Furman, Karpov's coach and a noted theoretician, defended like a lion, but he couldn't do anything against Stein's various threats.

---

**Game 5**

**L. Stein - S. Furman**

**USSR Championship, Moscow 1969**

1 e4 c5 2...f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4...xd4 a6 5...c3...c7 6 g3 b5

This risky move, neglecting development of the king's wing, has been all but abandoned at higher levels in favour of the disruptive 6...b4: for example, 7...de2 ef6 8...g2 e7! (the bishop drops back to e7 to answer a later...f4 with...d6, thereby keeping the said bishop out of harm's way) 9 0-0 0-0 10 h3...c6 11 f4 b5 12...e3...b7 13 g4 d5!

31...e4 32...f3 33...d5 34...a6 5...c3...c7 6 g3 b5

This risky move, neglecting development of the king's wing, has been all but abandoned at higher levels in favour of the disruptive 6...b4: for example, 7...de2 ef6 8...g2 e7! (the bishop drops back to e7 to answer a later...f4 with...d6, thereby keeping the said bishop out of harm's way) 9 0-0 0-0 10 h3...c6 11 f4 b5 12...e3...b7 13 g4 d5!

---

**Games L. Stein - S. Furman**

**USSR Championship, Moscow 1969**

1 e4 c5 2...f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4...xd4 a6 5...c3...c7 6 g3 b5

This risky move, neglecting development of the king's wing, has been all but abandoned at higher levels in favour of the disruptive 6...b4: for example, 7...de2 ef6 8...g2 e7! (the bishop drops back to e7 to answer a later...f4 with...d6, thereby keeping the said bishop out of harm's way) 9 0-0 0-0 10 h3...c6 11 f4 b5 12...e3...b7 13 g4 d5!
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G.Sigurjonsson, London 1975, which went 9 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{e}7\) 10 a4 bxa4 11 \(\text{w}h5!\) g6 12 \(\text{w}e2 \text{c}6\) 13 \(\text{d}xa4\) with a strong initiative. Also if 8...\(\text{c}6\) 9 \(\text{e}1\) d6? (Quinteros later played the stronger 9...\(\text{e}5\)) 10 a4 b4 11 \(\text{d}5!\) \(\text{w}a5\) then White has a pleasant choice between Hulak’s 12 \(\text{d}xc6\) and Almasi’s 12 \(\text{w}h5\). Finally, Taimanov’s 8...\(\text{c}5\) 9 \(\text{d}b3\) \(\text{e}7\) can be met with Davies’ suggestion of 10 \(\text{e}1\) d6 11 a4 b4 12 \(\text{d}a2\).

9 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{d}6\) 10 a4

10 a3 is passive and not in the spirit of the Open Sicilian. White must be prepared to offer his knight when the signs are favourable.

10...\(\text{b}4\) 11 \(\text{d}5\)

11 \(\text{d}a2\) is another good possibility which leads after 11...\(\text{w}c4\) (or 11...\(\text{e}5\) 12 \(\text{d}f5\) g6 13 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{d}c6\) 14 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 15 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{w}a5\) 16 c3 \(\text{bxc3}\) 17 \(\text{w}b3\) \(\text{d}8\) 18 \(\text{dxc3}\) and White got some advantage, A.Berelovich-K.Van der Weide, Solingen 2005) 12 \(\text{d}b3\) a5 13 c3 to a slight advantage.

11...\(\text{exd}5\) 12 \(\text{exd}5++ \text{d}8\)

Many computers will tell us that Black is better, but White’s threats are coming. Instead 12...\(\text{e}7\) is bad due to 13 \(\text{d}f5\) \(\text{g}8\) 14 \(\text{g}5\) f6 15 \(\text{d}xg7+ \text{f}7\) 16 \(\text{d}e6\) \(\text{w}b6\) 17 \(\text{w}h5\) mate.

13 \(\text{g}5\)

A common idea which generally leads to the capture of Black’s knight and the consequent spoiling of his structure.

13...\(\text{bd}7\)

Our computer likes 13...\(\text{c}8\), but praxis proves otherwise. The game O.Quinones-K.Higashi, Siegen Olympiad 1970, continued 14 \(\text{d}xf6+\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 15 \(\text{w}h5\) \(\text{a}7\) 16 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}7\) 17 \(\text{e}ae1\) \(\text{w}c5\) 18 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{d}7\) 19 \(\text{d}b3\) \(\text{w}b6\) 20 a5 \(\text{w}b5\) 21 \(\text{w}e3\) \(\text{c}7\) 22 \(\text{w}f4\) \(\text{e}8\) 23 \(\text{x}d6\) \(\text{x}e4\) 24 \(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{c}8\) 25 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{a}4\) 26 \(\text{x}b4\) \(\text{w}a2\) 27 \(\text{d}x5\) \(\text{w}a1\) 28 \(\text{x}b8+\) \(\text{x}b8\) 29 \(\text{d}xa6+\) 1-0.

We find it curious that Levy cites this game and not Stein’s antecedent.

14 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{c}8\)

The king tries to scurry away, but Stein is not deterred. His next move aims to open the c-file for his rook.

15 c3 \(\text{b}3\)

Black keeps the c-file closed, but White has more tricks up his sleeve.

16 \(\text{c}6\)
16...\textit{\textsc{xc6}} 17 \textit{\textsc{dxc6}}

A natural move, but White missed a simple win. After 17 \textit{\textsc{we8+ \textsc{xe8}} 18 \textit{\textsc{xe8+ \textsc{b7}} 19 \textit{\textsc{dxc6+ \textsc{b6}} 20 \textit{\textsc{a5+ \textsc{b5}} 21 \textit{\textsc{c4+ \textsc{b4}} 22 \textit{\textsc{cxd7 \textsc{e7}} 23 \textit{\textsc{d2+ \textsc{c5}} 24 \textit{\textsc{e3+ \textsc{b4}} 25 \textit{\textsc{a8 \textsc{xd7}} 26 \textit{\textsc{h8}}}}} Black is lost.

17...\textit{\textsc{de5}} 18 \textit{\textsc{a3}}

An original idea! The manoeuvre \textit{\textsc{a3-b3-b7}} will cause Black extra problems.

18...\textit{\textsc{d5}} 19 \textit{\textsc{xb3 \textsc{d6}} 20 \textit{\textsc{xf6 gxf6}} 21 \textit{\textsc{xd5 \textsc{xc6}}}

It took some doing, but now we have the typical aftermath of a \textit{\textsc{ed5}} sacrifice. Black’s disorganized pieces and bad pawn structure give White a serious advantage.

22 \textit{\textsc{w4g4+ \textsc{d7}} 23 \textit{\textsc{xd7+ \textsc{c7}} 24 \textit{\textsc{b7+ \textsc{c7}}}}

25 \textit{\textsc{g2}}

The best move. White wins material.

25...\textit{\textsc{ad8}} 26 \textit{\textsc{h3+ \textsc{d6}} 27 \textit{\textsc{d1+ \textsc{c5}} 28 \textit{\textsc{b4+ \textsc{c4}} 29 \textit{\textsc{f1+ \textsc{b3}} 30 \textit{\textsc{xc7}}}}

30 \textit{\textsc{b1+ \textsc{a2}} 31 \textit{\textsc{xc7 \textsc{e5}} 32 \textit{\textsc{f4 \textsc{xb1}} 33 \textit{\textsc{fxe5 fxe5}} 34 \textit{\textsc{xa6 \textsc{c2}} 35 \textit{\textsc{f2 \textsc{d2+ \textsc{e2}} is another way to win.}}

30...\textit{\textsc{xd1}} 31 \textit{\textsc{xc6 \textsc{xa4}} 32 \textit{\textsc{g2 a5}} 33 \textit{\textsc{bxa5 \textsc{d8}} 34 \textit{\textsc{xf6 \textsc{d7}} 35 \textit{\textsc{a6}}}}

An extra passed pawn and two weak black pawns decide this game.

35...\textit{\textsc{c1}} 36 \textit{\textsc{d3 \textsc{xc3}} 37 \textit{\textsc{xxh7 \textsc{b5}} 38 \textit{\textsc{e4 \textsc{a3}} 39 \textit{\textsc{b7 \textsc{c5}} 40 \textit{\textsc{h4 \textsc{d4}} 41 \textit{\textsc{f5 \textsc{e7}} 42 \textit{\textsc{h5 \textsc{e5}} 43 \textit{\textsc{f4+ \textsc{c5}} 44 \textit{\textsc{h6 \textsc{1-0}}}}} Black can’t stop all White’s passed pawns.

Stein’s approach in this game is a model. Decades later, his plan is still scoring points. Witness the following game:

\begin{center}
\textit{Game 6}
E.Hagara-M.Manik
Pardubice 2000
\end{center}

1 \textit{\textsc{e4 c5}} 2 \textit{\textsc{f3 e6}} 3 \textit{\textsc{d4 cxd4}} 4 \textit{\textsc{xd4 a6}} 5 \textit{\textsc{c3 b5}} 6 \textit{\textsc{g3 \textsc{b7}} 7 \textit{\textsc{g2 \textsc{c7}} 8 \textsc{0-0 \textsc{d6}} 9 \textit{\textsc{e1 \textsc{f6}}}}

10 \textit{\textsc{a4}}

Dangerous but less incisive is 10 \textit{\textsc{d5!? \textsc{exd5}} 11 \textit{\textsc{exd5+ \textsc{d8}} 12 \textit{\textsc{g5 \textsc{bd7}} 13 \textsc{a4} (the wild 13 \textsc{c4!? \textsc{h6}} 14}
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\[ \text{\L}xf6+ \text{\L}xf6 15 \text{cxb5} \text{axb5} 16 \text{\W}b3 \text{\W}c4 \]

as in B.Horberg-A.Kotov, Telegraph Game 1959, looks unpleasant for Black after 17 \text{\W}e3 \text{\L}xd5 18 \text{\W}e8+ \text{\W}c7 19 \text{\W}xf7+) 13...h6 14 \text{\L}xf6+ \text{\L}xf6 15 axb5 axb5 16 \text{\L}xa8+ \text{\L}xa8 17 \text{\W}a1 \text{\L}b7 18 \text{\L}c6+ \text{\L}xc6 19 dxc6 d5! 20 \text{\W}a8+ \text{\W}c8 21 \text{\W}a5+ \text{\W}c7 and the opponents decided on a draw in W.Browne-L.Evans, U.S. Championship, Chicago 1974.

10...bxa4

Deviating from Furman's 10...b4. It doesn't look right for Black to create a weak pawn on a6, but the open b- and c-files may give him counterchances.

11 \text{\L}d5!

After 11 \text{\L}xa4 \text{\L}e7 12 \text{\W}e2 0-0 White has a comfortable position. The text is more ambitious.

11...\text{\L}xd5 12 \text{\L}xd5+ \text{\L}d8 13 \text{\L}g5 \text{\L}d7

Probably 13...\text{\L}c8 14 \text{\L}xa4 \text{\L}e7 15 \text{\L}d2 a5 creates an unclear mess with chances for both sides.

14 \text{\W}e2

White is copying Stein's moves, but the extra \text{\L}a1-a4-c4 threat gives him even better chances.

14...\text{\L}c8

Instead 14...\text{\W}b6 15 \text{\L}xa4 \text{\W}xb2 16 \text{\W}e8+ \text{\W}c7 17 \text{\W}xf7 \text{\W}c8 18 \text{\L}xf6 \text{\W}xf6 19 \text{\L}h3 is winning for White.

15 \text{\L}xa4 \text{\L}c5

Losing, but 15...\text{\L}e5 16 \text{\L}xf6 (another way is 16 f4! \text{\W}d7 17 \text{\L}b4 \text{\L}xd5 18 \text{\L}xf6 a5 19 \text{\L}xd5 axb4 20 \text{\L}xa8) 16...\text{\L}xf6 17 f4 \text{\W}b6 18 fxe5 dxe5 19 \text{\L}h1 is but a temporary stay of execution.

16 \text{\L}xf6 \text{\W}xf6 17 \text{\W}e8+ \text{\W}d8 18 \text{\L}h3+ f5

19 \text{\L}xf5+ \text{\L}c7 20 \text{\W}xf7+ \text{\W}b8 1-0

Black can't argue with 21 \text{\L}b4 and 22 \text{\L}c6 or 21 \text{\L}e8. In this excellent example of White's mating attack after a \text{\L}d5 sacrifice, all of White's pieces enjoyed enhanced mobility.
Now we will see how Anatoly Karpov sacrificed his knight on d5 against a great player and coach, CM Dorfman. Even though this sacrifice in the Scheveningen Variation was perfect and effective, Black almost drew a lost position.

**Game 7**

A.Karpov-J.Dorfman

*USSR Championship, Moscow 1976*

1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 exd4 d3 f6 5 c3 e6 6 g4 e7 7 g5 ffd7 8 h4 c6 9 e3 a6 10 e2

This is not Karpov’s natural style. However, he is happy to block his king’s bishop with his queen in order to castle queenside and open the e-file by sacrificing his knight on f5 or d5.

10...c7 11 0-0 b5 12 xc6 xc6 13 d4 b4 14 c51?

After this rather unclear positional sacrifice, White will get at least two pawns for the piece, while Black will have four pawn islands and a king in the centre. All these factors give White plenty of compensation.

14...exd5 15 xg7

According to Speelman, 15 exd5 xdx5 16 xg7 wXh1 17 e1 e5 18 xexe5 dxe5 19 xexe5 0-0 wins for Black.

15...g8 16 exd5 c7 17 f6 e5

Black defends as well as he can, trying to trade as many of White’s active pieces as possible, but White’s attack still leads to the gain of a third pawn for the knight.

18 xxe5

18 f4 xfx6 19 gxf6 g4 20 e4 xdx1 21 xdx1 g4 22 e2 d8 23 xg4 xg4 was good for Black.

18...dxe5 19 f4

The best move which wins a third pawn due to the pin on the e-file.

19...xf5 20 h3

20 fxe5 was another good choice.

20...xh3 21 xh3 h8 22 fxe5

22...xc4

Dorfman’s brilliant defensive skill has forced Karpov to trade almost all the pieces, but White must keep on the queens to retain his attack.

23 xdd3! xF4+
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23...\textit{Wxa2} 24 \textit{d6} \textit{Ec5} 25 \textit{We3} \textit{Wa5} 26 \textit{e6} \textit{Ec5} 27 exf7+ \textit{Wxf7} 28 \textit{Wf2+} \textit{Wg7} 29 dxe7 \textit{Ec8} 30 \textit{Wf6+} \textit{Wg8} 31 \textit{Whe3} gives White a winning position.

24 \textit{Wb1} \textit{Ea4} 25 \textit{d6} \textit{Ee4} 26 \textit{Whe3} \textit{Exe3} 27 \textit{Wxe3} \textit{Wxh4}

The best chance to hold. After 27...\textit{Wd8} 28 \textit{Wf3} \textit{Wxh4} 29 \textit{e6} f5 30 \textit{e7} \textit{Wd4} 31 d7+ \textit{Wxd7} 32 \textit{Wxe4} fxe4 33 \textit{Eh8} White is winning.

28 \textit{Wf3} \textit{Wxg5}

Possibly better was 28...\textit{Wd8} since the long line 29 d7+ \textit{Ec7} 30 \textit{Wf6+} \textit{Wxd7} 31 \textit{Wxf7+} \textit{Wc6} 32 \textit{Wc6+} \textit{Wb7} 33 \textit{Wd5+} \textit{Wb8} 34 a3 \textit{Wxe5} 35 \textit{Wd6+} \textit{Ec7} 36 \textit{Wxb4+} \textit{Wc8} 37 \textit{Wd4} is only slightly better for White.

29 \textit{Wc1} \textit{Wg2}

Otherwise 29...\textit{Wd8} 30 \textit{Wf1} \textit{Wg6} 31 \textit{Wc6+} \textit{Wf8} 32 \textit{Wd7} \textit{Wg7} 33 \textit{e6} \textit{Wf6} 34 \textit{e7} \textit{We4} 35 \textit{Wg1+} \textit{Wb6} 36 \textit{Wxe3+} \textit{Wc4} 37 \textit{Wc1} \textit{Wc6} 38 \textit{Wxh4+} \textit{Wxd7} 39 \textit{b3} and the white pawns are unstoppable.

30 \textit{Wf5}

30...\textit{Wg6}

After 30...\textit{Wg4} 31 \textit{Wxe7} \textit{Wg7} 32 \textit{Wd3} \textit{Wd4} 33 \textit{Wf1} \textit{Wc8} 34 \textit{We1} \textit{Wc8} 35 \textit{d7} \textit{Wd8} 36 \textit{Wf5} \textit{Wg8} 37 \textit{e6} \textit{Wf6} 38 \textit{Wd5} \textit{Wf8} 39 \textit{Wf1} a5 40 \textit{c4} Black position is tied up and hopeless.

31 \textit{Wf1} \textit{Wd5} 32 dxe7 \textit{Wxe7}

Instead 32...a5 33 \textit{Wh5} h6 34 \textit{e6} is given a "!!" by Speelman, but after 34...\textit{Wxe6} 35 \textit{Wxa5} \textit{Wxe7} 36 \textit{Wc8+} \textit{Wd7} 37 \textit{b7+} \textit{Wd8} we don't see a win.

33 \textit{Wf4}

Black's three pawn islands and centralized king give Karpov enough targets and advantage to win this endgame.

33...a5 34 \textit{Wh4+} \textit{Wb8} 35 \textit{Wxe7} \textit{Wf3} 36 \textit{Wh8+} \textit{Wd7} 37 \textit{Wc4} \textit{Wxe8} 38 \textit{Wc8} \textit{Wb7} 39 \textit{b3}

At long last White makes some luft!

39...\textit{Ec6} 40 \textit{Ec1}

Karpov's temporary pawn sacrifice further opens up Black's king.

40...\textit{Wxe5} 41 \textit{Wh8+} \textit{Wf7} 42 \textit{Wf5} \textit{Wf7} 43 \textit{Wf6} \textit{Ee7} 44 \textit{Wf5+} \textit{Wd6} 45 \textit{Wxa5} \textit{Ee5} 46 \textit{Wd8+} \textit{Wc6} 47 \textit{Wb2} f6 48 \textit{Wh8} \textit{Wg7} 49 \textit{Wc8} \textit{Wd5} 50 \textit{Ec4+} 1-0

Black gave up as 50...\textit{Wd6} 51 \textit{Ed8+} \textit{Wf7} 52 \textit{Wb7+} wins the queen.

We now come to a very complicated
game with hundreds of variations which are very difficult to calculate even for a computer. After Iordachescu sacrificed his knight on d5 in the Scheveningen, I had to prove to the computer in a lot of variations that White is better, not worse. I believe that if you too analyse this game with a computer, your tactical ability will improve and maybe you can find improvements for both sides.

Instead 14 $\text{wx}b4 $\text{xb}8 15 $\text{xa}4 $\text{xb}2 gives Black counterchances, while 14 h6 e5 15 $\text{wx}b4 $\text{xb}8 16 $\text{a}4 g6 17 $\text{d}5 $\text{xb}2 is good for Black.

14...$\text{ex}d5 15 h6 $\text{gx}h6 16 0-0-0 b3

Instead after 16...hxg5 (which looks good because 17 $\text{hx}h7? fails to 17...$\text{f}6) 17 $\text{wx}d5 $\text{xb}6 18 $\text{xd}3! f5 19 $\text{h}6 fxe4 20 $\text{b}3+$ $\text{f}7 21 $\text{h}5 $\text{f}8 22 $\text{gx}f5 $\text{b}7 23 g6 hxg6 24 $\text{gx}g6 $\text{d}5 25 $\text{xf}7+ $\text{xf}7 26 $\text{xd}5, White wins.

17 $\text{ax}b3 $\text{a}5 18 $\text{b}1 hxg5 19 b4 $\text{c}7 20 $\text{ex}d5 $\text{e}8

Black might have raced on, but after 20...a5 21 $\text{hx}h7 $\text{f}6 (21...$\text{f}6 22 $\text{we}4 $\text{ax}b4 23 $\text{edx}1 $\text{d}8 24 $\text{xf}7 $\text{xf}7 25 $\text{h}5+$ $\text{f}8 26 $\text{we}6 $\text{a}1+ 27 $\text{xa}1 $\text{xb}2+ 28 $\text{xb}2 $\text{wc}3+ 29 $\text{b}1 $\text{f}6 30 f5 $\text{g}7 31 $\text{xc}5 wins material) 22 $\text{h}6 $\text{ax}b4 23 $\text{d}3 $\text{d}8 24 $\text{edx}1 $\text{e}8 25 $\text{h}8+$ $\text{g}7 26 $\text{h}7+ $\text{xf}7 27 $\text{wx}h7+$ $\text{f}6 28 $\text{h}6+$ White wins.

21 $\text{wd}3

And not 21 $\text{hx}h7? $\text{f}6 22 $\text{wd}3 $\text{xe}3 23 $\text{wx}e3 $\text{hx}h7.

21...$\text{f}8 22 $\text{d}4 $\text{d}7?

Closing the b1-h7 diagonal by 22...f5 doesn’t save Black: 23 $\text{h}5 $\text{d}8 24 $\text{c}3 $\text{wa}7 25 $\text{de}1 h6 26 $\text{e}6 $\text{xe}6 27 $\text{xf}5 $\text{f}6 28 $\text{xf}6 $\text{g}7 29 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{f}8 30 $\text{xe}6 $\text{xf}6 31 $\text{xf}6 $\text{xe}6 32 $\text{xe}6 $\text{e}8 33 $\text{d}5 and wins. However, the superior defence 22...$\text{wd}7 23 $\text{fx}g5 $\text{f}5 24 $\text{c}3 $\text{f}6 25 $\text{gx}f6 $\text{xe}2 26 $\text{d}2 $\text{xd}2 27 $\text{xd}2 $\text{g}6 28 $\text{h}6 $\text{f}5 29 $\text{h}1 $\text{g}6 30 $\text{h}6 $\text{f}5 31 $\text{h}1 leads only to a draw as I discovered.

23 $\text{hx}h7!

A rook sacrifice which heralds the final, decisive wave of the attack.
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23... \( \text{h}7 \) 24 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 25 \( \text{fxg5 \text{hac8}} \) 26 \( \text{gx}f6 \text{xc}2+ \) 27 \( \text{xc}2 \text{xc}2 \) 28 \( \text{fxe7} \) 1-0

Black can’t save his rook and avoid checkmate.

Fritz likes 15 \( \text{hxg7}! \) as White mates after either 15... \( \text{hxg7} \) 16 \( \text{wh6+ g8} \) 17 e5 or 15...bxc3 16 e5. We will analyse similar variations in the next game.

15...exd5 16 e5

Throwing another pawn on to the fire. Two centralized bishops, an active queen and a potent pawn-storm gives White more than enough compensation for the knight. Alternatively, 16 \( \text{hxg7} \) most likely leads to another win: for example, 16... \( \text{dxc5} \) 17 \( \text{wh6} \text{b3} \) 18 axb3 \( \text{e}8 \) 19 b4 \( \text{xf8} \) 20 c7+ \( \text{e}5 \) 21 bxc3 \( \text{xf8} \) 22 f5 \( \text{e}6 \) 23 \( \text{xf6} \text{xf7} \) 24 \( \text{h8} \) 25 e3 \( \text{xf5} \) 26 exf5 \( \text{d}7 \) 27 \( \text{e}7 \text{yg7} \) 28 \( \text{hxg6}+ \text{g8} \) 29 f6 and wins. However, the typical 16 exd5 is probably not so good in view of the resource 16...f5 17 \( \text{h1e1} \text{c5} \) 18 \( \text{b6} \text{cxd5} \) 19 \( \text{h8} \text{xb7} \) 20 \( \text{xd6} \text{hac8} \).

16...g6

According to the computer the best move, but in any case it won’t save the black king.

17 \( \text{wh6 e8} \)

Otherwise, 17...dxe5 18 h5 exd4 19 hxg6 \( \text{xf4+} \) 20 b1 \( \text{f6} \) 21 g7 \( \text{f5} \) 22 \( \text{xf8w+ e8} \) 23 \( \text{xf6} \) wins material.
and 17...fxe5 18 fxe5 dxe5 19 h5 $f5 20
xg5 xg5 21 g6 fxg6 22 hgx6 $f6 23 g7
$wg7 24 $dg1 is hopeless for Black.

18 e6

The final nail in the coffin. White’s
mating threats decide the game.

18...$6

18...$e5 doesn’t help, since 19 exf7+
$xf7 20 $xh7+ $e6 21 $xe5 dxe5 22
$wg6+ wins for White.

19 $xg6 1-0

Game 10
E.Szalanczy-V.Gavrikov
Debrecen 1988

1 $e4 $c5 2 $f3 $d6 3 $d4 $xd4 4 $xd4 $f6
5 $c3 $e6 6 $e3 $a6 7 $g4 $c6 8 $g5 $d7 9
$h4 $e7 10 $h5 0-0 11 0-0-0 $xd4 12
$fxd4 $b5 13 $d3
Aiming at the h7-pawn.

13...b4

Losing immediately. According to
the computer, 13...$e5 was the best
choice for Black, neutralizing the white
bishops. However, after 14 f4 $xd3+ 15
$xd3 $b4 16 $e2 $a5 17 $b1 e5 18 $e3

14 $d5?

Amazingly enough 14 $xg7! wins
after 14...bxc3 (14...$xg7 15 $h6+ $h8
16 $e5 f5 17 g6 $f7 18 $xg7 $g8 19 $xf8+
$xf8 20 $hg1 costs Black material) 15
$e5 cxb2+ 16 $bl f5 17 $xf6 with a mat­ing
attack.

14...$xd5

14...$e5 could give Black counter-
chances after 15 $xb4 $c7 16 $b3 $b7.

15 $xg7
This unexpected sacrifice finishes the game.

15...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{We8}}}

Alternatively, 15...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{Q}}xg7}} 16 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{Wh6+}}}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{Q}}g8}}} (16...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\texttt{\textbf{Q}}h8}} is perhaps more stubborn, but 17 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\textbf{e5}}} f5 18 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\textbf{g6}}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}f7}}} 19 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{gxf7}}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Qf8}}}}} 20 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}xf8+}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}xf8}} 21 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}nd5}} looks good for White) 17 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{exd5}}} f5 18 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{gxf6}}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}f7}} 19 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}hg1+}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}h8}} 20 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Qg7}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}xf6}}} 21 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Qxf7}}} wins for White.}

16 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{Q}}f6}} 1\textit{-0}

Following 16...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{Q}}xf6} 17 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{Q}}xf6}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}xg6}}} 18 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{e5}}} h6} 19 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}hg1+}} Black will be mated in a couple of moves. Note that Cavrikov is a strong tactician who participated in the legendary USSR Championship. Indeed, it’s amazing how he couldn’t survive more than three moves after the \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qd5}}} sacrifice.

\textit{\textbf{Game 11}}

\textbf{M.Tal-M.Mukhin}

\textit{USSR Championship, Baku 1972}

1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e4}}} c5 2 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Qf3}}} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}xd4}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}f6}} 5 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Qc3}}} a6 6 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}c4}}

Sacrificing a bishop and preparing the next trick after 11...b4.

11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b4}}}

After 11...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{exd5}}} 12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{exd5+}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qd7}}} 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b4}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qa4}}} 14 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxa4}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{bxa4}}} 15 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qc8}}} 16 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxa4}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qd7}}} 17 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qc6}}} White’s great activity gives him good winning chances.

12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxb7}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qxb7}}} 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{Qd5}}}

After this sacrifice Black is losing in all variations.

13...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{exd5}}}

Entertaining is the line 13...a5 14
14 exd5+

Levy's 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5+ d7 16 c4 also looks good for White.

14...d7 15 c3

15 c6 b6 16 xf6 gxf6 17 wh5 d8 18 f5+ c7 19 xdx8 xdx8 20 wxf6 is another way to win material.

15...b3

Many years later after 15...a5 16 xf6 gxf6 17 xbx4 xdx5 18 a4+ c7 19 ac1+ c5 20 bxc5 dxc5 21 ed1 g8 22 g3 ba6 23 b3 wh5 24 ed7 ec8 25 wa5+ cc6 26 ac1 we2 27 cd4+!


16 wb7 cc5 17 wc4 wc8 18 cc6 h6 19 xf6 gxf6 20 xe3

White follows the typical plan after sacrificing a knight on d5: place the remaining knight on c6, spoil Black's pawn structure on the kingside, double rooks on the open file, and wait for the resignation.

20...c7 21 b4

Winning a piece.

21...g8 1-0
Sacrificing a pawn, but closing the c-file.

17 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{wxc8} \) 18 \( \text{xf6} \) gxf6 19 \( \text{d4} \)

19 \( \text{f3} \) and 19 \( \text{wh5} \) were two other strong possibilities to attack Black's king and pawns.

19...\( \text{c7} \) 20 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{h7} \) 21 \( \text{axb3} \)

White can consider his sacrifice a success. He has won three pawns for his bishop and all his pieces are very active, whereas Black can only dream about finding good squares for or exchanging his pieces.

21...\( \text{d7} \) 22 \( \text{d4} \)

Among many ways to win this tricky position is 22 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 23 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 24 \( \text{xe8} \) \( \text{wxe8} \) 25 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{g7} \) 26 b4 \( \text{d7} \) 27 \( \text{d4} \) which wins material.

22...\( \text{g7} \) 23 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 24 \( \text{d4+} \) \( \text{c5} \) 25 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 26 b4 \( \text{b7} \) 27 \( \text{e4} \)

The superior 27 \( \text{xa6} \) wins immediately in view of the line 27...\( \text{xa6} \) 28 \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{wxc8} \) 29 \( \text{c6+} \) \( \text{c7} \) 30 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b5+} \).

27...\( \text{c8} \)

27...\( \text{xe4} \) 28 \( \text{c6+} \) wins the queen.

28 \( \text{c6} \)

Now White regains his piece, leaving him a couple of pawns ahead. Black's position is hopeless.
11 \texttt{Qg1}

Preparing a kingside attack.

11...\texttt{Qd7} 12 g4 \texttt{Qc5} 13 g5 b5 14 \texttt{Qxc6} \texttt{Qxb3+} 15 axb3 \texttt{Qxc6} 16 \texttt{Wh5}

According to the computer, Black’s threats make his position very dangerous, but White’s future sacrifices will destroy the black king’s fortress.

16...b4 17 \texttt{Ad4!}

17...\texttt{Qb7}

It’s hard to believe, but the best try here is most likely 17...bxc3 18 \texttt{Wh6} cxb2+ 19 \texttt{Qxb2} e5 20 \texttt{Qxe5} \texttt{Qxc2+} 21 \texttt{Qxc2} dxe5 22 \texttt{Wh5} \texttt{Qe6} 23 \texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qfc8+} 24 \texttt{Qb2} a5 25 \texttt{Qa1} \texttt{Qc5} when White has a queen for a pair of bishops, but his attack is spent while Black has plenty of potential. ‘Unclear’ is perhaps a cop-out, but this is as close to the truth as I can determine.

18 \texttt{Qd5}

The computer believes that White is absolutely lost, but after the two players follow its recommendations for seven moves, White lands up winning! This reminds us that sometimes a human’s intuitive sense can still be better than the computer’s calculations.

18...exd5 19 \texttt{Qd3}

The typical queen sacrifice, 19 \texttt{Qh6}, loses after 19...\texttt{Qxc2+} 20 \texttt{Qxc2} \texttt{Qfc8+} 21 \texttt{Qb1} gxh6 22 gxh6+ \texttt{Qf8} 23 exd5, leaving White down a piece.

19...\texttt{Qfc8}

Alternatively, 19...\texttt{Qac8} 20 c3 bxc3 21 bxc3 f6 22 \texttt{Qh3} fxg5 23 \texttt{Qxg7} wins, while after 19...f6 20 \texttt{Qh3} \texttt{Qac8} 21 \texttt{Qxh7+} \texttt{Qf7} 22 exd5 \texttt{Qxc2+} 23 \texttt{Qxc2} \texttt{Qxc2+} 24 \texttt{Qxc2} \texttt{Qc8+} 25 \texttt{Qd3} fxg5 26 \texttt{Qf3+} \texttt{Qg6} 27 \texttt{Qe3} White wins material.

20 c3 bxc3 21 bxc3 dxe4 22 \texttt{Qh3} \texttt{Qf8} 23 g6!

The natural 23 \texttt{Qxh7?} actually loses for White after 23...\texttt{Qc8} 24 g6 \texttt{Qd5} 25
gxf7+ @d7.

23...fxg6?

This loses in couple of moves. Instead 23...h6 was the best move which leads to a very unclear position after 24 @xg7+ &e8 25 gx7+ &d7 26 @f5+ @c7 27 c4 a5 28 @xh6 a4 29 &e6 &d7 30 b4. Even though computers like Black here, I believe that White has enough counterchances to survive this mess.

24 @xh7 &e8 25 @xg6 @b5 26 @xg7 &g5+ 27 @e3! &xe3+ 28 fxe3

Black’s extra rook is nothing compared to White’s mating attack. Indeed, only a couple of checks can postpone Black’s fate.

28...@f1+ 29 @b2 1-0

The line 29...@f2+ 30 @a3 @f8 31 @g6+ @d8 32 @b6+ @c7 33 @xc7+ @c8 34 @e6 mate finishes the game.

The computer doesn’t believe that after Black played all the natural moves one crazy sacrifice can win the game. However, we shall soon prove otherwise...

16...exd5 17 @f5 @fe8

Interesting is 17...@d8 18 exd5 g6 (this weakening appears forced) 19 @h6+ @g7 20 @d4+ f6 21 @e6 @xc4 22 @xc4 bxc4 23 @g1 @b8 24 f5 @c5 25 @e3 @h8 26 fxg6 hxg6 27 gx6 @xf6 28 @xg6 @xd4 29 @xd4+ @h7 30 @dg1 and
White has a mating attack. Another possible line runs 17...\( \text{Na5} \) 18 exd5 \( \text{Nxd5} \) 19 h4 d8 20 d4 \( \text{Nd7} \) 21 \( \text{Ne4} \) \( \text{Nc4} \) 22 h3 f6 23 \( \text{Nf7+} \) \( \text{Nxe7} \) 24 \( \text{Nxf7} \) 25 \( \text{Nh5+} \) g6 26 \( \text{Nh7+} \) \( \text{Ne8} \) 27 \( \text{Nxe6} \) \( \text{Nd8} \) 28 \( \text{Nxf6} \) \( \text{Nxf6} \) 29 \( \text{Nxf6+} \) \( \text{Nc8} \) 30 \( \text{Nh7} \), trapping Black's queen.

18 exd5 \( \text{Nf8} \)

Alternatively, 18...\( \text{Nd5} \) 19 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{Nxe5} \) \( \text{Nxe5} \) \( \text{Wg4} \) h6 22 \( \text{Nxe5} \) dxe5 23 \( \text{Wxd8} \) 24 h3 \( \text{Wxf6} \) 25 \( \text{Nxe6} \) g6 26 h5 leaves Black's king with no chances to survive.

19 \( \text{Wxe8} \) \( \text{Wxe8} \) 20 \( \text{Wxe8} \)

White threatens 21 \( \text{Wxe7+} \) \( \text{Wf8} \) 22 \( \text{Wf5} \).

20...f6

Even after the best response 20...g6 White still wins: 21 \( \text{Wf6+} \) \( \text{Wg7} \) 22 \( \text{Wd4+} \) f6 23 \( \text{Nxf6+} \) \( \text{Nh6} \) 24 \( \text{Wxe3} \) \( \text{Nxf6} \) 25 \( \text{Nxf6} \) \( \text{Nc8} \) 26 f5 \( \text{gx5} \) 27 \( \text{Wg1} \) f4 28 \( \text{Wg5+} \) \( \text{Nh5} \) 29 \( \text{Wxe2+} \) \( \text{Wg4} \) 30 \( \text{Nxe4} \) \( \text{Nxe4} \) 31 \( \text{Nf5} \) \( \text{Nf6} \) 32 \( \text{Nf3} \) 33 \( \text{Nd3+} \) \( \text{Wf4} \) 34 \( \text{Nc4+} \) \( \text{Wf5} \) 35 \( \text{Nc4+} \) wins the queen.

21 g6

After this move Black's king is in huge trouble.

21...hxg6 22 \( \text{Ne7+} \) \( \text{Nh7} \) 23 \( \text{Nxe6+} \) \( \text{Nh6} \) 24 \( \text{Ng1} \) 1-0

Black can't escape checkmate.

Game 15
B.Spassky-G.Zaichik
Moscow 1972

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{Nf3} \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{Nxd4} \) \( \text{Nf6} \) 5 \( \text{Nc3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 6 \( \text{g5} \) e6 7 f4 \( \text{Nd7} \) 8 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 9 0-0-0 b5 10 \( \text{Nf3} \)

A popular variation which leads to lots of very complicated continuations with many sacrificial possibilities for both sides.

10...b4

As hinted elsewhere in this chapter, 10...\( \text{b7} \) is a decent alternative here.

11 \( \text{Wd5} \)

Otherwise 11 \( \text{Wb5} \) is safe but unpromising.

11...exd5 12 \( \text{Nhe1} \) \( \text{Nf7} \)

The alternative 12...\( \text{Wb7} \) will be discussed in the next game.

13 exd5

The promising, extremely complicated 13 \( \text{Wf5} \) actually appears to be winning after 13...b3 14 \( \text{axb3} \) \( \text{Nc5} \) 15
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White is trying to double his rooks on e-file and trade the light-squared bishops, thereby capturing the f5-square with serious pressure.

15...\texttt{Ha7} 16 \texttt{Hf2} \texttt{Hf8}

16...\texttt{Ha5} 17 \texttt{Hb1} \texttt{Cc7} 18 \texttt{Hf5} is very unpleasant for Black.

17 \texttt{Hf5} \texttt{Hd8} 18 \texttt{Wxh7} \texttt{Cc5} 19 \texttt{Hxc8} \texttt{Hxc8} 20 \texttt{Wg7} \texttt{Hd8} 21 \texttt{Wxf7} \texttt{Hdd7} 22 \texttt{Hf5}

White successfully follows his positional plan. He has easily traded the light-squared bishops, placed the knight on f5 and prepared to double his rooks on the open file.

13...\texttt{Hb8}

Trying to cover the c6- and f5-squares, but Black is helping White to organize a dangerous attack. Better is 13...\texttt{Hf8} 14 \texttt{Hf5} \texttt{Hd8} 15 \texttt{Xg7} \texttt{Hb6} 16 \texttt{Xf6} \texttt{Xxf6} 17 \texttt{Hf5} with chances for both sides.

14 \texttt{Xf6} \texttt{Gxf6} 15 \texttt{Wf5}

White’s activity is more than enough compensation for the bishop. Note that Black’s pieces are very passive and his pawns are weak, while White is trying to stop
White’s passed pawns, White has put more pressure on the weak b4-, d6- and f6-pawns.

White wins another pawn.

The Knight Sacrifice on d5

White wins another pawn.

We will next see another important idea behind the Qd5 sacrifice; White trades his knight on c6 and the resulting passed c-pawn becomes an extra threat.

Game 16
U.Atakisi-L.Mazi
European Championship, Antalya 2004

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4 Qf6
5 @c3 a6 6 @g5 e6 7 f4 Qbd7 8 Qf3 Qc7 9 0-0-0 b5 10 Qd3 b4 11 Qd5

In the previous game we saw how Spassky successfully used this sacrifice against Zaichik. In this game Atakisi uses Spassky’s ideas, but adds his own flavour.

11 exd5 12 exd5 @b7

For 12...@e7 13 @e1, see the previous game.

13 @e1+ @d8 14 Qc6+ @xc6

14...@c8 is losing after 15 @xf6 @xf6 16 @f5+ @d7 17 @e8+.
15 dxc6 \( \text{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{b8}}} \)

Another alternative is 15...\( \text{\texttt{c6}} \), but after 16 \text{\texttt{xf6+}} (16 \text{\texttt{h4!? c8 17 xxa6}} \text{\texttt{a8 18 b7 xxa2 19 wb1 a5 20 e5 d4 21 we4 xe5 22 fxe5 wb6 23 ed4 d5 24 d5 b3 25 exd6 bxc2+ 26 xc2 xxc2 27 xf6+ forced Black to resign in E.Berg-Li Chao, Beijing 2006}) 16...\text{\texttt{xf6}} 17 \text{\texttt{f5 e7}} 18 \text{\texttt{e3 c8}} 19 \text{\texttt{e2 b8}} 20 \text{\texttt{de1}} Black's uncoordinated pieces are in big trouble.

Practice has seen too 15...\text{\texttt{c5}} when 16 \text{\texttt{xf6+}} \text{\texttt{xf6}} 17 \text{\texttt{c4 a7}} 18 \text{\texttt{d5 wb6}} 19 \text{\texttt{f5 e7}} 20 \text{\texttt{d5 a5}} 21 \text{\texttt{g4 a4}} 22 \text{\texttt{g7 e8}} 23 \text{\texttt{xf6}} b3 24 \text{\texttt{exd6+ c8}} 25 a3 gave White more than enough initiative for the piece in P.Thipsay-L.Ravi, Mumbai 2003.

16 \text{\texttt{xf6+}} \text{\texttt{xf6}} 17 \text{\texttt{e4}}

This position reminds us of Spassky-Zaichik. For the knight White has a pawn, active pieces, a dangerous c-pawn which paralyses Black's queenside, an open e-file, weak black pawns to target and a mating attack. However, even though Black's pieces are badly placed, an extra piece can give him good drawing or even winning chances if he can just trade a couple of active white pieces. Indeed, objectively the position is unclear with chances for both sides.

17...\text{\texttt{h5}}

Black's best chance was to free his pieces on the queenside by 17...\text{\texttt{a5}} 18 \text{\texttt{we3 e7}} 19 \text{\texttt{d5 a6}} 20 \text{\texttt{d2 xxc6}} 21 \text{\texttt{de2 e8}} 22 \text{\texttt{xf7 e8}} 23 \text{\texttt{d5 e8}}, which would have remained rather unclear.

18 \text{\texttt{d5 a7}} 19 \text{\texttt{we4 g7}} 20 \text{\texttt{xb4}}

The collection of the pawn harvest begins.

20...\text{\texttt{a5}} 21 \text{\texttt{wc4 f5}} 22 \text{\texttt{e3 a6}} 23 \text{\texttt{f3}}

Preventing ...\text{\texttt{c5}} and aiming at Black's weak pawns.

23...\text{\texttt{c8}} 24 \text{\texttt{d1 e8}} 25 \text{\texttt{d5 c5}} 26 \text{\texttt{xf5+?}}

The f5-pawn was not going anywhere. Better is 26 \text{\texttt{xe5 wb6}} 27 \text{\texttt{c3 c7}} 28 \text{\texttt{xf5+}} and the extra material gives White excellent winning chances.

26...\text{\texttt{b8}} 27 \text{\texttt{d5 wb6}} 28 \text{\texttt{c3 e6}} 29 \text{\texttt{g3 h4}} 30 \text{\texttt{b1}}

I believe this prophylactic move was a small mistake. The active 30 \text{\texttt{h5 wc5}} 31 \text{\texttt{d3 hgx3}} 32 \text{\texttt{hgx3 e7}} 33 \text{\texttt{xf7}}
Suddenly Black has activated his pieces, defended his weak pawns and is ready to seize the initiative. Probably it was wrong to give up the e5- and g5-squares by pushing White's f-pawn.

37 \(\text{exd}3\) \(\text{cxc5}\)?

After the manoeuvre 37...\(\text{d7}\) 38 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{d8}\) 39 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{cxd6}\) White could only dream about survival.

38 \(\text{exd5}\) \(\text{wa3}\) 39 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{xb6}\) 40 \(\text{c4}\)

The sacrifice 40 \(\text{exe5!}\) gives White an extra pawn and good winning chances after 40...\(\text{dxe5}\) 41 \(\text{d7}\) \(\text{xb3}\) 42 \(\text{axb3}\) 43 \(\text{wb2}\) 44 \(\text{xb2}\) 45 \(\text{d6}\).

40...\(\text{a6}\)?

A better try was the wild 40...\(\text{xb3}\) 41 \(\text{axb3}\) 42 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{xc4}\) 43 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{g4}\) 44 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{a4}\) 45 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{g3}\) 46 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{a1}\) 47 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{xd1}\) 48 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{e5}\) 49 \(\text{b1}\), although this still is lost for Black.

41 \(\text{b5}\) a4 42 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{AXB3}\) 43 \(\text{dxb3}\) \(\text{wa4}\) 44 \(\text{we3}\) +1-0

Checkmate follows.

---

**Game 17**

D.Bronstein-F.Gheorghiu
Petropolis Interzonal 1973

1 \(e4\) \(c5\) 2 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 3 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{cxd4}\) 4 \(\text{dxd4}\) \(\text{d6}\)

5 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 6 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e6}\) 7 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 8 \(\text{we2}\)

Innovative. In order to castle as quickly as possible, White blocks his light-squared bishop. In addition, e4-e5 and \(\text{c3-d5}\) can become serious threats in the future.

8...\(\text{wc7}\) 9 0-0-0 \(\text{b5}\) 10 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{eb8}\)

Threatening 11...\(\text{b4}\). A respectable
alternative is 10...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{e7}}, while after}
10...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{b7}}} 11 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{g4 e7}}} 12 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{g2 0-0}} 13 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{h4}}}
\textit{\texttt{g6}} 14 \textit{\texttt{hff1}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{b6}} 15 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{d3 c4}} 16 \textit{\texttt{h3}}}
\textit{\texttt{eac8}} 17 f5 e5 18 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{b3 d5 19 exd5}} 20 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe4}}}
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe4}}} 21 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe7}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xc3}} 22 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xc3}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe8}}}
23 f6 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xd5}}} White achieved an advantage, but the game was later drawn, in
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{11 d5}}}

After the sacrifice is accepted, Black's rook on b8 will become a target
for White's remaining knight.
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{11...exd5}} 12 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{exd5+ \textit{\texttt{\textbf{e7}}}} 13 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{c6}}}} 14 \textit{\texttt{xf6}}}
\textit{\texttt{gxf6}} 15 \textit{\texttt{g3}}
After 15 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xb8}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xb8}}} both sides have
their chances.
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{15...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{b7}}}}}}
15...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{b7}} 16 \textit{\texttt{wh5 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{d7}}}} 17 \textit{\texttt{g2}} \textit{\texttt{xc6}}
18 \textit{\texttt{dxc6 \textit{\texttt{b8}}}} 19 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe1}}}} gives White
enough initiative for the piece.
\textit{\texttt{16 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xb8}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xb8}}}} 17 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{g2}}}} 18 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe1}}}
Material is equal, but by attacking Black's weak structure and centralized
king, White can continue to pose his opponent serious problems.
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{18...f5}} 19 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{d3 d7}} 20 \textit{\texttt{wh5}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{c8}} 21 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xf5+}}}}
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{b8}} 22 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xf7}}}}

So the Black king has escaped, but
White's two extra pawns and open e-file give him a winning advantage.
\textit{\texttt{22...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{f6}}}}} 23 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{de3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xb2+}}}}}}
The last chance to complicate the
game.
\textit{\texttt{24 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xb2}}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{c4+}}} 25 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{a2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe3}}}}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe3}}}
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{b6}} 27 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{e8+ \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe8}}}}}} 28 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xe8+ \textit{\texttt{\textbf{a7}}}}}} 29 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{we4}}}

White has defended his king and is
now ready to roll his passed f-pawn.
\textit{\texttt{29...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{f2}}}}} 30 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{b2 a5}} 31 \textit{\texttt{f5 \textit{\texttt{b6}}}} 32 \textit{\texttt{g4 \textit{\texttt{h6}}}}
33 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{f3 \textit{\texttt{wxb2}}}}} 34 \textit{\texttt{f6 \textit{\texttt{wh4}}}} 35 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{d4+ \textit{\texttt{c7}}}}}
36 \textit{\texttt{f7 1-0}}
36...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{e7}} 37 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{g7}}}} will make a second
queen.

\textit{\texttt{Game 18}}
\textit{\texttt{l.Zaitsev-B.Anetbaev}}
\textit{\texttt{Odessa 1972}}

\texttt{1 e4 c5 2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{f3}}}} \texttt{d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{xd4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{f6}}}}
5 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{c3 a6}} 6 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{g5}}} e6 7 f4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{e7}}}} 8 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{f3 \textit{\texttt{c7}}}}}
9 \textit{\texttt{0-0-0 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{bd7}}}}} 10 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{d3 b5}}} 11 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textbf{he1}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{b7}}}
12 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{d5}}}

Kasparov doesn't trust this sacrifice, although GM Alex Stripunsky believes
it is enough for a draw. Maybe it’s not so good, but it has baffled many strong players. Certainly, though, it’s a memorable sacrifice for me, as a while ago I was teaching one of my students this crazy variation. In the beginning it made her lose a couple of important games, but later she easily checkmated a master and so qualified for a World Girl’s Championship.

12...exd5

My student’s game continued 12...Qxd5 13 exd5 Qxd5? (critical is 13...Qxg5 14 Qxe6+) 14 Wxd5 exd5 15 Qxe7+ Qf8 16 f5 h6 (16...Qd8 17 Qe6 wins) 17 Qg6 (better was 17 Qxd7) 17...hxg5? (the amazing 17...Qh7 creates an unclear position) 18 Qxf7+ Qe8 19 Qe6 Wc4 20 Qxg7 and mate.

13 Qf5 Qf8

This should lose! Better is 13...dxex4 14 ex4 Qxe4 (14...Qe5 15 fxex5 Qxe4 16 Qxe7 Qc8 17 Qxg7+ forced Black to give up in M.Brotsky-V.Mudrov, Novgorod 1995) 15 Qxe4 with chances for both sides.

14 e5!

Superior here to 14 exd5+, as my student once tried without success. 14...dxex5 15 fxex5

15...Qxex5

According to the computer Black is better after 15...Qe4, but in fact he should lose after the fascinating line 16 Qxe4 dxex4 17 exex4 Qxe4 18 Wxe4 Wb8 19 e6 Qe5 20 exf7+ Qxf7 21 Qd7+ Qxd7 22 Qd5+ Qg6 23 Qh4+ Qh5 24 Wf5 Qe5 25 Qf4+ Qxh4 26 Wg5 mate.

16 Qxg7+

This wins back the material and soon the game. 16...Qxg7 17 Qxf6 Qf8 18 Qxg7+ Qxg7 19 Qg3+ Qf8 20 Qxe5 Wb6 21 Qf1 Wh6+ 22 Qb1 Qg8 23 Qf7+!
A beautiful sacrifice, which immediately concludes the game.

23...\textit{xf7} 24 \textit{f5}+ 1-0

It's mate after 24...\textit{e6} 25 \textit{e5}+ \textit{d7} 26 \textit{f7}+ \textit{d8} 27 \textit{e7}+ \textit{c8} 28 \textit{c7}.

\textbf{Game 19}

\textbf{J.Fluvia Poyatos-A.Gual Pascual}

\textit{Badalona 2001}

\begin{center}

\begin{tabular}{c}
1 \textit{e4} c5 2 \textit{f3} d6 3 d4 \textit{f6} 4 \textit{c3} cxd4 5 \\
\textit{xd4} a6 6 \textit{c5} g6 7 f4 \textit{bd7} 8 \textit{f3} \\
\textit{e7} 9 0-0-0 b5 10 \textit{d3} \textit{b7} 11 \textit{h1} \\
\textit{e7} 12 \textit{d5}?
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

White chose to give this complicated idea a try even though theory hasn't always trusted it.

\begin{center}

\begin{tabular}{c}
12 ... \textit{xd5} 13 \textit{exd5} \textit{c5} 14 \textit{xe6}+ \\
\textit{xh5}+ g6 16 \textit{c5}+ \textit{d7} 19 \textit{e6}+ \textit{d5} 20 \textit{e7}+ \\
\textit{e7} 21 \textit{f5}+ \textit{d6} 22 \textit{g5}+ \textit{d5} 23 \textit{e7} \\
\textit{c7} 24 \textit{f5}+ \textit{d7} 25 \textit{e8} 26 \textit{e6}+ \\
\textit{e6} 27 \textit{e6}+ \textit{c7} 28 \textit{f6}, which forced
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Black to resign in Djikic-B.Damljanovic, Yugoslavia 1980)

17 \textit{xf6}+ \textit{d8} 18 \textit{xe6}+ \textit{c8} 19 \textit{xf5}, despite being down two pieces White can still pose a number of problems: for example, 19 ... \textit{e4} 20 \textit{g7} \textit{e8} 21 \textit{e7} \textit{g8} 22 \\
\textit{f7} \textit{e6} 23 \textit{d4} \textit{f1}+ 24 \textit{d4} \textit{c4} 25 \\
\textit{d4} with a repetition.

\begin{center}

\begin{tabular}{c}
15 ... \textit{xf4}+?
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Natural, but bad. Better is 15 ... \textit{e6} 16 \textit{e5}+ \textit{g6} 17 \textit{f6} 18 \textit{c5}+ \\
\textit{xf5} 19 \textit{xg6}+ \textit{g8} 20 \textit{e7} \textit{e3}+ 21 \textit{h1} \\
\textit{c8} 22 \textit{d4} \textit{xg7} 23 \textit{e1} \textit{xe1}+ 24 \\
\textit{xe1}+ \textit{d8}, when material is equal, but
\end{center}

the position very unclear.

\begin{center}

\begin{tabular}{c}
16 \textit{xf4} \textit{b6} 17 \textit{g5} \\
\textit{xf4} \textit{b4} \textit{e6} \\
\textit{e7} \textit{e8} 18 \textit{e5}+ \textit{d7} 19 \textit{f5}+ \\
\textit{d8} \textit{e6}+ \textit{c7} 20 \textit{f6}, which forced
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

A theoretical rook sacrifice which makes life very difficult for Black.

\begin{center}

\begin{tabular}{c}
14 ... \textit{xe6} 15 \textit{e6} \\
\textit{h5}+ \textit{d6} 18 \textit{f8} 19 \textit{e7} 20 \textit{f8} \\
\textit{f5}+ 1-0
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

After 20 ... \textit{g8} 21 \textit{e1} \textit{xf1}+ 22 \textit{xf1} \\
\textit{xf1}+ 23 \textit{xf1} \textit{exd5} 24 \textit{f5} \textit{c4} 25 \\
\textit{d7} White will force mate.

We now turn to a famous game in which the American master Sidney Bernstein sacrificed his knight on d5, but Fischer easily won by placing his pieces on the right squares.
1 e4 c5 2 ∆f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∆xd4 ∆f6 5 ∆c3 a6 6 ∆g5 e6 7 f4 ∆e7 8 ∆f3 ∆bd7 9 0-0-0 ∆c7 10 g4 b5 11 ∆g2

This natural move wastes a vital tempo and probably misplaces the bishop. Instead 11 ∆xf6 gxf6 12 g5 ∆xd7 13 f5 is a well-known theoretical variation. However, if White wants to sacrifice his knight he should prefer the central strategy 10 ∆d3 followed by 11 ∆he1, as we’ve just seen in action.

11...∆b7 12 ∆he1 b4

After 12...∆b6 13 ∆xf6 ∆xf6 14 g5 ∆c7 15 h4 b4 16 ∆ce2 g6 17 ∆b1 d5 18 e5 ∆a4 19 h5 ∆b6 20 ∆h1 0-0-0 21 hxg6 hxg6 22 ∆h6 ∆b8 23 ∆dh1 ∆h8 24 ∆h7 a5 25 ∆g7 ∆a6 26 ∆hh7 ∆c5 the position was unclear in Y. Sakharov-V. Korchnoi, Leningrad 1960.

13 ∆d5?

This certainly looks good, as all White’s pieces are ready to smash the black king. However, Black’s king can sidestep the threats. Thus 13 ∆a4 looks like the best try.

13...exd5 14 exd5 ∆f8!

14...∆d8?! 15 ∆e2 ∆b6 16 ∆f5 g6 17 ∆xg7 gxe8 18 ∆f5 ∆xe5 19 fxg5 is too dangerous for Black.

15 ∆f5 ∆e8

White hopes to double his rooks on the e-file, improve the position of his queen and push his kingside pawns, but Black can position his pieces in the right places much more quickly.

16 ∆e3 ∆d8

Larsen against Tal forgot to place his Bishop on d8, as we will see shortly, but Fischer understood how this seemingly passive bishop can spring into action from b6.

17 ∆d4 ∆c8

Alternatively, the line 17...a5 18 ∆xe8+ ∆xe8 19 ∆xd8 ∆xd8 20 ∆e1 ∆c5 21 ∆xe8+ ∆xe8 22 ∆xg7 ∆d7 23 ∆xf7+ ∆c8 should win too for Black.

18 ∆h4

18 ∆xb4 gives White chances to survive.
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18...\( \text{c5} \) 19 \( \text{dxg7} \)

Better fighting chances were offered by 19 \( \text{xf6} \) \( gx6 \) 20 \( \text{xe8+} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 21 \( \text{xb4} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 22 \( \text{gxf5} \) \( \text{gg8} \).

19...\( \text{dxg7} \) 20 \( g5 \) \( \text{xf5} \) 21 \( \text{gxf6+} \) \( \text{h6} \)

The black king is actually quite safe, whereas White king's is in danger.

22 \( \text{wc4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 23 \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{xc7} \) 24 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 25 \( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 26 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 27 \( \text{h4+} \) \( \text{h6} \)

Sid continues to fight, but down a piece he could have packed it in for the day.

28 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 29 \( \text{ag5} \) \( \text{e4} \) 30 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{g6} \) 31 \( \text{f1g1} \) \( \text{e3} \) 32 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e4} \) 33 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 34 \( \text{e2} \) a5 35 h4 \( \text{h3} \) 36 h5 \( \text{hxh3} \) 37 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{ag6} \) 38 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{xf8} \) 39 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f6} \) 40 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 41 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e3} \) 42 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 43 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 44 \( \text{f3} \) 0-1

19...\( \text{exd5} \) 20 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{d7} \)?

This logical move loses immediately. The superior 20...\( \text{d8} \) 21 \( \text{c6}+ \) \( \text{xc6} \) 22 \( \text{dx6} \) \( \text{ag7} \) 23 \( \text{exg7} \) \( \text{ag8} \) 24 \( \text{wxh5} \) \( \text{e6} \) 25 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{ag7} \) 26 \( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{e8} \) 27 \( \text{d7+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 28 \( \text{wxg6} \) \( \text{f5} \) 29 \( \text{wxh5} \) \( \text{g7} \) 30 h4 would only have given White a slight advantage.

21 \( \text{dx7+} \) \( \text{wx7} \) 22 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 23 \( \text{e1}+ \)

---

Game 21
D.Lima-I.Morovic Fernandez
Sao Paulo 2002

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 2 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 3 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 4 \( \text{cxd4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 5 \( \text{c3} \) a6 6 \( \text{g5} \) e6 7 f4 \( \text{bd7} \) 8 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{wc7} \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 10 g4 b5 11 \( \text{xf6} \) 

\( \text{xf6} \) 12 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 13 f5 \( \text{c5} \) 

13...\( \text{ag5+} \) is another theoretical move, but the text will allow White to demonstrate two amazing sacrifices.

14 \( f6 \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 15 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 \( \text{g1} \) h5 17 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{b7} \)

After 17...\( \text{ag5} \) 18 \( \text{fxg7} \) \( \text{g8} \) 19 \( \text{dxb5} \) axb5 20 \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{we7} \) 21 \( \text{d6+} \) Whites wins the queen and the game. Thus the most popular option is 17...b4?, after which, for example, 18 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{exd5} \) 19 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{b7} \) 21 \( \text{e1+} \) \( \text{e5} \) 22 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{dxe5} \) 23 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 24 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 25 \( \text{xe5+} \) \( \text{e5} \) 26 \( \text{xe5+} \) \( \text{d8} \) 27 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{c8} \) 28 \( \text{exh5} \) \( \text{exh5} \) 29 \( \text{fxg8+} \) \( \text{c7} \) 30 \( \text{d6+} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 31 \( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{e7} \) 32 \( \text{d8+} \) saw Black manage to draw in R.Hall-A.Kiss, correspondence 2002.

18 \( \text{h3} \) b4 19 \( \text{d5} \)

---

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{f3} \) d6 3 d4 \( \text{cxd4} \) 4 \( \text{cxd4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 5 \( \text{c3} \) a6 6 \( \text{g5} \) e6 7 f4 \( \text{bd7} \) 8 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{wc7} \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 10 g4 b5 11 \( \text{xf6} \) 

---

40
Wd8 24 dxc6 Wc7 25 We4 Wxg7 26 fxg7 1-0

We now come to a famous game, the finale of Tal’s 1965 Candidates match against Larsen. Tal’s knight sacrifice has long graced the pages of many chess books and magazines. Indeed, for about 40 years now many chess coaches have demonstrated this game as an example of Tal’s tactical genius. That it may well be. But was it correct? Let us see...

**Game 22**
**M.Tal-B.Larsen**
10th matchgame, Bled 1965

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4 e6 5 Qc3 d6 6 a3 Qf6 7 f4 Qe7 8 Wf3 0-0 9 0-0 Qc7 10 Qdb5 Wb8 11 g4 a6 12 Qd4 Qxd4 13 Qxd4 b5

The aggressive 13...e5 14 g5 Qg4 15 Qg3 exd4 (15...Qxd1? 16 gxh6 Qxh6 17 Qd5 Qh8 18 Qxf6 gxh6 19 Qc3 looks like a win for White) 16 Qxd4 Qe6 17 gxh6 Qxf6 18 Qd3 is unclear, but we would rather be White.

14 g5 Qd7 15 Qd3 b4

The seemingly natural 15...Qb7 forced Black to resign after 16 Wh3 Qd8 17 Qhg1 e5 18 Qd5 Qxd5 19 exd5 g6 20 f5 exd4 21 fxg6 hxg6 22 Qxg6 Qf8 23 Qxf7+ Qxf7 24 g6+ Qg7 25 Qd1 Qf6 26 Qxf6 in A.Suetin-E.Jimenez Zerquera, Havana 1969.

16 Qd5?!

In almost every book before you will have seen ‘!!’ attached to this move, perhaps because the great Tal won this game. However, we believe 16 Qe2 was safer and stronger.

16...exd5!

16...Qd8? 17 Qf6+ is winning for White: 17...Qxf6 18 Qxf6 Qxf6 19 Bh5+ Qh8 20 e5 Qg8 21 Qxf6 Qxf6 22 Wh5 d5 23 Qxg8+ Qxg8 24 Wh6 mates.

17 exd5 f5 18 Qxe1 Qf7?!

Much better was 18...Qd8! à la Fischer. It is important to keep this bishop for now, watching e7 and preparing a well-timed ...Qb6! to kill off a white attacker. Then 19 h4 Qc5! (19...Qb6?! 20 Qxg7! Qxg7 21 Wh5 Qf7 22 Wh6+ Qg8 23 Qe8+ Qf8 24 h5 Qd4 25 g6 Qc7 26 Qxh7+ Qh8 27 Qg1 Qxg1 28 Qg6 leads to mate) 20 Qc4 Qe4 21 g6 h6 easily stops White’s attack, leaving Black with an extra piece.

19 h4

19...Qxf5 20 Qf8 20 Qe6 Qxe6 21 dxe6 Qf5 is good for Black.

19...Qb7

The alternative 19...Qc5 is not good enough, e.g. 20 h5 Qxd3+ 21 Wh3 Qf8 22 g6 Qb7 23 h6 gxh6 24 Wh3 Qc7 25 Qe8 with a win.
20 $\text{xf5 xf5}$

The best was $20...\text{xf8}$, but even so
21 $\text{xe7+ xh7 22 h5 xe5 23 ef4+}$
$\text{xf8 24 fxg5 xd8 25 g6 ef7 26 ehl}$
$\text{e6 27 h6 gxh6 28 ef4 xc2+ 29 Db1}$
should crush the black king.
21 $\text{xe7 ef5 22 ef4 ff8 23 fxe5 ef4}$
24 $\text{ef3}$

24...$\text{xf3}$

24...$\text{xd5 25 exd6 xd4 26 xd4}$
$\text{xe1 27 b3! leaves Black with an extra}$
bishop, but a bad position where
White’s dangerous d-pawn, active
pieces and attack should prove deci-
sive.
25 $\text{ee2 xe7 26 xf3 dxe5 27 e1}$

$\text{d8 28 xe5 de6 29 ef4 ef8 30 ef4}$

With two extra pawns, White can
even allow some checks.
30...b3 31 axb3 ef1+ 32 db2 ef4+ 33
c3 ed6 34 ec5 xc5 35 ef8+ ef8 36
$\text{ef6+ eh8 37 ef7 1-0}$

Larsen defended like a lion, but
Tal’s amazing tactical ability over-
whelmed his resistance.

Let us now return to the position af-
ter 17 exd5 and check out Black’s main
alternative defence:

17...g6

For many years this was considered
a better try than 17...f5, but...

18 $\text{eh1! d8}$

After 18...$\text{e8 19 ef6 xf6 20 xf6}$
h5 21 $\text{g3 e4 22 fxe7 xd1 23 xg6}$
$\text{fxg6 24 xg6+ xh8 25 xh6+ xg8 26}$
$\text{xg5+ xh8 27 f5}$ Black can’t protect his
king.

19 $\text{w3 e5}$

19...xc5? doesn’t stop the mating at-
tack after 20 $\text{h6 xd3+ 21 xd3 f6 22}$
gxf6 $\text{we7 23 xe7 xe7 24 fxe7}$ Neither
would 19...h5 have helped: 20 gxh6 $\text{xf6}$
21 $\text{xf6 xf6 22 wh4 eh7 23 wg3 wc7}$
24 f5 g5 25 f6 g4 26 e7 c5 27 f4 b3 28 axb3 a5 29 b1 d8 30 xh7+ xh7 31 g5 g8 32 xf7+ h8 33 g7 a7 34 e1 f5 35 xf5 and Black's position is hopeless.

20 Wh6 b6 21 f5!!

We analysed many moves, but only this generates a strong enough attack to keep White in the game.

21...xf5

Here 21...gxf5 22 xb6!! g4 23 d4!! is an amazing queen sacrifice which took us many hours to find and then work out: 23...xb6 24 gxh6 Ad8 (the superior 24...f6 25 e7 Ef7! 26 e8+ f8 27 e7 Ef7 forces a repetition) 25 d2 e6 26 dx6 fx6 27 e6 e8 28 g2 e8 29 f6+ e7 30 xf5 d8 31 e7 a7 32 e7 d7 33 e7 wins.

22 xf5 gxf5 23 xe5 dxe5 24 xb6 c8

Another eventually level line runs 24...c8 25 d3 e4 26 d1 f4+ 27 b1 g4 28 g1 w2 29 g6 xc2+ 30 a1 fxg6 31 xg6+hxg6 32 xg6+ f8 33 f6+ f8 34 w6+ f8 35 f6+ g8 36 w6+ f8 37 f6+ with perpetual check.

25 d6

25...d7

Better than 25...c6? 26 d7 xh6 27 g6 Ad8 28 g1+ h8 29 c7 f8 30 d1 d8 31 d6 e8 32 g1+ h8 33 e7 f6 34 xd8 d8 35 g7 e4 36 d7 d8 37 e8+ f7 38 xd8 and wins.

26 d3 f4 27 h3 f5 28 d7 f8 29 d3 f3 30 f6 xf6 31 gxf6 f2 32 xf2 h6 33 c5 b7 34 g3+ h8 35 e7 edx7 36 f8 h5 37 g5 h7 38 g7+ h8 39 g5

Again the game should finish in a draw by repetition.
Chapter Two

The Knight Sacrifice on e6

The sacrifice $\text{\textit{g}}(x)e6$ is one of the less common sacrificial ideas in the Sicilian, as it tends to be a true sacrifice; White generally obtains only two pawns for his piece. However, from a strategic viewpoint, White gains complete domination of the vital central squares d5 and f5, whilst ripping away the pawn cover of the black king. The light-squared bishop which settles on e6 can play a leading role in the attack, especially if the g6-square has been weakened by an advance of Black’s h-pawn. The weakness of g6 is in fact a green light for $\text{\textit{g}}xe6$, as in the following classic contest.

At that time 7...$\text{\textit{h}}a5$ had been getting hammered, as in Spassky-Petrosian, 19th matchgame 1969, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Seven.

8 0-0

Threatening a timely $\text{\textit{h}}xe6$.

8...h6 9 $\text{\textit{g}}xf6$

White plays à la Spassky.

9...$\text{\textit{g}}xf6$ 10 $\text{\textit{b}}3$ b6 11 f4 $\text{\textit{b}}7$ 12 $\textit{d}3$ $\textit{e}7$

Now White must decide whether to

Game 23

M.Stean-W.Browne

Nice Olympiad 1974

1 e4 c5 2 $\text{\textit{f}}3$ d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 $\text{\textit{x}}d4$ $\text{\textit{f}}6$

5 $\text{\textit{c}}3$ a6 6 $\text{\textit{g}}5$ $\text{\textit{b}}d7$ 7 $\textit{c}4$ e6
play fairly calmly with the standard thrust f4-f5, or to sacrifice something on e6. Since the American chess patron L.S. Turover had offered a prize of $1000 for the most brilliant game at Nice, the young English IM went for the sacrifice with gusto.

13 \textit{\textct{D}}xe6! fxe6 14 \textit{\textct{D}}xe6

Now Black's king is stuck in the centre, and there is the nasty if obvious threat of e4-e5 followed by \textit{\textct{D}}d3-g6+. Note that White had to sacrifice this way round: 13 \textit{\textct{D}}xe6? fxe6 14 \textit{\textct{D}}xe6 \textit{\textct{D}}d7 15 \textit{\textct{D}}xb7+ \textit{\textct{D}}f8! 16 \textit{\textct{D}}f5 \textit{\textct{D}}xe4! wins for Black.

14...b5

In the tournament book, Stean noted that he would have answered 14...\textit{\textct{D}}d7 with 15 \textit{\textct{D}}ad1 \textit{\textct{D}}c5 16 \textit{\textct{D}}h3 \textit{\textct{D}}xe6 17 \textit{\textct{D}}xe6. If instead 14...\textit{\textct{D}}c8, the bishop drops back to b3 and Black is no closer to escaping from the centre.

15 e5 \textit{\textct{D}}b6+ 16 \textit{\textct{D}}h1 dxe5 17 \textit{\textct{D}}g6+ \textit{\textct{D}}d8 18 \textit{\textct{D}}f7!

Now the plan is \textit{\textct{D}}ad1+ and/or fxe5.

18...\textit{\textct{D}}c5 19 fxe5 \textit{\textct{D}}xg2+

Hoping for a miracle on the g-file. Gligoric gives 19...\textit{\textct{D}}f8 20 \textit{\textct{D}}xg7 \textit{\textct{D}}d7 21 \textit{\textct{D}}f1 as winning, while 19...\textit{\textct{D}}e8 20 \textit{\textct{D}}ad1+ \textit{\textct{D}}c7 21 \textit{\textct{D}}d7+ is futile.

20 \textit{\textct{D}}xg2 \textit{\textct{D}}f8 21 \textit{\textct{D}}ad1+ \textit{\textct{D}}c7 22 \textit{\textct{D}}xg7 \textit{\textct{D}}g8 23 \textit{\textct{D}}xh6!

Keeping the bishop around to support the resulting passed pawn proves to be the cleanest way to win.

23...\textit{\textct{D}}xg7+ 24 \textit{\textct{D}}xg7 \textit{\textct{D}}d6

The point of White's 23rd is apparent after 24...\textit{\textct{D}}g5+ 25 \textit{\textct{D}}h1 \textit{\textct{D}}xg7 26 \textit{\textct{D}}f7 \textit{\textct{D}}g5 27 \textit{\textct{D}}xe7+ \textit{\textct{D}}xe7 28 \textit{\textct{D}}d5+.

25 \textit{\textct{D}}f7+ \textit{\textct{D}}c6 26 \textit{\textct{D}}d5+ \textit{\textct{D}}b6 27 \textit{\textct{D}}xa8 \textit{\textct{D}}g5+ 28 \textit{\textct{D}}h1 \textit{\textct{D}}e5 29 b4 a5

30 \textit{\textct{D}}b7+

White has mate in 8 with 30 \textit{\textct{D}}d5+ but the text is good enough.

30...\textit{\textct{D}}c6

It's mate after 30...\textit{\textct{D}}a6 31 \textit{\textct{D}}xb5 \textit{\textct{D}}xg7 32 \textit{\textct{D}}xa5+ \textit{\textct{D}}b6 33 \textit{\textct{D}}d5, as Gligoric pointed out.

31 g8/\textit{\textct{D}}w \textit{\textct{D}}xg8 32 \textit{\textct{D}}b8+ 1-0

Browne was undoubtedly short of time and could not pause to resign sooner. By the way, Stean got his $1000!

It's harder to make \textit{\textct{D}}xe6 work if you pick up less than two pawns or if
the black king has castled. Thus when Black has castled, the sacrifice tends to be of the sham variety. White may be able to use the d5-square to recoup his investment, as in the following extract.

**Game 24**

O.Nikolenko-Z.Nagy

*Budapest 1990*

1 e4 c5 2 d5 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 exd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 c4 e6 7 0-0 b5 8 b3 e7 9 w3 b6

This eccentric manoeuvre stems from Kavalek, I believe. These days 9... c7 is sometimes preferred.

10 e3 b7 11 w3 a6 12 f3 0-0 13 d5! d8

Of course, 13... exd5? 14 d5 is decisive.

14 xf6+ xf6 15 xal

A computer would snatch the d6-pawn at once.

15...e5?

More obstinate was 15... e5.

16 xe6!

This transaction will leave White comfortably ahead in material. 16...fxe6 17 xe6+ h8 18 d5

There’s that square again!

18...wb8 19 xa8 xa8 20 xd6

Only now! At this point 20... d8 21 xd8! is strong, so Black played...

20...b7 21 w6

and White duly converted his material plus and won in 38 moves.

Nonetheless, we have included a few examples of xe6 sacrifices against a castled king. It’s hard, though, to find many examples at high levels nowadays, as defensive technique has improved considerably thanks to the proliferation of silicon. (Also, consult Minic-Fischer in the introduction to Chapter Four for an example of xe6 working against a king castled short.)

Over to Yury...

**Game 25**

B.Spassky-K.Darga

*Varna Olympiad 1962*

1 e4 c5 2 d5 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 exd4 e6
5 d3 c7 6 e3 a6 7 a3 b5 8 e2 b7 9 f4 f6 10 f3 d6 11 0-0 a5

It must be wrong to play actively before developing your pieces. More logical is 11...e7 12 wC1 Cxd4 13 Cxd4 e5 14 Cxe3 0-0 15 Cd1 Cfe8 16 Cg3, as in R.Nezhmeddinov-B.Vladimirov, Baku 1961, and now the direct seems to be 16...wC4 with good play.

12 wE2 Cc4 13 e5

13...Cxe3

After 13...dxex5? 14 Cdxb5 axb5 15 Cxb5 wD7 16 wC4 wC8 17 wB3 an extra pawn, three passed pawns and decent activity should give White a winning position.

14 wxe3 dxex5 15 fxe5 d7 16 Cb7 wxb7 17 wF4 wB6 18 Cxd1 wA4??

After 18...Cd8! 19 Cc4 we have:

a) The attempt to win a pawn can cause Black a lot of problems: 19...Cc4?! 20 b3 Cxa3 21 wH1 wD7 22 wG5 wC5 23 Cdxex6!! wxe6 24 Cxe6 wB6 25 Cxd7 wD7 (25...Cxd7 leaves Black's king in a mating net after 26 wG4 Cxe8 27 wXg7+) 26 wF8! wB7 (26...wE7 27 wF3 wxf8 28 wC6+ wins) 27 wG4 wD5 (27...wxf8 28 wE6+ wE7 29 wC6+) 28 wH5+ g6 29 wXg6 wG8 30 wH4+, protecting the g2-pawn and winning material after 30...Cd8 31 Cd1 wD4 32 Cc3.

b) 19...Ed5! 20 wH1 Cc4 21 Cg5 &c5 22 b3 Cxd4 23 Cxd4 Cxe5 24 wF4 gave Black a defensible position in S.Korolev-H.Palm, correspondence 1982, but after couple of bad moves he lost.

19 wxa4 bxa4 20 wH1 wC5

The best try was 20...wC8, although 21 Cf3 leaves White with an advantage sufficient to win.

21 wxe6!
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

Game 26
G.Kasparov-L.Van Wely
Wijk aan Zee 2000

1 e4 c5 2 d4 cxd4 4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 e3 e6 7 f3 b5 8 g4 h6 9 d2 b7 10 0-0-0 b7 11 h4 b4 12 a4

A typical position for the English Attack where White is planning to assault Black's kingside.

12...d5

12...a5 is another choice which after the popular 13 b3 c5 14 a3 bxa4 15 axb4 c7 16 bxa4 leads to a very complicated position with chances for both sides.

13 h3 g5

Alternately, 13 a5 14 b3 dxe4 15 g5 h5 16 hxg5 exf3 17 gxf3 fxe6 18 dxe6 xh1 19 xh7 xg1 20 xh1 dxe4 21 xh4 led to a very unclear position in the game B.Lugo-L.Novikov, San Diego 2004. We believe this game should finish as a draw, but after couple of mistakes White lost the endgame.

14 g2 gxh4

Kasparov suggests 14...g8!? with a playable game.

15 xh4 dxe4

Our computer's choice 15...xe4?! left Black in a completely lost position after the further 16 fxe4 xh4 17 exd5 e5 18 d6 e4 19 c5 dxc5 20 f5 d3+ 21 cxd3 xh4 22 dxe4 xh4 23 w4 of A.Copar-P.Clement, correspondence 2003. Instead 15...a5 was analysed by Kasparov, who gave 16 b3 dxe4 17 g5 d5 18 xex6! fxe6 19 fxe4 as winning.

16 g5 d5 17 xex4 hxg5

The computer believes that after 17...a5 Black is better, but according to our analysis after 18 xex6! fxe6 19 h3 xxa4 20 xex6 0-0 21 c4+! (21 xdx5? is losing after 21...c5 22 xb4 xdx5 23 xex5 xdx5 24 xdx5 xdx4 25 xdx5 h5 26 xex5 xh1+ 27 xh2 xh2+ 28 xg3 xg3+ 29 xg4 xg2 and Black will enjoy an extra knight) 21...b6 22 xdx4 xdx5 23 xex5 xdx5 24 xdx5 x dx5 25 f4+ a8 26 xxb7+ xxb7 27 xex4+ b6 28 xdx8 h5 29 xdx8 xh1+ 30 xg2 xg5 31 c6+ a5 32 a8 Black will be mated in a few moves.

18 xg5 a5?

Better is 18...xg5! 19 xdx5 h6, although White is still better according to Kasparov.

19 f4 h2

The attempt to slow White down by playing 19...e5 proves fruitless after 20 f5 (Kasparov gives 20 b3! as winning) 20...f6 21 c3 fxg5 22 xex5 gxh4 23 ab6 xxd5 24 xdx5 xg8 25 f3 xg7 26 xxf4. Meanwhile the defensive
try 19...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f7-f6 leads to trouble after 20 \\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f6 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f6 21 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e6! \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e4 22 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e4 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c8 23 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f8 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} w c7 (23...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x a4 24 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} w d6 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e4 25 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} w e5+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f8 26 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x h8+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e7 27 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c8 wins material and mates shortly) 24 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d8 25 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d7 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d7 26 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e1+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f8 27 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x b4+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} g7 28 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d4+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f6 29 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} g1+ and Black will lose material.

20 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e6!

This concludes the game in style.

20...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e6 21 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e6+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f7 22 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} g7 23 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f5+ \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} g8 24 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x a4 25 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} e7 1-0

Black can’t escape the mating threats. A crushing attack from the 13th World Champion which left neither the computer nor Van Wely able to figure out what was going on.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 27}
L.Shamkovich-P.Benko
U.S. Championship,
Pasadena 1978
\end{center}

1 e4 c5 2 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f3 e5 3 d4 cxd4 4 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d4 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c6 5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c3 d6 6 g4 a6 7 g5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d7 8 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} e3 b5 9
\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} a3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} b6 10 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} g1 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f6 11 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} b7 12 f5

After the less direct 12 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d8 13
\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f2 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c7 14 0-0-0 e5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} a4 16 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} e1 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d5 17 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d3 g6 18 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} e3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d3+ 19
\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d3 exf4 20 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f4 we see a very unclear position which White managed to win in P.Enders-L.Espig, German League 1999.

12...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} e5 13 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f6?

This looks like a good sacrifice where all White’s pieces are ready to pounce on an open black king, but in reality Black has enough resources to protect his Majesty. Instead 13 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} b3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c8 14 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c4 15 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c4 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c4 16 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} a8
17 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d2 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c8 18 0-0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c5 19 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c5 left White with a slight advantage in Y.Balashov-B.Malich, Leipzig 1973.

13...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e6!

If Black refuses this kind offer, White can get a better position: for example, after 13...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} b8 14 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f8 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x f8 15
\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d2 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c5 16 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} g4 Black has to solve many problems.

14 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} h5+

The alternative 14 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x e6!? doesn’t give White enough initiative for a piece after 14...\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} c5; for instance, 15 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c5
\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x c5 16 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f3 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} e7 17 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d5 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d5 18 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} x d5
\texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d8 19 0-0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} d6 20 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} h3 g6 21 \texttt{\textbackslash \textbackslash} f6
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...g7 22 \(\mathbb{W}xe7+\) \(\mathbb{Q}xe7\) 23 \(\mathbb{A}gf1\) \(\mathbb{A}f8\) and White's position is hopeless.

14...g6?

We believe the fearless 14...\(\mathbb{Q}c7!!\) was winning in all variations: 15 \(fxe6\) (fruitless is 15 \(g6\) \(\mathbb{Q}f6\) 16 \(\mathbb{A}g5\) \(\mathbb{Q}d7\) 17 \(fxe6+\) \(\mathbb{Q}c7\) 18 \(\mathbb{A}xf6\) \(\mathbb{W}xf6\) 19 \(gxh7\) \(\mathbb{W}xe6\) and White is losing) 15...\(\mathbb{Q}xe6\) 16 \(\mathbb{A}h3+\) \(\mathbb{Q}e7\) 17 \(\mathbb{A}f1\) \(\mathbb{W}e8\) 18 \(\mathbb{W}h4\) \(\mathbb{Q}d8\) and Black will finish castling by hand while keeping an extra piece.

15 \(fxg6\) \(\mathbb{Q}e7\) 16 \(gxh7\)

Black has simply handed his opponent two passed pawns for no reason.

16...\(\mathbb{Q}g7\) 17 0-0-0 \(\mathbb{W}e8\) 18 \(g6\) \(\mathbb{Q}f6\)

A rule says: 'If you are up material, trade pieces.' Thus after 18...\(\mathbb{Q}a4\) White would play 19 \(\mathbb{Q}xa4\) \(bxa4\) 20 \(\mathbb{W}g5+\) \(\mathbb{Q}f6\) 21 \(\mathbb{W}xe5!\) \(\mathbb{A}d8\) 22 \(\mathbb{A}c4\) \(\mathbb{Q}c8\); this slows down White's attack a bit, but most likely Black is doomed in the long run.

19 \(\mathbb{W}xe5!\)

In this endgame Black is down the equivalent of three pawns. In order to win White will trade as many pieces as possible and then his queen and passed pawns will decide matters.

25...\(\mathbb{Q}e6\) 26 \(\mathbb{A}xe6\) \(\mathbb{W}xe6\) 27 \(\mathbb{Q}c5+\) \(\mathbb{W}e8\) 28 \(\mathbb{W}f5\) \(\mathbb{Q}e7\) 29 \(\mathbb{A}d1\) \(\mathbb{W}f7\) 30 \(\mathbb{A}d5\) \(\mathbb{W}xd5\) 31 \(\mathbb{W}xd5\) \(\mathbb{Q}e5\) 32 \(\mathbb{W}c6\) \(\mathbb{W}d8\) 33 \(\mathbb{A}d5\) \(\mathbb{Q}f8\) 34 \(\mathbb{W}a8+\) 1-0

Game 28

E.Vasiukov-B.Modr

Prague 1980

1 e4 c5 2 \(\mathbb{Q}f3\) e6 3 \(\mathbb{Q}c3\) d6 4 d4 cxd4 5
Two more popular answers against the Keres Attack are 6...\( \text{dxc6} \) and 6...h6.

7 g5 \( \text{\textit{\&}}d7 \) 8 \( \text{e3} \) b5 9 a3 \( \text{\textit{\&}}b6 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g1 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}b7 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g4 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}d7 \)

11...\( \text{\textit{\&}c6} \)? 12 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xc6 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xc6 \) gives Black a playable position.

12 0-0-0 \( \text{\textit{\&}}c8 \)?

This looks like the reason for Black's defeat. After 12...g6!? 13 f4 \( \text{\textit{\&}}c8 \) 14 f5 exf5 15 exf5 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e5 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xc3 \) 17 bxc3 \( \text{\textit{\&}}c7 \) 18 \( \text{\textit{\&}}f4 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) Black had just about enough initiative for the pawn, which led to a draw in M.Matulovic-B.Malich, Siegen Olympiad 1970.

13 g6! hxg6 14 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xe6! \) fxe6

After 14...\( \text{\textit{\&}}e7 \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xg8 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xg8 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}f6 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \) Black's open king and isolated pawn give White the advantage.

15 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xg6+ \)

White plays the rest in best silicon fashion.

15...\( \text{\textit{\&}}e7 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g5+ \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}f6 \) 17 e5

Winning back material with interest and keeping the attack. The battle is decided.

17...\( \text{\textit{\&}}d7 \) 18 exf6 gxf6 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xf6 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e7 \) 20 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xh8 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xh8 \) 21 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \) 0-0

Should Black have been inclined to continue, there might have occurred 21...\( \text{\textit{\&}}xh2 \) 22 \( \text{\textit{\&}}h3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \) 23 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xe6+ \) with an extra exchange.

The American IM Mark Ginsburg wrote about this tricky idea in the early 1980s.

7...\( \text{\textit{\&}}d7 \)

Another line runs 7...\( \text{\textit{\&}}d7 \)? 8 e5 dxe5 9 fxe5 \( \text{\textit{\&}}d5 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd5 \) exd5 11 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd7+ \) (11 e6?! fxe6 12 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xe6 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}b4+ \) 13 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e7 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}h4 \) doesn't help White) 11...\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd7 \) 12 0-0 \( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}c6 \) 14 \( \text{\textit{\&}}f5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xe3+ \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xe3 \) 0-0 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd5 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}ad8 \) 18 \( \text{\textit{\&}}ad1 \), and this ended up as a draw in J.Timman-V.Salov, Madrid 1995.

8 f5 e5

8...0-0 is another interesting idea to sacrifice a pawn for an activity, but after 9 fxe6 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e5 \) 10 exf7+ \( \text{\textit{\&}}xf7 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{\&}}f1 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}h4+ \) 12 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}f6 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{\&}}f5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}bc6 \) 14 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}wa5 \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd6 \) Black didn't get enough compensation and later lost in the game J.Van der Wiel-I.Sokolov, Rotterdam 1999.

9 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e6! \)

The inferior 9...\( \text{\textit{\&}}g6 \) allows 11 fxe6 \( \text{\textit{\&}}f8 \) 12 g7+ \( \text{\textit{\&}}xg7 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{\&}}h6+ \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}g8 \) 14 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g4+ \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}f7 \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}}g7+ \) followed by mate in a couple of moves.
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11 fxe6 \( \text{We8} \) 12 0-0+ \( \text{f6} \) 13 exd7 \( \text{Qxd7} \)

White also won after the alternative 13...\( \text{Qxd7} \) 14 \( \text{Qxf6+} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 17 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 19 \( \text{h6} \) in M.Geeren-T.Penson, Ghent 1989.

14 \( \text{Qxf6+} \)

A winning sacrifice.

14...\( \text{gxf6} \)

Yet another disaster for Black was 14...\( \text{Qxf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qxe8} \) \( \text{Qxh5} \) 16 \( \text{Qxh5} \) which gave him no hope of survival in the game R.Lau-H.Schuh, Bad Neuenahr 1982.

15 \( \text{Wh6+} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 16 \( \text{d5+} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 17 \( \text{Qxd7} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)

Or 17...\( \text{Qxd7} \) 18 \( \text{Qxf6+} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 19 \( \text{Qxd6} \) and wins.

18 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 20 \( \text{Qxf6} \)

20 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 21 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 22 \( \text{e3} \) was another way to win.

20...\( \text{Qxh6} \) 21 \( \text{Qxh6} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 22 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \)

23 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 24 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qf8} \)

Black's rook is pinned forever and for the rest of the game White will optimize the placement of his pieces before liquidating to an easily winning ending.

25 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 26 \( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 27 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 28 \( \text{Qd5} \) a5 29 a3 \( \text{Qd7} \) 30 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 31 \( \text{Qf2} \)

White's king is running for his dessert on b6.

33...\( \text{Qg4} \) 34 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qh3} \) 35 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 36 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qh3} \) 37 b4 \( \text{Qd7} \) 38 bxax5 bxax5 39 c5!

White opens a square for his king, while Black's mobility is decreasing...

39...\( \text{dxc5} \) 40 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{a4} \) 41 \( \text{Qxf6} \)

White prudently avoids the painful trap 41 \( \text{Qxc5??} \) \( \text{Qc8+} \) 42 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Qxc6+} \).

41...\( \text{Qxf6} \) 42 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qd1} \) 43 \( \text{Qb5} \) a4 44 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c2} \) 45 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 46 bxax4 \( \text{Qf5} \) 47 bxax4 \( \text{Qc3} \) e3 49 a4 1-0

**Game 30**

V.Tseshkovsky-W.Browne

*Manila Interzonal 1976*

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{Qf3} \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
5 \( \text{Qc3} \) a6 6 \( \text{Qe3} \) e6 7 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 8 g4 h6
9 f4 b5 10 g5 hgx5 11 fxg5 \( \text{Qh3?!} \)

This sharp position has seen too 11...b4!? 12 gx6 (12 \( \text{Qc6} \) might be more promising: for example, 12...\( \text{Qc7} \) 13
12...J!xc3 13 gxf6 J:l:h3

The probably superior 13...kSc5! 14 J!xe6! W:a5+ 15 c3 fxe6 16 b4 W:a3 17 bxc5 J!xc3+ 18 W:f1 created a very unclear position which White happened to win in V.Isupov-K.Akhmedzhanov, Prokojevsk 1998.

14 J!xe6!

12 J!f2!

Tseshkovsky had done his homework and prepared this move, improving over Browne's published analysis. Our computer likes Black, but it will become evident that Tseshkovsky was right, decades before the advent of the analysis engine. Previously, 12 J!f4 b4 13 J!d5 exd5 14 gxf6 J!xf6 15 J!c6 W:b6 16 exd5 J!e4 17 J!d4 Wxd4 18 J!xd4 g5 19 J!c1 J!g7 20 J!c6 J!g3 had left Black with the advantage in R.Byrne-W.Browne, Oberlin 1975.

12...J!xc3 13 gxf6 J:h3


14 J!xe6!

Of course, 14...f!xe6?? 15 J!h5+ wins.

Or 17...J!f7 18 0-0 J!f6 19 J!b6 W:a4 20 W:c6 J!b8 21 b3 W:a3 22 W:c7+ J!g6 23 Wxb8 and White wins material.

18 J!g1 J!f8

18...J!xc3+ wins a pawn, but after 19 J!f1 J!b4 20 J!g8+ J!f7 21 J!g3 J!f8 22 J!h5+ J!xh5 23 J!g6+ J!e7 24 W:h5 W:b4 25 J!d1 J!d8 26 J!b6+ J!e7 27 J!g5+ J!e8 28 J!g6+ J!e7 29 J!h8 W:c4+ 30 J!g1 Black's king is in a mating net.

19 J!g8 Wd8

After 19...J!f7 20 J!xf8! J!xf8 21 W:f4+ J!f6 22 J!h5+ J!g6 23 W:h6 J!g8 24 J!g5 W:d8 25 J!xg6 J!f8 26 e5 J!xf2 27 J!e4+ J!g7 28 Wxg7+ J!xg7 29 J!xf2 White is up two pawns.

20 0-0-0 J!e7

Our computer thinks that 20...J!f7 is
the best try, but we believe that after 21
\( \text{Wg3} \text{ Wf6} \) 22 e5! \( \text{Qxe5} \) 23 \( \text{Qxf8} +! \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 24
c5+ \( \text{Qf7} \) 25 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Wxf1} +\) 26 \( \text{Wxf1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 27
\( \text{Wg5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 28 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qxc5} \) 29 \( \text{Qh5} +\) \( \text{Qe7} \) 30
\( \text{Qg7} +\) \( \text{Qd6} \) 31 \( \text{Wxf6} \) White wins.
21 \( \text{Wc6} \)

White now recoups his investment with a tidy profit.
21...\( \text{Qb8} \) 22 \( \text{Qa7} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 23 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qb7} \)
Alternatively, 23...\( \text{Qb7} \) 24 \( \text{Qc7} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 25 \( \text{Qxb7} \) and White is winning.
24 \( \text{Qxc8} \) \( \text{Qxa7} \) 25 \( \text{Qf1} +\) \( \text{Qf6} \) 26 \( \text{Qd7} \)
27 \( \text{Qxf6} +\) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 28 \( \text{Qh5} +\) \( \text{Qg6} \) 29 \( \text{Qxg6} +\)
\( \text{Qe7} \) 30 \( \text{Qc5} +\) 1-0
White wins a piece.

I had the privilege of observing the following game firsthand while playing in the 2003 U.S. Championship. It is equally a privilege to annotate it.

**Game 31**
M.Ashley-H.Nakamura
*U.S. Championship, Seattle 2003*

1 \( \text{e4} \) c5 2 \( \text{Qf3} \) d6 3 d4 \( \text{cxd4} \) 4 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)

5 \( \text{Qc3} \) a6 6 \( \text{Qc4} \) e6 7 \( \text{Qb3} \) b5 8 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \)
9 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qb6} \) 10 0-0-0 \( \text{Qd7} \) 11 \( \text{Qhe1} \)

11...h6

This looks like a new move to us. Previously Black had tried 11...0-0 and after 12 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 13 \( \text{Qh6} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 14 \( \text{Qf5} \)? (an interesting but doubtful sacrifice; 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 15 \( \text{Qg5} \) is better) 14...exf5
(14...\( \text{Qxb3} +\)
15 \( \text{axb3} \) exf5 16 exf5 \( \text{d5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 19 \( \text{Qxd5} \)
\( \text{Wh6} +\) 20 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qfd8} \) was quite good for Black in A.Fernandez-Y.Quezada, Quemado 2005) 15 exf5 \( \text{Qd8} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe7} \)
\( \text{Qxe7} \) 17 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 18 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 19 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 20 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 21 \( \text{Qd2} +?\) (Fritz suggests 21 \( \text{Qe7} +\) \( \text{Qh8} \) 22 \( \text{Qe3} \) as a likely win) 21...\( \text{Qd8} \) 22 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qa5} \) 23 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qd8} \)
24 \( \text{Qg5} \) the game finished as a draw in W.Hendriks-L.Van Wely, Dutch League 1998.

Also Black has tried 11...\( \text{Qc5} \), but practice has shown that after 12 \( \text{Qf5} \)? White gets the advantage: for example, 12...exf5 13 \( \text{Qxf6} \) gxf6 14 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 15
exf5 \( \text{Qa7} \) 16 \( \text{Wg4} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 17 \( \text{Qe3} \) h5 18 \( \text{Wf4} \)
a5 19 a3 \( \text{Qxb3} +\)
20 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qc7} +\) 21 \( \text{Qb1} \)
\( \text{Qg7} \) 22 \( \text{Qg3} +\) \( \text{Qf8} \) 23 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 24 \( \text{Qde1} \)
\( \text{Qf8} \) 25 \( \text{Qg3} +\) \( \text{Qh7} \) 26 \( \text{Qe8} \) and Black
gave up in the game A.Tukhaev-R.Wojtaszek, Belfort 2005

12 e5 d6 13 wh3 dxe5

Another important line runs

13...fxe5 14...fxe6! fxe6 15...xe6 wd8
16...xf6 gxf6 17 f4...c8 18...d5...g4 19...
fxe5 dxe5 20...c6+...d7 21...f3 wb8
(21...exd4 22...c5...c6 23...h5+...f8 24
...d6 25...e6+ wins) 22...c5...f8 23
...c7+...xc7 24...xa8+ and White wins
material.

14...xe6!

A natural but losing move. Instead
we believe that 15...f8! was a good
way to force White to achieve a draw
by finding 'only' moves: 16...xe5...xe6
17...xe6...c5 18...e3! (after 18...xf6?!)
...xf6 19...d1...h7 20...b1...f8 21...g3
...g7 22...xg7+...xg7 23...xe7+...h8 24
...xb7...xf2 25...be7 it looks like White
has only a small chance to draw this
position) 18...c8 (18...c7 19...b6
...f4+ 20...e3...c7 is a draw) 19...d4
...f7 20...d1...e8 21...f5...xg2 22...xf6
...xf6 23...xf6+...xf6 24...h7+...f8 25
...h8+ with a draw. Another option was
15...c5, but 16...xf6...xe6 17...h5+
...f8 18...xe7+...xe7 19...xe5...hg8 20...f4
g6 21 g4 is very good for White.

16...xd7...xd7 17...xf6...d6 18...h5+
...d8 19...xe7+...xe7 20...xe5...d8 21
...d5?!

This gives Black a great chance to
survive. Instead 21...d5! would have
been an easy win after 21...f6
(21...xd5 22...xd5...c5 23...xg7...xd5
24...xh8+ wins) 22...e7+...c8 23...xg7
...h8 24...e7...c6 25...e4...xd5 26...xf6
...xf6 27...e8+.

14...fxe6 15...xe6...d8?

21...xd5 22...xd5...c7 23...d7 24
...f5?!

This further error helps Black to
take over the initiative. The preferable
24...g3...xe5 25...xe5 looks about equal.

24...c5 25...e6??

Instead 25...d1...e8 26...g3...e3+ 27
...f2...xd2 would give chances for both
sides, but not here 27...d2? since 28
...d7+...xd7 29...e6+...xe6 30...d2
wins.

25...d2! 0-1

Nothing can save White. Indeed, it's
mate after both 26...d1...e3+ 27...b1
...xd1 and 26...d2+ 27...b1...d1+ 28...xd1...xd1.
1 e4 c5 2 d3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 c6 5 c3 d6 6 e3 f6 7 c4 a6 8 w2 w7 e7 9 0-0-0 w7 10 b3 0-0 11 h3 g1 a5

Velimirovic theory also includes the sharp line 11...b5 12 g4 b4 13 d5 exd5 14 xxe6 wxe6 15 g5. Play might continue 15...xe4 16 xxe4 wa4 17 xe4 (the possibly superior 17...d4!? f5 18 xe4 xe4 19 wxe4 e8 20 b5 b8 21 w3 w6 22 h4 w4 23 h5 e8 24 e3 e6 25 wxe4 xxe4 26 d5 e4 27 c1 e7 28 b3 e4 29 xcd1 gave White a positional edge which he used masterfully to win in A.Fedorov-I.Lutsko, Minsk 2005, but there’s also 19...wa2 – see page 17...xe6 18 d4 ac8 19 a3 a5 20 d3 g6 21 h4 wb3 22 axb4 wa2, which left White helpless against Black’s attack in V.Ivanchuk-A.Grischuk, Odessa (rapid) 2007.

12 g4 b5 13 g5

13...d7

Allowing White to sacrifice on e6, whereas 13...xb3+!? would stop all such ideas.

14 d5

White couldn’t sacrifice immediately because 14 xe6? wxe6+ 15 axb3 fxe6 wins for Black.

14...b4?

The most natural is 14...b7 when 15 xe6 fxe6 16 xe6 wc4 17 xf8 xxe6 18 fxe1 xe6 19 xe6 dc4 20 fc2 xe3 21 xe3 xe8 22 a3 b6 23 d2 c6 24 h4 a5 25 dxe1 b4 26 axb4 axb4 27 d1 g6 28 fc2 b5 29 d2 g7 gave Black a slight edge in J.Fumero Sanchez-R.Hernandez, Spain 1996.

However, accepting the sacrifice with 14...exd5? is inadvisable because after 15 xd5 w8d8 16 d2 b4 17 xxd5 axd5 18 xe1 xe1 19 d2 b7 20 xg7+ xg7 21 w4 White wins.

15 xe6!

Much better than 15 xa8? bxc3 16 b4 wb8 17 a3 xe5 18 f4 xe4 19 f3 xd3 wxa8 20 bxa5 xe4 21 xc3 d5, which gives Black a tremendous attack and one which should be enough to win.
15...fxe6 16 â5xe6+ âh8 17 âd5 âd8
18 g6!
Decisive.
18...âe5
After 18...h6 19 âh5 âf6 20 âxf6 âxf6 21 âd5 âf8 22 âxa8 White wins material.
19 âh5 âxg6 20 âxg6 âe8 21 âxg1
21 âxe7 âxe6 22 âg5 âf7 23 âxe6 was another way to win.
21...âxe6 22 âd4

Black is completely lost. Every single white piece says 'hello' to the black king. Indeed, with so many 'hellos' about, soon one of White's pieces will say a final 'goodbye'.

22...âf6 23 âxf6 âxf6 24 âxf6 gxf6 25 âh6 âf8 26 âg7 âb3+ 27 axb3 âxb3
28 âxh7 mate (1-0)

---

Game 33
P.Keres-A.Kotov
Budapest Candidates 1950

1 e4 c5 2 âf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 âxd4 âf6 5 âc3 a6 6 âe2 âc7 7 âg5 âbd7 8 0-0 e6 9 âh5 âc4?

Better is 9...g6 hitting the bishop, after which, for example, 10 âe2 b5 11 âe1 âb7 12 a4 b4 13 âxd5 exd5 14 exd5 âe7 15 âc6 âxc6 16 dxc6 âc5 17 âxa6 0-0 18 âb5 âe6 19 âh4 d5 which gave Black a slight advantage in the game L.Yurtayev-A.Wojtkiewicz, Manila Olympiad 1992.

10 âxe6!

10...âxe6 11 âd5 âd8
11...âxd5 12 exd5 âf5 13 âe1+ âe5 14 f4 g6 15 fxe5 âxg5 16 exd6+ âe6 17 dxe6 gxh5 18 âb4 âb5 19 âc3 leaves Black with no chances whatsoever for survival.
12 âg4 âe5 13 f4
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Black tries to resist, but Keres snuffs out any remaining hopes.

17...\textit{c}6 18 \textit{d}2 \textit{h}6 19 \textit{ae}1 \textit{g}6 20 \textit{e}7+ \textit{d}8 21 \textit{fe}1 \textit{a}5 22 \textit{d}4 \textit{a}6 23 \textit{f}2 \textit{f}8 24 \textit{b}6+ \textit{c}8 25 \textit{e}8+ \textit{xe}8 26 \textit{xe}8+ \textit{d}7 27 \textit{xf}8 1-0

\section*{Game 34}
\textit{B.Spassky-N.Rashkovsky}
\textit{USSR Championship, Moscow 1973}

1 e4 \textit{c}5 2 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}6 3 \textit{d}4 \textit{xd}4 4 \textit{xd}4 \textit{f}6 5 \textit{c}3 \textit{a}6 6 \textit{g}5 \textit{e}6 7 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}7 8 \textit{d}3 \textit{bd}7

More recently Black has favoured 8...\textit{b}5, perhaps because after 9 \textit{we}2 \textit{b}4 the sacrifice 10 \textit{dd}5? no longer works in view of 10...\textit{exd}5 11 \textit{exd}5+ \textit{we}7! compare the note to Black’s 10th move, below. Instead here White should play 10 \textit{dd}1; for example, 10...\textit{bd}7 11 \textit{f}2 \textit{b}7 12 0-0-0 \textit{e}7 with equality, L.Nisipeanu-A.Istratescu, Mamaia 1991.

9 \textit{we}2

13...\textit{xe}4

After the best try 13...\textit{xb}2 White continues 14 \textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}7 15 \textit{b}1 \textit{a}3 16 \textit{d}4 \textit{c}5 17 \textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5 18 \textit{f}d1 when Black can’t save the piece: 18...\textit{c}4 19 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{gf}6 20 \textit{xf}6 \textit{e}7 21 \textit{xd}7 \textit{b}5 22 \textit{b}6 and White’s extra pawn should be enough for a win.

14 \textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}7 15 \textit{xf}6 \textit{gf}6

After 15...\textit{wc}6, 16 \textit{dd}5+ \textit{c}8 17 \textit{d}4 \textit{b}8 18 \textit{ff}3 wins material. Another try was 15...\textit{f}5, but White wins after 16 \textit{dd}5+ \textit{f}6 17 \textit{d}4 \textit{c}6 18 \textit{bb}6+ \textit{dd}7 19 \textit{wc}7+ \textit{ee}6 20 \textit{fe}1+ \textit{xd}5 21 \textit{wa}5+ \textit{bb}5 22 \textit{c}4+ \textit{xc}4 23 \textit{wc}3+ \textit{dd}5 24 \textit{ad}1+.

16 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{c}7 17 \textit{kh}8

This prepares many nasty sacrifices,
although 9...\textit{f}3 is the most popular move in this position.

9...\textit{b}5

Many years later 9...\textit{e}7 10 0-0-0 \textit{h}6 11 \textit{h}4 \textit{b}5 12 \textit{xf}6 \textit{x}f6 13 \textit{d}xe5 14 fxe5 \textit{d}d7 15 \textit{e}4 \textit{b}8 16 \textit{c}6 \textit{b}4 17 \textit{xb}8 \textit{g}5+ 18 \textit{b}1 \textit{xb}8 19 \textit{a}4 \textit{w}b5 20 \textit{wb}5 \textit{axb}5 21 \textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}7 22 \textit{xc}5+ \textit{c}7 gave Black an equal endgame in O.Perez Mitjans-O.Zambrana, Havana 2006.

10 0-0-0 \textit{b}7

10...\textit{b}4 11 \textit{d}d5! \textit{exd}5 12 \textit{exd}5+ \textit{e}7 13 \textit{he}1 \textit{vb}8 14 \textit{f}5 should give White more than enough compensation for a piece.

11 \textit{he}1 \textit{e}7

11...0-0-0 12 \textit{xb}5 \textit{axb}5 13 \textit{d}xb5 was suggested by Spassky with no further analysis or evaluation, but Fritz thinks this is promising.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\end{center}

12 \textit{e}5 \textit{dxe}5 13 fxe5 \textit{d}5 14 \textit{xe}7

14 \textit{xe}6!? gives White some winning chances:

a) 14...\textit{fxe}6 was mentioned by Spassky. His analysis ran 15 \textit{h}5+ \textit{d}8 16 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 17 \textit{xe}7+ \textit{xe}7 18 \textit{g}5+ \textit{f}8 19 \textit{f}1+ \textit{e}8! 20 \textit{xg}7, but here Black can improve on his 20...\textit{f}8 with 20...\textit{xe}5!. Instead 20 \textit{xh}7! as per Fritz is the right way.

b) 14...\textit{xg}5+ 15 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xc}3 16 \textit{bc}3 \textit{xc}3 17 \textit{e}6 (17 \textit{wg}4, Keres' suggestion, quoted by Spassky, also looks good after 17...\textit{xc}5 18 \textit{b}1 \textit{h}6 19 \textit{xe}3 \textit{e}7 20 \textit{xf}7 \textit{a}4 21 \textit{c}1 \textit{c}8 22 \textit{wg}7; here 18...\textit{xd}3 19 \textit{xd}3 \textit{xe}1+ 20 \textit{d}1 \textit{c}8 21 \textit{e}6 \textit{xd}1+ 22 \textit{xd}1 \textit{xe}6 23 \textit{wd}6 is perhaps an improvement but White still has chances) 17...\textit{a}3+ 18 \textit{d}2 favoured White in S.Ter Sahakyan-G.Popilsky, Kemer 2007.

14...\textit{xe}3 15 \textit{wg}4 \textit{xd}1

After 15...\textit{xe}7 White has 16 \textit{xe}6! \textit{xa}2+ 17 \textit{b}1 \textit{c}3+ 18 \textit{bc}3 \textit{xc}3 19 \textit{g}5+ \textit{e}8 20 \textit{xg}7+ \textit{f}8 21 \textit{e}6 \textit{b}4+ 22 \textit{c}1 \textit{f}6 23 \textit{h}6 \textit{a}3+ 24 \textit{d}2 \textit{a}5+ 25 \textit{e}2 which left Black in a completely lost position in V.Gurevich-B.Katalymov, Moscow 1975.

16 \textit{xe}6!

Much better than 16 \textit{d}6 \textit{xe}5! (Spassky) 17 \textit{xe}5 \textit{f}2 which looks good for Black.

16...\textit{c}6

This is a fairly good move, but it
won’t save Black. However, of the many possible variations, none of them really help Black. For example, 16...fxe6 17.d6 wa5 (or 17...wb6 18.wxe6+ cxd8 19.d5 a6 20.wxe7+ al8 21.wxg7 bxd8 22.xxd1 with good winning chances) 18.wxe6+ d8 19.f5 c6 20.xd1 c8 21.b4 wb4 22.wc6+ wb8 23.axd7 a7 24.e6 we7 25.wb6+ b7 26.wxa6 and White should win.

17.oxg7+l axe7 18.wg5+

18.f6

After 18...al8 19.d5 wg6 20.wxe7+ ag8 21.e6 White enjoys crushing threats: for instance, 21...d5 22.exd7 h6 23.db6+ edx8 24.wxd8+ ah7 25.wxd5 and wins.

19.exf6+ ad8 20.f7+ ac7 21.wf4+ 1-0

Black loses material after 21...ab6 22.a6 cb6 23.axb2 cbxb2 24.axc5 24.wc3 ac8 25.axc6+ axc6 26.df5 af8 27.wd7.

A theoretical sacrifice that leads to an unclear game with chances for both sides.

11...axb5 12.axb5+ af7?

After the correct 12...ab7! one example saw 13.wd3 bd3 14.wxb3 ad5 15.c4 ac4 16.wc2 ab7 17.he1 axg5 18.fxdg5 0-0-0 19.axd7+ axd7 20.oxb5 wb6 21.ab1 af7 (Brunner gives 21...dxe5! 22.axd7 axd7 23.ad1+ af8 24.wd2 ac5 as winning in Informator) 22.wb3 dxe5 23.axd7 24.ad1+ af8 25.ad6+ wxd6 26.wxd6 wxd6 27.c5 af4+ 28.axa1 af7 and Black was better, but couldn’t win due to his exposed king in J.Van der Wiel-L.Brunner, Baden-Baden 1992.

and a draw was agreed in K.Milton-M.Vachier Lagrave, Dresden Olympiad 2008. However, both Fritz and Rybka rather like White after 28 g3. The variations are numerous and complex, so we think it is best for the reader to analyse this with a good engine and come to a decision.

13 Qxe6!

We believe that any computer program will, at least initially, consider this position as completely lost for White, but our analysis shows that really it is Black who is in trouble.

13...fxe6 14 Wh3 Qf7 15 f5

17...Qxc2

After 17...Qc5 Fritz indicates 18 Qc4 d5 19 Qxd5 Qxe6 20 Qc5! as best (20 Qxe4 Qg5 21 Qc4 is not bad), after which 20...Qf7 (or 20...Qxc5 21 Qxe6+ Qf7 22 Qc8+ Qf8 23 Qc4 Qd5 24 e6) 21 Qf1 Qf5 22 Qc8 Qg6 23 h4 supplies crushing threats like g2-g4 or Qe8.

18 Qxc2 Qxc2+ 19 Qxc2 Qxe5 20 e7 Qxe7 21 Qxe7 Qb6 22 Qxd6 Qa5 23 Qd5 Qxb5 24 Qxb5 Qd4+ 25 Qb1 Qxb5

The young Kasparov has lost his extra material and now in desperation seeks salvation in the ending.
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26 \text{\texttt{\textbackslash e}e5}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 36}
\end{center}

\textbf{Y.Grünfeld-F.Van der Vliet}

\textit{Amsterdam 1982}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
1 e4 c5 2 \texttt{\textbackslash f}f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 \\
5 \texttt{\textbackslash c}3 a6 6 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 e6 7 f4 b5 8 e5 dxe5 9 \\
fxe5 \texttt{\textbackslash w}c7 10 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e2
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Instead 10 exf6 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e5+ is the main line of this, the Polugaevsky Variation.

10...\texttt{\textbackslash f}d7 11 0-0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash b}7 12 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e6?! 

We don’t trust this sacrifice. As I always tell my students: ‘Before you do something active, develop your pieces.’ According to De Firmian, 12 \texttt{\textbackslash g}4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 13 \texttt{\textbackslash d}3 should be a better line: for example, 13...h6 14 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4 g5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e6 h5 16 \texttt{\textbackslash w}h3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 17 \texttt{\textbackslash b}1 g4 18 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7+ \texttt{\textbackslash x}c7 19 \\
\texttt{\textbackslash h}e1+ \texttt{\textbackslash f}8 20 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7+ \texttt{\textbackslash g}8 21 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xh5 \texttt{\textbackslash g}7 22 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 \texttt{\textbackslash c}6 23 \texttt{\textbackslash f}5 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 24 \texttt{\textbackslash d}6 was good for White in the game W.Sauermann-H.Lassen, correspondence 1983.

12...fxe6 13 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5+ g6 14 \texttt{\textbackslash g}4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 15 \\
\texttt{\textbackslash d}3

15...\texttt{\textbackslash e}7
This was popular at the time, but we prefer 15...\texttt{c5!} because it's important for Black to defend the e6-pawn and trade as many pieces as possible. Indeed, after 16 \texttt{h1} \texttt{xd3+} 17 \texttt{cxd3} \texttt{w5} 18 \texttt{g3} \texttt{d7} 19 \texttt{f1} \texttt{d6} 20 \texttt{wh4} \texttt{c5} 21 \texttt{f1} \texttt{d5} the extra bishop soon proved to be decisive in the game J.Aliqogin-I.Suniakov, Novokuznetsk 2007.

\texttt{16 \texttt{xe7 \texttt{xe7} 17 \texttt{he1} \texttt{h5}}}

Black wants to sacrifice a pawn to gain a tempo for the defence.

\texttt{18 \texttt{xe6} \texttt{f4+}}

Another good try is 18...\texttt{f6}, after which 19 \texttt{g3} \texttt{d8} 20 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c8} 21 \texttt{xb7+} \texttt{xb7} 22 \texttt{e4} \texttt{h6+} 23 \texttt{b1} \texttt{f8} 24 \texttt{a4} \texttt{a7} 25 \texttt{d6+} \texttt{a8} 26 \texttt{xb5} is unclear, although later White achieved a decisive initiative in the game D.Jabot-J.Bennhorn, correspondence 1999.

\texttt{19 \texttt{b1} \texttt{g4}}

It looks like Black will trade queens, but White has one more trick up his sleeve.

\texttt{20 \texttt{xe6+!}}

Winning a pawn and maintaining the attack.

\texttt{20...\texttt{xe6} 21 \texttt{g7+} \texttt{d8} 22 \texttt{wh8+} \texttt{c7} 23 \texttt{wh5 \texttt{xe2}}}
It was more important for Black to improve the other pieces. Indeed, 31...\( \text{\&}e5 \) 32 \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}c4 \) 33 \( \text{\&}g6+ \) \( \text{\&}c6 \) 34 \( \text{\&}g1+ \) \( \text{\&}b7 \) looks good for Black.

32 \( h6 \)

Two more squares for a touchdown!

32...\( \text{\&}f6 \) 33 \( \text{\&}b4 \) \( \text{\&}e8 \) 34 \( \text{\&}a3?! \)

White stumbles just before the goal line: 34 \( \text{\&}a5! \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 35 \( \text{\&}c8 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 36 \( \text{\&}c3 \) \( \text{\&}f7 \) 37 \( \text{\&}d4 \) \( \text{\&}bd7 \) 38 \( \text{\&}d6 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 39 \( \text{\&}c3 \)

and White’s activity will cause Black too many problems.

34...\( \text{\&}h2 \) 35 \( \text{\&}a5 \) \( \text{\&}a7 \) 36 \( \text{\&}c8 \) \( \text{\&}h5?? \)

This allows checkmate in six moves.

The correct 36...\( \text{\&}e7 \) 37 \( \text{\&}b6+ \) \( \text{\&}a7 \) (but not 37...\( \text{\&}b7? \) 38 \( \text{\&}c8+ \) \( \text{\&}a7 \) 39 \( \text{\&}xa6 \) \( \text{\&}xa6 \) 40 \( \text{\&}c8+ \) \( \text{\&}b8 \) 41 \( \text{\&}b6+ \) \( \text{\&}b7 \) 42 \( \text{\&}xc6 \) \( \text{\&}e2 \) 43 \( \text{\&}d8 \) and White wins) 38 \( \text{\&}c8+ \) \( \text{\&}a8 \) 39 \( \text{\&}b6+ \) would have been a draw.

37 \( \text{\&}b6+ \) \( \text{\&}b7 \) 38 \( \text{\&}c8+ \) \( \text{\&}c7 \) 39 \( \text{\&}a8+ \) \( \text{\&}xc8 \) 40 \( \text{\&}d8+ \) \( \text{\&}b7 \) 41 \( \text{\&}b6+ \) 1-0

It’s funny how Black couldn’t develop his knight. The moral of the story: checkmate is better than a touchdown!

We now turn to a famous game with a funny story. According to various sources, three Argentineans, Najdorf, Panno and Pilnik, had prepared a new idea against the 6 \( \text{\&}g5 \) Najdorf and all three got to use it in the same round of the Gothenburg Interzonal against no lesser players than Keres, Geller and Spassky. However, led by Geller, the Soviets found a refutation over the board!

**Game 37**

**B.Spassky-H.Pilnik**

**Gothenburg Interzonal 1955**

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{\&}f3 \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{\&}xd4 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \) 5 \( \text{\&}c3 \) a6 6 \( \text{\&}g5 \) e6 7 f4 \( \text{\&}e7 \) 8 \( \text{\&}f3 \) h6 9 \( \text{\&}h4 \) g5 10 fxg5 \( \text{\&}fd7 \) 11 \( \text{\&}xe6! \)

11...\( \text{\&}xe6 \) 12 \( \text{\&}h5+ \) \( \text{\&}f8 \) 13 \( \text{\&}b5! \)

The Argentineans were ready only for 13 \( \text{\&}c4 \) which they had analysed together before the round. The idea of White’s 13th, first played by Geller, is to control the d7- and c6-squares so as to remove the important defender from b8. Instead after 13 \( \text{\&}c4? \) \( \text{\&}e5 \) (this knight holds Black’s position together) 14 \( \text{\&}g3 \) \( \text{\&}bc6 \) (now Black gets to keep a
13...\texttt{g7?}

White won too after 13...\texttt{c5} 14 \texttt{g3!} in the encounter between Geller and Panno. However, better is 13...\texttt{h7}, Fischer's improvement, which he introduced against Gligoric. Now:

a) 14 \texttt{0-0+} is the most famous continuation: 14...\texttt{g8} 15 \texttt{g6} \texttt{g7} 16 \texttt{f7} \texttt{xf8} 17 \texttt{xh6} \texttt{xf7} (a queen sacrifice which we don't trust is 17...\texttt{xf6}: after 18 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{gxf6} 19 \texttt{e5} \texttt{xe5} 20 \texttt{d3} \texttt{c5} 21 \texttt{f1} \texttt{d7} 22 \texttt{h4} \texttt{c6} 23 \texttt{h5} \texttt{xd3} 24 \texttt{cxd3} 25 \texttt{f8} 26 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{c7} 27 \texttt{g4} White's passed pawns were a headache for Black in A.Shabalov-D.Sadvakasov, Los Angeles 2000) 18 \texttt{gxf7+} \texttt{xf7} 19 \texttt{wh7+} \texttt{f8} 20 \texttt{f1+} \texttt{f6} 21 \texttt{e2} \texttt{wb6+} 22 \texttt{h1} \texttt{e8} 23 \texttt{g8+} \texttt{w7} 24 \texttt{h5} \texttt{d5} 25 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{xc3} 26 \texttt{bxc3} \texttt{e5} 27 \texttt{xc8} \texttt{ed6} 28 \texttt{g4} was better for White in V.Jansa-J.Fichtl, Jablonec 1962.

b) 14 \texttt{g6} is not popular, but contains its dangers too, although 14...\texttt{xf7} 15 \texttt{wh6+} \texttt{g8} 16 \texttt{wh6+} \texttt{g7} 17 \texttt{xe6+} \texttt{h8} 18 \texttt{xd7} \texttt{xd7} 19 0-0-0 \texttt{c5} 20 \texttt{d5} \texttt{g4} 21 \texttt{df1} \texttt{g5+} 22 \texttt{yg5} \texttt{wg5+} 23 \texttt{b1} \texttt{w7} 24 \texttt{wd2} was roughly equal in the game S.Gligoric-R.Fischer, Portoroz Interzonal 1958.

14 \texttt{0-0} \texttt{c5} 15 \texttt{g3} \texttt{g6} 16 \texttt{gxf6} \texttt{xf6} 17 \texttt{f7+} \texttt{xf7} 18 \texttt{g6} \texttt{axb5} 19 \texttt{f1+} \texttt{e8} 20 \texttt{wg6+} \texttt{d7} 21 \texttt{f7} \texttt{c6} 22 \texttt{d5!!}

A final blow which puts more pressure on Black's bishop.

22...\texttt{xa2}

Alternatively, 22...\texttt{exd5} 23 \texttt{xd6+} \texttt{e8} 24 \texttt{g6} \texttt{d7} 25 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{a6} 26 \texttt{h7} \texttt{b8} 27 \texttt{d6} \texttt{a2} 28 \texttt{g4+} \texttt{d8} 29 \texttt{exe7+} \texttt{exe7} 30 \texttt{d1+} \texttt{d7} 31 \texttt{h4} wins.

23 \texttt{h3}

Keres and Najdorf also reached this position (!) and in that game White won with 23 \texttt{h4}.

23...\texttt{wh8}.

Or 23...\texttt{xb2} 24 \texttt{exe7} \texttt{exe7} 25 \texttt{h2} \texttt{c6} 26 \texttt{f6} \texttt{xc2} 27 \texttt{exe7} \texttt{e5} 28 \texttt{xe5} and wins.
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24 hxet Qxe7 25 Wg5 Qa1+ 26 Wh2
Wd8 27 Wxb5+ Qc7 28 Wc5+ Wb8 29
Qxd6+ Wa8 30 Qxe7 Qa5 31 Wb4 1-0

Game 38
A.Zwaig-J.Bednarski
Tel Aviv Olympiad 1964

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4 Qf6
5 Qc3 a6 6 Qg5 e6 7 f4 Qe7 8 Wf3 h6 9
Qh4 Qbd7 10 0-0-0 Wc7 11 Qe2 b5

15...Qd5

Practice has seen too 15...Qd7, after
which 16 Qxe6 fxe6 17 Qh5+ Qd8 18
Wxg7 Wf8 19 Qg4 Wxg2 (or 19...Wc5 20
Qxe6 Qc6 21 Qxd7 Qxd7 22 Wg4 Qd6
23 Wc4 Qc6 24 Wc6 Wc7 25 Qxd6 and
White won in R.Vasquez-H.Contreras
Rodriguez, Minneapolis 2005) 20 Wg1
Qf3 21 Wxf3 Wxf3 22 Wg2 Qg5+ 23 Qb1
Qxc3 24 Wxa8+ Wc8 25 Wd7 Qd7 26 Wb6
Wb7 27 Wxe6 Qc6 28 Wg8+ Qc7 29 Wf7
Qc8 30 e6 Wc5 31 Wxc5 forced Black to
resign in M.Molner-F.Corrales Jimenez,
Yerevan 2007.

16 Wxe6

The queen sacrifice 12 e5 Qb7 13
exf6 Qxf6 14 Wxf3 Wxf6 15 Wxf6 Wc8 16
Qh4 d5 was praised highly by Geller,
but later Nunn was not convinced.

12...Qxf6 13 e5 Qb7 14 Wg3 dxe5 15
fxe5

16...fxe6 17 Wg6+ Qd7 18 Qg4
The pair of pins ensures that White will regain his material.  
18...\texttt{Wxe5} 19 \texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qxd5} 20 \texttt{Qxd5}+ \texttt{Qxd5} 21 \texttt{Qd1} \texttt{Qg5+} 22 \texttt{b1} \texttt{Qxd1}+ 23 \texttt{Qxd1} \texttt{Qf6}  
Whatever the correct assessment of this position, there is no doubt that it is more pleasant to play for White.  
24 \texttt{Wf7}+ \texttt{d6} 25 \texttt{f3} \texttt{ab8} 26 \texttt{wa7}  
There seems to have been no way to prevent this unpleasant incursion of the white queen. White’s advantage is now clear.  
26...\texttt{Hhd8} 27 \texttt{a3} \texttt{e5} 28 \texttt{g4} \texttt{dxc8} 29 \texttt{xa6+} \texttt{c6} 30 \texttt{wa7} \texttt{bc8}  
Or 30...\texttt{Af8} 31 h3 \texttt{Ac7} 32 \texttt{wb6+} and White continues to collect pawns. The weakness of the light squares is fatal.  
31 \texttt{Wf7} \texttt{c5} 32 \texttt{f3}  
32...\texttt{Ab6}  
After 32...\texttt{Ac7} 33 \texttt{Wg6} \texttt{Ad6} 34 b4+ \texttt{Ab6} 35 \texttt{We8} the mating threats mean that White will gain even more material.  
33 \texttt{Wd7} \texttt{bc6} 34 \texttt{wa7+} \texttt{d6} 35 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{xc6} 36 \texttt{Wb8+} \texttt{Ac7} 37 \texttt{xb5} \texttt{Cxc2} 38 \texttt{c4} \texttt{g1} 39 b4 \texttt{Wf7} 40 c5+ \texttt{e5} 41 \texttt{wb8+} \texttt{d4} 42 \texttt{wd6+} \texttt{c3} 43 \texttt{wd1} \texttt{e3} 44 \texttt{wc2+} \texttt{d4} 45 \texttt{c6} \texttt{f4} 46 \texttt{Wf2+} \texttt{e4} 47 \texttt{Wf3+} \texttt{f5} 48 g3 g5 1-0
Chapter Three

The Bishop Sacrifice on e6

The sacrificial possibility $\text{hxg6}$ is one of the most common themes in the Sicilian, if not one that is commonly realized. In some circles it is referred to as the 'Capablanca sacrifice', because of a couple of games the Cuban played in the 1920s. Consider the following:

**Game 39**

J.Capablanca-K.Havasi

*Budapest 1928*

1 $d4 \, d5 \, 2 \, c4 \, e6 \, 3 \, \text{dxf3} \, \text{dxc4} \, 4 \, \text{e4} \, c5 \, 5 \, \text{hxg6} \, cxd4 \, 6 \, \text{xf3} \, \text{gxf3} \, 7 \, \text{c3} \, a6?

At Moscow 1925 Bogoljubow played $7 \, \text{c5} \, 8 \, \text{c3} \, \text{c5} \, 7 \, \text{xf3} \, \text{c6} \, 8 \, \text{e3} \, \text{c6}$ which allowed 9 $\text{hxg6}$, but at least White had not castled there.

8 0-0 $\text{c5} \, 9 \, \text{e3} \, \text{bd7}$?

He really had to castle. Leaving the king in the centre is asking for it.

10 $\text{hxg6} \, \text{fxe6} \, 11 \, \text{f6} \, \text{a5} \, 12 \, \text{xg7+} \, \text{he7} \, 13 \, \text{f5}$

Three pawns and an attack for the piece. So far, so caveman, but the rest is a bit more subtle...

13 $\text{f6} \, 14 \, \text{g6} \, 15 \, \text{c1} \, \text{f8} \, 16 \, \text{h5} \, 17 \, \text{a5} \, 18 \, \text{f4+} \, \text{e8} \, 19 \, \text{b6} \, \text{b5} \, 20 \, \text{c7+} \, \text{h8} \, 21 \, \text{xb5}$

Trading queens in the midst of a violent attack is so typically Capablanca.

21 $\text{xa5} \, 22 \, \text{d8} \, \text{xa2} \, 23 \, \text{dxc8} \, \text{a8} \, 24 \, \text{h3} \, \text{xb6} \, 25 \, \text{xf8} \, \text{b7} \, 26 \, \text{f7} \, \text{xb2} \, 27 \, \text{d5} \, 1-0
Yes, I know it was a QGA, but if you like you can think of it as a funky Maroczy Bind. And, yes, I know that Black played the opening like a zombie, but a lot of people played like that back then. However, this is as clear and simple an example of the mechanics of the $\text{\textit{xe6}}$ sacrifice as we could find. Virtually every game in this chapter has some complication which makes life difficult. (Don’t ask about Fedorov-Kobalija, which could fit into four different chapters! I’m still not wholly sure why we put it in this one.)

We will consider differing placements of the black king, as per custom.

1. The Uncastled King

The aim here is naturally to keep His Majesty in the centre and expose him to attack. If you can get three pawns and an attack, then go ahead and sacrifice! If you get only two pawns, though, you need to start with a big lead in development to support that knight on $e6$ to make things fly. At least, once the $e6$-pawn leaves the premises, you get to use $d5$. You may also be able to push $f4$-$f5$ and nail down exclusive use of $e6$. Another positive indicator is a weakening move like ...$h6$.

Of course, if the black king can run to the queenside as in Cervenka-Schneider, below, then look for a better opportunity to sacrifice.

2. The Castled King

It’s hard to give specifics here. Look for a weakness in the castled position and/or a massive concentration of your forces near the king’s address. And, while you’re at it, look for other sacrifices as well!

Now it’s time to get down to some specific examples with Yury.

---

**Game 40**

V.Tseshkovsky-G.Zaitshik

USSR Championship,
Telavi 1982

1 $e4$ $c5$ 2 $\text{\textit{gf3}}$ $d6$ 3 $d4$ $\text{\textit{cx}}$d4 4 $\text{\textit{x}}$d4 $\text{\textit{gf6}}$
5 $\text{\textit{Cc3}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc6}}$ 6 $\text{\textit{g5}}$ $\text{\textit{ad7}}$ 7 $\text{\textit{Wd2}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc8}}$ 8 $f4$
$\text{\textit{xd4}}$ 9 $\text{\textit{xd4}}$ $\text{\textit{fa5}}$ 10 $e5$ $\text{\textit{dxe5}}$ 11 $\text{\textit{fxe5}}$
$e6$ 12 0-0-0 $\text{\textit{Cc6}}$ 13 $\text{\textit{b5}}$ $\text{\textit{xb5}}$ 14 $\text{\textit{exf6}}$
$\text{\textit{Cc6}}$?!$^1$

Much more recently 14...$g6$ 15 $\text{\textit{Wc5}}$
$a6$ 16 $\text{\textit{xb5+}}$ $\text{\textit{axb5}}$ 17 $\text{\textit{Ed3}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc5}}$ 18 $\text{\textit{Wb1}}$
0-0 19 $\text{\textit{g3}}$ gave White a slight advantage in the game F.Caruana-Bui Vinh, Budapest 2007.

15 $h4$ $g8$ 16 $\text{\textit{Cc4}}$ $\text{\textit{gxf6}}$ 17 $\text{\textit{He1}}$ $\text{\textit{G6}}$

Worse is 17...$\text{\textit{fxg5}}$? on account of 18 $\text{\textit{xe6!}}$ $\text{\textit{fxe6}}$ 19 $\text{\textit{Wf6}}$ and after 19...$\text{\textit{xe1}}$
20 $\text{\textit{Xe1}}$ $\text{\textit{Ce7}}$ 21 $\text{\textit{xe6+}}$ $\text{\textit{Be7}}$ 22 $\text{\textit{Cc8+}}$ $\text{\textit{Bf7}}$

---
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23 ²f1+ ²g7 24 ³d8 ³e6 25 ³d4+ ²g6
26 ³c4 ³d7 27 ³d3+ ²h5 28 ³xh7+
Black had to resign in K.Lahno-

18 ³xe6?! 
This obvious sacrifice is enough
only for a draw. Tseshkovsky gives the
stronger 18 ³xf6 which prepares a
³xe6 blow. He analyses, for example,
18...³xg2 19 ²b1! ³b6 20 ³d3 ³g6 21
³xe6 fxe6 22 ³xe6+ ³f7 23 ³f5 ³g8 24
³d4 ³c7? (here, though, Fritz prefers
24...³d7 25 ³xb6 ³xe6 26 ³f3 axb6 27
³xb7 ²h8 with an edge for Black!) 25
³xg6+ hxg6 26 ³xg6+ ³g7 27 ³e6+
³h7 28 ³xg7 ³xg7 29 ³g1+ ²h7 30
³g6+ ²h8 31 ³h6+ and mates.

18...³fxe6 19 ³xe6+
19 ³wc4?? is not good, because after
19...³d7 20 ³xe6+ ³e7 21 ³xd7 ³xd7
22 ³g4 ³xg5 23 hxg5 f5 24 ³e2 ³xg5+
Black is up a bishop.

19...³f7 20 ³xf6+
After 20 ³c4 ³g7 21 ³xf6+ ³xf6 22
³xf6 ³c5 23 ³g4+ ³xf6 24 ³xc8 ³xg2
25 ³g4 it seems to us that any result
might occur.

20...³g8 21 ³c4+ ³h8

22 ³xg6
The more aggressive 22 ³e6 ³c7 23
³xg6 hxg6 24 ³xg6 ³g7 25 ³h6 ³g8 26
³xg7+ ³xg7 27 ³h5+ ³h7 28 ³e5+
leads to a draw.

22...³hxg6 23 ³f6+ ³g7 24 ³f7 ³xf6 25
³xf6+ ³h7 26 ³e7+ ³h8 ½-½
26...³h6 leads to a draw too, says
Tseshkovsky: 27 ³e3+ ³h5 28 ³g4+
³xh4 29 ³h6+ ³g3 30 ³e3+ ³h4
(30...³xg4?? allows White to push the
black king into a mating net with 31
³d4+ ³h5 32 ³h3+ ³g5 33 ³h4+ ³f5
34 ³f4+ ³e6 35 ³d6+ ³e7 36 ³f6+ ³e8
37 ³e6+ ³d7 38 ³e7 and mate) 31
³h6+ and White must repeat.

Game 41
P.Svidler-R.Sherbakov
Russian Championship,
Krasnoyarsk 2003

1 e4 c5 2 ³f3 ³c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ³xd4
³f6 5 ³c3 d6 6 ³g5 ³d7 7 ³d2 ³c8 8
³d3 d5 9 ³x4d ³a5 10 e5 dxe5 11
³xe5 e6 12 0-0-0 ³c6 13 ³b5 ³xb5 14
³xf6 ³c6 15 h4 g6 16 ³c4 ³c5?
Taking away the c5-square from Black’s bishop and creating a traffic jam in his camp. Better is 16...\cell{c5} 17 \cell{g4} h5 18 \cell{e2} 0-0 19 \cell{h1} b4 with chances for both sides, V.Sukulak-T.Abergel, Meurthe et Moselle 2007.

**17 \cell{d3}**

Instead 17 \cell{x}xe6 \cell{xd}4 18 \cell{x}c8 \cell{d}6 19 \cell{h}1+ \cell{d}8 20 \cell{xd}6+ \cell{d}6 21 \cell{h}3 wins a pawn, but in the ending the f6-pawn will remain a target, so a win is not certain.

**17...\cell{f5}**

Other continuations don’t help: 17...\cell{b}5 18 \cell{b}3 \cell{f}5 19 \cell{x}e6 \cell{x}e6 20 \cell{f}7+ \cell{h}1 and White wins material; or 17...\cell{a}4 18 \cell{b}3 \cell{b}5 19 \cell{d}2 h5 20 \cell{h}1 \cell{f}5 21 \cell{f}1 \cell{xf}1 22 \cell{xf}1 \cell{xf}1 23 \cell{xe}6 \cell{x}e6 24 \cell{f}7+ \cell{f}1 25 \cell{d}7+ and wins.

**18 \cell{b}3! \cell{d}8**

White wins immediately after 18...\cell{g}2?? 19 \cell{h}1 \cell{xf}1 20 \cell{b}7.

**19 \cell{d}f1 \cell{g}4 20 \cell{xe}6!**

The Bishop Sacrifice on e6

**20...\cell{fxe}6**

Neither is Black saved by 20...\cell{xe}6

21 \cell{e}1 \cell{e}4 22 \cell{a}4+ b5 23 \cell{xb}5+ \cell{d}7 24 \cell{a}4 and it’s game over.

**21 \cell{f}4 \cell{e}2 22 \cell{f}7+ \cell{d}7 23 \cell{d}4+ \cell{d}6 24 \cell{h}d1 \cell{d}5**

24...\cell{c}7 25 \cell{xd}8+ \cell{d}8 26 \cell{xd}6 \cell{xd}6 27 \cell{xd}6 \cell{f}1+ 28 \cell{d}1 \cell{f}7 29 \cell{e}3 is just as bad, according to Svidler.

**25 \cell{xd}5!**

The final nail in the coffin.

**25...\cell{exd}5 26 \cell{xb}7+ 1-0**

Svidler indicates 26...\cell{c}7 27 \cell{xd}5+ \cell{e}6 28 \cell{c}6+ \cell{d}6 29 \cell{xd}6+ \cell{xd}6 30 \cell{e}8+ and wins.

**Game 42**

R.Kasimdzhanov-P.Van der Sterren

*German League 2001*

1 \cell{e}4 \cell{c}5 2 \cell{f}3 \cell{e}6 3 \cell{d}4 \cell{x}d4 4 \cell{x}d4 \cell{c}6 5 \cell{c}3 \cell{d}6 6 \cell{g}4 \cell{h}6 7 \cell{e}3 \cell{f}6 8 \cell{h}3

The more aggressive 8 \cell{g}1 \cell{e}7 9 \cell{h}4 \cell{d}5 10 \cell{b}5 \cell{d}7 11 \cell{exd}5 \cell{xd}5 12 \cell{xd}5 \cell{exd}5 13 \cell{g}5 \cell{hxg}5 14 \cell{hxg}5 was slightly better for White in S.Movsesian-A.Maksimenko, Chalkidiki 2002.

8...\cell{e}7 9 \cell{d}2 \cell{a}6 10 0-0-0 \cell{xd}4 11
**Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian**

**\[ \text{\textcopyright xd4 e7d7} \]**

Black might do better with 11...e5: for example, 12 \text{\textcopyright d2 e6} 13 f4 \text{\textcopyright a5} 14 a3 exf4 15 \text{\textcopyright x f4 d8} 16 g2 \text{\textcopyright d7} 17 \text{\textcopyright b1 e5} 18 \text{\textcopyright d5 xd2} 19 \text{\textcopyright d2 xd5} 20 exd5 and the strong central knight maintained equality in A.Rogic-Z.Kozul. Austrian League 2005.

**\[ \text{\textcopyright f4} \text{\textcopyright c6} 13 \text{\textcopyright g1} \]**

Kasimdzhanov doesn’t like 13 g5? hXg5 14 fxg5 e5 15 \text{\textcopyright d3 g4}. We continue his line as follows: 16 \text{\textcopyright g1 x e3} 17 \text{\textcopyright x e3 h5} 18 g6 \text{\textcopyright g5} 19 gxf7+ \text{\textcopyright x f7} 20 \text{\textcopyright x g5 x g5} 21 \text{\textcopyright x g5 x g5} 22 \text{\textcopyright x d6} and Black has good chances to win this ending.

**\[ \text{\textcopyright d7} \]**

It’s too dangerous for Black to castle kingside, because after 13...0-0 14 g5 hXg5 15 fxg5 \text{\textcopyright d7} 16 g6 \text{\textcopyright e5} 17 gxf7+ \text{\textcopyright x f7} 18 \text{\textcopyright e2 c8} 19 \text{\textcopyright h5} White will get a tremendous attack.

**\[ \text{\textcopyright c4 a5} \]**

According to Kasimdzhanov, 14...b5 is losing after 15 \text{\textcopyright x e6} fxe6 16 \text{\textcopyright x g7 f8} (it would not help to try 16...\text{\textcopyright f6} 17 \text{\textcopyright g6+ e7} 18 e5 \text{\textcopyright x e5} 19 fxe5 \text{\textcopyright x e5} 20 \text{\textcopyright x h6} \text{\textcopyright g8} 21 g5+ \text{\textcopyright x g5+} 22 \text{\textcopyright x g5+} \text{\textcopyright d7} 23 h4 and one extra pawn with two passed pawns should give White good winning chances) 17 \text{\textcopyright g6+ f7} 18 \text{\textcopyright x e6} and Black’s various problem pieces give White more than enough compensation for the bishop.

**\[ \text{\textcopyright x e6} \]**

A piece sacrifice which opens Black’s king to a deadly attack. Instead the seemingly aggressive 15 f5 weakens the dark squares and gives Black a chance to get a small initiative, such as with 15...\text{\textcopyright f6} 16 \text{\textcopyright x d6} 0-0-0 17 \text{\textcopyright d2 d4} 18 \text{\textcopyright d3 e5} 19 a3 \text{\textcopyright a5} 20 \text{\textcopyright f1 c4} 21 \text{\textcopyright x c4 x d2} 22 \text{\textcopyright x d2 e5}.

**\[ \text{\textcopyright f6} \]**

Another possibility with 16...\text{\textcopyright f8} 17 \text{\textcopyright g6+ f7} 18 \text{\textcopyright x e6 f8} would have saved the king, but not for long. Here 19 \text{\textcopyright b3} (best, since 19 \text{\textcopyright x h6} \text{\textcopyright h7} traps the queen) 19...\text{\textcopyright d7} 20 \text{\textcopyright d5} looks good, but this position is so complicated that even a computer can get lost. We believe, though, that White’s activity and pair of passed pawn should be enough for a win: for instance, 20...\text{\textcopyright c8} 21 \text{\textcopyright a4} 22 \text{\textcopyright a3 c2+} 23 \text{\textcopyright b1 c4} 24 \text{\textcopyright c1 x c1+} 25 \text{\textcopyright x c1 d8} 26 g6 \text{\textcopyright g7} 27 \text{\textcopyright x d6}
\[ \text{\textcolor{red}{Wb5 28 We6+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf8}} 29 Wf5+ \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{g8}}} 30 b3 \textcolor{red}{Wc6+ 31 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{b1}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{b5}}} 32 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{d4}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{d3+}}} 33 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{a1}}} and White's attack should be enough.}}}}
\]

**17 Wg6+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{e7}} 18 e5**

This is a decoy sacrifice to open the d-file and prepare the next coup.

**18...dxe5?**

We agree with Kasimdzhanov that 18...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{dxe5}}} was the only way to save Black's position. He gives the following variations: 19 fxe5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wx5}}} 20 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{d2}}} (alternatively, 20 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{ge1}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{h4}}} is equal, while 20 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wd3}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{wx3+}}} 21 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{wx3}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{g5}}} 22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{ge1}}} leads to a level endgame) 20...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{ag8}}} 21 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wd3}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{b5}}} 22 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wxf3}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c6}}} and now 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wd3}}} repeats, but in our opinion 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wxf2}}}! could perhaps help to light a fire around the black monarch.

**19 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xd7+!}}**

And now an elimination sac, with decoy ideas added. Rudolf Spielmann would have loved this game, as he could have displayed his entire sacrificial nomenclature!

**19...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xd7}}**

19...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xd7}}} 20 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{e4}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{a8}}} 21 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c5+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{d8}}} 22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf8}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{xf8}}} 23 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xa2}}} 24 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{g7}}} is winning for White.

**20 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{d1+ e7}}**

If 20...\textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c7}}}, then 21 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{f7+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{b8}} 22 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wx6}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{e8}}} 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{fxe5}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c7}}} 24 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{g7+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{b8}}} 25 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{d6}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c7}}} 26 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wh6}}} and the active white pieces and two passed pawns are enough for a win.

**21 g5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{h8}}} 22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{wh7+ f7}}**

According to Kasimdzhanov, after 22...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{g7}}} 23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wxg7+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf7}}} 24 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wxh6}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf4}}} 25 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{g6}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{fxe3}}} 26 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{wh4+}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{f6}}} 27 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{wh7+}}} Black can't stop the passed g-pawn.

**23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{gxf6+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} 24 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wh6+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{e7}} 25 f5!**

This diversionary sacrifice crowns a fine effort. White wins in all variations: for instance, 25...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf5}}} (or 25...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{exf5}}} 26 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{d6+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{e8}}} 27 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{we6+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{f8}}} 28 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{h6+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{g8}}} 29 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{e1+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{h8}}} 30 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{wh7}}} 26 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{g7+}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{e8}}} 27 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{e4}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{wb4}}} 28 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{c5}}} and it's all over.

**Game 43**

I.Cervenka-A.Schneider

**USSR 1974**

1 e4 c5 2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{f3}}} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xd4}}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{f6}}} 5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{c3}}} a6 6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{c4}}} e6 7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{b3}}} b5 8 0-0 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{e7}}} 9 f4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{b7}}} 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{c5}}} 12 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{f3}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c6}}} 13 exf6 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} 14 fxg7?!

Tony Kosten prefers 12...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xd4}}} in his Easy Guide to the Najdorf, and this move would avoid the following headaches for Black.

**13 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{exf6}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} 14 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{fxe7}}}**

Better is 14 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{we2}}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xe3+}}} (14...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} 15 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{ad1}}} \textcolor{green}{\textit{\texttt{c7}}} 16 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} 17 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{e4}}} is too dangerous for Black's king) 15 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{we3}}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{d4}}} 16 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{ae1}}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} 17 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{e4}}} 0-0-0 18 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xf6}}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{\texttt{xe3+}}} 19 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\texttt{exe3}}} which gave White a slight advantage in the game N.De
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14...\text{\#}e3+ 15 \text{\#}h1 \text{\#}g8 16 \text{\#}xe6?

We believe that the simple 16 \text{\#}f3 \text{\#}xg7 17 \text{\#}xe3 gives chances to both sides in this complicated position, which holds perils for both kings.

16...\text{\#}xg7

16...\text{\#}xe6 leads to complicated variations, but should be enough to win: for example, 17 \text{\#}h5+ \text{\#}d7 18 \text{\#}ad1+ \text{\#}d4 19 \text{\#}e2 \text{\#}e8 20 \text{\#}f7+ \text{\#}c8 21 \text{\#}xd4 \text{\#}xg7 22 \text{\#}f5 \text{\#}xf7 23 \text{\#}d6+ \text{\#}d7 24 \text{\#}xe8+ \text{\#}xe8 25 \text{\#}d7 \text{\#}xd7 26 \text{\#}xf7+ \text{\#}e7 and Black's three pieces should win.

17 \text{\#}xf7+

17 \text{\#}h5 looks very aggressive, but Black will keep an extra piece after 17...\text{\#}e5! 18 \text{\#}d5 \text{\#}g5 19 \text{\#}d1 \text{\#}xd5 20 \text{\#}xd5 \text{\#}g4 21 \text{\#}xe3 \text{\#}xe3 22 \text{\#}e1 \text{\#}xd1 23 \text{\#}axd1 \text{\#}e5.

17...\text{\#}xf7 18 \text{\#}h5 \text{\#}e5

Instead 18...\text{\#}d7! 19 \text{\#}ae1 \text{\#}f8 20 \text{\#}xf7+ \text{\#}xf7 21 \text{\#}xf7+ \text{\#}xf7 22 \text{\#}xe3 was an easier way to win.

19 \text{\#}xe5+ \text{\#}e7! 20 \text{\#}h8+?

Better was 20 \text{\#}h5, but the accurate 20...\text{\#}f8 21 \text{\#}xh7 \text{\#}d4 22 \text{\#}ae1 \text{\#}g7 still leaves White with almost no chances for survival.

20...\text{\#}d7 21 \text{\#}ad1+

According to Florian, 21 \text{\#}xf7 is losing after 21...\text{\#}xf7 22 \text{\#}e5 \text{\#}xg2+! 23 \text{\#}xg2 \text{\#}g8+.

21...\text{\#}e6! 0-1

Black's king is safe enough and 22 \text{\#}f1 \text{\#}g5 leaves White facing a bunch of deadly threats.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 44}
\end{center}

\textbf{D. Stellwagen-A. Naiditsch}

\textit{Wijk aan Zee 2003}

1 e4 c5 2 \text{\#}f3 d6 3 d4 \text{\#}xd4 4 \text{\#}xd4 \text{\#}c6 5 \text{\#}c3 a6 6 \text{\#}c4 e6 7 b3 b5 8 \text{\#}g5 \text{\#}e7 9 \text{\#}f3 \text{\#}c7 10 e5 \text{\#}b7 11 exd6 \text{\#}xd6 12 \text{\#}we3 h6?!

The unclear queen sacrifice 12...\text{\#}c5 13 0-0-0 \text{\#}c6 14 \text{\#}xe6+? fxe6 15 \text{\#}xe6 was played in V. Ivanchuk-S. Karjakin, Nice (rapid) 2008. Ivanchuk won this game, but we believe that after 15...\text{\#}e7 16 \text{\#}he1 \text{\#}xe6 17 \text{\#}xe6+ \text{\#}e7 18 \text{\#}xf6 \text{\#}xf6 19 \text{\#}xf6 \text{\#}f8 20 \text{\#}xf8+ \text{\#}xf8 21 f3 \text{\#}e8 Black is the one trying to win.

13 \text{\#}xf6 \text{\#}xf6 14 \text{\#}xe6!
White opens up the black king, placing a bone in the throat on e6 while preparing to destroy Black with two rooks in the centre.

14...f6 15 cxe6+ fxe6 16 0-0-0

It looks like Black has defended himself, but now White throws more wood on to the fire.

18 f4! cxe6 19 fxe5

20 b6 f4+ 21 b1 c6 22 g3 f5 23 c7+ d7

The extra piece can't compensate for Black's lack of development. After 23...g6 24 e2 h5 25 c4+ h6 26 d6 h7 27 c7 e7 28 cxe7 d7 29 x6 Black's position is helpless.

24 g4

24 f1 c6 25 d5 c8 26 b7 e2 27 c3 c7 28 c4 c6 29 e1 c6 30 x8 was another way to win.

24...f3 25 d5 c8 26 d6 xg4 27 e7+ g6 28 f4+

28...f4

Black's king is in a mating net. After 28...g5 29 g7+ f5 30 e6+ xf4 31 d4+ the next move will be checkmate.

29 xf4 xh1 30 e4+ 1-0

It's forced mate: 30...f5 31 e6+ g5 32 h4+ h5 33 f4 xg2+ 34 a1 c6 35 xh6+ xh6 36 g5 and mate.

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 xd4 4 xd4 f6
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

5  d3  a6  6  c4  e6  7  b3  b5  8  g5  e7  
9  f3  c7  10  xf6?!  xf6  11  0-0-0  b7?!

Better was 11...0-0 12 e5  xe5  13
xa8  xd4  14  cxd4  c6  15  d2  b7  
16  xb5  axb5  17  wa3  b4  18  wa4  wb6 

12  xe6!!

After this move a deluge of white pieces descends on the black king's head. Also very promising was 12
da5  b4  13  b3  c5  (or 16...a6  17  e5  e7  18  f5  c5  19  fxe6  d6  20
exd6  fxe6  21  c4  d4  22  f3  f6  23
h4 with a killing attack after 23...e7  
24  wh5+  g6  25  w5)  17  e5  d5  18
xb3  d5  19  exf6+  xf6  20  wa4  a6  
21  f5+ and Black was checkmated in 
A.Volokitin-P.Harikrishna, Cap d'Agde (rapid) 2006. Which approach is 
the better of the two, though? I'm 
afraid that the reader must decide – it's 
too hard for us!

12...fxe6

12...xd4?! would evade the imme-
diate onslaught, but the prospect of 
defending his weak d-pawn after 13
xd5  xd5  14  xd5  xb2+  15  xb2 
a7  16  b5  0-0  17  d5  b4  18  hd1  a5 19  a4  a6  20  g3 would have been quite cheerless for Black. Note the dis-
parity in effectiveness between the mi-
nor pieces here.

13  g4

The alternatives call forth what Dr. Tartakower would call a 'spectrum analysis':

a) 13...w7  14  d5  xd5  15  exd5  
c6  16  h3  d8  17  he1  f7  18  xg7 
xb2+  19  b1  e5  20  h5  e8  21  f4 
f3  22  fxe5  dxe5  23  f4  g8  24  d3 is 
winning for White.

b) 13...w7  14  xd6  c6  15  d5  c8  
6  f6+  xf6  17  hd1  g8  18  h3  b8 19  f5  e7  20  d7  xd7  21  xd7 
xd7  22  c5+  c7  23  xh7+  b6  24 
d7+  a7  25  xb8  xb8  26  w7 and 
White's passed pawns will snuff out all resistance.

c) 13...d7  14  d5  xd5  15  wh5+ 
g6  16  xd5  c6  17  e5!  xe5  18  f4  f6  
19  he1  e7  20  f5  xf5  21  xf5  c8  22
The Bishop Sacrifice on e6

14 \( \text{exd}6 \text{b4} \)

After 14...\( \text{exc7} \) 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 16 \( \text{cxd7} \) 
\( \text{cxd7} \) 17 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 18 \( \text{wd6} \) \( \text{dxe8} \) 19
\( \text{exb7} \) \( \text{we4} \) 20 \( \text{we7} \) \( \text{we6} \) 21 \( \text{exb8}+ \) \( \text{xb8} \)
22 \( \text{wb8}+ \) \( \text{f7} \) 23 \( \text{wd7+} \) \( \text{g7} \) 24 \( \text{we7} \)
\( \text{exe7} \) 25 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{bxc3} \) White is winning.

15 \( \text{g3}! \) \( \text{g6} \)

15...\( \text{bxc3?} \) 16 \( \text{cxd7}+ \) \( \text{f7} \) 17 \( \text{xf6}+ \)
\( \text{xf6} \) 18 \( \text{h5}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) 19 \( \text{ld1} \) \( \text{cxb2}+ \) 20
\( \text{b1} \) \( \text{d5} \) 21 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{f1} \) 22 \( \text{xb2} \) is hopeless for Black.

16 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 17 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 18 \( \text{g5}+ \)
\( \text{g7} \)

Or 18...\( \text{cxd5}+ \) 19 \( \text{wd5} \) \( \text{c8} \) 20 \( \text{we6}+ \)
\( \text{g8} \) 21 \( \text{ld8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) 22 \( \text{xd8}+ \) \( \text{f7} \) 23
\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{f4} \) 24 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 25 \( \text{we7}+ \) \( \text{f7} \) 26
\( \text{wd6} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 27 \( \text{wd7}+ \) \( \text{h6} \) 28 \( \text{h3}+ \) \( \text{g5} \)
29 \( \text{we5} \), which also wins for White.

19 \( \text{xf6!} \)

Luring the enemy king forward into White's clutches.
11...xf6

The wild complications after 11 e5 d5 12 wgx3 dxe5 13 wxe6 fxe6 14 f4 wxf7 (14...g6 15 dxe6 Wd7 16 Ahe1 wxf7 17 f5 wxf8 18 xf6 xf6 19 Axd6 wc8 20 Aeg5+ wg8 21 xf6 gx6 22 Aeg4+ wg6 23 fxg6 forced Black to resign in L.Christiansen-A.Wojtkiewicz, U.S. Championship, San Diego 2006) 15 fxe5 dxe5 16 dxe6 dxe6 17 wh3+ wxf7 18 xf6 gx6 19 Axd6 wc6 20 Ahd1 wad8 21 wh5+ wxe6 22 wh3+ wxf7 23 wh5+ wxe6 led to a draw in the earlier game L.Nisipeanu-S.Karjakin, Foros 2006.

11...xf6

According to Nisipeanu, 11...xf6 can get Black into big trouble after 12 dxe6 fxe6 13 dxe6 wc6 14 d5 wxf7 15 d5+ we8 (15...we8 doesn’t help because 16 wh5 g6 17 wh6+ wg8 18 wh7! dxe7 19 wxe6+ wh8 20 wxf6 wxf6 21 wxf6+ wg7 22 dxe6 will soon finish off the black king) 16 wh5+ g6 17 wg4 and White’s mating net will soon force resignation.

12 g4 d7

In the later game Y.Vovk-S.Tolontegin, Tashkent 2008, after 12...0-0 13 g5 Axe7 14 g6 Axe7 15 g5 wh8 16 wh7 Ahe8 17 a3 Axe7 18 Axe7 19 Axe7 20 Axe7 21 Axe7 22 Axe7 White got a better position, but 22 wg4! would have been a more precise way to finish. However, we believe Nisipeanu is right that 12...b4! 13 Axe2 Axb7 14 Axe2 d5 15 exd5 Axd5 16 Axd5 Axd5 17 Axe7 0-0 gives Black a slight edge.

13 Axe6!
square in exchange for a piece. This position is unclear and looks very dangerous for both sides. The knight in the middle is key to White's chances, since it will lead his attack.

White begins to peel away the black king's guardians.

22...hxg6 23 hxg6+ $f8

24 exf5

Even more precise was 24 $dd4!
$xe4 25 $hg1 $xd4 26 $g7+ $e7 27 $xd4.

24...$e3+ 25 $b1 $xf4 26 $d4 $e4

The attempt to swap queens by 26...$h6 doesn't end Black's trouble after 27 $h5 $e4 28 $hf1 $a7 29 $c6 $d7 30 $f6 $e8 31 $e7 $h8 32 $h6 $e5 33 $f7 $ed8 34 $g8+ $xe7 35 $h7 $b7 36 $f8$+ $xf8 37 $xf8 and White wins.

27 $hg1

According to Nisipeanu, 27 $e6+!
$xe6 28 $xe6 $e5 29 $e7+ $xe7 30 $xd6+ $e8 31 $e6+ $f8 32 $hg1 $f7 33 $g6 was another way to finish.

27...$xd4 28 $g7+?

A better way to end the story was 28 $xd4! $xd4 29 $f6 $e8 30 $e1+ $e6 31 $xe6+ $d7 32 $xf7+ $c6 33 $e1 and White's f-pawn concludes proceedings.

28...$e7 29 $xd4 $xf5??

We believe the only attempt to defend was 29...$e5!.
30 \(\text{e1 + d7}\) 31 \(\text{dd1!}\)

This move wins knight or bishop and makes Black’s position hopeless.

31...\(\text{wh5}\)

Fruitless was 31...
\(\text{d8}\) 32 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{f3}\) 33 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{e8}\) 34 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{e2}\) 35 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{c5}\) 36 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{wh5}\) 37 \(\text{fxf3}\), winning a piece.

32 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e8}\) 33 \(\text{d1+}\) 1-0

The knight is lost.

Game 47
A.Fedorov-M.Kobalija
Russia 1998

1 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 2 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 3 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 4 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{f6}\)
5 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 6 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{e6}\) 7 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 8 \(\text{e2}\)
\(\text{wc7}\) 9 0-0-0 \(\text{e7}\) 10 \(\text{b3}\) 0-0 11 \(\text{hg1}\)
\(\text{d7}\) 12 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 13 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{b5}\)

Of course, 13...
\(\text{xb3+}\) 14 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{exf5}\) 15 \(\text{gxf5}\) gives White a strong attack.

14 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{b7}\) 15 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{fc8}\) 16 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{b4}\)

After 16...
\(\text{f8}\) 17 \(\text{wh5}\) \(\text{g6}\) 18 \(\text{h6+}\)
\(\text{h8}\) 19 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{b4}\) 20 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) 21 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{f5}\)
22 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{h6}\) 23 \(\text{wh6+}\) the game finished with perpetual check in I.Sofronic-A.Istratescu, Sovata 1998.

17 \(\text{gxg7!}\)?

The aim of this kingside sacrifice is to checkmate Black somewhere along the h-file. White plays like Tal: he brings his forces to the centre to give them away on the flank. Instead after 17 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{g6}\) 18 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 19 \(\text{h6+}\) \(\text{g7}\) 20 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{e8}\) 21 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) 22 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 23 \(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{g8}\) 24 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{a5}\) 25 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{xbl}\) \(\text{xb3}\) 26 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{ab8}\) Black could have developed a winning attack in the earlier game M.Kobalija-E.Prokopchuk, Kolontaevo 1997.

A word of warning: if the reader finds the following analysis too hard to follow, the game can still be appreciated for its flamboyance!

17...
\(\text{gxg7}\)

17...
\(\text{bxg7}\)

17...\(\text{bxg7}\) could lead to a very complicated game (co-author’s note: my partner has a gift for understatement!) with chances for both sides: for example, 18 \(\text{wh5!}\) \(\text{cxb2+}\) 19 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{f8}\) 20 \(\text{f5}\) and then:

a) 20...
\(\text{xd5}\) 21 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 22 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{e6}\)
23 \(\text{g1+}\) \(\text{g7}\) 24 \(\text{wh7+}\) \(\text{f8}\) 25 \(\text{g7+}\) and White wins.

b) 20...
\(\text{g7}\) 21 \(\text{xc5}\) \(\text{dxc5}\) (or 21...
\(\text{d8}\) 22 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{exf5}\) 23 \(\text{wh7+}\) \(\text{f8}\) 24...
exf5 \( \text{ex}c5 \) 25 f6 \( \text{ex}c2+ \) 26 \( \text{ex}c2 \) \( \text{ex}c2 \) with an exchange to the good 22 \( g7 \) \( g7 \) 23 \( h6+ \) \( g8 \) 24 g6 hxg6 25 \( \text{ex}g6+ \) fxg6 26 \( \text{ex}e6+ \) \( f7 \) 27 \( \text{ex}g6+ \) and mates.

c) 20...\( \text{a}4 \) 21 g6 \( \text{c}3+ \) 22 \( \text{x}b2 \) \( \text{xd}1+ \) 23 \( \text{c}1 \) fxg6 24 \( \text{ex}e6+ \) \( h8 \) 25 \( \text{ex}g7 \) \( g7 \) 26 \( \text{ex}g7 \) \( \text{ex}g7 \) 27 \( \text{ex}g7 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 28 fxe3 \( \text{c}7 \) 29 \( \text{f}5 \) gives White a winning position.

However, in this fascinating variation we can find many other crazy lines; some good for White, others for Black.

18 \( \text{h}5 \) \( g8 \)

Fedorov considers that 18...\( \text{h}8 \) loses after 19 \( \text{xc}5 \) dxc5 20 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( g8 \) 21 g6. Meanwhile we believe that 18...\( \text{xc}3 \) doesn’t stop White’s mating attack in view of the line 19 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( g8 \) 20 g6 \( \text{xb}2+ \) 21 \( \text{b}1 \) fxg6 22 \( \text{ex}g6+ \) \( f7 \) 23 \( \text{g}7+ \) \( e8 \) 24 \( \text{xc}5 \).

19 \( \text{xe}6! \)

A multi-purpose sacrifice, targeting the squares e6 or g6 according to Black’s choice.

19...\( \text{bxc}3? \)

The superior 19...\( \text{xe}6! \) 20 \( \text{d}5 \) \( d8 \)

21 f4 \( \text{h}8 \) 22 \( \text{xf}7 \) \( c8 \) 23 f5 \( \text{g}5 \)

(23...\( g7 \), Rybka’s choice, may cast doubt on the correctness of White’s play: 24 \( \text{h}5 \) \( g5 \) 25 fxe6 \( \text{xe}3+ \) 26 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 27 hxg3 \( \text{xe}6 \) 28 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 29 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{d}8 \) looks better for Black) 24 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 25 \( \text{g}8+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 26 \( \text{g}4+ \) \( \text{g}5 \) 27 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 28 f6 creates an unclear position.

However, the weaker 19...\( \text{f}6? \) 20 g6!! peels away the last remnants of resistance.

20 \( \text{xf}7! \)

20...\( \text{a}5 \)

After 20...\( \text{xb}2+ \) 21 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 22 g6 \( \text{c}3+ \) 23 \( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{xd}1+ \) 24 \( \text{c}1 \) Black is cooked.

21 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 22 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 23 \( \text{d}5+ \) \( g7 \)

24 \( \text{f}7+! \) 1-0

Fedorov gives 24...\( \text{xf}7 \) 25 \( \text{xf}7+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 26 \( \text{d}4+ \) followed by mate.

**Game 48**

A.Matsukevich-A.Vooremaa

USSR 1968

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{f}3 \) d6 3 d4 \( \text{xd}4 \) 4 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( f6 \)
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

5 c3 a6 6 g5 bd7 7 c4 a5 8 d2 e6 9 0-0-0 b5 10 b3 b7 11 he1 c5 12 e5?! 12 xf6? was a better and safer choice because after 12...gx6 13 w4 White will be able to probe the weak black pawns.

12...dxe5 13 xe6?

Here White wins an amazing game with this typical xe6 sacrifice. However, we believe that this version is incorrect, even though it gives Black a big headache. Indeed, by the end poor Vooremaa was so bewildered he lost in prosaic fashion.

Instead the better try 13 xe5 gives chances for both sides: for example, 13...xg2 14 xe6 fxe6 15 xxe6 c7 16 d5 gxf6 17 xg2 xxe5 18 xxa8 leads to an unclear mess.

13...fxe6?

After 13...b4!! White can't defend three pieces at the same time: 14 xe5 fxe6! leads to a complicated win after 15 w3 bxc3 16 xe6 xfl 17 xf6 xa2 18 d8+ g8 19 xc3 ec8 20 e8 c3+ and White loses too much material. However, here Black must avoid

14...bxc3? 15 c4+ e7 16 xe7+ xe7 17 f5+ e8 18 w6 which led to mate in A.Krzyzanowski-M.Sukiennik, Poland 1993.

14 xe6 cd7

14...xe6 would give chances for both sides: for example, 15 xxf6 c6 16 xe5 f7 17 d3 e8 18 f5+ g8 19 cd6 xd6 20 xd6 f8 21 xe8 when we feel that White has sufficient play for the piece.

15 xxf6 xxf6 16 xe5 f7 17 e3

17 xxf8? xhx8 18 e7+ xe7 19 d5+ xd5 20 xxa5 ad8 should finish as a draw.

18...h6

This looks feeble, but the alternatives may be even worse: for instance, 17...g8 18 xg7? (this is even stronger than 18 f5 e8 19 xf6 gxf6 20 ad7 e7) 18...g4 (or 18...xg7 19 e7) 19 wg5 xe5 20 h5+ g6 21 ad7 and wins.

18 xxf8 xhx8

18...xh8 19 c5+ g8 20 e7 embarrasses the black bishop, viz. 20...b8 21 we5 or 20...c8 21 xe4!!.

19 e7+ g8 20 xb7 b4 21 d5 xd5
22 \(\text{We5} \text{xf6} 23 \text{x xd5} 1-0\)

After 23...\(\text{wx a2}\) 24 \(\text{ex g7+ ex g7}\) 25 \(\text{ex d7+ ex g6}\) 26 \(\text{ex e4+ ex f5}\) 27 \(\text{ex d6+ ex g7}\) 28 \(\text{wx f5}\) Black cannot escape the mating net.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 49}
\textbf{A.Martín Gonzalez-M.Chiburdanidze}
\textbf{Barcelona 1979}
\end{center}

1 \(e4\) \(c5\) 2 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(d6\) 3 \(d4\) \(\text{cxd4}\) 4 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 5 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(a6\) 6 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Qbd7}\) 7 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(e6\) 8 \(\text{We2}\) \(h6?!\)

The preferable 8...\(\text{wa5?!}\) 9 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{wb6}\) 10 \(\text{Qb3}\) \(\text{wc7}\) 11 0-0 \(b5\) 12 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qb7}\) 13 \(a4\) \(b4\) 14 \(\text{Qd1}\) \(d5\) 15 \(\text{exd5}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 16 \(\text{Qf4}\) 17 \(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xf4}\) gave Black a comfortable position in M.Vokac-S.Movsesian, Pribram 1998.

9 \(\text{Qh4}\) \(b5\) 10 \(\text{Qxe6}?!\)

\begin{center}
\textbf{The Bishop Sacrifice on e6}
\end{center}

\(\text{Qxf8}\) \(\text{Qxf8}\) 14 \(\text{Qxd6}\)

In this position it seems to us that White has enough compensation for a piece, but he must not tarry. If Black can develop all his pieces, White can get in big trouble. Moreover, a tiny mistake for either side could be fatal.

14...\(\text{de5}?!\)

14...\(\text{xe6}\)? 15 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{vb6}\) would slow down White’s attack.

15 \(\text{Qh4}?!\)

Too slow. Much better was 15 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 16 \(\text{Qh5+}\): for instance, 16...\(\text{Qg7}\) 17 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{Qf7}\) 18 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 19 \(\text{Qg3+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 20 \(\text{Qg6}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 21 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 22 \(\text{exd5}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 23 \(\text{Qg7+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 24 \(\text{Qe3+}\) \(\text{Qd6}\) 25 \(\text{Qxf6+}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 26 \(\text{Qc3+}\) is hopeless for Black.

15...\(\text{Qg4}\) 16 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{Qe6}\)?

Instead 16...\(\text{Qc4}\) 17 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 18 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Qb4}\) 19 \(\text{Qxf6+}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 20 \(\text{Qxf8+}\) \(\text{Qxf8}\) 21 \(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{bxa4}\) 22 \(c3\) \(\text{Qb5}\) 23 \(h4\) leaves matters very unclear; we feel it should finish as a draw.

Possible too is 16...\(b4\) 17 \(\text{Qxf6}\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 18 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 19 \(\text{fxg4}\) \(\text{bxc3}\) 20 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 21 \(\text{Qxd8}\) \(\text{Qxd8}\) 22 \(\text{Qxd8}\) \(\text{Qxd8}\) 23 \(\text{Qe3}\) and the strong knight gives Black a slight advantage, but White has good drawing chances. Only a deep analysis beyond the scope of this book can ascertain more.

17 \(\text{Qxe6}\)!

Best. Black’s extra rook can’t stop White’s crushing attack in the centre. Instead 17 \(\text{Qxf6}?!\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 18 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 19 \(f4\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 20 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Qxd1+}\) 21 \(\text{Qxd1}\) \(\text{f5}\) 22 \(\text{Qd5+}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 23 \(\text{Qd6+}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 24 \(\text{Qxe5+}\) \(\text{Qh7}\) 25 \(\text{Qe7+}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) is better for White, but Black has some hope of saving the game.
17...@xe6 18 f4 @ad8

According to Chiburdanidze, 18...c4 19 e5 @e8 20 wg4+ @f7 21 @d7+ @g8 22 @f6 @f7 23 @e6 is winning for White.
19 fxe5 @xe5

19...@xd1+ 20 @xd1 @xe5 21 @f3 @d6 22 wg3+ @c6 23 w@xg7 @d7 24 @xh6+ wins too much material.
20 @d5+!

This further offer cannot be accepted.
20...@e6

White wins after 20...@xd5 21 exd5+ @d6 22 @e7 is mate.
21 @xd8 @xd8

The capture 21...@xd8 is met by 22 e5 winning material.
22 e5 g5 23 exf6+ @xf6 24 @g3

In this hopeless position, common courtesy demands we remain silent.
24...@e8 25 @f3+ @g7 26 @e4 @d4 27 @d6 @g1+ 28 @f2 @d4+ 29 @d3 @xd3+ 30 @xc3 @e6 31 @e4 @g6 32 @c5 @ce6 33 d4 h5 34 b4 h4 35 @e5 @f5
36 @d3 @h6 37 h3 @g6 38 @e3 @g4 39 @h4+ @xh4 40 @f3 @xe6 41 @f4 1-0

Let us now present a classical brevity played by the great Keres. His @xe6 sacrifice has graced a good many books.

Game 50
P.Keres-J.Sajtar
Amsterdam Olympiad 1954

1 e4 c5 2 @f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 @xd4 @f6 5 @c3 a6 6 @g5 @bd7 7 @c4 e6 8 0-0 @c7?

Two more aggressive choices are 8...@a5 9 @wd2 @c7 10 @ad1 h6 11 @e3 @c5 12 @b3 @xb3 13 @xb3 b5 14 f3 @b7 15 @f2 @c7 16 @g3 @g8 and White achieved a slight advantage. V.Ivanchuk-J.Ehlvest, Elista Olympiad 1998; and 8...b5? 9 @xe6! fxe6 10 @xe6 @b6 11 @d5 @xd5 12 @xd5 @b8 13 @xf8 @c6 14 @e6 @xd5 15 exd5, which left White up two pawns in J.Ehlvest-A.Anastasian, Yerevan 1988.
9 @xe6!
9...fxe6 10 dxe6 wC4

After 10...wb6 11 d5 exd5 12 exd5 d5 13 xf8 xf8 14 e1+ f7 15 e7+ g8 16 wd4 e7 17 xf7 xf7 18 e1 c7 19 f4+ g6 20 e7 White’s attack is decisive.

11 d5 f7

The logical 11...xd5 should nonetheless be good for White: 12 exd5 xb8 13 e1 e5 14 b3 c3 15 d2 b2 16 xf8 xf8 17 b4 and White should win material.

12 xf6 dxe6?

This leaves Black with an exposed king and minimum chances for survival. That said, even after the superior

12...xf6 13 b3 xf1+! 14 xf1 xe6 15 x7 c8 16 x6 xe6 17 d3 e7 18 f4 he8 19 g4 White should be better.

13 c3 xf6 14 xf6 gxf6 15 b6 c6

16 xa8 e7 17 a4

The idea is to push a4-a5 and free White’s knight.

17...b6 18 d5+ d7 19 a3 d8

Trying to catch the white knight.

20 x6b6+! 1-0

White wins with 20...xb6 (or 20...xb6 21 f5+ c7 22 c3+) 21 f7+ d8 22 xf6+ c7 23 xh8.

Game 51
A.Matanovic-E.Gufeld
Skopje 1969

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 f6
5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 bd7 8 c4 b5?

Another choice is 8...b6, which will be covered shortly in Sulskis-Kobalija.

9 xe6!
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theory. For 10...\texttt{a}5 see the next game.

\textbf{11 \texttt{d}5! \texttt{d}x\texttt{d}5 12 \texttt{w}x\texttt{d}5 \texttt{w}e3+??}

This ill-adviced check puts the black queen out of action. Even grandmasters sometimes do crazy things! Instead 12...\texttt{b}8!? 13 \texttt{xf}8 \texttt{x}f8 14 \texttt{xa}8 h6 15 0-0-0 \texttt{hx}g5 16 \texttt{wd}5 looks better for White, but leaves Black with some counterplay.

\textbf{13 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{b}6 14 \texttt{c}7+ \texttt{d}7 15 \texttt{w}f7+ \texttt{c}6 16 \texttt{d}5}

16 \texttt{xa}8 looks like a simple win after 16...\texttt{xa}8 17 \texttt{wd}5+ \texttt{c}7 18 \texttt{xa}8.

\textbf{16...\texttt{xe}4}

Alternatively, 16...\texttt{xd}5 17 \texttt{ex}d5+ \texttt{b}6 18 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{e}4 19 \texttt{d}8+ \texttt{c}5 20 \texttt{c}7+ \texttt{xd}5 21 \texttt{d}1+ \texttt{e}6 22 \texttt{e}1 and Black loses his queen and the game.

\textbf{21 \texttt{f}5+ \texttt{d}5}

21...\texttt{x}f5 22 \texttt{f}7+ \texttt{e}4 23 \texttt{f}2 leads to a forced checkmate: for example, 23...\texttt{hx}g5 24 \texttt{f}3+ \texttt{d}4 25 \texttt{c}3+ \texttt{c}5 26 \texttt{b}4+ \texttt{c}4 27 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{hx}h2 28 \texttt{d}4 mate.

\textbf{22 \texttt{xb}6 \texttt{hx}g5}

This is an amazing position where Gufeld's only developed piece is his wandering king. Is this really a 20th Century game?

\textbf{23 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{h}4 24 \texttt{d}1+ \texttt{e}5 25 \texttt{w}c6 \texttt{b}8 26 \texttt{we}8+ 1-0}

\textbf{Game 52}

\textbf{A.Zakharov-S.Yuferov}

\textbf{USSR 1973}

1 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{c}5 2 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{d}6 3 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{cxd}4 4 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{c}6 5 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{a}6 6 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{e}6 7 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{bd}7 8 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{b}5 9 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{fxe}6 10 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{a}5

Correct, whereas 10...\texttt{b}6? 11 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{xd}5 12 \texttt{w}x\texttt{d}5 \texttt{w}e3+ 13 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{b}6 14 \texttt{c}7+ \texttt{d}7 15 \texttt{w}f7+ \texttt{c}6 16 \texttt{xa}8 \texttt{xa}8 17 \texttt{wd}5+ wins for White as in the previous game.
11 0-0

The most popular move is 11 \( \text{d}x\text{f}8 \) \( \text{d}x\text{f}8 \) 12 \( \text{w}x\text{d}6 \) \( \text{b}b6 \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{w}x\text{d}6 \) 14 \( \text{d}x\text{d}6 \) \text{b}4 15 \( \text{a}4 \) \text{h}6 16 \( \text{h}4 \) \text{a}5 17 \( \text{d}h\text{d}1 \) \( \text{a}6 \). Gipslis assessed this as being slightly better for Black, but in \text{Ma}.\text{Tseitlin}-\text{L.Polugaevsky}. \text{Leningrad} 1971, White managed to win.

In a much more recent game White played the novelty 11 \text{d}d\text{d}4!? and after 11... \( \text{b}4 \) 12 \( \text{e}x\text{f}6 \) \( \text{g}xf6 \) 13 \text{d}5 \text{e}3+ 14 \text{f}1 \text{b}6 15 \text{h}5+ \text{e}7 16 \text{e}1 \text{d}e1+ 17 \text{e}xe1 \text{d}xe6 18 \text{d}d5+ \text{d}x\text{d}5 19 \text{ex}d5 \text{d}f7 20 \text{f}5 \text{g}7 21 \text{d}d2 \text{h}c8 22 \text{e}1+ \text{e}8 this complicated struggle finished as a draw, \text{A.Shomoev}-\text{E.Najer}, \text{Moscow} 2008. However, we believe that this 11 \text{d}d4 line will gain many followers in the future.

11... \text{b}4

The probably preferable 11... \( \text{f}7 \) 12 \( \text{f}x\text{f}8 \) \( \text{f}x\text{f}8 \) 13 \( \text{w}x\text{d}6 \) \( \text{b}b6+ \) 14 \( \text{w}x\text{b}6 \) \( \text{b}x\text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{a}a1 \) \text{b}4 16 \( \text{d}d1 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 17 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{a}c8 \) 18 \text{e}5 \( \text{x}x\text{c}2 \) 19 \text{e}x\text{f}6 \text{g}x\text{f}6 left Black with tremendous pressure in \text{K.Spraggett}-\text{R.Vazquez Igarza}. \text{Lorca} 2005.

12 \( \text{d}d5 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 13 \text{f}5 \( \text{b}7 \) 14 \text{c}4

14... \text{bxc}3?

14... \( \text{x}d\text{d}5 \) 15 \( \text{ex}d\text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}7 \) is given by Gipslis as unclear.

15 \( \text{x}f\text{f}6 \) \( \text{x}f\text{f}6 \) 16 \( \text{g}5+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 17 \( \text{x}f\text{f}6+ \) \( \text{g}x\text{f}6 \) 18 \( \text{b}3+ \) \( \text{d}5 \) 19 \( \text{ex}d\text{d}5 \) \text{fxg}5 20 \text{b}xc3

This is much stronger than 20 \text{f}6? \( \text{a}7 \) 21 \text{bxc}3 \( \text{f}7 \) 22 \text{c}4 \( \text{d}d8 \) 23 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{x}f\text{f}6 \) 24 \( \text{x}x\text{g}5+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) 25 \( \text{h}5 \) \text{h}6 26 \text{h}4 \( \text{h}7 \), which won shortly for Black in \text{B.Roeschla—who-M.Womacka}, \text{German League} 2004.

20... \text{h}6 21 \text{f}6 \( \text{h}7 \) 22 \text{f}7+ \( \text{h}8 \)

Gipslis points out that 22... \( \text{x}f\text{f}7 \) 23 \( \text{x}f\text{f}7 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 24 \( \text{b}7+ \) is winning for White.
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23 c4

23...a7

White wins too after the long line 23...g7 24 wb7 ff8 25 we7 wc5+ 26 wh1 a5 27 nab1 wc4 28 xd6 a4 29 fe1 c8 30 ec8 ecx8 31 fxe8+ wc8 32 xb8.

24 wb2+ g7 25 ff6 axf7 26 xf7 1-0

We end this chapter with another very complicated game, featuring the Russian grandmaster Mikhail Kobalija. He has analysed it very deeply, but we will discuss only his most important notes. Our engine is sure that his opponent’s sacrifice was wrong, but Kobalija is no less certain that it was sound. We find this conflict of human and silicon intellect quite enjoyable, and hope you will feel the same.

Game 53
S.Sulskis-M.Kobalija
Moscow 2003

1 e4 c5 2 df3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 exd4 df6
5 ac3 a6 6 eg5 e6 7 f4 bd7 8 c4

wb6 9 db2? xb2 10 0-0

Practice has seen too 10 bb1 wa3 11 f5 (after our typical sacrifice 11 xxe6 fxe6 12 xxe6 ff7 13 f5 wa5 14 0-0 b5 15 a4 xb5 16 bxc8 bxc8 Black achieved a better position in T.Radjabov-B.Gelfand, Gothenburg 2005) 11...e5 12 ab3 xe7 13 0-0 h6 14 xfx6 xfx6 15 xfxd1 xb8 16 xf6 xd6 17 xd6 b5 18 xd5 xe7 19 xe6 0-0, which gave Black a slight advantage in J.Aldrete Lobo-R.Boger, Switzerland 2002.

10...wb4

After 10...wb6 11 wh1 the natural move 11...wc7 can get Black in trouble after 12 xxe6! fxe6 13 xxe6 wc4 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 (15...wc6 16 exf6 wins for White) 16 wd8+ wh7 17 xf6+ xfx6 18 xf6+ xex6 19 xg7+ xd7 20 xd1+ cc7 21 xex5+ and Black gave up in L.Perez-A.Abreu Delgado, Havana 2005.

Another instructive line here runs 11...e7 12 xxe6! fxe6 13 xxe6 cc7 14 cc5 xd5 15 ab1 we3 16 xd5 cc6 17 cc8+ we8 18 xfx6 xc6 19 xd8+ we7 20 wb6+ cc7 21 wb5+ cc7 22 wa5+ cc7 23 wxa6, which gives White good
attacking chances according to Kobalija.

11 \text{x}e6! \text{f}xe6 12 \text{xe}6

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{Diagram}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{12...f7}

According to Fritz, 12...\text{c}4!? gives Black good winning chances, but we believe that after 13 \text{x}xf8 \text{xf}8 14 \text{ae}1 \text{f}7 15 \text{f}3 \text{c}5+ 16 \text{h}1 \text{e}7 17 \text{d}3 \text{e}6 18 f5 \text{e}5 19 \text{xd}6 White has more than enough initiative for the piece.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{Diagram}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{13 e5}

We believe that Nataf’s 13 f5! gives White enough activity for a piece: for example, 13...\text{c}4 14 \text{ae}1 \text{e}7 15 \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 16 \text{ex}d5 \text{f}6 17 \text{g}7 \text{e}4 18 \text{xe}4 \text{xe}4 19 \text{e}6 \text{g}8 20 f6 \text{d}8 21 \text{xd}8+ \text{xd}8 22 \text{e}1 and White has a winning attack.

\textbf{13...\text{xe}6}

According to Kobalija, 13...\text{dxe}5 14 \text{fxe}5 \text{xe}5 (after 14...\text{b}6+ Kobalija shows that 15 \text{h}1 \text{xe}6 16 \text{ex}f6 \text{gxf}6 17 \text{d}5 has to be better for White) 15 \text{xf}6 \text{gxf}6 16 \text{d}6+ \text{xe}6 17 \text{d}5+ \text{xe}6 18 \text{xb}4 gives White good attacking chances.

\textbf{14 \text{xf}6 \text{c}5+}

Kobalija believes that both 14...\text{xf}6 15 \text{ae}1+ \text{f}7 16 \text{d}5+ \text{g}7 17 \text{e}4! and 14...\text{xf}6 15 \text{xf}6 \text{gxf}6 16 \text{d}5+ \text{d}7 17 \text{f}7+ \text{d}6 18 \text{f}3 \text{g}4 19 \text{d}3 cause Black too many problems.

\textbf{15 \text{h}1 \text{xf}6!}

The weaker 15...\text{xf}6? 16 \text{e}4 \text{c}4 17 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 18 \text{ae}1+ \text{e}5 (after 18...\text{e}5 19 \text{fxe}5 \text{fxe}5 20 \text{ad}1 White has more than enough initiative for a piece) 19 \text{fxe}5 \text{b}4 (or 19...\text{fxe}5 20 \text{ad}1 \text{c}5 21 \text{f}6! \text{xf}6 22 \text{h}6+ \text{g}7 23 \text{f}1+ and White is winning) 20 c3 \text{c}5 21 \text{xf}6 \text{g}8 22 \text{ad}1 gives White a strong attack.

\textbf{16 \text{ae}1+}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{Diagram}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Thus White is able to give a strong-
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looking check, but this is not quite enough for a whole piece. That's partly because White must worry about his knight, and he must trade too many attackers to make it active. Meanwhile Black threatens to run his king to safety and to activate his slumbering army. Those two or three pawns White usually gets are certainly not to be underestimated!

16...f7 17 xf6 gxf6 18 e4

Kobalija points out that 21 b1 c6 22 b6 c7 23 xd6 xd6 24 xf6+ g8 25 g5+ f7 26 f6+ ends in perpetual check.

21...c6

22 g5?

According to Kobalija, 22 xf6+ g8 23 g5+ g7 24 f3 e8 25 f6+ f7 26 h5+ f8 27 xd7+ xd7 is better for Black, but we feel that Black’s development problems gives White chances of survival.

22...e8 23 g6+ hxg6 24 xf6+ g8 25 g1 h7 26 xg6+ g7 0-1

Black wins more material after 27 d4 f5.
Chapter Four

The Knight Sacrifice on f5

The sacrifice $\text{Nd4-f5}$ is a relatively infrequent visitor to the Open Sicilian, at least compared to the knight sacrifice on d5. It commonly occurs these days in two systems: the Velimirovic Attack and the Scheveningen.

For a change, rather than start with a verbal explanation, let's begin by looking back at the game that put the Velimirovic and its creator on the map.

**Game 54**
D.Velimirovic-J.Sofrevski  
Yugoslav Championship, Titograd 1965

1 e4 c5 2 $\text{Nf3 Nc6}$ 3 d4 $\text{cxd4}$ 4 $\text{Nx}d4$ e6 5 $\text{Nc3}$ d6 6 $\text{e4}$ $\text{Nc6}$ 7 $\text{Bc4}$ $\text{e7}$ 8 $\text{We2}$ a6 9 0-0-0 $\text{Wc7}$ 10 b3 $\text{Wa5}$

Less accurate is 10...b5? 11 $\text{Bxc6!}$ $\text{Bxc6}$ 12 $\text{Nd4}$ when 12...0-0 is met by 13 $\text{Bd5!}$.

11 g4 b5 12 g5 $\text{Bxb3+}$ 13 $\text{Kxb3}$

Of course, 12...$\text{Nd7}$? 13 $\text{Bxe6!}$ gets three pawns and an attack for the bishop.
13 a4

Over forty years later, this is still a common position in grandmaster play. The sedate 14 h4 has its followers too, but the more adventurous still play Velimirovic's original idea. To Sofrevski it must have felt like a left hook to the jaw.

14 $\text{Bf5!}$ exf5
Acceptance is pretty much forced. Evans gives 14...\textit{f8} 15 \textit{d4} exf5 16 exf5+ \textit{d8} 17 \textit{he1} \textit{wa5} 18 \textit{d5} as winning.

\textbf{15 \textit{d5} \textit{d8}}

Velimirovic dismisses 15...\textit{b7} with 16 exf5 \textit{e5} 17 \textit{f4} \textit{xf5} 18 fxe5 \textit{e4} 19 exd6 \textit{xd5} 20 \textit{c5} \textit{h1} 21 d7+ \textit{xd7} 22 \textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 23 \textit{exe7}+ \textit{c6} 24 \textit{d6+ mating.}

\textbf{16 exf5}

Here we see the basic idea of White's sacrifice. He has diverted the pawn from e6 to allow \textit{c3-d5} with tempo, and he has opened the e-file while the Dark Majesty still resides there. So it's now very tempting for Black to castle...

\textbf{16...0-0?}

Fatal. Praxis has shown the correct defence to be 16...\textit{b7} 17 \textit{f6}! gxf6 18 \textit{he1} \textit{xd5} 19 \textit{xd5} \textit{g8}! (an idea of Larsen's, first played in F.Gheorghiu-S.Hamann, Vrnjacka Banja 1967) when Yrjola gives 20 gxf6 \textit{xf6} 21 \textit{f5} \textit{g4} and now White can force a draw with 22 \textit{g5} or play in risky fashion for a win with 22 \textit{d4}!? For more details see Finnish GM Jouni Yrjola's fine work \textit{Easy Guide to the Classical Sicilian}.

\textbf{17 \textit{f6}! gxf6}

The penitent 17...\textit{xf6} 18 gxf6 \textit{xf6} fails to gain absolutation after 19 \textit{b6} \textit{d7} 20 \textit{xf6+} gxf6 21 \textit{h1}.

\textbf{18 \textit{d4}}

Gaining a necessary tempo to open the g-file and grab the dark squares with killing effect.

\textbf{18...\textit{e5} 19 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 20 \textit{h1} \textit{f7} 21 \textit{xe5} \textit{e5} 22 \textit{xe5} \textit{f6} 23 \textit{e7+ f7} 23...\textit{h8} 24 \textit{xg8} fx\textit{e5} 25 \textit{xf8+ \textit{xf8} 26 \textit{g8} is checkmate.}

\textbf{24 \textit{h5}+ 1-0}

When Black has castled the \textit{f5} sacrifice has more limited aims. Generally the big idea is to allow White to follow up with \textit{c3-d5}, although occasionally the point might simply be to divert the e-pawn or to gain a tempo in some fashion. The main difference is that, with Black having castled, the g7-square tends to be guarded, affording the defender the chance to ignore the knight thrust. Consider the following extract:

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 55}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
D.Minic-R. Fischer
Rovinj-Zagreb 1970
\end{center}

\begin{center}
1 e4 c5 2 \textit{f3} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd4 \textit{f6}}
5 \textit{c3} a6 6 \textit{g5} e6 7 \textit{f4} \textit{e7} 8 \textit{f3} \textit{c7}
9 0-0-0 \textit{bd7} 10 \textit{g4}
\end{center}

The main alternative to 10 \textit{d3}, as we've already seen.

10...\textit{b5} 11 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 12 \textit{g5} \textit{d7} 13 \textit{a3}
This was in vogue in the 1960s, but has been superseded by 13...f5.

**13...b8**

The older move 13...b7 became unpopular after M.Tal-S.Cligoric, Moscow 1963, which saw Tal win a fine game with 14.h3!.

**14 h4 b4 15 axb4 a6 16.h3 0-0?**

A daring idea introduced in this game. 16...wc5 is considerably safer.

In this position White would like to eliminate the pawn on e6 so as to play c3-d5. There are two ways to do this.

**17 f5!**

The knight need not be accepted, so a better approach is the forcing 17...xe6! fx6 18.xe6+ h8 19.d5 wc4 and now 20.f5! with the menace of xh7 is very strong.

**17...c5!**

Fischer continues to play thematically and press against the e-pawn whilst building up against the white king.

**18 xe7+ xe7 19 h5**

Gligoric prefers 19...e3.

**19...b7 20 h6 xe4 21 xe4 xe4 22 hxg7 c8!**

Gligoric explains that Minic’s likely intention 23.f5 exf5 24.h5 fails to 24...xc2+! 25.xc2 h7+ 26.b1 c3+, so he had to slow down.

**23 h2 a4 24 b1 d5**

And Fischer, whose counterattack was by now in full swing, won in 10 more moves.

We shall see many successful examples of f5 against a castled king in the body of this chapter, including some fiendishly complex Velimirovic Attacks. I did say in the introduction that this is not intended as a theoretical work, but we will analyse no fewer than six examples of Pereyni’s passive f5 sacrifice in the Scheveningen/English Attack.

Over to Yury:

**Game 56**

L.Barczay-L.Kavalek

Salgotarjan 1967

1.e4 c5 2.d4 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.cxd4 f6
5.c3 g6 6.e3 e7 7.f3 c6 8.d2
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0-0 9 \textup{c4} d7 10 \textup{b3} a5 11 g4 fxc8
12 0-0-0 e5 13 h4 c4

14 \textup{xd3}!?

Fischer’s method of attack, introduced in his game with Gligoric from the 1959 Candidates. White feels his light-squared bishop is the more important, so he insists on keeping it. Instead 14 \textup{xc4} \textup{xc4} 15 h5 \textup{ac8} 16 \textup{b3} is more often seen these days, after which 16...\textup{a6} 17 hgx6 hxg6 18 e5 \textup{e8} 19 \textup{h2} h5 20 \textup{d4} \textup{xd4} 21 \textup{xd4} \textup{xc3} 22 \textup{bxc3} \textup{a3}+ 23 \textup{b1} \textup{xe5} 24 f4 \textup{e6} 25 fxe5 was to finish in perpetual check in J.Moreno Carnero-A.Martín González, Barcelona 2000.

14...\textup{xe3} 15 \textup{xe3} \textup{c5} 16 h5! e5?

After 16...a5! 17 hgx6 hxg6 18 a4 b5 19 \textup{h6} bxa4 20 \textup{g6} axb3 21 \textup{g5} bxc2! (and not 21...e5? 22 \textup{g7+} \textup{xg7} 23 \textup{g5+} \textup{xh8} 24 \textup{xf6} \textup{xg6} 25 \textup{xe4} dxe4 26 \textup{e8+} \textup{xh8} 27 \textup{d5+} \textup{e6} 28 \textup{xf6} and 1-0 in G.Protze-R.Stach, Germany 1975) 22 \textup{h1} \textup{xg5} 23 \textup{xg5} a4 24 \textup{xc2} a3 this unclear position ended up as a draw in G.Weinitschke-G.Melzer, Germany 1984.

17 hxg6 hxg6 18 \textup{xf5}!

We already believe that White is better.

18...\textup{gxf5} 19 \textup{dxc5} 20 \textup{xf5} c4 21 \textup{a4} gx5 22 g5 \textup{h7} 23 \textup{d5} gives White some advantage.

19 \textup{gs5!} \textup{f2}

Alternatively, 19...f4 20 \textup{h6} \textup{e3+} 21 \textup{b1} \textup{xc3} 22 \textup{d1} a5 23 \textup{xf5} c3 24 \textup{e1} h8+ \textup{xh8} 25 \textup{xc3} \textup{xc3} 26 \textup{f1} \textup{g1}+ \textup{e7} 27 \textup{h6} \textup{d1}+ 28 \textup{b2} \textup{d8} 29 \textup{xh6+} \textup{c7} 29...\textup{d5} wins for White.

20 \textup{h6!} \textup{g4}

Or 20...\textup{h7} 21 \textup{xf7}+! and Black’s king is in a mating net, as in the game.

21 \textup{xf7}+! \textup{xf7} 22 \textup{g6+} \textup{f8} 23 \textup{h7}
Game 57
A.Shirov-V.Topalov
Wijk aan Zee 2001

1 e4 c5 2 ∆f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∆xd4 ∆f6
5 ∆c3 a6 6 ∆e3 e6 7 g4 e5 8 ∆f5!? g6
9 g5 gxg5 10 exf5

White offers the knight to clear the
e4- and d5-squares and the long light-
square diagonal, as well as to keep the
initiative. Instead recapturing the knight
at once allows 10...f4. As usual, the en-
gines tell us that this sacrifice is un-
sound, but many grandmasters do not
agree. We feel, in fact, that Black should
be able to unravel and eventually win
with the extra piece, but many top
grandmasters have lost trying to uphold
our point of view, as in this game.

10...d5 11 ∆f3 d4 12 0-0-0 ∆bd7 13
∆d2 ∆c7 14 gxf6 dxc5 15 ∆xc5 ∆c6 16
∆g3 ∆h6+ 17 ∆b1 ∆f4

The immediate 17...∆xh1 18 ∆xe5 is
fraught with peril for Black, as shown
by the possible continuation 18...∆e4
19 ∆c7 ∆d2 20 ∆d3 ∆c6 21 c4.
18 ∆d3

18...∆g8

At present the daring try 18...0-0 is
unrefuted. White got a small advantage
in the variation 19 ∆g1+ ∆h8 20 ∆b4
∆c5 21 ∆xc5 (after 21 ∆xc5 ∆xc5 22
∆h3 ∆b6 23 ∆a3 ∆e8 24 ∆d6 ∆xh2 25
∆gd1 ∆h6 26 ∆d3 ∆f6 27 ∆f1 ∆c5 28
∆d8 ∆xf5 29 ∆xf5 ∆xd8 30 ∆h3 h6
Black went on to win in P.Smirnov-
A.Shomoev, Kazan 2001) 21...∆xf5 22
∆xc5 ∆xc8 23 ∆d3 ∆xf6 24 ∆b4, but
with a big effort Black later drew in
19 ∆h3 ∆d8 20 ∆b4! ∆xf6 21 ∆c4!

The threat is ∆d6 followed by dou-
bling rooks and/or ∆a5+.
21...∆g5

21...a5 was essential, but after 22
∆d6 ∆g5 23 ∆hd1! axb4 24 f6 White has
a winning attack: for example, 24...∆d2
25. \( \text{exd7} \) \( \text{exd7} \) 26. \( \text{xf7} \) and wins.

\( 22. \text{d6} \) \( \text{g7} \) 23. \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g1}+ \) 24. \( \text{f1} \) 1-0

An amusing final position, with both sides having pieces undeveloped on the first rank so late in the contest. Here 24...\( \text{g8} \) 25. \( \text{a5}+ \) \( \text{e8} \) 26. \( \text{c7} \) b6 27. \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{xf1}+ \) 28. \( \text{xf1} \) mates.

Next, Shirow, a leading supporter of this variation, easily destroys another strong grandmaster.

**Game 58**

A. Shirow - L. Van Wely

Istanbul Olympiad 2000

1. \( \text{e4} \) c5 2. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 3. d4 cxd4 4. \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xf6} \)

5. \( \text{c3} \) a6 6. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 7. \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 8. \( \text{f5} \) g6 9. \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 10. \( \text{exf5} \) d5 11. \( \text{f3} \) d4 12. 0-0-0 \( \text{bd7} \) 13. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f47} \)

Black defers the capture on c3 for the moment.

14. \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{dxc3} \) 15. \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 16. \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h1}+ \)

A new idea which unfortunately finishes in tragedy for Black. For 16...\( \text{h6}+ \) see the previous game.

17. \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{h6}+ \) 18. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd2}+ \) 19. \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{wxg2}?? \)

19...\( \text{xd1}+ \) is the only way to get counterchances, but Black is in trouble anyway: 20. \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 21. \( \text{d5} \) a5 22. \( \text{c4} \) a4 23. \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d8} \) 24. \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 25. \( \text{d6} \) (utter paralysis) 25...h5 26. \( \text{e2} \) e4 27. \( \text{e3} \) h4 28. a3 h3 29. c4 b6 30. d5 \( \text{a7} \) 31. \( \text{xf7} \) when material might be equal, but White’s passed pawns ensure victory. Unless somebody can improve on this line, it seems to us that 16...\( \text{h1} \) is refuted.

20. \( \text{wxg2} \) a5

\( 21. \text{f4}! \)

Winning, according to Van Wely.
21...exf4
How else to meet 22 fxe5?
22 \textit{Wg7 f8 23 \textit{\textit{e1+ d8 24 e7}}

Black is paralysed and helpless. He has to give up material.
24...\textit{c7 25 \textit{xf8 1-0}}

\textbf{Game 59}
\textit{V.Ivanchuk-L.Van Wely}
\textit{Monaco (rapid) 2005}

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd4 f6 5 \textit{c3 a6 6 e3 e6 7 g4 e5 8 f5 g6 9}
\textit{gx f5 10 exf5 d5 11 \textit{f3 d4 12 0-0-0}
\textit{bd7 13 \textit{d2 Wa5}}

14 a3!
After 14 \textit{gx f6 dxc3 15 \textit{xxc3 \textit{b4 16}
\textit{d5 my German friend IM Stefan}
Bromberger (I know him as a master of
novelties which he creates with his
computer; I remember how in a tour-
nament in Barcelona he destroyed a
seemingly stable variation with a new
move) played the novelty 16...\textit{b6},
and after 17 \textit{x e5 \textit{xe5 18 \textit{xe5+ d8 19 g2 c7 20 d1 d7 21 f4 d6 22}
w c4+ \textit{b8 23 e7 d8 24 \textit{xf7 c7 25}
d2 f4 26 b3 \textit{xd2+ 27 xd2 f4+}
28 \textit{d1 e7 29 g3 \textit{xf5 30 e4 \textit{g4+}
31 f3 \textit{g3 32 h3 \textit{d7 33 g4 b6 34}
g5 \textit{c6 35 xc7 \textit{xc7 36 \textit{h7 \textit{xf3+ 37}
d2 \textit{e8 38 g6 d5 39 f7 \textit{d8 Black}
won with his extra rook, M.Carlsen-
S.Bromberger, Gausdal 2004.}

14..dxc3 15 \textit{xcc3 a4 16 \textit{xf6 f4+}
16...\textit{h6+ looks like a good
developing move, but after 17 \textit{b1}
g5 18 d6 \textit{f4 19 \textit{d5 \textit{xf6 20 h3}
Wh4 21 d1 \textit{f8 22 b4 \textit{e7 23 xd7}
(the engines point out that 23 f6! \textit{xf6}
24 \textit{xe5, intending 24...\textit{xh3 25 ed4,}
is another winning line) 23...\textit{xd7 24}
\textit{exe5 g8 25 ed4 e1g+ 26 a2 \textit{xe3 27}
g5 \textit{xe7+ g8 28 xd7 White is winning
due to his piece activity and the open
black king.

17 \textit{xf4 exf4 18 c4!}
According to Ivanchuk, 18 g2 \textit{b8
19 \textit{he1+ d8 20 e7 \textit{e7 21 fxe7+}
ex7 22 \textit{h8 6 23 g7 \textit{e5 24 c4 is
another way to give White the
advantage.

18...\textit{c5 19 \textit{he1+ d8 20 e7!!
The rook on e7 exacerbates all
Black’s problems: paralysed queenside
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pieces, a weak second rank, numerous pawn islands, a weak king, and a soon-to-be-realized passed f-pawn.

20...\(\text{Qf8}\)

_Fritz_ believes that 20...\(\text{Qxf2}\) gives Black a playable game, but our analysis shows that after 21 \(\text{Qxf7} \text{Qa7} 22 \text{Qe6} \text{Qe3+} 23 \text{Qb1} b6 24 f7 \text{Qxe7} 25 \text{Qxh8 Qa8} 26 \text{Qg7} h5 27 \text{Qd5} \text{Qb8} 28 f6+ \text{Qd6} 29 \text{Qf8\+} \text{Qxf8} 30 \text{Qxf8+} \text{Qe5} 31 f7 \text{Qg4 32 Qg7\+} White's f-pawn wins the game. Note too that 20...\(\text{Qxe7?} 21 \text{fxe7+ \text{Qxe7} 22 \text{Qe1+} \text{Qd6} 23 \text{Qxh8}\) is winning for White.

21 \(\text{Qb4}\)

This move helps White anchor his rook on e7, but the exchange of pieces weakens his attack. According to Ivanchuk, 21 \(\text{Qxg7}\?) b6 22 \text{Qe6} \text{Qxe7} 23 \text{Qxd7} \text{Qxd7} 24 \text{fxe7+} \text{Qxe7} 25 \text{Qb4+} \text{Qf6} 26 \text{Qxf8} \text{Qxf5} 27 \text{Qh6} \text{Qe8} 28 \text{Qxf4 Qe2} 29 \text{Qd6\+} \text{Qf7} 30 \text{Qxb6} \text{Qxc2+} 31 \text{Qd1} is good for White.

21...\(\text{Qxb4}\) 22 \(\text{axb4 b5}\) 23 \(\text{Qxf7 Qa7} 24 \text{Qe6}\)

Black simply can't untie his pieces without losing material, while White can improve his pieces as much as he wants.

24...\(\text{h6}\)

24...\(\text{Qxf6}\) 25 \(\text{Qxh7}\) seems unhelpful, as a healthy black pawn is traded for a rickety white pawn, and White gets a new passer to boot.

25 \(\text{Qh7} \text{Qxf6} 26 \text{Qh8\+} \text{Qc7} 27 \text{Qd3! Qf8?}\)

Black can't save material. Ivanchuk points out that 27...\(\text{Qb6!} 28 \text{Qxc8 Qa8} 29 \text{Qc3+} \text{Qd6} 30 \text{h3} \text{Qxc8} 31 \text{Qxc8} \text{Qxc8} 32 \text{Qxc8} \text{Qe5}\) could give Black better chances to survive, but at any rate was good for White.

28 \(\text{Qc3+} \text{Qb6} 29 \text{Qxc8 Qc7} 30 \text{Qxc7} \text{Qxc7} 31 \text{Qxa6} \text{Qb6} 32 \text{Qc8}\)
Three extra pawns should be enough material to win.

32...f3 33 b3 c7 34 e6 cxe6 35 fxe6 xe6 36 h7+ c6 37 f7 e1+ 38 b2 h1 39 f6+ d5 40 xf3+ h2 41 f5+ c6 42 c4 h5 43 c5+ d6 44 xb5 h4 45 h5 h3 46 c3 h1 47 b5 h2 48 b4 1-0

Against such an armada there is no recourse.

Game 60
J.Polgar-V.Anand
Dos Hermanas 1999

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 e3 e6 7 g4 e5 8 f5 g6 9 g5 xf5 10 exf5 d5 11 f3 d4 12 0-0-0 bd7 13 d2 dxc3 14 xc3

14...g7

Instead 14...g8! is a computer move if ever we saw one. I was present when it was played and in the post-mortem Novikov told Krush that in his preparations at home he couldn’t find a single good variation for White: 15 xe5 xe5 17 xd8+ xd8 18 e4 c5 19 h3 h6 20 d1+ e8 21 g4 hxg5 22 f6 xg4 23 xg4 xd8 24 xd8+ xd8 25 xe7+ xe7 26 f5 f6 and Black easily won the endgame in L.Krush-I.Novikov, New York 2001.

Another interesting move is 14...wc7 and after 15 d3 wb6 16 he1 xb4 17 xb4 wb4 18 gxf6 wh4 19 e4 h6+ 20 b1 wb6 21 xb7 xh6 22 xb7 ed8 23 f4 xf5 24 fe5 we see an unclear position with chances for both sides, M.Palac-J.Pinter, Pula 2000.

15 g1 0-0?

According to Judit Polgar, 15...c7 16 gxf6 xf6 17 g4 gives White good play for the piece. However, according to Fritz, the simple 15...g8! 16 f6 (what else?) 16...gxf6 17 gxf6 wb6 gives Black good winning chances.

16 gxf6 xf6 17 e3

This position does not appear too tricky for Black, but somehow White works up a powerful attack.

17...h8 18 f4

18...wb6?!

In this position Polgar considered
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many defensive tries. We will mention here only the most important:

a) 18...\textit{Wh6} 19 \textit{\texttt{c4}}! \textit{f6} (or 19...\textit{b5} 20 \textit{\texttt{d5}} \textit{\texttt{b8}} 21 \textit{\texttt{xg7}} \textit{\texttt{xg7}} 22 \textit{\texttt{g1}} \textit{\texttt{Wh6}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xe5+ f6}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xb8}} \textit{\texttt{xb8}} 25 \textit{\texttt{g3}}, trapping the king) 20 \textit{\texttt{b4}}! \textit{\texttt{d8}} (alternatively, 20...\textit{e8} 21 \textit{\texttt{f7}} \textit{\texttt{d8}} 22 \textit{\texttt{e7}} \textit{\texttt{exf4}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xf3}} \textit{\texttt{f8}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xf8}} \textit{\texttt{xf8}} 25 \textit{\texttt{d8}} mates or wins material, and 20...\textit{exf4} 21 \textit{\texttt{e7}} is winning for White due to the threat of \textit{\texttt{xe6}} 21 \textit{\texttt{b6}}! \textit{\texttt{xf4+}} 22 \textit{\texttt{b1}} \textit{\texttt{e8}} 23 \textit{\texttt{c7}}! \textit{\texttt{xf5}} (23...\textit{b5} 24 \textit{\texttt{f7}} \textit{\texttt{xb4}} 25 \textit{\texttt{xe8}} \textit{\texttt{c5}} 26 \textit{\texttt{xc5}} \textit{\texttt{xc5}} 27 \textit{\texttt{c6}} wins material) 24 \textit{\texttt{f7}} with a deadly attack.

b) 18...\textit{e8}! 19 \textit{\texttt{c4}}!? gives White enough compensation for a piece, but \textit{\texttt{Fritz}} believes that Black is winning. However, we feel that Polgar’s assessment is most likely the more valid: 19...\textit{h6} (the most obvious attempt) 20 \textit{\texttt{g4}} \textit{\texttt{xf5}} 21 \textit{\texttt{h4}} \textit{\texttt{f6}} 22 \textit{\texttt{xb6}}! \textit{\texttt{xf6}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xf7}} \textit{\texttt{f7}} 24 \textit{\texttt{b3}} and despite Black’s extra rook, White seems to be doing well: for instance, 24...\textit{b6} 25 \textit{\texttt{e4}} \textit{\texttt{b8}} (25...\textit{a7} 26 \textit{\texttt{c4}}!) 26 \textit{\texttt{xd7}} \textit{\texttt{xd7}} 27 \textit{\texttt{xe5+ g7}} 28 \textit{\texttt{xb8}} \textit{\texttt{e1+}} 29 \textit{\texttt{d2}} \textit{\texttt{wh2+}} 30 \textit{\texttt{c3}} \textit{\texttt{g3+}} 31 \textit{\texttt{b4}} and wins.

The subtle idea behind this obvious tactic is to induce a fatal weakening of the e6-square.

20...\textit{f6}

Better than 20...\textit{f6}! 21 \textit{\texttt{b1}} \textit{\texttt{wh4}} 22 \textit{\texttt{xf6}} \textit{\texttt{xg3}} 23 \textit{\texttt{g3}} \textit{\texttt{xf6}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xe5}} \textit{\texttt{h6}} 25 \textit{\texttt{xf6+ wh7}} 26 \textit{\texttt{g7+ wh8}} 27 \textit{\texttt{c4}} when the black king is caught in a mating net.

21 \textit{\texttt{d2}} \textit{\texttt{e4}}

According to both Polgar and \textit{\texttt{Fritz}} after 21...\textit{\texttt{xg3}} 22 \textit{\texttt{f5!}} \textit{\texttt{e4}} 23 \textit{\texttt{exf6}} \textit{\texttt{xg3}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xf7+ wh7}} 25 \textit{\texttt{g3}} \textit{\texttt{xf6}} 26 \textit{\texttt{hgxg3}} \textit{\texttt{xf5}} 27 \textit{\texttt{c3}} Black can resign.

22 \textit{\texttt{c4}}

Black has problems untying his pieces while White coordinates her army step by step.

22...\textit{b5}

Polgar mentioned that 22...\textit{\texttt{xb8}} is fruitless due to 23 \textit{\texttt{c3}} \textit{\texttt{xf5}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xf6}} \textit{\texttt{g6}} 25 \textit{\texttt{g7+ wh7}} 26 \textit{\texttt{wh4}}, regaining the sacrificed material with interest.

23 \textit{\texttt{e6}}

23...\textit{\texttt{a7}}

\textit{\texttt{Fritz}} initially thinks that after 23...\textit{\texttt{c5}} Black has a playable position, but according to our analysis Black is
losing after 24 ... e3 gxe6 25 fxe6 g6 26 Wh3 We8 27 f5 g8 28 xd4 f5 29 Axe8 30 xe4 h5 31 Wg2+ Wh8 32 Ah4 Bb8 33 Wg4 g7 34 Exh5+ g8 35 Ah6.

24 c6! a5 25 e3 Bb7 26 d5 Bb8 27 Bc7 b4 28 b3!

At this point even the computer understands that the extra piece is of no value to Black.

28...Bb5 29 c6 Bxf5 30 Bxc8 Bxc8 31 Bxd7 Bcc5 32 Bxf5 Bxf5 33 Bc1!

White has achieved material equality. All Black's pieces are in awkward positions and the outcome is clear.

33...g8 34 Bg2 1-0

White wins material and is ready to commence the final assault.

An original idea from Bologan, which in our view casts doubt on White's sacrifice.

14 ... c4?

14 gxf6 is the most recent try for White: 14...dxc3 15 Bxc3 Wxf6 16 g1 Bb8 17 Wd5 Be7 (better than 17...Be7 18 f4 b6 19 fxe5 Bxe5 20 Bxe5 Wxe5 21 Wd2 Bd8 22 Bxa6 Bc5 23 Bc8 Wxc8 24 Bg3 with a winning attack) 18 Axe1 Wd6 (18...Wxf5 is a possible improvement: 19 Axe5 Wxf2 20 Bd4 Wf4+ 21 Bb1 Axe5 22 Wxe5 Wxe5 23 Bxe5 Bc5 24 g3 Bh3 25 Bc3 Bf2 26 Bxh3 g8 27 Bc1 with some chances for White to hold) 19 Be4 b5 20 f4 Bb7 21 Be2 Bc8 22 fxe5 Wh6+ 23 Bb1 Bxc3 24 Bxc3 Bc6 25 g3 Bc5 26 g2 Wh6 27 e6 fxe6 28 fxe6 Bf8 29 Bc1 Axe6 30 Bxb7 Bf5 31 Be8 Bf4 32 Bc4 Bf7 33 Bg8+ and White won in T.Wedberg-R.Astrom, Sweden 2005.

14...c7 15 Bb3 dxc3 16 Bxc3 e4!
Solving the problem of king safety at a stroke. White's next is justifiable desperation.

20 $\text{axd7} \text{xf4} + 0-1$

**Game 62**

**J. Polgar-R. Kasimdzhanov**

**FIDE World Championship, San Luis 2005**

1 $e4 c5 2 \text{dxc6} d6 3 d4 $\text{cxd4} 4 \text{exd4} \text{c5} 5 \text{c3} a6 6 \text{e3} e6 7 g4 e5 8 $\text{f3} g6 9 g5 $\text{gxf5} 10 $\text{exf5} d5 11 \text{f3} d4 12 0-0-0 $\text{bd7}$

13 $\text{axd4}$

Fritz's favourite move, which is not popular among grandmasters. 13 $\text{d2}$ was analysed in the last few games.

13...$\text{exd4}$ 14 $\text{exd4} \text{g7}$

Probably not the even best try. Judit Polgar mentions 14...$\text{c5}$ 15 $\text{d2} \text{wc7}$ instead and 16 $\text{gxf6} \text{xf6} 17 \text{c4} \text{c7}$ 18 $\text{b3}$ 0-0 19 $\text{e1} \text{h8} 20 \text{e3} \text{d8} 21 \text{d4} \text{xf5} 22 \text{e5} \text{g6} 23 \text{d5} \text{d6} 24 \text{f4} \text{c8} 25 \text{f5} \text{h5} 26 \text{g2} \text{f3} 27 \text{g3} \text{xd5} 28 \text{xd5} \text{b6}$ forced resignation in K. Pulkkinen-L. Oll, Helsinki 1990.

15 $\text{g1} \text{f8}$

We believe that 15...$\text{g8}?! 16 \text{e4} + \text{f8} 17 \text{f6} \text{gxf6} 18 \text{gxf6} \text{xf6} 19 \text{d5} \text{d6} 20 \text{h4} \text{h6} + 21 \text{xh6} \text{xh6} +$ is another way for Black to get the advantage.

16 $\text{d3} \text{d7}$

We think that by stopping $\text{d3}$-$\text{h6}$ with 16...h5!? 17 $\text{xf6} \text{xf6} 18 \text{d1} \text{b6}$ Black obtains the advantage.

17 $\text{d2}$

Fritz thinks that Polgar's variation 17 $\text{dxe7} + \text{xe7} 18 \text{gxf6} + \text{xf6}$ (18...$\text{xf6} 19 \text{f4}!?) 19 $\text{d5} + \text{e8}! 20 \text{d7} \text{d8} 21 \text{exd7} + \text{xd7} 22 \text{xa8} \text{d4}$ gives White the advantage, but our analysis shows equality after 23 $\text{g2} \text{xf2} 24 \text{d1} \text{e8} 25 \text{xb7} + \text{xb7} 26 \text{xd7} + \text{c6} 27 \text{xf7} \text{xa8} 28 \text{e7}$.

17...$\text{h6}$?

After 17...$\text{g8}! 18 \text{gxf6} \text{xf6} 19 \text{d3} \text{h6} 20 \text{exg8} + \text{ag8} 21 \text{f4} \text{xf5} 22 \text{d5} \text{h8} 23 \text{h3} \text{e4} 24 \text{e3} \text{e4} 25 \text{f4} + \text{f8} 26 \text{e3} \text{c5} 27 \text{b4} \text{c6} 28 \text{d4} + \text{f6} 29 \text{d8} \text{h3} 30 \text{xa8} \text{g8} \text{Black has a huge advantage due to White's weak pawns and king.}$

18 $\text{gxf6} \text{xf6}$

Instead 18...$\text{xf6}?! 19 \text{d5} \text{e5} 20 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 21 \text{d3} \text{e3} \text{e5} 22 \text{e3} \text{f6} 23 \text{f4} + \text{g8} 24 \text{e5} + \text{h7} 25 \text{d6}$ wins material for White, but 18...$\text{xf6}! 19 \text{d6} \text{xf5} 20 \text{d5} \text{e5} 21 \text{b4} \text{a5} 22 \text{d7} + \text{xb4} 23 \text{d8} + \text{e8} 24 \text{xf7} + \text{g7} 25 \text{d8} + \text{e7} 26 \text{e8} + \text{d8} 27 \text{xf7} + \text{ag8} 28 \text{c5} 27 \text{c4} \text{c2} 28 \text{e1} + \text{f6} 29 \text{b6} \text{f4} + 30 \text{b1} \text{e6} 31 \text{c6} \text{xe6} 32 \text{d7} + \text{f5} 33 \text{c5} \text{g8} 34 \text{dxe6} \text{g2} 35 \text{xf4} \text{xf4} 36 \text{a4}$ should be a draw.

19 $\text{d8} + \text{e8} 20 \text{b5} +$
Clearing a path for the rook to visit e1, of course, but this sacrifice is a bit deeper than it looks at first.

20...AXB5

Polgar points out 20...AXB5 21 axa8 AXB5 22 e5+ Xd6 23 Xxe8+ AXe8 24 Xg7 wins for White.

21 Xe1 b4?

According to Polgar, 21...e5 22 f4 e6 23 Xxe8+! Xxe8 24 Xxe8+ AXe8 25 Xe4 Xe7 26 f6 Xg8 27 Xd6+! Xd7 28 Xxe8+ Xxe8 29 Xc3+ Xd7 30 fxe7 wins for White.

22 AXb5??

Missing 22 Xxe8+! Xxe8 23 Xxe7+ AXe7 24 Xd5+ Xd6 25 AXb6+ XC6 26

\(\text{Qxa8} \text{Qxf5} 27 Xc7 Xg6 28 Xd5\) and wins.

22...AXb2+?

A slip in return. Polgar mentions that 22...e5! 23 b1 Xg7 24 Xd5 Xg5 wins for Black.

23 AXb2

23 AXb1 was another good approach for White: for example, 23...e5 24 f4 f6 25 fxe5 fxe5 26 f6 Xe6 27 Xxe8+ AXe8 28 Xc7+ Xd7 29 Xxe6 Xxe6 30 Xxb4 and White is up material.

23...Xf6+ 24 Xd4 Xg7 25 Xxe8 Xxe8 26 Xxe8 Xxd4+ 27 Xxd4 Xf6 28 f4

While Black’s pieces are paralysed, White is improving her pieces every move.

28...b6 29 Xd8 AXb7 30 Xxa8 AXa8

In this unusual position it’s easy for White’s king to capture the b-pawns and win by creating a passed pawn on the queenside.

31 Xb3 Xd5+ 32 Xb4 AXa2 33 AXb5 Xb1 34 c3 Xe7 35 Xb6 Xd6 36 c4 Xd3 37 c5+ Xd5 38 Xc6 Xe4 39 Xe7 Xc2 40 c6 AXa4 41 c7 Xd7 42 Xc5 1-0

After 42...Xxf4 43 Xd6 nothing can stop White’s passed pawn.
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

Game 63
N. Davis - G. Wastell
Australia 1973

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4 Qf6
5 Qc3 Qc6 6 a4 e6 7 Qe3 Qe7 8 Qb3
0-0 9 We2

Again we see the Velimirovic Attack.

9...a6 10 0-0-0 Qc7 11 Qg1 Qd7 12 Qg
Qc5 13 g5 Qd7 14 Qg3

14...Qfd8

To us 14...Qf6? looks like a good move which helps in the attack on the white king: 15 Wh5 g6 16 Wh6 Qf8 17 Wh4 Qxd4 18 Qxd4 Qxb3+ 19 axb3 e5? (Black should play 19...Qe7 with the threat of ...h5) 20 Qd2 Qe6 21 Qh3! (it seems Black overlooked this) 21...h5 22 gxh6 Qh7 23 Qf3 Qe7 24 Qg5 Qf8 25 Qf6 b5 26 f4 Qxb3 27 fxe5 Qe6 28 Qd5 Wa5 29 Qb1 Qe7 30 Qf4 and Black had to resign in G. Binder - A. Lanc, German League 1996.

15 Wh5 g6 16 Wh4

Alternatively, 16 Wh6!? Qf8 17 Wh4 Qe7 18 f4 b5 (18...h5 19 f5 Qxd4 20 Qxd4 Qxb3+ 21 axb3 Qac8 is also possible for those with strong nerves) 19 f5 b4 leads to an unclear position with chances for both sides.

16...b5?

Instead 16...h5!? could delay White’s attack down the h-file and give Black valuable time for counter-threats against the white king.

Possible too is 16...Qac8!? 17 Qf5 Qxb3+ (17...gxh5? 18 Qh3 Qd8 19 Wh7 Qe8 20 g6 is White’s big idea) 18 axb3 h5 (18...exf5? 19 Qd5 Wa5 20 Qxe7+ Qxe7 21 Qd4 fxe4 22 Wh6 Wa1+ 23 Qd2 Wa5+ 24 c3 f6 25 gxf6 Qc3+ 26 Qxe3 Qf5 27 f7+ Qxf7 28 Wh7+ leads to mate) 19 Qh6+ Qg7 20 f4 Wa5 21 Qb1 Qb4, which gives chances for both sides.

17 Qf5!!

It’s rare for this knight to impale itself on two pawns, but here it does. If the g-pawn captures, then 18 Qh3 follows when the counter 18...h5 is no longer available, while the usual drawbacks apply to the e-pawn capture.

17...Qxb3+

Fleshing out the alternatives a little:
a) 17...gx5 18 £h3 £xb3+ 19 axb3 £f8 20 £xh7 £e8 21 g6 £c8 22 £d5! £b7 23 £xf7+ £d7 24 £b6 exd5 25 £xf5+ wins.

b) 17...h5!? could put up the most resistance, but after 18 £h6+ £g7 19 f4 £xh3 20 axb3 b4 21 £a4 £dc8 22 £b6 £b8 23 f5 (or 23 £f2 £d8 24 £gd3 £c7 25 f5 exf5 26 exf5 £e5 27 £d4 £xf5 28 £xf5+ gxf5 29 g6 £b5 30 gx7 £xf7 31 £hx5+ and White has a crushing attack) 23...exf5 24 exf5 £h7 25 £e3 £c7 26 £g2 £ab8 27 £f2 £e5 28 £b6 £e8 29 £d4 White has emerged with some advantage.

18 axb3 exf5??

Even though Fritz will initially tell you that White is completely losing, analysis shows that White is winning. Indeed, Mr. Davis finished his attack much better than Fritz!

19 £d5 £a5 20 £xe7+ £xe7 21 £d4!

Nothing can save Black. The obvious threat is, of course, 22 £xh7+.

21...fxe4

Here Black had a few choices, all of them bad: 21...£f8 22 £xh7 £e6 23 £h8+ £g8 24 exf5 gx5 25 £f6 £dc8 26 £b1 f4 27 £gd3 d5 28 £xd5 £xd5 29 £g7+ £e8 30 £xg8+ £d7 31 £xf7+ £c6 32 £xd5+ £b6 33 £d4+ £c7 34 £f7+ is winning for White, as is 21...£a1+ 22 £d2 £a5+ 23 £c3.

22 £h6 £f5

Or 22...£a1+ 23 £d2 £a5+ 24 £c3 £xc3+ 25 £xc3 £g4 26 £h4 £xd1 27 £xd1 d5 28 £h3 and wins.

23 £xh7+!

By now this type of offer should seem routine to our readers.
After 14...exd5 15 cxd5 wxb7 16 e5 the attack is strong; for example, 16...dxe6 17 exd6 cxd8 18 f4 f6 19 wxf3 c7 20 d7 wxd7 21 wxe4 dxe8 22 c5 cxd5 23 wxc5+ d6 24 wfd6 c7 25 wxc6 fxd4+ 26 b1 wxc6 27 wxe7+ f7 28 wxc6 dxe2 29 wxe8+ d5 30 fxe1 wxe1 31 wxe1 d4 32 wxe4+ f5 33 wxe7 wxc5 34 d6 d5 35 wxe5 fxe5 36 wxf7+ Black gave up in G.Ginsburg-Z.Lanka, Cappelle la Grande 1997.

15 g5 exf5

After 15...wxc8 16 w5 d5 e5 17 f4 w6 18 g3 b4 19 w3 d8 20 d4 exd5 21 e7 d8 22 d4 f6 23 gxf6 w6 24 f7+ Black gave up in G.Ginsburg-Z.Lanka, Cappelle la Grande 1997.

16 g6!

From this moment Fritz thinks that Black is absolutely winning. Moreover, Salov defends his position exactly like Fritz, but here Fritz’s amazing ability to defend is overwhelmed by human attacking skills.

16...hxg6

Another fruitless defence is 16...d5 17 exf5 a6 18 w5 h5 h5 19 fxg6 w3d8 20 w5! w5+ 21 w5 c3+ 22 d1 w4 23 w7+ w7 24 w7 d5 25 w4 b4 26 wxe5 wxc3 27 w7 g6 and White will checkmate in a couple of moves.

17 w7 g5 18 w7+!

Opening the helpless king even further.

18...w7 19 w4+ w5 20 e5 w8 21 w4+ f6 22 f7 w7

According to both Fritz and Sokolov, after 22...wxd5 23 gxf7+ w6 24 w4 w7 25 w4 f6 26 w4 w7 Black is losing.

23 w4 w6 24 f7+ w5 25 w5 exf6 w4 26 w3 w7

Unappealing too was 24...w6, since 25 w4+ w6 25 w7+ w7+ 28 w5+ (28 w6+ w7 29 w5+ wins) 26 w3 w3 27 w5+ w6 28 w6 w7+ w7+ w7+ w7+ w7+

25 w1 w5 26 w5 w4+ 27 w4 w5+ w6 28 w6 w7+ w7+ w7+ w7+ w7+

Another pleasant alternative was 29 w5+ w6 29 w5+ w7+ w7+ w7+ w7+

29...w5 30 w7+ 1-0

Black resigned, not a moment too soon because of 30...w7 31 w5 w6 32 w3+. 
Game 65
M.Hansen-G.Fawbush
correspondence 1983

1 e4 c5 2 d4 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 f6 5 c3 d6 6 c4 c6 7 e3 e7 8 e2 0-0 9 0-0 a6 10 b3 c7 11 g4 d7

Compared with the Velimirovic game in the introduction to this chapter, Black has castled already and avoided an early ...b5.

Here 11...a5!? was good for Black after White attacked with 12 g5 d7 13 h4 b5 14 g6 c5 15 gxf7+ xf7 16 b1 a5 17 b3 b4 18 c5 bxc3 19 b3 a5 20 d4 b7 21 c1 b2 22 g5 f8 23 g1 a4 24 f b5 25 h5 a3; Black's extra pawn survived while White's attack soon disappeared in H.Nakamura-I.Van Wely, Bastia (rapid) 2007.

12 g1 a5 13 g5 b3+ 14 b3 b5 15 f4 b4?

Black has to cover the d5-square with 15...b7.
16 f5!

White must strike before Black develops all his pieces, in particular the light-squared bishop.

16...exf5

To help us get a better feeling for the Velimirovic, we will also analyse:

a) 16...bxc3!? 17 e7+ h8 18 f5 cxb2+ 19 x b2 b7 20 f6 g6 21 d4 ffd8 22 h4 c5 23 h5 x e4 24 h x g6 x g6 25 wh2 e5 26 h4 wb7 27 el1 wins for White.

b) According to Fritz, 16...d8 is winning for Black, but our analysis shows that 17 d4! (threatening 18 h6+) 17...bx c3 (17...exf5? 18 d5 a5 19 wh5 c5 20 f6+ x f6 21 gxf6 g6 22 w h6 d6 23 e3 with a forced mate) 18 h6+ h8 19 wh5 transposes to variation 'c1'.

c) 16...c5

with a further divide:

c1) 17 h6+ (we spent much time on this line before hitting on the simpler alternative, 'c2'; the complications are hard to fathom) 17...gxh6? (stronger is 17...h8! 18 d4 bxc3 19 wh5 d8 20 b1 a7 and Black seems to survive, such as in the long line 21 e5 cxb2
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22 exd6 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) a5 23 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xh2 \( \text{\textit{D}} \) e4 24 f5 \( \text{\textit{C}} \) c3+ 25 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xc3 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) x3 26 \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g3 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) a5 27 d7 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) xd7 28 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xd7 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xh2 29 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) x7+ \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g8 30 g6 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) xg6 31 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) h6+ \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8 32 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f7+ and it's perpetual) 18 g6 33 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h6+ \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f6 20 \( \text{\textit{d}} \) d4

26 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h6+ \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g8 27 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xd4 dxe5 28 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) c7 is an elegant possibility.

20 fxg6 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) f6

20...h6!? could give White many problems:

a) 21 \( \text{\textit{C}} \) c4? \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8 22 \( \text{\textit{d}} \) d4 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f8? (better is 22...f6 23 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) c7 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f5 24 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xe8 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) xe8 25 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x4 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) e6 26 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) e2 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xa8 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) h5 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) g8 27 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x5 dxc5 28 f5 \( \text{\textit{d}} \) d5 29 f6 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) d8 30 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f7+ \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8 31 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h4 a5 32 \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g1 a4 33 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) x8 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) x8 34 \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g5+ 35 \( \text{\textit{b}} \) b1 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) xg6 36 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) x8+ \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h7 37 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8+ \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8 38 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f8+ \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g8 39 \( \text{\textit{d}} \) d8 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) e6 and 1-0 was D.Velimirovic-B.Ivanovic, Niksic 1978.

b) Better is 21 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f5!: for instance, 21...f6 (or 21...\( \text{\textit{g}} \) g5 22 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xg5 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) xg5 23 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) c4 \( \text{\textit{D}} \) e5 24 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f6+ \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8 25 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x5 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) x4 26 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) x8 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xf5 27 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \) c7 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) c8 28 bxc4 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x7 29 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x6 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) g6 30 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) xg6 h x g 5 31 b3, which leads to a winning endgame) 22 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) c4 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h8 23 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x6 \( \text{\textit{D}} \) e5 24 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) f4 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f8 25 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) d1 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) a5 26 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) e4 \( \text{\textit{d}} \) d7 27 \( \text{\textit{b}} \) b1 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) d8 28 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x g 7 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x g 7 29 f6+ \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x f6 30 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) x f6 \( \text{\textit{A}} \) c5 31 \( \text{\textit{h}} \) h5+ \( \text{\textit{g}} \) g8 32 \( \text{\textit{f}} \) f4 finishes off.

21 \( \text{\textit{W}} \) h5
21...hxg6

21...h6 locking it up is a stronger defence. Could this be why Patrick Wolff chose 19.d4 in our next game?

22 hxg6 h6

After 22...hxg6 23 ed1 b6 24 d3 a7 25 h6 Black is losing because he can't defend the g7-square.

23 a6!

An attempt to divert a defender from f6.

23...wc8

It's mate after 23...xf6 24 xf6+ ef7 25 eg5+ ef8 26 wh8+ ef7 27 xg7+ e6 28 e1+ e4 29 xe4.

24 h6!!

According to Hansen, after 25...xf6 26 gh8+ h6 27 wh6+ the attack is too strong: 27...g8 (or 27...h7 28 ed4+ e6 29 xe5 wh8 30 e6+ g8 31 g1+ and White will checkmate in couple of moves) 28 g6+ h8 29 xf6+ h7 30 f7+ h6 31 xd6+ and wins.

26 h7+ e7

Or 26...g7 27 g1+ h8 28 wh6 and it's all over.

27 e1+ e5 28 xe5+ dx5 29 xe5+ e6

Hansen was ready to meet 29...d7 with 30 f6+ c6 31 c5 mate.

30 w7+ d7 31 c5+ e6 32 f5+ d5

33 f6 mate (1-0)

An amazing checkmate which fully deserves a diagram.

Game 66

P.Wolff-1.Sokolov
Baguio City 1987

1 e4 c5 2 f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 c6
5 c3 d6 6 e3 f6 7 c4 c7 8 we2
a6 9 0-0-0 ♘c7 10 ♘b3 0-0

In the early development of this variation 10...♘d7 preparing ...♗b5 was one of the most popular moves. For example, 11 ♗b1 (11 g4 ♘xd4 12 ♘xd4 ♘c6 13 g5 ♘d7 14 ♘g1 ♘c5 15 h4 offered chances to both sides in D.Janosevic-M.Kapelan, Vrsac, 1977) 11...♗b5 12 ♗f4 ♘a5 13 ♗f3 ♘b7 14 e5 dxe5 15 fxe5 ♘xf3 16 gxf3 ♘h5 17 ♘g1 ♘c6 18 a4 ♘xd4 19 ♘c6 20 axb5 axb5 21 ♗e4 0-0 22 ♘g5 ♘fd8 23 c3 ♘xd4 24 cxd4 ♘xg5 25 hxg5 ♘f4 26 ♘g4 was equal, but somehow Black managed to win in M.Damjanovic-V.Simagin, Sochi 1967.

11 ♘h1 ♗b5 12 g4 ♘a5 13 g5 ♘xb3+ 14 axb3 ♘d7 15 f4 ♘b4? 16 ♘f5 ♘xf5 17 ♘d5 ♘d8 18 ♘xf5 ♘e8 19 ♘d4!

According to Paunovic this is a powerful novelty, improving over our previous game.

19...♘f8

An important alternative is 19...♗b7 20 g6!. Here we believe that in this complicated position, White should win in all variations:

a) 20...hxg6 21 fxg6 ♘xd5 22 ♘h5 ♘f6 23 ♘h7+ ♘f8 24 gxh7 ♘xf7 25 ♘xg7+ ♘xg7 26 ♘xg7+ ♘e6 27 ♘g4+ ♘e7 28 ♘g5+ ♘f7 29 ♘xd5+ ♘f8 30 ♘xf5+ ♘xf5 31 ♘f6 ♘c8 32 ♘g6 ♘e7 33 ♘g1 and it's all over.

b) 20...♘f6 21 gxh7 ♘xf7 22 ♘h5+ ♗f8 (or 22...♗g8 23 ♘xf6+ ♘xf6 24 ♘xg7+ ♘xg7 25 ♘g1+ ♗h8 26 ♘xe8+ ♘xe8 27 ♘xc6 mate) 23 ♘xh7 ♘e5 24 fxe5 ♘xe5 25 ♘c5+ ♘f7 26 ♘xf6 ♘xf6 27 ♘d7+ checkmates in couple of moves.

c) 20...♗f6 21 gxh7 ♘xf7 22 ♘e6+ ♘f8 23 ♘xg7! ♘xg7 24 ♘g1+ ♗h6 25 ♘xg5 ♘c8 26 ♘xf6 ♘xf6 27 ♘xf6 ♘xe6 28 ♘g4 mate.

d) 20...fxg6 21 ♘e6+ ♗h8 22 ♘xg7+ ♘xg7 23 ♘xg6 ♘e5 24 gxh7+ ♘g5 25 ♘xg5+ ♘xg5 26 h8♕+ ♘xh8 27 ♘h3+ wins material.

20 ♘h5 ♘e4

After 20...♗b7 21 ♘d3 ♘xd5 22 ♘h3 h6 23 gxh6 ♘f6 24 ♘h4 ♘h7 25 ♘g4 White has a winning attack.

21 ♘f6!

An important alternative is 21...♗b7 22 ♘g6+. Here we believe that in this complicated position, White should win in all variations:

a) 21...hxg6 22 fxg6 ♘xd5 23 ♘h7+ ♘f8 24 gxh7 ♘xf7 25 ♘xg7+ ♘xg7 26 ♘xg7+ ♘e6 27 ♘g4+ ♘e7 28 ♘g5+ ♘f7 29 ♘xd5+ ♘f8 30 ♘xf5+ ♘xf5 31 ♘f6 ♘c8 32 ♘g6 ♘e7 33 ♘g1 and it's all over.

b) 20...♘f6 21 gxh7 ♘xf7 22 ♘h5+ ♗f8 (or 22...♗g8 23 ♘xf6+ ♘xf6 24 ♘xg7+ ♘xg7 25 ♘g1+ ♗h8 26 ♘xe8+ ♘xe8 27 ♘xc6 mate) 23 ♘xh7 ♘e5 24 fxe5 ♘xe5 25 ♘c5+ ♘f7 26 ♘xf6 ♘xf6 27 ♘d7+ checkmates in couple of moves.

c) 20...♗f6 21 gxh7 ♘xf7 22 ♘e6+ ♘f8 23 ♘xg7! ♘xg7 24 ♘g1+ ♗h6 25 ♘xg5 ♘c8 26 ♘xf6 ♘xf6 27 ♘xf6 ♘xe6 28 ♘g4 mate.

d) 20...fxg6 21 ♘e6+ ♗h8 22 ♘xg7+ ♘xg7 23 ♘xg6 ♘e5 24 gxh7+ ♘g5 25 ♘xg5+ ♘xg5 26 h8♕+ ♘xh8 27 ♘h3+ wins material.

21 ♘e8

More stubborn was 21...♗a5, although after 22 g6 fxg6 23 fxg6 h6 24 ♘xg7 ♘c5 25 ♘f6 ♘g7 26 ♘b1 ♘b7 27
\[ \text{xg7 xg7 28 f5 \text{Qd7 29 f6+ Qxf6 30 Qxf6 Ze5 31 Wh4 White is winning. Meanwhile after 21...gx}\text{f6? 22 Qxf6+ Qxf6 23 gxf6+ \text{Sh8 24 Wg5 \text{Sh6 25 Wh6 mate follows.}} 22 \text{Qc7 Qxf6 23 gxf6 Wd8}} \]

According to Paunovic, 23...Wd7 24 \[ \text{Exg7+ Exg7 25 Wg5 traps the black king.} \]

\[ \text{24 Qd5 Qb7 25 fxg7 Qe7 26 Qg3 Qf6 27 Wh3 Qxg7 28 Wxh7+ Qf8} \]

\[ \text{29 Qf6} \]

Paunovic and Fritz point out that White missed the simple 29 Wxg7+! \[ \text{xg7 30 Wg1+ Qf8 31 Qh8 mate.} \]

\[ \text{29...Qxf6 30 Wxe4 Qa5 31 Qf5 Qg7 32 Qd7 1-0} \]

---

**Game 67**

**S.Martinovic-V.Musil**

**Yugoslavia 1973**

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 exd4 e6 5 Qc3 d6 6 Qe3 Qf6 7 Qc4 Qe7 8 We2 a6 9 0-0-0 Qc7 10 Qb3 Qa5 11 g4 b5 12 g5 Qxb3+ 13 axb3 Qd7 14 Qf5+ exf5 15 Qd5 Qd8 16 exf5 Qb7 17 f6 gxf6 18

\[ \text{Heal? Qxd5 19 Qxd5 Qg8 20 Qf4!} \]

This is assessed by Yrjola as 'a risky attempt to win' in his *Easy Guide to the Classical Sicilian*. The threat to take with the bishop on d6 forces further concessions from Black. Moreover, for his piece, White has one pawn, the safer king, the better structure, the more active pieces and an enduring initiative.

Is it enough, though?

The alternative 20 gxf6 will be seen in the next game.

\[ \text{20...Qg8} \]

The weaker 20...Qc5 21 gxf6 Qxf6 22 Qxe5 Qxe5 23 f4 Qf8 24 fxe5 Wg5+ 25 Qb1 dxe5 26 Qxe5 gives White a safe edge.

\[ \text{21 Qh5} \]

After 21 Qxd6 Qxd6 22 Qxd6 fxg5 23 We4 Qg6 24 Wd4 Qc8 25 Qxd7 Wf6 26 Wd2 Wf5 27 c3 Qf6 28 Qe2 h6 29 Qd4 Qcc6 30 h4 Qce6 31 Qxe6 Qxe6 32 hxc5 Wxc5 33 Qxg5 h5 34 Qd5 f6 35 Qd2 a draw was looking likely in M.Paragua-D.Khismatullin, Oropesa del Mar 2000.

\[ \text{21...Qg7?} \]

According to Vladimir Sokolov, 21...Qa5 is the best try. Indeed, 22 We2
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1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 d5 c6 5 g3 c6 6 c4 e6 7 e3 e7 8 w2 a6 9 0-0-0 w7c7 10 b3 a5 11 g4 b5 12 g5 axb3+ 13 axb3 d7 14 f5

A necessary corollary to the previous play. White exposes the enemy king further and lures it forward.

22...exf7! 23...xd6+ e6

The fearless king has to attack White’s pieces to gain a tempo for developing its army. Worse is 23...e8 24 e2+ e5 25 gxf6 g1+ 26 d2 xf6 27 e5+ d7 28 d3 w6+ 29 e2 xd6 30 e5 e8+ 31 f3 e6 32 xd6+ xe6 33 w7h7 and White has good winning chances.

24 c4! bxc4 25 bxc4 xg5 26 wh3+ f5 27 fa1 f6?

Black should curb his Steinitzian impulse and hide his king with 27...g1+ 28 d2 f6 29 w7h7 g2+ 30 d3 w8 31 xf5+ g7 32 xd7 w7+ 33 d4 d2+ 34 e3 xd5 35 xd5 w7h2 when a perpetual is likely.

28 e3+ e4 29 fxg5 e8

29...w5 30 f4 w6 31 wb6+ e7 32 wb7+ f6 33 wa8 wins for White.

30 b3 c6 31 e5+ d7 32 wa7+ c8 33 wa8+ wd7 34 wb7+ 1-0

White wins material.

Game 68
M.Sion Castro-S.Atalik
Oviedo 1993

1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 d5 c6 5 g3 c6 6 c4 e6 7 e3 e7 8 w2 a6 9 0-0-0 w7c7 10 b3 a5 11 g4 b5 12 g5 axb3+ 13 axb3 d7 14 f5

14...exf5

The knight doesn’t have to be touched and 14...b4!? 15 a4 bxc3 16 xg7+ d8 17 e6+ fxe6 18 xh8 e5 19 wh1 b7 20 f6 xf6 21 xf6 xf6 22 g8+ e7 23 d1 xg8 24 xg8 w5 25 bxc3 xc3 26 wh5 wa1+ 27 d2 wd4+ 28 c1 wa1+ finished as a perpetual check in L.Dominguez-Cu.Hansen, Esbjerg 2003.

15 d5 w8 16 exf5 d7 17 f6 xg6

After 17...xd5 18 fxe7 (18 xd5 xg6 19 d4 f8 20 wh5 h6 21 w7g1 e5 22 f4 g6 23 xf6 xf6 24 xg6 xd4
25 gx{6} w{a}5 26 {x}d{4} also gives White an advantage, (A.Minasyan-T.Thorhallsson, Bled Olympiad 2002).

18...g{8} 19 {x}d{5} {x}g{7} 20 f{4} d{8} 21 h{4} w{a}5 22 e{1} e{8} 23 d{4} g{6} 24 c{3} w{d}8 25 w{h}5 g{8} 26 b{1} f{6} 27 {x}e{8}+ w{e}8 28 f{5} x{c}3 29 b{xc}3 w{e}1+ 30 b{2} g{7} 31 {x}d{6} f{6} 32 e{6} g{1} 33 gxf{6} Black resigned in A.Zapata-R.Leitao, Americana 1997.

18 w{h}1 e{5} 19 {x}d{5} g{8}

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, this line is still played 40 years after its debut in 1967.

20 gxf{6}

Theory considers this a safer approach than Martinovic's 20 f{4}. The only drawback is that a draw is quite likely. Of course, when playing a strong grandmaster that may be a benefit.

20...{x}f{6} 21 f{5} b{8}

Alternatively:

a) 21...g{6}?! 22 b{6} w{d}7 23 f{3} c{8} 24 xf{6} d{5} 25 xgx{6} hxg{6} 26 w{f}6 w{b}7 27 b{4} c{4} 28 f{3} and Black was overwhelmed in S.Azarov-B.Jobava, Kemer 2007.

b) After the aggressive 21...g{4}! an unclear position was reached following 22 g{5} (22 g{5} e{5} 23 x{e}7 w{e}7 24 f{4} w{e}6 25 w{e}4 d{3}+ 26 d{2} x{e}1 27 w{xa}8+ w{e}7 28 w{b}7+ w{e}8 29 w{a}8+ w{e}7 30 w{b}7+ led to a draw in M.Sion Castro-Z.Franco Ocampos, Pamplona, 1998) 22...x{g}5 23 x{g}5 e{5} 24 x{e}7 w{xe}7, but this was actually agreed drawn in J.Howell-A.Lisenko, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

22 h{4} g{4}!

This appears to us to be the best remedy against the threatened g{5}. Of course, Black would love to snap off that nasty cleric, so...

23 g{5}

23 g{1}? h{6}! achieves a favourable simplification.

23...f{6}! 24 w{g}4 fx{g}5 25 w{h}5+ d{7}

26 x{e}7+!

Some folks call this a 'fifty-percenter'. Maybe Black will oblige with 26...x{e}7?? allowing mate in one.

26...x{e}7 27 f{7} x{h}4 28 x{e}7+ w{e}7 29 w{x}h{7}+ 1/2-1/2

We believe that had play continued, a perpetual would have ensued 20 or

113
so moves down the road. Apparently the opponents shared our forecast and decided to save time.

**Game 69**
**G.Kasparov-B.Gelfand**
**Amsterdam 1996**

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 exd4 4 cxd4 f6
5 c3 a6 6 e2 e5 7 b3 e7 8 0-0 0-0
9 h1 c6 10 f4 a5
Perhaps better is 10...b5: for example, 11 a3 a5 12 dxa5 wxc5 13 wxe1 c7 14 a3 b7 15 kg3 fe8 16 e3 c4 17 fxe5 dxe5 18 h6 f8 19 c6 was roughly even in W.Arencibia Rodriguez-Y. Quezada, Santa Clara 2007.
11 a4 b4 12 e3
According to Kasparov, 12 e3 d5 13 fxe5 dxe4 14 e3 xc3 15 bxc3 c6 leads to an unclear position.

In a more recent game, 12...e6 13 e3 c7 14 d2 c4 15 f5 xc2 16 dxa5 a5 17 xc2 d7 18 b3 c7 19 c1 c8 20 d2 d8 21 b4 a8 22 a5 h6 23 b6 e8 24 d3 d5 25 xd5 led to a draw in S.Azarov-F.Vallejo Pons, European Championship, Plovdiv 2008.

13 g4 exf4
Kasparov points out that 13...e6? 14 g5 e8 15 f5 ecx2 16 fxe6 xc3 17 a3 wc4 18 e2 wins for White.
14 xf4 d7 15 d4 g6
We believe that 15...e5 16 f5 xf5 17 exf5 fx3 18 xf3 c6 19 ad1 ac8 20 wc6 bxc6 21 d2 d5 is roughly even.
16 h6 e8 17 f5!?

White sacrifices the knight to open the g-file for his attack. It’s not so easy for Black to regroup his pieces for the defence, although he hopes that his knight’s access to e5 will help repulse White’s invasion. Both 17 e3 and 17 e2 were safer ways to continue the attack.

17...gxf5
Kasparov points out that 17...e5 18 e7+ e7 19 g5 is better for White, but our further analysis show that after 19...e8 20 e2 e6 21 d2 xg4 22 xg4 xg4 23 f6 e6 24 h6 xf6 25 xf6 e6 the position is unclear.
18 gx{f}5 {f}6?

We believe that 18...{h}h8! 19 {g}1 {f}8 (according to Kasparov, 19...{g}8? 20 {x}g{+} 21 {g}1+ {x}g1+ 22 {x}g1+ {h}8 23 {h}5 is winning for White) 20 {d}2 {d}5 21 {x}f8 {x}f8 22 {e}5 {x}e5 23 {g}5 {g}6 24 {x}d5 {x}d5 25 {x}d5 {x}b2 26 {l}f{1} {d}7 27 fxg6 fxg6 gives Black good chances to win.

19 {g}1+ {h}8 20 {d}2

White takes back his piece and starts the second wave of the attack.

23...{g}7?!

Black trades his most important defender and gets in trouble. We believe Kasparov is right when he mentioned that 23...{e}5 24 {a}d1 {e}6 25 {b}5 {c}4 26 {e}2 gives White only a slight advantage.

24 {x}g7+ {x}g7 25 {a}d1

After Black traded his bishop, the d6-pawn became an excellent target for the attack.

25...{d}7 26 {g}3 {e}5 27 {g}2

Kasparov prefers 27...{e}2? {c}6 (after 27...{f}8? 28 {x}e5+ White wins material, while 27...{x}c2 28 {c}4 {e}6 29 {x}e6 {x}e6 30 {d}5 {c}6 31 {h}3 {x}e4 32 {f}7+ wins) 28 {x}d6 {c}5 29 {d}f6 when White has a clear advantage.

27...{x}c2

Kasparov points out that other tries are fruitless: 27...{e}8 28 {f}4! {e}6 29 {b}5 is winning for White, and 27...{f}8 28 {f}8 {f}8 29 {f}1+ {g}8 30 {h}4 {e}8 31 {f}6 {d}8 32 {x}d6 gives White some advantage.

28 {d}5 {d}8 29 {f}2!

b) 20...{d}8 21 {b}5 {a}6 (21...{e}5 22 {x}d6 {a}6 23 {x}e8 {x}d2 24 {x}d2 {x}f3 25 {x}f6 is winning for White) 22 {e}7 {x}f7 23 {g}2 {x}c2 24 {g}7+ {g}8 25 {g}3 {e}5 26 {f}6+ {g}6 27 fxg6 fxg6 28 {a}c1 {x}a4 29 {c}7 {d}7 30 {h}5! {x}e4 31 {x}g6 {g}4 32 {x}g4 {x}g4 33 {h}5 and to escape checkmate Black is forced to surrender material.

21 {g}2 {g}6 22 fxg6 fxg6 23 {g}f1
A decisive move which attacks Black's knight and prepares \( \texttt{Wf7} \) and/or \( \texttt{Qb6} \).

**29...\texttt{Qb4}**

According to Kasparov, after

29...\texttt{Qc8} 30 \texttt{Qb6} \texttt{Qg4} 31 \texttt{Qxc8} \texttt{Qxd1} 32 \texttt{Qb6} \texttt{Qc5} (32...\texttt{Qg4} 33 \texttt{Qc4} wins) 33 \texttt{Qd5} \texttt{Qh5} 34 \texttt{Wf7+} \texttt{Qh8} (34...\texttt{Qh6} 35 \texttt{Qf6}) 35 \texttt{Qe7} White's mating threats will finish the game.

**30 \texttt{Qb6} \texttt{Qg4} 31 \texttt{Wf7+}**

Another way to finish the game was 31 \texttt{Qc1} \texttt{Qb8} 32 \texttt{Wf7+} \texttt{Qh6} 33 \texttt{Qc7} \texttt{Wh5} 34 \texttt{Wxh7+} \texttt{Qg5} 35 \texttt{Wg7} \texttt{Qa6} 36 \texttt{Qc7} \texttt{Wh8} 37 \texttt{Qf5+} \texttt{Qh4} 38 \texttt{Wf7+} g5 39 \texttt{Wxd6}.

**31...\texttt{Qh8} 32 \texttt{Qxa8} \texttt{Qxd1} 33 \texttt{Qxd1} \texttt{Qxa8} 34 \texttt{Wf6+} \texttt{Qg8} 35 \texttt{Qxd6} \texttt{Qe8} 36 \texttt{Qd7} \texttt{Qe7} 1-0**

---

**Game 70**

**D.Ghizdava-A.Munteanu**

**Romania 1971**

1.\texttt{e4} \texttt{c5} 2.\texttt{\underline{Qf3}} \texttt{d6} 3.\texttt{d4} \texttt{cxd4} 4.\texttt{\underline{Qxd4}} \texttt{Qf6} 5.\texttt{\underline{Qc3}} \texttt{a6} 6.\texttt{f4} \texttt{e5} 7.\texttt{\underline{Qf3}} \texttt{\underline{Qc7}} 8.\texttt{\underline{Qd3}} \texttt{b5} 9.0-0 \texttt{\underline{Qbd7}} 10.\texttt{\underline{Qe1}} \texttt{\underline{Qe7}} 11.\texttt{\underline{Qh1}} 0-0 12.\texttt{fxe5} \texttt{dxe5} 13.\texttt{\underline{Qg5!}} \texttt{\underline{Qb7}}

After 13...\texttt{b4} 14.\texttt{\underline{Qd1}} (or 14.\texttt{\underline{Qd5}} \texttt{\underline{Qxd5}} 15.\texttt{exd5} \texttt{f6} 16.\texttt{\underline{Qe4}} \texttt{g6} 17.\texttt{\underline{Qh6}} \texttt{\underline{Qb7}}? 18.\texttt{\underline{Qf8}} \texttt{\underline{Qf8}} with compensation for the exchange, A.Kapengut-V.Savon, Ashkhabad 1978) 14...\texttt{\underline{Qc5}} 15.\texttt{\underline{Qe3}} \texttt{\underline{Qe6}} 16.\texttt{\underline{Qxf6}} \texttt{\underline{Qxf6}} 17.\texttt{\underline{Qc4}} \texttt{\underline{Qxc4}} 18.\texttt{\underline{Qxc4}} \texttt{\underline{Wb7}} 19.\texttt{\underline{We3}} \texttt{\underline{Qa4}} 20.\texttt{\underline{Wb3}} \texttt{\underline{Qc5}} 21.\texttt{\underline{Qe3}} \texttt{\underline{Qa4}} 22.\texttt{\underline{Wb3}} the game was drawn by repetition, D.Bronstein-I.Boleslavsky, Grozny 1969.

**14.\texttt{\underline{Qh4}} \texttt{g6!}** 15.\texttt{\underline{Qf5!?}} (see Diagram)

White is sacrificing his knight to open up Black's king and to put more pressure on the f6-knight, which stands in front of another White target, the pawn on f7.

15.\texttt{\underline{Qh6}} is another try, but we believe that Black can hold the position after 15...\texttt{\underline{Qf8}} 16.\texttt{\underline{Qf5}} \texttt{\underline{Qd8}} 17.\texttt{\underline{Qg7}} \texttt{\underline{Qf8}} 18.\texttt{\underline{Qf5}} \texttt{\underline{Qe8}} when White can either take a draw or try to destroy Black's fortress.

**15...\texttt{\underline{Qxf5}} 16.\texttt{\underline{Qxf5}} \texttt{b4!} 17.\texttt{\underline{Qe2}}**

White's knight is moving towards its dream squares, f5 and h5. According to Ciocaltea, the inferior 17.\texttt{\underline{Qd5}}? \texttt{\underline{Qxd5}} 18.\texttt{exd5} \texttt{f6}! gives Black an advantage.

**17.\texttt{\underline{Qf8}}**

A good try for Black to get counterplay is 17...\texttt{\underline{Qh8}}: for example, 18.\texttt{\underline{Qh4}} \texttt{\underline{Qg8}} (perhaps Black can defend with 18.\texttt{\underline{Wd6}} 19.\texttt{\underline{Qaf1}} \texttt{\underline{Qg8}} 20.\texttt{\underline{Qg3}}, but White's attack is still very dangerous: for example, 20...\texttt{\underline{Qd8}} 21.\texttt{\underline{Qc4}} \texttt{\underline{Qxg5}} 22.\texttt{\underline{Qxg5}} \texttt{\underline{Qd6}} 23.\texttt{\underline{Qf5}} \texttt{\underline{Qc6}} 24.\texttt{\underline{Qd3}} \texttt{\underline{Qac8}} 25.\texttt{\underline{Qg7}} \texttt{\underline{Qc7}} 26.\texttt{\underline{Qg5}} \texttt{\underline{Qh5}} 27.\texttt{\underline{Qxh5}} \texttt{\underline{Qh6}} 28.\texttt{g4} with a crushing attack) 19.\texttt{\underline{Qxf6}} \texttt{\underline{Qxf6}} (19...\texttt{\underline{Qxg5}}? 20.\texttt{\underline{Qxf7}} \texttt{\underline{Qg7}} 21.\texttt{\underline{Qxe7}} \texttt{\underline{Qf7}} 22.\texttt{\underline{Qxf7}} \texttt{\underline{Qf8}} 23.\texttt{\underline{Wf7}} leaves Black...
down two pawns) 20 \textit{\L xf6+} \textit{\L xf6} 21 \textit{\L xf6+} \textit{\L g7} 22 \textit{\L g3} \textit{\L d8} 23 \textit{\L xe5} \textit{\L g5} 24 \textit{\L d4} a5, but anyway White has a slight advantage.

\textbf{18 \textit{\L h4} \textit{\L d8}}

Fritz initially believes that 18...\textit{\L c6} can give Black an advantage, but our analysis shows that after 19 \textit{\L g3} \textit{\L d8} 20 \textit{\L af1} \textit{\L e6} 21 \textit{\L xf3} \textit{\L e7} 22 \textit{\L f5} \textit{\L f8} 23 \textit{\L g3} \textit{\L h8} 24 \textit{\L h3} \textit{\L g8} 25 \textit{\L xf6} \textit{\L xf6} 26 \textit{\L h6+} \textit{\L xh6} 27 \textit{\L xh6} \textit{\L d7} 28 \textit{\L g3+} \textit{\L g4} 29 \textit{\L xg4+} \textit{\L g6} 30 \textit{\L xg6+} \textit{hxg6} 31 \textit{\L c4} \textit{\L xe4} 32 \textit{\L xf7} \textit{\L xf7} 33 \textit{\L xf7+} \textit{\L xf7} 34 \textit{\L h4} \textit{\L f5} 35 \textit{\L xg4} White wins.

\textbf{19 \textit{\L af1} \textit{\L e6} 20 \textit{\L f3!}}

20 \textit{\L h6?!} \textit{\L f8} 21 \textit{\L xh8} \textit{\L xf8} 22 \textit{\L h6+} \textit{\L e8} 23 \textit{\L xf6} \textit{\L xf6} 24 \textit{\L xf6} \textit{\L xf6} 25 \textit{\L x6} \textit{\L d8} 26 \textit{\L h8+} \textit{\L d7} 27 \textit{\L xh7} \textit{\L e8} gives chances to both sides.

\textbf{20...\textit{\L c6}}

White's attack is nearing its zenith. He should now send in the cavalry.

\textbf{21 \textit{\L g3}?}

We believe that White needed to include his knight in the attack by means of 21 \textit{\L g3!} \textit{\L e8} 22 \textit{\L h5} \textit{\L xh5} 23 \textit{\L xh5} \textit{\L c7} 24 \textit{\L xf7+} \textit{\L h8} 25 \textit{\L h3} \textit{\L f8} 26 \textit{\L c4} \textit{\L xc4} 27 \textit{\L f6+} 28 \textit{\L xf6+} \textit{\L g8} 29 \textit{\L g5+} when Black is checkmated in two moves.

\textbf{21...\textit{\L e4}?!}

It looks like 21...\textit{\L f8} 22 \textit{\L gf3} \textit{\L e8} 23 \textit{\L g3} \textit{\L e7} 24 \textit{\L h5} \textit{\L xh5} 25 \textit{\L xh5} \textit{\L f6} 26 \textit{\L xf6} \textit{\L xf6} 27 \textit{\L xh7} \textit{\L e6} could give Black an advantage.

\textbf{22 \textit{\L xe4} \textit{\L xe4}}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\caption{The Knight Sacrifice on f5}
\end{figure}

23 \textit{\L f6+!}

This wins material.

\textbf{23...\textit{\L f8} 24 \textit{\L h6+} \textit{\L e8} 25 \textit{\L g8+} \textit{\L f8} 26 \textit{\L xf8}+! \textit{\L d7} 27 \textit{\L xf7+}}

\textbf{27...\textit{\L e7}}

Alternatively, 27...\textit{\L c8} 28 \textit{\L f2} \textit{\L xc2} 29 \textit{\L wh3} \textit{\L e6} 30 \textit{\L xd8} \textit{\L xd8} 31 \textit{\L xb7} wins for White.
28 \textit{xf2} \textit{g8} 29 \textit{exe7+} \textit{exe7} 30 \textit{exe7} \textit{g6}

Ciocaltea points out that after 30...\textit{exg2}, 31 \textit{d6+} \textit{e8} 32 \textit{d8} is mate; and that 30...\textit{hgxg2+} 31 \textit{exg2} \textit{e8} 32 \textit{d6+} \textit{f7} 33 \textit{d7} wins for White.

31 \textit{w8f} \textit{h2}

Alternatively, 31...\textit{hgxg2+} 32 \textit{exg2} \textit{e8} 33 \textit{d8+} \textit{f7} 34 \textit{d7} wins.

32 \textit{d8+} \textit{c6} 33 \textit{exg2} \textit{b5} 34 \textit{d3+} 1-0

\textbf{Game 71}

\textbf{R.Calvo Minguez-L.Kavalek}

\textbf{Las Palmas 1973}

1 e4 c5 2 \textit{d3} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd4} \textit{c6} 5 \textit{c3} a6 6 \textit{g5} e6 7 f4 \textit{c7} 8 \textit{e2} \textit{bd7} 9 0-0-0 \textit{e7} 10 g4

10...\textit{h6}?!?

Better is 10...\textit{b5}?! and then:

a) According to Velimirovic, 11 \textit{g2} \textit{b7} (11...\textit{b4} 12 e5 \textit{bxc3} 13 exf6 gxf6 14 \textit{xaxa8} fxg5 15 \textit{f3} gx4f 16 \textit{c6} cxb2+ 17 \textit{b1} 0-0 18 \textit{xd7} \textit{xxd7} 19 \textit{exh1} \textit{g5} 20

\textit{h4} \textit{xh4} 21 \textit{wxf4} was drawn in G.Kuzmin-J.Dorfman, Ordzhonikidze 1978) 12 e5 dxe5 13 fxe5 \textit{b4}! is unclear.

b) 11 a3 \textit{b7} 12 \textit{g2} 0-0 0 13 \textit{h4} \textit{xc5} 14 \textit{g3} \textit{exh5} (14...\textit{h6} is safer) 15 \textit{g5} \textit{d7} 16 \textit{w5} \textit{g6} 17 \textit{w5} leaves White with an extra pawn and the better position, E.Najer-M.Kraemer, German League 2007. Black can actually trap White's queen here with 17...\textit{h8} 18 \textit{wxf7} \textit{exf5}, but both 19 \textit{exe6} \textit{gxf8} 20 \textit{xc7} \textit{xc7} and 19 \textit{wxe6}+? \textit{exe6} 20 \textit{exe6} \textit{w6} 21 fxe5 offer excellent compensation.

11 \textit{h4} \textit{g5}?

11...\textit{c5}?! might still hold the balance.

12 \textit{fxg5} \textit{h7} 13 \textit{f5}!

White sacrifices his knight to open the e-file for the attack and place his remaining knight on d5.

13...\textit{exf5}

Instructive too is 13...\textit{hxg5}?! 14 \textit{g3} \textit{e5} 15 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 16 h4 \textit{d7} 17 \textit{d2} \textit{h8} 18 \textit{e2} \textit{b5} 19 a3 \textit{ab8} 20 \textit{hxg5} \textit{gxh2} 21 \textit{h6} a5 22 \textit{h4} \textit{f6} 23 \textit{xf6}! \textit{xf6} 24 \textit{fw4}+ \textit{e7} 25 \textit{g5}+ \textit{e8} 26 \textit{w6} \textit{hxg5} 27 \textit{w5} \textit{f7} 28 \textit{g6} \textit{d8} 29
14...d5 w.d8 15...e5 16...g3 17...b1 0-0

According to Velimirovic, both 15...hxg5 16...g3 and 15...e5 16...g3 are very good for White.

16...g3 e.xg5+ 17...xf6 0-0

Velimirovic points out that other choices are fruitless for Black: 17...f6 18 h4 and White wins back a piece with a big advantage; and 17...w.f8 18 h4...e7 (18...w.f6 19...xf6 wxf6 20...xd6! w.xd6 21...xe5 w.e7 22...g7+ gives White two extra pawns and winning position) 19...xe7 w.xe7 20...xd6...c6 21...d2 when the many threats should give an easy win.

18...h4...f6

After 18...e7 19...xe5 dxe5 20...g5

A routine offer to pry open the kingside for further attack.

19...hxg5 20...hxg5...xg5 21...xe5 dxe5 22...w.e4...g7

After 22...f6, 23...xh7...xh7 24...h5+...h6 25...g6+...h8 26...xh6+...g8 27...w.g6+...h8 28...g2 checkmates Black’s king.

23...f6+!...g8

23...wxf6 24...xh7+...xh7 25...xf6+...g6 26...d7 wins.

24...w.e4 1-0

After 24...e.xf6 25...x.f6+...g7 26...xd8...xd8 27...d5 White wins.
The sacrifice $\text{Q}(x)b5$ is considerably less common in the Sicilian than its clerical counterpart ($\text{Q}xb5$). One reason for this is that it rarely has any point after Black has castled short, unless Black has been so incautious as to leave a pawn on d6 under-protected, so that a second knight can capture on b5 and then d6 to get a third pawn for the piece. Even then, though, the knight does not give check when it arrives on d6, which certainly affords Black more options for counterplay.

Occasionally a $\text{Q}xb5$ sacrifice will strip away the pawn cover from a king which has castled long and thus allow a frontal assault by White’s heavy pieces. It might also undermine a black knight which has made an unwise sojourn to the square c4. But most often $\text{Q}xb5$ works when the black king is still in the centre.

Bronstein has pioneered the $\text{Q}xb5$ attack against the Sveshnikov, but modern theory considers this line more or less harmless for Black. The most useful version of $\text{Q}xb5$ is that which gets two pawns and gives check to the uncastled enemy king, as in the following example from that self-proclaimed Sicilian beater himself, Dr. John Nunn.

**Game 72**

**J.Nunn-G.Sosonko**

**Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984**

1 e4 c5 2 $\text{Q}f3$ $\text{c}6$ 3 d4 cxd4 4 $\text{Q}xd4$ $\text{Q}f6$ 5 $\text{c}3$ d6 6 $\text{c}4$ e6 7 $\text{e}3$ a6 8 $\text{W}e2$ $\text{c}7$ 9 0-0-0 $\text{a}5$

This method of countering the Velimirovic Attack is a bit controversial, as White has the option of retreating his bishop to d3, thus preserving it. However, Black wishes to attend to the development of his queenside at once, reckoning to lessen the impact of White’s traditional pawn storm. Prac-
TUCE has shown this plan to be viable.  
10 \textit{d}d3 \textit{b}5 11 \textit{a}3 \textit{b}7 12 g4!?  

Anyway! 12 f4 is an alternative.  

12...\textit{d}5  

This break is consistent, but risky. Safer is the anticipatory 12...\textit{d}d7, and this looks more logical to us than 12...\textit{c}8 which may commit this rook prematurely.  

13 exd5 \textit{xd}5  
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14 \textit{dx}b5! axb5?  

As I am fond of telling my students, this is not checkers and captures are not compulsory! Indeed, 14...\textit{wb}8! is much more stubborn. Nunn gives 15 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 16 \textit{c}c3 \textit{hx}1 17 \textit{hx}1 \textit{wc}7 18 \textit{xa}6 \textit{xa}3 as unclear. A couple of years later Hawelka preferred 18 \textit{d}d5!? here against Gaprindashvili, but then 18...\textit{wc}6 19 \textit{xa}6 \textit{xa}6 20 \textit{wa}6 \textit{b}b3! was a clever intermezzo, driving White's king away from the defence of the square \textit{d}1. The following 21 \textit{b}b1 \textit{xd}5 22 \textit{e}e1 \textit{c}c5 23 \textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5 24 \textit{d}d1 could have been answered by 24...\textit{wc}7, whereas the former Women's World Champion tried 24...\textit{e}e7 25. \textit{wb}7+ \textit{f}6 26 \textit{d}d7 and eventually was check-  
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mated, although she may not have been lost at this stage.  

Nunn considers the similar 14...\textit{we}5 15 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 16 \textit{f}4 \textit{wb}8 17 \textit{c}c3 as unclear, but White is a useful move ahead of Hawelka's line.  

15 \textit{xb}5+ \textit{d}8  

15...\textit{c}c6 16 \textit{xd}5 \textit{exd}5 17 \textit{b}b6+ \textit{we}7 18 \textit{xa}5 \textit{xe}2 19 \textit{xc}6+ \textit{e}e7 20 \textit{h}e1 regains the queen and wins, as analysed by Nunn.  

16 \textit{xd}5 \textit{exd}5  

Or 16...\textit{xd}5 17 \textit{xd}5+! \textit{exd}5 18 \textit{d}d1 \textit{c}c6 (best according to Nunn, whose detailed analysis in \textit{Informator 38} gives winning lines against other tries which we have no space to reproduce here) 19 \textit{xd}5+ \textit{c}8 20 \textit{f}f3! with a winning attack.  

17 \textit{d}d3!  

A useful dual-purpose move, clearing a square for the king's rook while activating the queen's rook.  

17...\textit{c}c4?  

A nice line given by the winner is 17...\textit{e}e7 18 \textit{c}c3 \textit{wd}6 19 \textit{e}e1! \textit{f}6 20 \textit{b}b6+! (anyway) 20...\textit{xb}6 21 \textit{e}e8+! and mate next move. The superior
17...c5! (Nunn) keeps Black in the game. Then 18 c3 xe3+ 19 wxe3 w6 20 e1 w6! looks tenable, so White should continue 18 e1 xe3+ 19 xe3 w4 20 b1 c7 21 f3 w6 22 xf7+ b6 23 e1 with advantage as Nunn prefers.

18 c3 b4
A good last-ditch try.

19 xc4 dxc4 20 d1+ c8 21 d4!
That's all she wrote. The king can't possibly escape the crossfire.

10...d7

Over to Yury for the specifics...

---

**Game 73**

T.Horvath-K.Hulak

Virovitica 1980

1 e4 c5 2 f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 a6 5 c3 w7 6 e2 b5 7 0-0 b7 8 e1 d6

If 8...b4 White may sacrifice with 9 d5! exd5 10 exd5, which deserves further investigation:

a) After 10...c5 11 g5 b8 12 f3 d6 13 w2 d7 14 e7+ xe7 15 we7+ g8 16 e6 fxe6 the game could finish in perpetual check, but surprisingly after pushing for a win, White lost in L.Fressinet-A.Kogan, Paris 2005.

b) According to Horvath, 10...e7 11 h5 g6 12 w3 g7 13 d6! xf3 14 xe7+ w8 15 xc7+ xe7 16 xc6 c6 17 xc6+ dxc6 18 xc6 eac8 19 e4 xb2 20 e1+ wf6 21 d7! gives White an advantage. We believe this analysis needs to be tested in practice.

9 f3 d6 10 f4!

Also possible is 10 a4 when the following entertainment may ensue: 10...bxa4 11 d5 exd5 12 exd5+ d8 13 xa4 xd5 14 g5+ e7 15 xd5 xe5 16 wc4 wb6 17 xc7 f6 18 xe6+ e7 19 xg7+ w8 20 e8+ xg7 21 wg4+ and Black resigned, not waiting to be mated in several moves, B.Jobava-H.Steingrimsson, European Team Championship, Crete 2007.

10...d7

---

After 10...e5? White has several continuations, including all of 11 d5, 11 f5 e4? 12 e5! when White should have a crushing attack, and 11 g3 exd4? 12 e5! which should also give Black many problems. Likewise, 10...b4 11 e5 bxc3 12 exf6 w7 13 xg7 xe7 14 f5 f8 15 xb7 xb7 16 wh5 cxb2 17 ad1 won for White in V.Nevednichy-P.Deneufegls, St. Affrique 2004.

11 dxb5!

For his knight White will get three passed pawns and an attack.

11...xb5 12 xb5 wa5

Instead 12 w4! 13 xd6+ d6 14 b3 wc3 15 xd6 xe5 16 ec3 wb2!
leads to an unclear position, and for 12...\textit{\texttt{\$}}b6 see the next game.

13 \textit{\texttt{\$}}xd6+ \textit{\texttt{\$}}xd6 14 \textit{\texttt{\$}}xd6

The white queen shatters Black’s kingside. In this ruined position Black resorts to tactics but to no avail.

24...\textit{\texttt{\$}}xe4?! 25 \textit{\texttt{\$}}xe4 f5 26 \textit{\texttt{\$}}e6! 1-0

Horvath points out that 26...\textit{\texttt{\$}}xe6 27 \textit{\texttt{\$}}g8+ \textit{\texttt{\$}}d8 28 \textit{\texttt{\$}}c4+ \textit{\texttt{\$}}c6 29 \textit{\texttt{\$}}xc6+ \textit{\texttt{\$}}b7 30 \textit{\texttt{\$}}c7+ finishes the story.
11...axb5 12AXB5 WB6 13 Axd6+ Axd6 14 Axd6 Axd8

Nisipeanu believes that 14...e5 15 Aa6 16 c5 Axc5 17 Axex5 0-0 18 Axd4 gives White good attacking chances.

15 Axc5

After 15...e5 the game could continue 16 c5 Axf3+ 17 Axf3 Ac6 18 Ag3 Ag8 19 f3 g5 20 Ae5 Ac6 21 Aed1 when Fritz prefers White; White’s three passed pawns and strong bishop outweigh the extra piece.

16 e5 Afe4

According to Fritz, 16...Af7 is the best try, but after 17 b4! Axb4 18 Axb7 Axb7 19 Ag4 g6 20 Ag5 f6 21 exf6 Axc8 22 Ah6 Axf6 23 Axc5 Axc5 24 Axe6+ Axf7 25 Axf6+! Axf6 26 Afl4+ Af5 27 Aed4+ Ae5 28 Ae1 Ahe8 29 f4 White is winning.

17 b4!

In this complicated position nothing can save Black.

18 Axb7 19 exd6 Eed6 20 Aa4+ Ac6 21 Axc6+ Axc6 22 Aab1 0-0 23 Aed1 Afc8 could offer more resistance.

19 Wxf3 Wxc5 20 exd6 0-0 21 Axe1 Axd6 22 Axd6 Wxd6 23 Aa4

White is up one pawn, but the rest of the game shows how difficult it is to win with two disconnected passed pawns. White’s plan is to push his a- and c-pawns and when Black stops them, to switch to an attack on the black king.

23...Ac8 24 a5 Wa6 25 Aa4 g6 26 Ag3 h5

Nisipeanu points out that 26...Axc4?

27 Axc4 Axc4 28 Wa8+ Ag7 29 a6 is winning for White.

27 Axc4 Axb8

28 Aeg4?!?

Following 28 Aed3!? Afc6 (after the more active 28...Ab2 29 Adb8+ Ah7 30 Aed7 Ab7 31 Ad3 Aed6 32 a6 Aa7 33 Aa5 Axa6 34 Axb5+ Ag7 35 Aed4+ f6 36 Ac5 White is up one pawn and with the better position) 29 Ac2 Aa6 30 Aa2 Aa6 31 Aa8 32 Wa2 Ab8 33 Aa5 Ad8 34 Ab3 Ad2 35 Aa2 Ad8 36 Aa7 Ah7 37 Wa4 Aa8 38 c5 e5 39 c6 Ac8 40 Ab5 White wins.
28...\(\text{b2}\) 29 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{a7}\) 30 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{a6}\)

Now it might look like White is tied up and can't improve his position, whereas our analysis shows that after the inferior 30...\(\text{wc5}\)? 31 \(\text{a1}\) \(\text{a7}\) 32 \(\text{a6}\) \(\text{h7}\) 33 \(\text{a5}\) \(\text{g8}\) 34 \(\text{b5}\) White is winning.

31 \(\text{a1}\) \(\text{c2}\) 32 \(\text{d1}\)

It's time to take care of the black king.

32...\(\text{xc4}\)?

Absolutely losing. According to Nisipeanu, after 32...\(\text{xa5}\)! 33 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{d2}\) 34 \(\text{xd2}\) \(\text{xd2}\) 35 \(\text{e5}\) White is only slightly better.

33 \(\text{d8}\+) \(\text{g7}\) 34 \(\text{d7}\) \(\text{c6}\) 35 \(\text{xf7}\+) \(\text{g8}\) 36 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 37 \(\text{a7}\) \(\text{c2}\) 38 \(\text{a6}\)

With an extra passed pawn and an active rook, White can easily win with a king trip to the centre.

38...\(\text{a2}\) 39 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{a4}\) 40 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{a2}\) 41 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{a5}\) 42 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 43 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{a2}\) 44 \(\text{f3}\)

1-0

After 44...\(\text{f8}\) 45 \(\text{a8}\+) \(\text{g7}\) 46 \(\text{a7}\) \(\text{a1}\) 47 \(\text{c5}\) \(\text{h7}\) 48 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{a5}\+) 49 \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{g7}\) 50 \(\text{e6}\) \(\text{a6}\+) 51 \(\text{e5}\) White easily wins with two extra pawns.

---

### Game 75

**J.Becerra Rivero-A.Zapata**

**San Juan 2006**

1 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 2 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{e6}\) 3 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 4 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{a6}\) 5 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 6 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c7}\) 7 0-0 \(\text{c6}\) 8 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{b5}\) 9 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{dxc6}\) 10 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{b7}\)

Black has some alternatives:

a) After 10...\(\text{b4}\) 11 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{e7}\) 12 \(\text{xd2}\) 0-0 13 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{c5}\) 14 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{e5}\) 15 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{g4}\) 16 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{h5}\) 17 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{h4}\) 18 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{h6}\) 19 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{e6}\) 20 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{h7}\) 21 \(\text{a5}\) \(\text{xc4}\) 22 \(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{ad8}\) 23 \(\text{axh6}\) \(\text{axh6}\) 24 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{g6}\) 25 \(\text{e2}\) White got a positional advantage which he converted to a win in P.Zarnicki-E.Peralta, Cascavel 1996.

b) 10...\(\text{b8}\) 11 \(\text{f4}\) (11 \(\text{e5}\?) is an interesting speculation; then 11...\(\text{xe5}\) 12 \(\text{axb5}\) \(\text{cxb5}\) 13 \(\text{a7}\) \(\text{a8}\) 14 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{wb8}\) 15 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{gx6}\) 16 \(\text{f3}\) is one intriguing possibility) 11...\(\text{e5}\) 12 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 13 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{we7}\)

14 \(\text{h1}\)?! (hereabouts White loses a lot of his advantage; we are not sure, but this move might be the culprit and 14 \(\text{axb5}\) followed by \(\text{f3}\) might be better) 14...\(\text{c5}\) 15 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{b7}\) 16 \(\text{e2}\) 0-0 17
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

Lg5 wc7 18 xf6 gxf6 19 Lg3 bh8 20 Lh5 Le7 21 We3 Lg8 22 Lfd1 c5 23 axb5 c4 24 Le2 axb5 25 Lf3 wc6 26 Ld5 Wf8 27 Ld2 Lg5 28 h4 Lg8 29 Wh6 Wf8 30 Wxf8 Lgxf8 31 Ld7 Lc5 32 Lxf6 is better for White, but Black escaped with a draw in S.Haslinger-N.Miezis, Liverpool 2006.

11 axb5 cxb5

12 Lxb5!!

For the knight White will get two pawns and an attack on the uncastled black king.

12...axb5 13 Lxb5+

13...Ld7

According to Becerra and Moreno, after 13...Le7 14 We2! Lxe4 (or 14...Lxe4 15 Lxa8 Lxa8 16 Lc1 Lb7 17 Ld6 18 b4! Lc8 19 Lc5+ Lf6 20 Ld4+ Le7 21 Le5 Lb6 22 Ld3! and White's mating threats should win the game) 15 Ld4 Lxa1 (or 15...Lb7 16 Lc5+ Ld8 17 Lxa8+ Lxa8 18 Lb6+ Le7 19 Ld1 Ld5 20 Lc8 21 La5 Lb7 22 Lb4+ Ld8 23 Lxf8 Lxb5 24 Lg7 Lg8 25 Lxf6+ Lc8 26 g3 and White wins) 16 Lxa1 Lxc2 17 Lc3 e5 (the best way to try to free Black's pieces and escape checkmate) 18 Lxe5 Ld5 19 Lc7+ Le6 20 Lc3! Lxc3 21 Lc6+. White's crushing attack will shortly decide proceedings.

14 Wd3!

Preparing to seize the a-file and put more even more pressure on the pinned knight.

14...Le7?

Becerra and Moreno point out that Black can survive White's attack after 14...0-0-0! 15 Lc6 Lb8! (15...Lc5? 16 Lxb7+ Lxb7 17 Lc4 Lb4 18 Lc4! Lxc4 19 Lxc4 wins two pawns) 16 Lxb7+ Lxb7 17 Lc4+ Lc6 18 Lb3 Ld7 19 Lf4! Le6 (or 19...Lb7 20 Lg3 and we believe that both sides have chances to...
when White has enough compensation for the material deficit and either side could win the game.

15 \textit{\texttt{Exa8+}}

15 \textit{\texttt{fxa4! \texttt{Exd8} 16 \texttt{Exd1} 0-0 17 \texttt{Exd7}}}

should be winning for White.

15...\textit{\texttt{Exa8}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Exa1 \texttt{Ec6} 17 \texttt{Exa7}}}

17...\textit{\texttt{Ec8?}}

Better was 17...\textit{\texttt{Exb5}} 18 \textit{\texttt{Exb5 \texttt{Ed6} 19}} \texttt{g3} as given by Becerra and Moreno, and now Yury’s suggestion of 19...\textit{\texttt{Exf8}}, defending the rook and preparing a counterblow on the kingside, looks good to us.

18 \textit{\texttt{Ec3 \texttt{Db8}}}

18...\textit{\texttt{Exb7}} 19 \textit{\texttt{Exg7 \texttt{Ef8} 20 \texttt{Ed4 \texttt{Ec6} 21 \texttt{Ewc4 \texttt{Exb7} 22 \texttt{Wa4}}}}, as analysed by the winner, leaves Black in a pickle.

19 \textit{\texttt{Exg7 \texttt{Exb5}}}

Instead 19...\textit{\texttt{Ef8} 20 \texttt{Exe7+ \texttt{Exe7} 21 \texttt{Exc5+ \texttt{Ed7} 22 \texttt{Exf8 \texttt{Wxf8} (or 22...\texttt{Exb5} 23 \texttt{Ed6+ \texttt{Ee8} 24 \texttt{Ee7 mate}) 23 \texttt{Exc6+ \texttt{Exc6} 24 \texttt{Exf8}} is given by the winner as a trivial win.}

20 \textit{\texttt{Wxh8+ \texttt{Ef8} 21 \texttt{Exh6}} 1-0}

There follows 21...\textit{\texttt{Exd7} 22 \texttt{Wg8!}} with a deadly ‘tickle’ on f7.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 76}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
P.Smirnov-S.Shipov
Russian Championship,
Elista 2001
\end{center}

1 \textit{\texttt{e4 c5} 2 \texttt{cf3 d6} 3 \texttt{d4 \texttt{Exd4} 4 \texttt{Exd4 \texttt{Ef6} 5 \texttt{Ec3 a6} 6 \texttt{f3 e6} 7 \texttt{Exe3 b5} 8 \texttt{g4 \texttt{Exd7} 9 \texttt{Wd2 \texttt{Eb6} 10 0-0-0 \texttt{Ebd7 11 \texttt{Eg5 \texttt{Wc7}}}}}}

12 \textit{\texttt{Dxb5?!}}

An interesting alternative is 12 \textit{\texttt{Db1!? \texttt{Exb7} 13 \texttt{Dxb5 axb5} 14 \texttt{Dxb5 \texttt{Wc5} 15 \texttt{b4 \texttt{Wc6} 16 \texttt{Dxd6+ \texttt{Dxd6} 17 \texttt{Wxd6 \texttt{Wxd6} 18 \texttt{Dxd6 \texttt{Da4} 19 \texttt{Wc1 \texttt{Da8}, as in P.Svidler-K.Georgiev, Istanbul Olympiad 2000, and now 20 \texttt{c4!} h5 (20...\texttt{Dc3} 21 a3 h5 22 \texttt{Dc2 is better for White) 21 \texttt{c5 f6 22 \texttt{Dd2 hxc4} 23 \texttt{fxg4 \texttt{Ee7} 24 h4 e5 25 \texttt{Dc4 \texttt{Dxc5} 26 bxc5 \texttt{Exc5} 27 \texttt{Ec6 \texttt{Dxe4} 28 \texttt{Db4+ \texttt{Ed8} 29 \texttt{Ed1+ gives White the advantage.}

12...\textit{\texttt{axb5}} 13 \textit{\texttt{Dxb5 \texttt{Ec6} 14 \texttt{Dxd6+ \texttt{Dxd6} 15 \texttt{Wxd6 \texttt{Wxd6} 16 \texttt{Dxd6}}}}}

Giving up a piece for three passed pawns looks wrong, especially as White has no knight on c3 and might get hit by a timely ...h5. However, mat-
ters are still by no means easy for Black.

16...\(\text{\&}a6!\)

According to Shipov, 16...\(\text{\&}xa2\) 17 \(\text{\&}b1\) \(\text{\&}a5\) 18 \(\text{\&}d2!\) \(\text{\&}a8\) 19 \(\text{\&}b5\) 0-0 (after 19...\(\text{\&}d8\) 20 \(\text{\&}d1\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 21 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}a5\) 22 c4 White is better) 20 \(\text{\&}d1\) gives White the advantage. Meanwhile after 16...0-0 White has a simple plan to get the better position: 17 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}a4\) 18 b3 \(\text{\&}ac5\) 19 a4 \(\text{\&}a6\) 20 \(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 21 \(\text{\&}hd1\) \(\text{\&}b8\) 22 \(\text{\&}c5\) \(\text{\&}a6\) 23 c4 with a huge advantage, S.Karjakin-H.Nakamura, Cuernavaca 2004.

17 \(\text{\&}xa6\) \(\text{\&}xa6\) 18 a3 h5!

Black is trying to create a weakness in the white camp.

19 h4!

White has to take care of his weak pawns. After 19 gxh5 \(\text{\&}a5\) 20 h4 \(\text{\&}c4\) 21 \(\text{\&}c6\) \(\text{\&}c5\) 22 \(\text{\&}xc5\) \(\text{\&}xc5\) 23 b3 \(\text{\&}xa3\) 24 h6 gxh6 25 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 26 \(\text{\&}b2\) \(\text{\&}b5\) 27 e5 \(\text{\&}g8\) 28 \(\text{\&}xh6\) \(\text{\&}d4\) 29 h5 \(\text{\&}g2\) 30 \(\text{\&}c3\) \(\text{\&}xf3\) 31 \(\text{\&}f4\) this complicated, roughly equal position ended as a draw in R.Ponomariov-P.Svidler, FIDE World Championship, Moscow 2001.

19...hxg4 20 fxg4 f6

According to Shipov, 20...\(\text{\&}a4\) 21 \(\text{\&}hd1\) 0-0 22 \(\text{\&}xd7\) \(\text{\&}xd7\) 23 \(\text{\&}xd7\) \(\text{\&}e4\) 24 b4 \(\text{\&}xg4\) 25 b5 is better for Black, but this is not so clear to us.

21 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 22 \(\text{\&}hd1!\) \(\text{\&}b8?\)

Shipov points out that 22...\(\text{\&}xb6\) 23 \(\text{\&}xb6\) \(\text{\&}a4\) 25 \(\text{\&}xb6\) \(\text{\&}xe4\) 27 \(\text{\&}b7+\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 28 g5! gives White an advantage. However, with 22...\(\text{\&}d5!\) 23 \(\text{\&}xd7\) (or 23 \(\text{\&}xa6\) \(\text{\&}xe3\) 24 \(\text{\&}d3\) \(\text{\&}xg4\) and the coming ...\(\text{\&}xe5\) will make matters far from clear) 23...\(\text{\&}xd7\) 24 \(\text{\&}f2\) \(\text{\&}a4\) 25 exd5 \(\text{\&}xg4\) 26 dxe6+ \(\text{\&}xe6\) Black should hold.

23 \(\text{\&}c6!\)
Intending 24 $\text{Ec7}$.

23...$\text{Ea7}$

Shipov mentions 23...$\text{Ee5}$ 24 $\text{Ec5+}$ $\text{Ee7}$ 25 $\text{Ee7+}$ $\text{Eg6}$ 26 $\text{Ed6}$ $\text{Exg4}$ 27 $\text{Exe6}$ when the pin on the knight will be painful.

24 $\text{Ed6}$ $\text{Eab7}$ 25 $\text{Exe6+}$ $\text{Ee7}$ 26 $\text{g5}$ $\text{Ec8}$ 27 $\text{Ee4}$

Possible too was 27 $\text{gx6!}$? $\text{Exf6}$ 28 $\text{b4}$ and the mass of passed pawns gives White an advantage.

27...$\text{Ea8}$ 28 $\text{h5!}$?

28 $\text{Ea6!}$? $\text{Exg5}$ 29 $\text{h6xg5}$ $\text{Ec6}$ $\text{Ecb6}$ 30 $\text{Exa8}$ $\text{Exe6}$ 31 $\text{Ea5}$ $\text{Ec4}$ 32 $\text{Ed6+}$ keeps White on top.

28...$\text{fxg5}$ 29 $\text{Exg5}$ $\text{Ea5!}$?

Again not best: 29...$\text{Ea8}$! 30 $\text{Exc8}$ $\text{Exe6}$ 31 $\text{Exf4}$ $\text{Ed7}$ 32 $\text{Eg8}$ $\text{Ee6}$ offers better prospects of a successful defence.

30 $\text{Ed6}$?

30 $\text{h6!} \text{Exg5}$ 31 $\text{h7}$ $\text{Eh5}$ 32 $\text{h6!}$ is a direct win according to Shipov.

30...$\text{Ea7}$ 31 $\text{Ea6}$ $\text{Ee5}$?

The errors flow on: 31...$\text{Ea6}$ 32 $\text{Exa6}$ $\text{Ec5}$ 33 $\text{Ea5}$ $\text{Exe4}$ would have kept Black in the game.

32 $\text{h6!}$

After all that, White will win with a direct attack on the king:

32...$\text{gxh6}$ 33 $\text{Exh6}$ $\text{Ee4}$ 34 $\text{Exf7+}$ $\text{Ee8}$ 35 $\text{Eg5!}$ $\text{Exf8}$ 36 $\text{Exg6}$ $\text{Ecd6}$ 37 $\text{Exh7}$!

37...$\text{Eh6}$ $\text{Exe7!}$ is less clear.

37...$\text{Ee7}$ 38 $\text{Exg7}$ $\text{Eb6}$ 39 $\text{Ef6!} 1-0$

We now come to a game played in the last round of the U.S. Championship. The two grandmasters involved were competing for a high place and big money. I was playing in the same tournament near their table and tried to beat GM Larry Christiansen for a top-10 finish. However, with an extra pawn and a winning position, I couldn’t find the right plan and only drew the game. Let’s see if those involved in this sharp Sicilian struggle handled the pressure any better.

**Game 77**

J.Becerra Rivero- I. Novikov

*U.S. Championship, San Diego 2004*

1 $\text{e4}$ $\text{c5}$ 2 $\text{Ee3}$ $\text{d6}$ 3 $\text{d4}$ $\text{cx}d4$ 4 $\text{E xd4}$ $\text{f6}$ 5 $\text{Ee3}$ $\text{a6}$ 6 $\text{Ee3}$ $\text{e6}$ 7 $\text{f3}$ $\text{b5}$ 8 $\text{g4}$ $\text{Ed7}$ 9 $\text{E d2}$ $\text{b6}$ 10 0-0-0 $\text{Ea8}$ $\text{d7}$ 11 $\text{Exb5}$?

I am sure this sacrifice was Becerra’s opening preparation. In this tournament everyone played one game per day and Becerra had a whole day to prepare for Novikov’s Najdorf (which he has played all his life). Many strong players have spent many hours trying to surprise him, but he has always been ready for almost everything. Indeed, this game is another example
of Novikov's knowledge of the varia-

tion.

11...axb5 12 axb5 e5

After 12...a6 13 d6+ d6 14
d6 c4 15 xc4 xc4 16 a3 c8 17
d2 a6 18 b4 e5 19 hd1 e6 20 g5
c6 21 b1 c4 22 d6 c6 23 b4
c4 24 d6 the game was drawn,
S.Karjakin-V.Anand, Benidorm (rapid)
2003.
13 c3 a4 14 c7 d7!

Several years ago Nick witnessed a
game where Black couldn't even find
his mistake in the post-mortem:
14...f6?! 15 f4 d7 16 e5 d8 17 c6
a5 18 d2 c3 19 xc3 and Black
resigned because he was losing more
material, M.Thaler-M.Arnold, New

15 b3

Instead 15 d6+? d6 16 d6
f6 17 g5 f7 18 d3 b8 gives chances
to both sides. Here too, though, Black
has 18...f5 19 b3 e5 20 d6 f7
(after 20...c3?! 21 xe5 xd1 22 xg7
e3 23 xh8+ f7 24 xh7+ f8 25
h8+ f7 26 xd8 xd8 27 d3 we
believe White has more chances to win
this ending because of his three con-
nected passed pawns) 21 d3 e5
with a repetition.

15...f6!

Black returns the extra piece, but
gets a couple of pawns, ruins White's
structure and opens up the white king.
Not a bad bargain.

16 bxa4

Maybe White should consider 16 f4
g4 17 e5, but Black has good chances
after 17...d8 or 17...h4.

16...xf3 17 d4 xe4

Our analysis shows that after
17...xh1 18 xe5 xe4 19 d6 d8
20 d4 c3+ 21 b2 f6 22 d6 c8 23
According to Bruzon and Ibarra, 22 $\texttt{Cc7+ Ce7}$ 23 $\texttt{Ba6 Cf3}$ is winning for Black.

22... $\texttt{Cxc8}$ 23 $\texttt{Bb5}+ \texttt{Dd7}! 24 \texttt{Exh1 exd5}$
25 $\texttt{Be1}+$

Bruzon and Ibarra point out that 25 a5 $\texttt{Ce7}$ 26 $\texttt{Bd4} \texttt{Cf8}$ wins for Black.

25... $\texttt{Ce7}$

Down one piece, White is simply losing.

26 $\texttt{Cc7 Cf8}$ 27 a5

White's passed pawn is his hope for survival, but Novikov is a master of the art of eliminating threats.

27... $\texttt{Cc5}$ 28 a6 $\texttt{Ce6}$ 29 $\texttt{Bb8} \texttt{Cg5}+ 30 \texttt{Cd1 Ce7}$ 31 a7 $\texttt{Bb7}$ 32 $\texttt{Ce2} \texttt{Df4}$ 33 $\texttt{Bb1}$

$\texttt{Cc8}$ 34 $\texttt{La6} \texttt{Bxa6}+ 35 \texttt{Cd1 Ce2}+ 36 \texttt{Bxe2} \texttt{Bxc2}+ 37 \texttt{Dd3} \texttt{Bxa2}$ 38 $\texttt{Bb7}+ \texttt{Cf6}$

39 $\texttt{Bxd6} \texttt{Cf4}$ 40 $\texttt{Bd4} \texttt{Ce3}$ 41 h4 h6 42 h5 g6 43 $\texttt{Cf4} \texttt{Bf4}$ 44 $\texttt{Ce7}+ \texttt{Dg7}$ 45 $\texttt{Dd3} \texttt{Cc7}$ 46 $\texttt{Sc2} d3+ 47 \texttt{Bxd3} \texttt{Df5} 0-1

---

Game 78
C.Lutz-B.Gelfand
Budapest 2003

1 e4 c5 2 $\texttt{Df3}$ d6 3 d4 $\texttt{Cxd4}$ 4 $\texttt{Dxd4} \texttt{Cf6}$
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

A year later Browne tried the natural queen fork 16 \( \text{d}4 \) against the well-prepared Wojtkiewicz: 16...\( \text{a}2 \) 17 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 18 \( \text{x}g7 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 19 \( \text{x}d7! \) \( \text{x}d7 \) 20 \( \text{d}1+ \) \( \text{e}6 \) 21 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 22 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 23 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{a}1+ \) 24 \( \text{x}a1 \) \( \text{x}a1+ \) 25 \( \text{x}a1 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 26 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 27 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 28 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 29 \( \text{x}f4 \) \( \text{x}g4 \) 30 \( \text{b}2 \) and White’s two extra pawns were decisive in W.Browne-A.Wojtkiewicz, Fort Lauderdale 2004.

16...\( \text{e}2 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{x}f3 \) 18 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 19 \( \text{g}5 \)

A new idea at the time. 19 \( \text{fd}1 \) had occurred previously.

19...\( \text{f}6 \) 20 \( \text{xe}6+! \)

Lutz considered the alternatives 20 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 21 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 22 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{fxg}5 \) and 20 \( \text{fd}1 \) \( \text{fxg}5 \) 21 \( \text{xe}6+ \) \( \text{e}7 \) 22 \( \text{xe}7+ \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 23 \( \text{xd}7+ \) \( \text{e}6 \) 24 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xc}6 \), which are both good for Black.

20...\( \text{e}7 \) 21 \( \text{xe}7+ \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 22 \( \text{e}2! \)

22 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{fxg}5 \) 23 \( \text{xe}4+ \) \( \text{d}8 \) is unclear according to Goloshchapov.

22...\( \text{c}5 \)

Instead 22...\( \text{fxg}5 \) 23 \( \text{xe}4+ \) \( \text{d}8 \) 24 \( \text{f}7 \) keeps an edge, according to Lutz.

23 \( \text{d}2 \)

Not the only try: 23 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 24 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{xh}6 \) 25 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}8 \) 26 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 25 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \) is unclear.

23...\( \text{h}8 \)?

Black can’t save the piece, but he can sell it for a good price. However, this is the wrong way, whereas the superior 23...\( \text{d}6 \) 24 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 25 \( \text{bc}5+ \) \( \text{d}5 \) should hold in Lutz’s view.

24 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 25 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{a}3 \)

25...\( \text{b}3+ \) 26 \( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{e}8+ \) 27 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xc}3+ \) 28 \( \text{b}2 \) is good for White.

26 \( \text{bc}5+ \) \( \text{d}5 \)

27 \( \text{b}4? \)

A mistake in time trouble. Lutz claims a win with 27 \( \text{c}4+ \) \( \text{d}4 \) 28 \( \text{b}2! \) \( \text{d}3 \) (28...\( \text{h}3 \) 29 \( \text{xe}4+ \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 30 \( \text{xe}4+ \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 31 \( \text{c}6 \) wins; 28...\( \text{a}6 \) 29 \( \text{c}3+ \) \( \text{d}3 \) 30 \( \text{e}3+ \) wins a piece) 29 \( \text{c}3+ \) \( \text{xc}4 \) 30 \( \text{xe}4+ \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 31 \( \text{xe}4+ \) \( \text{xc}5 \) 32 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 33 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 34 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 35 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xe}2+ \) 36 \( \text{xc}1 \) and it’s all over.

27...\( \text{a}1+ \) 28 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \frac{1}{2} \)-\( \frac{1}{2} \)

Actually White might still be better.
The Knight Sacrifice on b5

Game 79
J.Rigo-C.Busu
Romania 1978

1 e4 c5 2 ∆f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∆xd4 a6 5 ∆e2!? ∆f6 6 ∆c3 d6 7 0-0 ∆e7 8 h1 ∆c7 9 f4 b5?!

This move will lead to problems on the a8-h1 diagonal. All of 9...0-0, 9...∆c6 and 9...∆bd7 are safer choices in this position.

10 ∆f3 ∆b7 11 e5! dxe5

Even worse is 11...∆fd7? 12 exd6 ∆xd6 13 ∆xb5 axb5 14 ∆xb5 ∆b6 15 ∆xd6+ ∆e7 16 ∆xb7 ∆a7 17 ∆c8+, which was catastrophic for Black who resigned here in O.Gutdeutsch-A.Palas, Decin 1997.

12 fxe5 ∆fd7

13 ∆g5?!

Possibly more promising is the routine 13 ∆xb7 ∆xb7 14 ∆g4 ∆c6 (14...g6 is safer) 15 ∆xc6 ∆xc6 16 a4 ∆c4? (16...b4 was necessary) 17 ∆xf4 ∆c5 18 ∆xg7 0-0-0 19 ∆xf7 ∆xe5 20 ∆d2 ∆g5 21 ∆e4 ∆f6 22 ∆xf6 ∆xf6 23 ∆xe6 b4 24 ∆e4 ∆xb2 25 ∆b1 ∆h8 26 ∆xb4 and Black gave up in A.Sokolov-R.Jacques, St. Martin 1992.

13...∆xe5

It seems that Black may be able to survive 13...∆xg5! 14 ∆xb5: for example, 14...axb5 15 ∆xb5 ∆xe5 16 ∆d6+ ∆e7 17 ∆xf7 ∆xf7 18 ∆xb7+ ∆f6 19 ∆xa8 ∆xb2 is certainly far from clear.

14 ∆xb5!?

The idea this time is to occupy d6 with the white queen, as will shortly become evident.

14...∆xb5 15 ∆xb5 ∆b6?

The correct 15...∆d7! contains a lovely defensive idea, to wit 16 ∆xb7 ∆a5!, attacking a substantial portion of the white army: 17 ∆xd7+ (White avoids both 17 a4 ∆xb7 18 ∆d2 ∆bc6 and 17 c4 ∆xd1 18 ∆fxd1 ∆xg5) 17...∆d8 18 ∆c7+ ∆d8 and now the best choice for White in this uncomfortable situation is perhaps the striking 19 ∆xf7!? ∆xf7 20 ∆xe6+ ∆e8 21 ∆xg7+ ∆f8 22 ∆e6+. Then if Black declines the repetition with 22...∆g8, there is 23 ∆xe7 ∆xe5 24 ∆h4 ∆xe6 25
\( \text{Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian} \)

when we feel that in this position White’s four pawns and bishop-pair offer good compensation for his missing rook.

16 \( \text{\texttt{\texttt{x}}b7} \) \( \text{\texttt{x}}b7 \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{d}}6!! \)

A nasty shock for Black. The queen attacks the crucial squares e7, c7 and e5 all at once.

17...0-0?

17...\( \text{\texttt{b}}c6! \) looks to us the best chance, as 18 \( \text{\texttt{x}}c7+ \) \( \text{\texttt{xc7}} \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{xc7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{x}}g5 \) avoids immediate doom, but in the long term after something like 20 \( \text{\texttt{fe1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d}}8 \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{d}}6 \) \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 22 \( \text{\texttt{d2}} \) 0-0 23 a4 White’s passed pawns should roll and collect at least a piece.

Instead 17...\( \text{\texttt{a}}6 \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{xe5}}! \) f6 19 \( \text{\texttt{d}}6+ \) \( \text{\texttt{x}}d6 \) (or 19...\( \text{\texttt{d}}7 \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{xb7}} \) fxe5 21 \( \text{\texttt{f7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e8}} \) 22 \( \text{\texttt{d}}1+ \) ) 20 \( \text{\texttt{xd6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xg5}} \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{xe6}}+ \) is winning for White, as pointed out by the winner.

18 \( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb5}} \)

18...\( \text{\texttt{c}}8 \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{xe5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc2}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) h6 21 \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{hxg5}} \) 22 \( \text{\texttt{xb7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) 23 \( \text{\texttt{xg5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb7}} \) 24 \( \text{\texttt{f2}} \) leaves Black with minimal drawing chances.

19 \( \text{\texttt{xf8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{bc6}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{wc5}}! \) \( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{a5}} \)

22 \( \text{\texttt{xa5}}! \)

White uses tactics to liquidate to a won ending.

22...\( \text{\texttt{xa5}} \) 23 \( \text{\texttt{ab1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{ec4}} \) 24 \( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) 25 \( \text{\texttt{ab1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{ac4}} \) 26 a4! 1-0

\text{Game 80}
\text{A.Martin Gonzalez-J.Magem Badals}
\text{Spanish Championship 1986}

Notes are based heavily on the winner’s in \textit{Informator 42}.

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{\texttt{f}}3 \) d6 3 d4 \( \text{\texttt{cx}}d4 \) 4 \( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \)
5 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) a6 6 \( \text{\texttt{g}}5 \) e6 7 \( \text{\texttt{wd3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{bd7}} \) 8 0-0-0
b5 9 f4 \( \text{\texttt{b}}7 \) 10 e5 \( \text{\texttt{dx}}e5 \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{fx}}e5 \) \( \text{\texttt{dx}}e5 \)
12 \( \text{\texttt{g}}3 \) \( \text{\texttt{wb8}}?! \)

A new idea, but probably not a good one. Critical is 12...\( \text{\texttt{ed7}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{dx}}b5 \) axb5 14\( \text{\texttt{xb5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c}}8 \), although after 15 \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{d4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c5}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \)
\( \text{\texttt{wb6}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{d1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{g}}7 \)
\( \text{\texttt{e8}} \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{xf7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 22 \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{axa2}} \) 23 \( \text{\texttt{xa2}} \)
\( \text{\texttt{xb5}} \) 24 \( \text{\texttt{xe6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wa4}} \) 25 \( \text{\texttt{f8}}+ \) \( \text{\texttt{sc7}} \) 26
\( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) 27 \( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wa2}} \) 28 \( \text{\texttt{d6}}+ \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \)
29 \( \text{\texttt{b6}}+ \) \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 30 \( \text{\texttt{d6}}+ \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) 31 \( \text{\texttt{b6}}+ \)
\( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 32 \( \text{\texttt{b4}}+ \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) 33 \( \text{\texttt{d3}} \) Black had to
resign in V.Kupreichik-V.Dydyshko, Minsk 2000.

13 Qdxb5!
Much stronger than 13 f4? Qh5.
13...axb5

14 Qxb5+?! 
More promising is 14 f4! pinning the black knight. The winner believed that 14...c6 (14...Qh5? 15 Qxe5 Qxg3 16 Qxb5+ wins) was a good response, but after 15 Qxe5 Qb7 White has the trick 16 Qxb5! Qxb5 (or 16...Qe4 17 We3! Qxb5 18 Wxe4 Qc6 19 Wd4 f6 20 Wxf6 Qxa2 21 Qb1 Wb8 22 Wd8+ Wf7 23 Wxa8 Qxa8 24 Qc3 and the extra pawn is not as significant as the two white passers; White has a big plus) 17 Wb3 Qc6 18 Wxb7 Qxb7 19 Qb5+ Qe7 20 Qd6+ Qd8 21 Qf8+, winning.

14...Qc6
A weaker defence was 14...c6 15 Wxe5! Wxe5 16 Qxc6+ Qe7 17 Qd7+ Qe8 18 Qd5+ and White wins.
15 Wf3

15...Wc7?
Missing 15...Qc8 16 Qxf6 gxf6 17 Qe4 (17 Wxf6? Qg8 18 Qxd5 Qxa2) and then our discovery of 17...f5!, which we believe demonstrates equality: 18 Wf6+ Qe7 19 Qf4 Qxf6! (19...h5? 20 Qg5 Qh6 21 Qg8+ Qf8 22 Qxb6 Qxa2 23 Qxc6 Qa1+ 24 Qd2 Qxd1+ 25 Qxd1 Qxc6 26 Wf6 Qh7 27 Qxf7 wins for White) 20 Qh4+ and it’s perpetual check.
16 Qxf6 gxf6 17 Qxf6 Qg8 18 Qd5!
The tempo this move gains makes all the difference.
18...Wa5? 
Alternatively, 18...exd5 19 Qxc6+! (19 Qhe1+ Qe7 20 Qxc6+ Qf8! is a mess) 19...Qxc6 20 Qhe1+ Qe7 21 Qxe7+ is conclusive. The best try was 18...Qd6! 19 Qhf1 Qg7 20 Qb6 Qe7, although after 21 Qxa8 (21 Qf4? Qd8! resists)
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

21...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{xf6}} (21...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{xa8}} 22 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{d4}} keeps a pull}) 22 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xc7+ \textsc{e7}}} 23 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xf6}} \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xf6}}} 24 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{e8+ \textsc{e7}}} 25 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xg7}} \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xg7}}} 26 a4 White is better.}

\textbf{\textit{\textsc{Hf1 \textsc{g7}}}}

20 a4!

This looks like the best.

\textbf{\textit{\textsc{ed8}}}

Otherwise, 20...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{c8}}} 21 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{e5 \textsc{g6}}} 22 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xc6+}}} and the queen will drop off.

\textbf{\textit{\textsc{b4 \textsc{xb4}}} 22 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xb4 \textsc{xd1+}}} 23 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xd1 \textsc{g6}}}}}

Time trouble. Resigning was equally good.

\textbf{\textit{\textsc{xc6+ \textsc{xc6}}} 25 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{h8+}}} 1-0}

A fiendishly difficult game to analyze!

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 81}
B.Rogulj-Kr.Georgiev
Varna 1977
\end{center}

1 e4 c5 2 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{f3}} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xd4 \textsc{f6}}} 5 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{c3}}} a6 6 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{g5}}} e6 7 f4 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{wc7}}} 8 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{f3}}} \textbf{\textit{\textsc{bd7}}} 9 0-0-0 b5 10 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xf6?! \textsc{xf6}}} }

Minev prefers 10...gx \textbf{\textit{\textsc{f6}}} to the text.

11 e5 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{b7}}} 12 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{wh3}}} \textbf{\textit{\textsc{dxe5}}}

12...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f4?!}}} 13 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xe4 \textsc{xe4}}} 14 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{we3}}} d5 looks equal to us.

13 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{cxb5}}!}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
13\textbf{\textit{\textsc{...axb5}}}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The knight can be ignored:

a) 13...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{wb8}}} 14 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xe6}}} axb5 15 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xb5+ \textsc{e7}}} 16 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{g5}}} with the threat of \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xd7+}}, and if, say, 16...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{wc8}}}, then 17 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{b3 \textsc{xd5}}} 18 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xd5 \textsc{xd5}}} 19 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xd5}}} with numerous crushing threats.

b) 13...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{wb6?!}}} 14 fxe5 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{e4}}} 15 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{c4}}} (15 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{wb3 \textsc{c5!}}} 16 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{d6+ \textsc{xd6}}} 17 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{wb7?! \textsc{xb7}}} 18 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{exe6}}} \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xd6}}} 19 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{d3 looks like an edge for White})} 15...\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f2}}} 16 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{b3}}} 0-0-0 17 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{d6+ \textsc{xd6}}} 18 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{exe6}}} \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xb3}}} 19 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{c3 \textsc{xe1}}} 20 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{c5 \textsc{xg2}}} 21 \textbf{\textit{\textsc{xe6+}}}}}

\textbf{\textit{\textsc{136}}}

The Knight Sacrifice on b5

\[ \text{d8! 22} \text{xf7 g6 23} \text{b1 c6 24} \text{e6+} \text{d7 25} \text{c5+} \text{d8 26} \text{e6+} \text{was drawn in M.Carlsen-B.Gelfand, Biel 2005.}

14 \text{xb5+ e7 15 fxe5}

15...\text{exe5}

Again Black has alternatives:

a) 15...\text{d5 16 b1 g5 17 h1f1 exe5 18 fe1 f6 19 c6 xd4? (a bit optimistic, but Black did not like 19...xc6 20 xc6+ d6 21 e5 g7 22 c4) 20 xd4 xc6 21 d3 g7 22 xd5 h8 23 d4 xg2 24 d7+ f8 25 c3 g8 26 g1 c6 27 c7 d5 28 b3 h6 29 f1 a4 30 c4 f5 31 xf5 and Black at last gave up in K.Haznedaroglu-Kr.Georgiev, Antalya 2001.}

b) 15...\text{e4 16 h1f1 exe5 17 f5+ exf5 18 xf5 e6 19 d7+ xd7 20 xd7 d6 was seen in E.Fernandez Romero-Wei Chenpeng, Moscow 2005, and now best is 21 xf7+! xf7 22 we6+ d8 23 wb6+ xd7 24 xb7+ e6 25 xa8 when White's pawns should carry the day.}

16 \text{he1 f4+}

Black hasn't anything better: 16...\text{g5+ 17 b1 g4 (17...d5 18 c6+ e8 19 b4+ e7 20 c6 wins)}

18...\text{exe6! fxe6 19 d7+ f6 20 f1+ is winning, according to Minev, and 16...\text{e4 17 c6 f4+ 18 b1 x6c6 19 xc6+ e8 20 b3 c7 21 d4 d6 22 exe6! fxe6 23 wxe6+ e7 24 xd6 was rather strong too in J.De Toledo-D.Di Berardino, Guarulhos 2006.}

17 \text{b1 d5 18 c6+}

18...\text{xc6}

Or 18...\text{d6 19 c4 f5+ 20 xf5 exf5 21 b4 and wins, according to Minev.}

19 \text{xc6 b8}

After 19...\text{a7 20 b3 (but not Minev's 20 c3 d7 21 d4 b8 22 ed1 which he considered to be winning, but after 22...e5 23 b4 c7 24 c5+ f6 25 w2+f2+ g6 26 w3+ f6 we see only a draw) 20...d7 21 b5 White wins material.}

20 \text{a3+ b4 21 a7+ 1-0}

---

Game 82
L.Psakhis-V.Tukmakov
USSR Championship, Frunze 1979

1 e4 c5 2 df3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 df6
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

5 d3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 wc7 8 w3 b5 9 0-0-0 b4 10 e5 w7

11 wh3?!

After the complicated 11 cb5! axb5 12 xb5+ we saw in Chapter Two that Kasparov once erred with 12...wd7?. As we indicated there, theory prefers 12...wd7.

11...dxe5 12 cb5

According to Tukmakov, 12 fxe5 wxe5 13 xf6 gxf6 is better for Black, but 13...wxf6 14 cb5! has long been known to be one to avoid since the game M.Chiburdanidze-V.Tukmakov, Tashkent 1980.

12...axb5 13 xb5+

13 w6!:

This looks like the winning move and is obviously much stronger than 13...wd7? 14 xex6 wb6 15 xd7+ xd7 16 xg7+ xg7 17 xd7+ xf8 18 we7+ xg8 19 xd7, which gives White an advantage as indicated by Tukmakov.

14 fxe5 xb5 15 exf6 xd7!

White is ahead in development, but it’s not enough for a piece: Black’s e6-pawn is a bulwark which can resist the enemy assault.

16 cb5

White desperately tries to crash through the black wall, but it’s all to no avail. Alternatively, after 16 xf1 xa2 17 g4 h5 18 e4 cb6 White’s attack is finished.

16...gxf6!

The inconsistent 16...exf5?? is punished by 17 xf1 xe6 18 xf5 xd7 19 f5 xg7 20 xh7 xg5+ 21 wb1 xg7 22 xg7 a5 23 xex6+ fxe6 24 g8+ we7 25 xg7+ with a draw.

17 xf6 xg8 18 xh7 b3!

A neat stiletto thrust which will penetrate the enemy defence.
19 \( \text{d6}^+ \)

Or 19 axb3 \( \text{axa1} + 20 \text{xd2} \text{xg2}^+ \) and Black is winning.

19...\( \text{xd6} \) 20 \( \text{xd6} \text{xf8}^! \) 0-1

Black's numerous threats forced White to resign.

The alternative sacrifice of the bishop on b5 will be discussed in the next chapter.

14...\text{axb5} 15 \text{xb5} \text{d5}

There's also 15...\text{e4}, an idea of Lev Gutman's. Play might then continue 16 \text{d2} \text{f8}! (Boris Spassky gave this as good for Black back in 1976) 17 \text{c4} \text{g6} 18 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 19 \text{xe5} \text{b4} 20 \text{f2} \text{f7} 21 \text{xf7} + \text{xf7} 22 \text{xf7} \text{xf7}, which looks roughly equal to us, although Black has scored well from here in practice.

However, 15...\text{d8} appears inferior:

16 \text{e1} \text{e4} 17 \text{d5} (or 17...\text{f8} 18 \text{dxe4!} \text{f7} 19 \text{c4} \text{d5} 20 \text{xd5} \text{xd5} 21 \text{xd5} \text{d6} 22 \text{b5} + \text{f8} 23 \text{xf6} \text{gf6} 24 \text{f5} with the better chances for White) 18 \text{xd5} \text{xd5} 19 \text{xe4} \text{c5} 20 \text{xe7} \text{wg1+} 21 \text{e1} \text{xe1} + 22 \text{xe1} \text{xe7} 23 \text{c5} \text{f8} 24 \text{hxh7} \text{g8} 25 \text{hxh7} \text{g2} 26 \text{b3} and White went on to win in M.Oleksienko-Y.Kuzubov, Lvov 2005.

16 \text{xd5}! \text{xd5}

17 \text{d1}!

The winner claimed this as a new move, but it had been given by Spassky in 1976! Instead 17 \text{xd5?} \text{c8} 18 \text{c3} \text{xg5} 19 \text{fxg5} \text{f7} 20 \text{e1} \text{a6} 21 \text{f1} \text{c8} 22 \text{e1} \text{f7} 23 \text{a4} \text{c8} 24 \text{e4} \text{c5} 25 \text{xe5+} \text{xe5} 26 \text{xe5+} \text{d6} 27 \text{e2} \text{f1} + saw Black win in H.Suradiradja-A.Bachtia, Surakarta 1982.

17...\text{0-0-0}

17...\text{c8} 18 \text{c4!} \text{d6} 19 \text{xd6} \text{xd6} 20 \text{xd5} is very strong too, as given by the winner.

18 \text{xd5} \text{xg5} 19 \text{fxg5} \text{e4} 20 \text{d6!} \text{he8}

Chudinovskih also analyses
20...\textit{wa7} 21 \textit{b3!} \textit{e3} 22 \textit{\textsc{xc}6+} \textit{\textsc{xb}7} 23 \textit{\textsc{d}5} \textit{\textsc{db}8} 24 \textit{\textsc{wd}6+} \textit{\textsc{a}8} 25 \textit{\textsc{xc}7} \textit{\textsc{wb}6} 26 \textit{\textsc{c}6+} \textit{\textsc{db}8} 27 \textit{\textsc{bd}7} as winning.


21 \textit{\textsc{xd}7+} \textit{\textsc{xd}7} 22 \textit{\textsc{c}4+} \textit{\textsc{c}7} 23 \textit{\textsc{c}6} \textit{\textsc{d}7} 24 \textit{\textsc{wa}6+} \textit{\textsc{d}8} 25 \textit{\textsc{xc}7} \textit{\textsc{xc}7}

Or 25...\textit{\textsc{xc}7} 26 \textit{\textsc{wa}8+} \textit{\textsc{xd}7} 27 \textit{\textsc{wa}4+} \textit{\textsc{d}8} 28 \textit{\textsc{wd}4+} and White will blockade the e-pawn with his queen and win easily.

26 \textit{\textsc{wa}7+} \textit{\textsc{c}6} 27 \textit{\textsc{e}3} \textit{\textsc{d}5} 28 \textit{\textsc{b}4} \textit{\textsc{ee}5} 29 \textit{\textsc{a}4} 1-0

\textbf{Game 84}
\textbf{A.Perez-P.McIntoch}
Camaguey 1997

1 \textit{e4} \textit{c5} 2 \textit{\textsc{f}3} \textit{d6} 3 \textit{d4} \textit{cxd4} 4 \textit{\textsc{xd}4} \textit{\textsc{f}6} 5 \textit{\textsc{c}3} \textit{a6} 6 \textit{\textsc{g}5} \textit{e6} 7 \textit{f4} \textit{\textsc{wc}7} 8 \textit{\textsc{f}3} \textit{b5} 9 \textit{\textsc{f}5} \textit{\textsc{b}4} 10 \textit{\textsc{cb}5}!?

The author of this sacrifice was that master of Sicilian sacrifices, Dragoljub Velimirovic. For a piece, White is getting couple of pawns and an attack. Instead after the more logical 10 \textit{\textsc{d}1} \textit{\textsc{c}6} 11 \textit{\textsc{xc}6} \textit{\textsc{xc}6} 12 \textit{\textsc{fxe}6} \textit{\textsc{fxe}6} 13 \textit{\textsc{d}3} \textit{\textsc{ae}7} 14 0-0 0-0 the position is roughly equal and the two legends took a draw

10...\textit{axb}5 11 \textit{\textsc{xb}5\textsc{d}7} 12 \textit{\textsc{f}xe}6 \textit{\textsc{xb}5} 13 \textit{\textsc{xb}5} \textit{\textsc{wb}7}

Not forced:

a) After the aggressive 13...\textit{\textsc{wc}4} 14 \textit{\textsc{xf}6} \textit{\textsc{gx}f6} 15 \textit{\textsc{wx}f6} \textit{\textsc{wx}e}4+ 16 \textit{\textsc{d}1} \textit{\textsc{wd}5+} 17 \textit{\textsc{c}1} \textit{\textsc{xb}5} 18 \textit{\textsc{exf7+} \textsc{d}7} 19 \textit{\textsc{wh}8} \textit{\textsc{g}5+} 20 \textit{\textsc{b}1} \textit{\textsc{xg}2} 21 \textit{\textsc{c}1} \textit{\textsc{c}6} 22 \textit{\textsc{a}3} \textit{\textsc{e}5} 23 \textit{\textsc{wx}h7} \textit{\textsc{wd}5} 24 \textit{\textsc{xf}5+} \textit{\textsc{c}7} 25 \textit{\textsc{ax}b}4 \textit{\textsc{xa}1+} 26 \textit{\textsc{xa}1} White won in V.Makij-Arnason, Helsinki 1991.

b) Theory has often preferred 13...\textit{\textsc{wc}5}, but after 14 \textit{\textsc{xf}6} \textit{\textsc{fxe}6} 15 \textit{\textsc{wh}3} \textit{\textsc{gx}f6} 16 \textit{\textsc{wx}e}+ \textit{\textsc{e}7} 17 0-0-0 \textit{\textsc{xb}5} 18 \textit{\textsc{w}c}8+ \textit{\textsc{d}8} 19 \textit{\textsc{xd}6} \textit{\textsc{f}7} (risky; 19...\textit{\textsc{g}5+} 20 \textit{\textsc{b}1} \textit{\textsc{wa}5} 21 \textit{\textsc{hd}1} \textit{\textsc{xa}2+} 22 \textit{\textsc{c}1} \textit{\textsc{f}7} 23 \textit{\textsc{xd}5} \textit{h}5 24 \textit{\textsc{xd}8} \textit{\textsc{wa}7} 25 \textit{\textsc{wh}5} \textit{\textsc{xd}8} 26 \textit{\textsc{wh}7+} finished as a draw in O.Milani-E.Dibley, correspondence 2004) 20 \textit{\textsc{wb}6+!? \textsc{g}7} 21 \textit{\textsc{xd}8} \textit{\textsc{we}5} 22 \textit{\textsc{wx}e}5 \textit{\textsc{fxe}5} 23 \textit{\textsc{hd}1} \textit{\textsc{xa}2} 24 \textit{\textsc{b}1} \textit{\textsc{xd}8} 25 \textit{\textsc{xd}8} \textit{\textsc{za}8} 26 \textit{\textsc{g}4} \textit{\textsc{f}7} 27 \textit{\textsc{h}4} \textit{\textsc{g}7} 28 \textit{\textsc{b}3} \textit{\textsc{f}7} 29 \textit{\textsc{b}2} \textit{\textsc{g}7} 30 \textit{\textsc{c}3} \textit{\textsc{bxc}3+} 31 \textit{\textsc{xc}3} \textit{\textsc{f}7} 32 \textit{\textsc{h}8} \textit{\textsc{g}7} 33 \textit{\textsc{c}8} \textit{\textsc{f}6} 34 \textit{\textsc{c}4} \textit{\textsc{h}6} 35 \textit{\textsc{b}4} Black gave up in the game M.Manduch-W.Casier, correspondence 2005.
14 $\text{x}f6 \text{xb}5$

And not 14...gxf6? 15 $\text{x}f6 \text{xe}4+$ 16 $\text{d}1 \text{d}5+$ 17 $\text{c}1 \text{h}6+$ 18 $\text{h}6$ $\text{xb}5$ 19 $\text{g}7$ when White wins.

15 $\text{x}g7 \text{x}g7$ 16 $\text{xf}7+$ $\text{d}8$ 17 $\text{xf}7$ $\text{e}8$ 18 $\text{f}1$ b3

Black prepares an assault with...

19 $\text{f}8$!?

A forgotten move which may be a refutation of Black’s strategy. 19 cxb3 is the main theoretical try.

20 $\text{f}2$

According to Pavlovic, 19...$\text{xa}2$ 20 $\text{d}1$ bxc2 (after 20...$\text{b}4+$ 21 $\text{f}2$ $\text{xf}8+$ 22 $\text{xf}8+$ $\text{c}7$ 23 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{b}6$ 24 $\text{e}7$ bxc2 25 $\text{e}8$ $\text{cxd}1$ $\text{c}+$ 26 $\text{g}3$ $\text{c}6$ 27 $\text{xa}2$ $\text{e}1+$ 28 $\text{g}4$ $\text{f}2+$ 29 $\text{f}5$ $\text{d}1$ 30 h3 the two queens were too much in W. Knebel-J. Exposito Cabrera, correspondence 2001) 21 $\text{d}6+$ $\text{c}8$ 22 $\text{xe}8+$ $\text{xe}8$ 23 $\text{c}3+$ is winning for White with his attack.

Instead in his analysis Pavlovic tried to prove that 19...bxc2 is the best way for Black to get a playable position. It took us many hours to find a win for White after 20 $\text{f}6+$ $\text{c}8$ 21 $\text{e}1$ $\text{b}4+$ (21...$\text{a}5+$ 22 $\text{e}2$ $\text{h}5+$ 23 $\text{d}2$ $\text{b}7$ 24 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{a}6$ 25 $\text{xc}2$ $\text{e}5$ 26 $\text{f}3$ $\text{a}5+$ 27 $\text{c}3$ $\text{c}6$ 28 $\text{d}3+$ $\text{b}6$ 29 $\text{c}1$ wins for White) 22 $\text{f}1$ $\text{c}4+$ 23 $\text{g}1$ $\text{xf}8$ 24 $\text{xf}8+$ $\text{b}7$ 25 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{c}8$ 26 h3 $\text{c}6$ 27 $\text{d}7+$ $\text{b}8$ 28 $\text{e}7$ $\text{d}4+$ (28...$\text{e}7$ 29 $\text{xe}7$ concedes a win to White; the text explores an attempt to keep fighting) 29 $\text{h}2$ $\text{e}5+$ 30 $\text{g}3$ $\text{xe}7$ 31 $\text{xc}2$ $\text{a}7$ 32 $\text{d}8+$ $\text{b}7$ 33 $\text{c}7+$ $\text{a}6$ 34 $\text{c}3$ d5 35 $\text{a}3+$ $\text{b}5$ 36 $\text{b}3+$ $\text{c}4$ 37 $\text{b}6$ and White’s various threats will finish the game. However, all this analysis needs testing and possibly the reader will find an improvement somewhere.
Now look how White's king masterfully escapes from the black queen.

20...\textit{c5}+ 21 \textit{f3} \textit{h5}+ 22 \textit{g4} \textit{h3}+ 23 \textit{e2} \textit{xh2}+

Or 23...\textit{g2}+ 24 \textit{e3} \textit{h3}+ 25 \textit{f3} \textit{h4} 26 \textit{b7} \textit{g5}+ 27 \textit{e2} and White wins material.

24 \textit{d3} \textit{xc2}+ 25 \textit{e3} \textit{c5}+

According to Pavlovic, 25...\textit{c6} 26 \textit{xex8} \textit{exe8} 27 \textit{f1} \textit{bxa2} 28 \textit{f8} a1\textit{w} 29 \textit{xex8}+ \textit{exe8} 30 \textit{f7}+ \textit{d8} 31 \textit{e7}+ is winning for White.

26 \textit{f3} \textit{wb5}

26...\textit{xa2} 27 \textit{exe8}+ \textit{exe8} 28 \textit{f7}+ \textit{d8} 29 \textit{e7}+ \textit{c7} 30 \textit{e8w}+ wins.

27 \textit{c1} 1-0

Presumably Black gave up. We couldn't find the rest of the game, but we believe it's a very important one for this variation. After 27...\textit{d3}+ 28 \textit{f4} \textit{d2}+ 29 \textit{g3} \textit{e3}+ 30 \textit{h4} \textit{xc1} 31 \textit{exe8}+ \textit{exe8} 32 \textit{f7}+ \textit{d8} 33 \textit{e7}+ \textit{c7} 34 \textit{e8w}+ Black's king can't escape the attention of the two ladies.
The Bishop Sacrifice on b5

The sacrifice \( \text{exb5} \) is after \( \text{c3-d5} \) the most common sacrificial theme in the Open Sicilian, since in many variations Black plays \( \text{...a6 and ...b5 at an early stage} \) when White’s lead in development is best exploited by this direct assault. In almost all cases Black is uncastled or has castled long, and the considerations outlined next apply in either case.

After playing \( \text{exb5 axb5} \), White will normally recapture with his knight from d4, especially in the typical case of the black queen being posted on c7. White thus gains a second pawn and a tempo straightaway. In certain cases, when the pawn on d6 is insufficiently guarded, White will gain a third pawn with check, disturbing the enemy king and, if Black has castled long, achieving a decisive fork on the weakened point f7. Other times, White may follow up \( \text{dxb5} \) with the thrust e4-e5 which often ensures a trade of dark-squared bishops to enable a big check on d6. (See Velimirovic-Al Kazzaz below for an illustration of these latter ideas.)

We haven’t examined many endings in this book (nor will we), but the following is a well-known classic which illuminates some considerations in the ‘three-pawns-for-a-piece’ structure which can arise if White is fortunate.

**Game 85**
**D.Bronstein-M. Najdorf**
**Buenos Aires 1954**

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{f3} \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{exd4 f6} \)
5 \( \text{c3} \) a6 6 \( \text{g5} \) e6 7 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{bd7} \)

Nunn prefers 7...h6 here, continuing 8 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{c7} \). Then White might try 10 \( \text{e2} \) which conceals a nifty trap, viz. 10...b5? 11 e5 \( \text{b7} \) 12 \( \text{xe6!} \) \text{xe6} 13 \( \text{wh5+} \). Also losing here.
is 12...\textit{w}c8 13 \textit{\text{gx}}g7 14 \textit{w}g3 dxe5 15 \textit{w}xg7.

8 0-0-0 \textit{w}c7 9 \textit{w}g3 b5 10 \textit{\text{ax}}b5? \textit{\text{ax}}b5 11 \textit{\text{dx}}b5

Pachman in his \textit{Modern Chess Strategy} prefers 15 \textit{\text{xf}}x6 \textit{\text{xf}}x6 16 \textit{\text{hd}}1 \textit{e}b7 17 f3 \textit{\text{e}}7 18 \textit{\text{kb}}6.

15...\textit{b}7 16 f3 0-0?

I must agree with Pachman that it is much more sensible to play 16...0-0-0 here. The black king would be well placed on the queenside to assist the blockade of White’s pawns, and just as important, it would be out of the way for Black to seek counterplay with ...g5-g4.

17 b3 \textit{\text{fc}}8 18 \textit{\text{b}2} \textit{\text{c}5} 19 \textit{e}3

19...e5?!

In a few moves this will look like hara-kiri, but it is hard to suggest a spirited alternative. At present I think the following is a good try: 19...\textit{w}f8 20 \textit{\text{hd}}1 \textit{\text{e}}7 21 e5 \textit{\text{d}5} 22 \textit{\text{dx}}d5+ exd5 23 c4 when Black should return the piece with 23...dxc4! 24 \textit{\text{xc}}x5 \textit{\text{xc}}5 25 \textit{\text{dd}}7+ \textit{\text{ee}}6 26 \textit{\text{xb}}7 c3+ 27 \textit{\text{sa}}1 \textit{\text{xe}}5 and this double rook ending offers some counterplay for Black. Also possible in this line is to put the king on e8 instead of e7; at least the computer does not show a forced win in that case.

20 \textit{\text{hd}}1 \textit{\text{e}6} 21 \textit{\text{b}6} \textit{\text{c}6} 22 \textit{\text{d}5}
\( \text{xd5} \)

After this virtually forced capture, White has four connected passers and the rest, as they used to say, is a mere bagatelle.

23 \text{exd5} \text{xc5} 24 \text{xb5}

This is an ideal square for the rook. It is a perfectly safe perch from which to fight for the key blockade square c5.

24...\text{xfd7} 25 \text{c4} e4 26 \text{xc5} \text{xc5} 27 fxe4 \text{xe4}

28 d6!

Establishing a pawn pair on the sixth rank is much more to be valued than hoarding all the booty.

28...\text{xa2+} 29 \text{xa2} \text{c3+} 30 \text{a3} \text{xd1} 31 \text{c5} \text{xc3} 32 \text{a5} \text{d5} 33 \text{c6} \text{f6}

34 \text{a6} \text{f8} 35 \text{b4} e8 36 \text{b5} \text{d7} 37 \text{a7} \text{b8} 38 \text{xd7} \text{xb5} 39 \text{a7} \text{b8} 40 \text{d7+ e7} 41 \text{d8+ xxd8} 42 \text{c7+ 1-0}

**Game 86**

D. Velimirovic-R. Al-Kazzaz

Nice Olympiad 1974

9 0-0-0 \text{bd7} 10 \text{d3} b5 11 \text{he1} \text{b7} 12 \text{g3}

Spassky’s idea, introduced in his 1972 match against Fischer.

12...0-0-0?!

12...b4 was considered in Conticelli-Paolozzi, at the beginning of Chapter One.

13 \text{xb5}!

This assault has pretty much put Black’s 12th move out of business, whereas Spassky preferred 13 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 14 \text{xg7} which won a pawn but Fischer scrounged up enough play to draw.

13...\text{xb5} 14 \text{xb5} \text{b6} 15 \text{e5}

15...d5

Moving the knight at once or swapping pawns on e5 will inevitably lead to a fatal knight check on d6. Thus Black offers to return a piece, hoping to recapture with tempo with his pawn and at least secure a bit of play. However, Velimirovic will not be mollified.

16 \text{f5}!

With this intermezzo, White opens both the e-file and the diagonal leading to c7. Moreover, he threatens 17 fxe6
Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian

fxe6 18 exf6 gxf6 19 ıt7xe6! ıt7xe6 20 ıt7c7
mate and, of course, 16...exf5 17 exf6
forces the bishop to recapture and so
allows the knight into d6.  

16...tı5 17 ıt7h4 ıt7xg5+ 18 ıt7xg5 ıt7xe5
19 ıt7xh5 d4 20 ıt7xe5 ıt7xc3 21 ıt7c3
ıt7xd1+ 22 ıt7xd1 ıt7d8 23 ıt7e1

The rest is perfunctory.

23...exf5 24 ıt7xf5 ıt7h6+ 25 ıt7b1 ıt7xh2
26 ıt7xf7 ıt7xg2 27 ıt7e6+ ıt7b8 28 ıt7e5+
1-0

As a matter of fact, it’s mate in ten
from here, but taking Black’s rook
with check would be enough to finish mat­
ters among the civilized.

In the Sveshnikov too the ıt7xb5 sac­
rifice is a recurring theme, here to retake
with the d4-knight and threaten ıt7c7+ aided by the other knight that has al­
ready reached d5. Yury will analyse
several attempts along these lines in the
body of this chapter, but for now I wish
to display a trap with which every
Sveshnikov fan should be familiar. The
following is an example of what I like to
term ‘one-time cons’, a name appropri­
atated from the American poker writer
John Fox. Should you happen to catch
an unprepared opponent in this line, it
is highly probable your victim will walk
right into the trap and so you will gar­
nner an easy point.

12 ıt7xb5! axb5 13 ıt7xb5

Now Black faces a conundrum:
13...ıt7a7 loses after 14 ıt7xa7 ıt7xa7 15
ıt7a4+ ıt7d7?? 16 ıt7f6+ and 13...ıt7a4??
just hangs a rook. So Wachtel tried...

13...ıt7g5 14 ıt7dc7+ ıt7d7 15 ıt7d5 ıt7b7
16 ıt7xf7 ıt7e7 17 ıt7f5 ıt7d7? 18 ıt7f6+ 1-0

Over to Yury:

Game 88
A.Shirov-V.Topalov
Leon (rapid) 2001

1 e4 c5 2 ıt7f3 ıt7c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ıt7xd4
ıt7f6 5 ıt7c3 e5 6 ıt7db5 d6 7 ıt7g5 a6 8
ıt7a3 b5 9 ıt7xf6 gxf6 10 ıt7d5 f5 11 ıt7xb5
axb5 12 ıt7xb5

This game made the chess world
pay more attention to White’s 11 ıt7xb5
sacrifice, at least for a while.

12...\texttt{Na4 13 b4 Nxb4 14 Qc7+ \texttt{Qd7 15 0-0}}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

15...\texttt{Nxc7}

Topalov and Fritz believe that three pieces are much better than one queen. In this game Shirov shows his disagreement.

16 \texttt{c3!}

Revealing excellent home preparation. Shirov doesn’t need to snap up the queen. For him a rook, the c-file, two connected passed pawns and an attack on the uncastled king are worth more. Instead after the logical 16 \texttt{Qxc7 Qxc7 17 \texttt{Wh5 Nxe4 18 Wxf7+ Ne7 19 a4 (19 Qfb1 Qf8 20 Qb3 Qb4 21 Qd5 Qxb1+ 22 Qxb1 Nxd7 23 a4 Qa8 24 Qc4 h5 25 g3 Qa5 26 Qb5 d5 27 Qxd5 Nc6 28 Wxc6+ Qxc6 29 Qxa5 Nc5 is roughly equal, M.Rytshagov-M.Ripari, Saint Vincent 2001) 19...Qf8 20 Qb3 Qb4 21 Qd5 Qa6 22 c3 Qe4 23 Qfb1 Qc4 24 Qd1 Qe2 25 a5 d5 26 Qa4 Qc5 27 Qxc4 Qxf2+ 28 Qf1 Qe1+ 29 Wxe1 Qxe1 30 Qxc6+ Qxc6 31 Qxe1 the game was soon drawn in C.Baljon-S.Dolmatov, Amsterdam 1979.}

16...\texttt{Qxe4}

According to Shirov, 16...\texttt{Wb7 17 cxb4 fx4 18 Qc1} gives White a dangerous attack.

17 \texttt{Wh5!}

17...\texttt{d8?!}

Shirov thinks that 17...\texttt{Wa5 18 Wxf5+ Qd8 19 Wxe4} gives White a slight advantage, but we believe that in this unclear position both sides have chances to win.

18 \texttt{Qxc7 Qxc7 19 Wxf7+ Ne7 20 Qab1 Qa6! 21 Qfd1 Qf8 22 Qb3 Qb8 23 We6 Qxb1}

After 23...Qc4 24 Qxf5 Qxb1 25 Qxb1 Qd3 26 Qf1 d5 27 Qe6 Qxf1 28 Qxf1 d4 29 cxd4 Qxd4 30 g3 the position was roughly equal in A.Naiditsch-A.Jakubiec, Griesheim 2002.

24 Qxb1 Qd3 25 Qd1 f4 26 Qd5 Qc2 27 Qc1 Qe2 28 a4 e4

Shirov thinks that 28...Qe4 29 Qb5 Qd2 30 a5 wins for White. Our analysis shows that he is right: for example, after 30...d5 31 f3 Qa3 32 fxe4 Qxc1 33 exd5 Qd1+ 34 Qf2 Qe3+ 35 Qf3 Qe7 36 c4 the three passed pawns should be enough to win.
29 a5 ♞d3 30 ♞a1!

Preparing to push the passed pawn, which is very difficult to stop.

30...♗b2

After 30...♖a6? 31 ♕b3 ♕d7 32 ♖b6 the a-pawn can’t be stopped.

31 ♔c4 ♕b7

Shirov points out that 31...♗b4 32 a6 ♔xc4 33 ♕xc6+ ♔xc6 34 ♖a7 wins for White.

32 a6 ♖a7 33 f3

Now that the black rook has become a spectator, it’s time to destroy the fortress in the centre. In the rest of the game Shirov finishes clinically:

33...♖e5 34 fxe4 ♕xc4 35 ♕c1 ♕xa6 36 ♕xc4+ ♔xc4 37 ♕xc4+ ♕c6 38 ♖f7 ♕d8 39 ♖g8+ ♔d7 40 ♕xh7 ♕c5 41 ♖f7 ♕c1+ 42 ♔f2 ♕c8 43 ♖f5+ ♕c7 44 ♖e6 1-0

15 ♔f4

Shirov’s home preparation, trying to open the centre immediately. A popular draw here is 15 ♖c3 ♔f4 16 ♖xa4 ♕xg2+ 17 ♖g2 ♕g4+, as in T. Luther-L. McShane, Lippstadt 2000.

15...♖d8! 16 ♕c3?!

According to Kasparov, after 16 ♕xd6? ♕xd6 17 ♕b6 ♕d4 18 ♖xa4 fxe4 Black wins with a crushing attack. Better too for Black is 16 fxe5? ♕xe5! 17 ♕d4 (after 17 ♕bc3? ♕xb4! 18 ♕xb4 ♕g4 Black is winning) 17...♕a6.

Perhaps White should try 16 ♕c4!? or 16 ♕b6!? . Indeed, after the latter, 16...♕xb4 17 ♕xc8 ♕xc8 18 ♕d5 ♕d4 19 ♕a8+ ♕d7 20 ♕b7+ ♕e8 21 ♕c8+ ♕e7 22 ♕c3 f6? (22...♕b5 23 ♕xb5 ♕e2+ 24 ♕h1 ♕g3+ 25 ♗g1 ♕e2+ is a draw) 23 ♕f2 ♕f7 24 ♕d5 ♕b2 25 ♕d7+ ♕g6 26 exf5+ ♕h6 27 ♕f7 saw White win in Li Shilong-Zhao Jun, Wuxi 2006.

16...♕a6
In our view White underestimated Black's attack and lost an important tempo with this move. This became the reason for his defeat. Kasparov points out 17  \( \text{dc7? } fxe4 \) 18  \( \text{dxa6 } \text{h3!} \) 19  \( \text{e1 xg2+} \) 20  \( \text{h1 } \text{g4} \) 21  \( \text{f2} \text{exf4} \) and Black is winning. However, we believe that White could get a playable position with 17  \( \text{exf5!? } \text{b7} \) 18  \( \text{f6 } \text{a7} \) 19  \( \text{a7 } \text{xa7} \) 20  \( \text{f2} \).

**17 a4?**

17  \( \text{fxe4} \)

**18 f5**

After 18  \( \text{dc7 } \text{b6} \) 19  \( \text{d5 } \text{g4} \) 20  \( \text{xe4 } \text{b7} \) 21  \( \text{f2 } \text{d4} \) 22  \( \text{d5 } \text{xb5} \) 23  \( \text{axb5 } \text{xb5} \) 24  \( \text{c4 } \text{xb4} \) 25  \( \text{d3} \text{exf4} \) 26  \( \text{exf4} \) 27  \( \text{g4} \) 28  \( \text{xe3} \) 29  \( \text{a2} \) 30  \( \text{b3} \)

**18...\( \text{xb7} \) 19 \( \text{a2} \)**

Alternatively, 19  \( \text{bc7 } \text{e7} \) 20  \( \text{xe7} \)  \( \text{xe7} \) 21  \( \text{d5} ) 22  \( \text{d3 } \text{e2} \) 23  \( \text{f2 } \text{xa4} \) wins for Black, and after 19  \( \text{dc7 } \text{e3} \) 20  \( \text{a2 } \text{b8} \) 21  \( \text{xa6 } \text{h3} \) 22  \( \text{c2 } \text{xa6} \) Black has a crushing attack.

**19...\( \text{e3} \) 20 \( \text{xe3 } \text{e4} \) 21 \( \text{e1} \)**

**21...\( \text{xb4!} \)**

A tactical blow which wins a pawn and the game.

**22 \( \text{xb4 } \text{h6} \) 23 \( \text{h1 } \text{xe3} \) 24 \( \text{we2 } \text{c6} \)**

24...\( \text{xa4} \) 25  \( \text{xd6 } \text{xa2} \) 26  \( \text{xb7+} \)  \( \text{xb7} \) 27  \( \text{xa2 } \text{d4} \) wins for Black according to the victor.

**25 \( \text{a5 } \text{xb4} \) 26 \( \text{xd6 } \text{xd6} \) 27 \( \text{xe3 } \text{wd4} \) 28 \( \text{wc1 } \text{wd5} \) 0-1**

With 29  \( \text{we2 } \text{g2} \) 30  \( \text{wg2 } \text{b5} \) Black wins material.

---

**Game 90**

**M.Yeo-M.Chandler**

**British League 1996**

1  \( \text{e4 } \text{c5} \) 2  \( \text{f3 } \text{c6} \) 3  \( \text{d4 } \text{xd4} \) 4  \( \text{xd4 } \text{e5} \)

5  \( \text{b5 } \text{d6} \) 6  \( \text{c3 } \text{a6} \) 7  \( \text{a3 } \text{b5} \) 8  \( \text{d5 } \text{ge7} \) 9  \( \text{g5 } \text{h6} \) 10  \( \text{xb5?!} \)
It’s amazing how calmly White puts a second bishop in danger and yet Black will have problems to win material. The safer 10 \texttt{Wh5 e6 11 Ed1 \texttt{xd}5 12 exd5 \texttt{d}4 13 c3 b4 14 cxd4 bxa3 15 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{c}7 16 b3 g6 17 \texttt{Wh}3 \texttt{g}7 18 \texttt{c}1 \texttt{a}5+ 19 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{b}6 20 dxe5 \texttt{xe}5 21 0-0 \texttt{fl}8 22 \texttt{d}7 gave White a slight advantage in the game A.Fier-L.Liascovich, Villa Martelli 2006.

10...hxg5

The inferior 10...axb5 11 \texttt{xb}5 \texttt{xa}7 12 \texttt{xa}7 \texttt{xa}7 13 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{xd}5 14 \texttt{xd}5 \texttt{c}7 15 0-0 \texttt{e}7 16 b4 0-0 17 a4 \texttt{b}7 18 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{c}6 19 c3 gave White two passed pawns and a clear advantage in T.Abrahanyan-M.Sarquis, Cuenca 2006.

11 \texttt{xe}7 axb5 12 \texttt{xc}6 \texttt{d}7 13 \texttt{b}4

Black is down one pawn, d5 is a weak square, the pawn on b5 is weak, his king is in the middle and his pieces are not developed, but anyway two active rooks and the bishop-pair give him enough compensation for the pawn!

13...\texttt{h}4?!

In our opinion, better is 13...\texttt{a}4?!
White has an extra pawn, but his advantage has gone with the wind. Black’s bishops are too active and his rooks have found h2 to be a juicy target.

28 g4 e6 29 cb4 bh8 30 b3 c8 31 f6??

Losing the exchange and the game. 31...h4 32 bd5 xf2 33 xf2 xd5 34 xd5 d3 35 f6 dx3 36 g5 d3 37 b2 d4 38 h3 b4 39 a4 d3 40 a5 xh3 41 d5 c5 42 c2 xd5 43 c7+ f8 44 a6 h2+ 0-1

Game 91
M.Tal-M.Stean
Hastings 1973/74

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 xd4 4 cb4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 bd7 8 f3 wc7 0-0-0 b5 10 xb5?

We believe this is not a winning move, but it is good enough for a draw. (Take it from us, there are people who play such lines without knowing all, or even most, of the theory.)

10...axb5 11 dxb5 b8 12 e5 b7

12...a5!? is another line which theory considers satisfactory.

13 we2 dx5 14 c4

14...c5

Another interesting try is 14...e7 15 cx7+ f8 16 xd7 xd7 17 d1 d5 (after 17...f6 18 fx5 d5 19 xe7+ xe7 20 c5+ d7 21 cxd5 dx5 22 xa8 xa8 23 d6+ c8 24 d3 a5 25 c3+ b7 it was perpetual check in M.Perunovic-D.Doric, Vogo­sca 2007) 18 cxd5? (better is 18 xd5! exd5 19 xe7+ when 19...g8 20 xd5 b6 21 d6 xc4 22 xe7+ f8 23 g6+ g8 24 e7+ is perpetual check and 19...xe7 20 cxd5+ d8 21 xa8 a7!? 22 fx5 xc5 23 h4+ f6 24 c6 is rather unclear) 18...xd5 19 xd5 b6 20 fxg5 bxa2 21 bxa2 bxc7 22 wa3+ e8 23 d3 d8 24 wa8+ c8 25 wa5+ wc7 26 wa8+ wc8 27 wa5+a5 and the opponents took a draw in A.Naiditsch-B.Gelfand, Dortmund 2006, but we believe that after 27...e7 28 b4+ e8 29 d6 b7 30 h4 h6 31 g6 f8 32 d1 wb5 33 b3 fxg6 34 c4
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Edmar Mednis used to say. Instead 21...d5! 22 cxd5 exd5 23 bxd5+ e7 24 e1+ f8 25 c5+ g7 26 g5+ is a draw.

22 c5+ f6

After 22...e8!? 23 b5 f5 24 d6+ e7 25 axb7+ White is better.

23 f1+

Now nothing can save Black’s king.

23 g6

23...g7 24 g5+ f8 25 f6 wins.

24 e7 f5 25 e6+ g7 26 e7+ g6

27 h4 g5

Here Tal spotted a checkmate in 7 moves which not everyone would find.

28 h5+ xh5 29 f7+ h4 30 f6+ g3 31 g5+ h2 32 h4+ xg2 33 f2+ g1 34 e2mate (1-0)

Game 92
L.Psakhis-Y.Anikaev
USSR Championship,
Frunze 1979

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 f6
5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 bd7 8 f3
wc7 9 0-0-0 b5
10 $bxb5$

10 e5 $b7 11 \text{W}h3$ will be seen in Vitolinsh-Yuferov later in this chapter. The text has been considered weaker.

10...$bxb5$ 11 $\text{Q}xb5$ $\text{W}b8$

Maybe 11...$\text{W}b6$? is better: 12 e5 $b7 13 \text{W}e2$ $\text{dxe5}$ (13...$\text{Q}e4$ 14 $\text{Q}xe4$ $\text{dxe4}$ 15 $\text{exd6}$ $\text{W}c8$ 16 $\text{W}c7+$ $\text{W}x7$ 17 $\text{dxc7}$ $b7$ 18 $e5$ 19 $\text{W}xe5+$ forced Black to resign in J.De Wit-L.Gutman, Wijk aan Zee 1984) 14 $\text{fxe5}$ $\text{Q}d5$ 15 $\text{Qxd5}$ $\text{Qxd5}$ 16 $\text{Axd5}$ $\text{exd5}$ 17 $\text{Qd6+}$ $\text{Qxd6}$ 18 $\text{exd6+}$ $\text{W}f8$ 19 $\text{W}xe7+$ $\text{Q}g8$ 20 $\text{W}xd7$ $h6$ 21 $\text{Q}e7$! and Psakhis thinks this is unclear.

12 e5 $\text{Qa5}$ 13 $\text{exf6}$ $\text{gxg6}$ 14 $\text{Qh6}$!

An idea introduced by Yuri Balashov three years earlier.

14...$\text{Qxh6}$ 15 $\text{Qxd6+}$ $\text{W}e7$ 16 $\text{Qb1}$ $\text{Qb6}$

Nobody seems to play this way anymore. 16...$\text{Qd8}$ is now popular: for example, 17 $\text{W}h1$ $\text{Qb6}$ 18 $\text{Qxb5}$ $\text{Qa6}$ 19 $\text{Qf5+}$ $\text{W}f8$ 20 $\text{W}c3$ $\text{Qxb5}$ 21 $\text{W}x6$ $\text{Qxb2}$+ 22 $\text{W}xb2$ $\text{Qd5}$ 23 $\text{Qxd5}$ $\text{W}xb2+$ 24 $\text{Qxb2}$ $\text{Qg7+}$ 25 $\text{Qxg7}$ $\text{Qxd5}$ 26 $\text{Qxe6+}$ $\text{fxe6}$ 27 $\text{Qxe6}$ was agreed drawn in C.Lutz-B.Gelfand, Dortmund 2002.

17 $\text{Qce4}$?

Trying to improve over the stem game, which continued 17 $\text{W}d4$ $\text{Qd8}$ 18 $\text{Qdb5}$ $\text{Qxb5}$ 19 $\text{Qxb5}$ $\text{Qd5}$ 20 $\text{c4}$ $\text{Qa6}$ 21 $\text{Qxd5}$ $\text{Qxb5}$ 22 $\text{W}h1$ $\text{Qb7}$ 23 $\text{W}xh7$ $\text{Qxd5}$ 24 $\text{W}xh6$ $\text{Qb8}$ 25 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{Qxa2}$+ 26 $\text{Qc1}$ $\text{Qc8+}$ 27 $\text{Qc2}$ $\text{Qxc2+}$ 28 $\text{Qxc2}$ $\text{Wc4+}$ 29 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{Wb4+}$ 30 $\text{Qe2}$ $\text{Qc4+}$ 31 $\text{Qd1}$ $\text{Wxb2}$ 32 $\text{Qe5}$ $\text{fxe5}$ 33 $\text{Wg5+}$ $\text{Qd7}$ and White resigned in Y.Balashov-L..Polugaevsky, Manila 1976.

17...$\text{Qa4}$! 18 $\text{Qxc8+}$ $\text{Qxc8}$ 19 $\text{Qa3+}$ $\text{Qc5}$

20 $\text{Qxa5}$ $\text{Qxe4}$ 21 $\text{Qa3+}$! $\text{Qc5}$ 22 $\text{g3}$ $\text{f5}$

23 $\text{Qhe1}$!

23 $\text{Qd4}$ $\text{Qg7}$ 24 $\text{Qc4}$ $\text{Wd6}$ should be okay for Black.
We prefer 23...\(\mathcal{g}7\) 24 \(\mathcal{d}5\) (24 \(\mathcal{e}3\) is possible) 24...\(\mathcal{w}b6\) 25 \(\mathcal{w}x\mathcal{f}5\) \(\mathcal{w}\mathcal{d}4!\) when White is in trouble: for instance, 26 \(\mathcal{c}3\) (or 26 \(\mathcal{h}5\) \(\mathcal{a}8!\)) 26...\(\mathcal{f}2\) 27 \(\mathcal{e}2\) \(\mathcal{w}d6\) 28 \(\mathcal{a}7+\) \(\mathcal{d}8\) 29 \(\mathcal{a}5+\) \(\mathcal{e}8\) 30 \(\mathcal{w}b5+\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) and Black wins.

\(24 \mathcal{d}4 \mathcal{g}7 25 \mathcal{c}4 \mathcal{w}d6 26 \mathcal{w}a5\)

Instead 26 \(\mathcal{c}1\) \(\mathcal{b}8!\) 27 \(\mathcal{d}1\) \(\mathcal{a}xb2+\) 28 \(\mathcal{w}xb2\) \(\mathcal{w}xd1+\) 29 \(\mathcal{w}xd1\) \(\mathcal{a}xb2\) 30 \(\mathcal{e}c5\) \(\mathcal{a}xa2\) is equal.

\(26...\mathcal{b}7 27 \mathcal{w}b4 \mathcal{a}b8?\)

Psakhis prefers 27...\(\mathcal{e}xc4\) 28 \(\mathcal{w}xc4\) \(\mathcal{w}b6!\).

\(28 \mathcal{d}1!\)

Stronger than 28 \(\mathcal{c}7+\) \(\mathcal{e}8!\).

\(28...\mathcal{c}5\)

White wins too after 28...\(\mathcal{w}xb4\) 29 \(\mathcal{a}xb4\); he will play \(\mathcal{a}3\) and \(\mathcal{d}3-b3\).

\(29 \mathcal{w}xc5 \mathcal{w}xc5 30 \mathcal{e}xc5 \mathcal{a}xb2 31 \mathcal{c}4!\)

\(\mathcal{a}a3+\) \(32 \mathcal{b}5 \mathcal{c}c8 33 \mathcal{c}c2 \mathcal{f}6 34 \mathcal{b}3\)

\(\mathcal{f}8 35 \mathcal{d}d7 1-0\)

\(11...\mathcal{b}7\)

According to Trajkovic, 11...\(\mathcal{w}xe5??\) 12 \(\mathcal{w}xe5\) \(\mathcal{d}xe5\) 13 \(\mathcal{d}xb5\) is winning for White.

\(12 \mathcal{g}4 \mathcal{w}xe5\)

After 12...\(\mathcal{d}xe5??\) 13 \(\mathcal{d}xe6!!\) \(f6e6\) 14 \(\mathcal{w}xe6+\) \(\mathcal{e}7\) 15 \(\mathcal{a}xb5+\) \(\mathcal{a}xb5\) 16 \(\mathcal{w}xb5\) \(\mathcal{c}c5\) 17 \(\mathcal{d}d6+\) Black gave up in Tietze-O.Amigo, Argentina 1990. However, 12...\(\mathcal{w}b6?!\) is possible: for example, 13 \(\mathcal{f}4\) \(\mathcal{c}c5\) 14 \(\mathcal{e}2\) \(b4\) 15 \(\mathcal{a}b1\) \(\mathcal{bd}7\) 16 \(\mathcal{d}2\) \(\mathcal{d}d5\) 17 \(\mathcal{c}c4\) \(\mathcal{xc}4\) 18 \(\mathcal{xc}4\) \(g6\) 19 \(h4\) \(g7\) 20 \(\mathcal{h}8e1\) \(h5\) 21 \(\mathcal{c}e2\) \(\mathcal{wc}7\) 22 \(\mathcal{c}c3\)

\(\mathcal{b}6 23 \mathcal{d}d4 0-0 24 \mathcal{e}d1\) \(a5\) 25 \(g4\) \(h4\) 26 \(\mathcal{h}2\) \(\mathcal{fd}8\) 27 \(\mathcal{w}xg4\) \(\mathcal{xd}4\) 28 \(\mathcal{e}d4\) \(\mathcal{d}d8\) 29 \(\mathcal{f}6+\) \(\mathcal{f}8\) 30 \(\mathcal{h}7+\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) 31 \(\mathcal{f}6+\)

\(\mathcal{f}8 32 \mathcal{c}h7+\) \(\mathcal{g}8\) and it was a draw in V.Liberzon-S.Tatai, Beersheba 1978.

\(13 \mathcal{d}xb5??\)

Trajkovic thought this was a winning move and put '?' after it, but with the hindsight of many years of theory we can say it's actually losing. Better is
13 \( \text{Ke}2 \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{Kf}4 \text{Wf}6 \) 15 \( \text{Kg}5 \) and White continued his attack in V.Kotronias-E.Hermansson, Malmö 2007. 

13...\text{axb5} 14 \text{h}5!!

The only way to stop the attack.

15 \( \text{Wh}4 \text{c}7?? \)

Black misses a strong resource: 15...\text{c}5!! 16 \text{Qxb5} (White isn’t helped by 16 \text{Qxe6 fxe6 17 Qxe6+ Kf7} 18 \text{Qd4} \text{Wf5} 19 \text{g}4 \text{Wxg4} 20 \text{Wf2+ Kg8} 21 \text{Kg7} \text{Qc}6 \text{0-1 A.Zaitsev-I..Belov, Saratov 1966}) 16...\text{Qxa2} 17 \text{b}1 \text{d}5 18 \text{d}3 (or 18 \text{Qc}3 \text{Wb6} 19 \text{Qxe6 Qxe6} 20 \text{Qc}4 \text{Qc}5!, which improves over 20...\text{Kc7} 21 \text{Wc8+ Qd8} 22 \text{Qc7+ with equality, as given by Nunn}) 18...\text{f}6 19 \text{Qc3} \text{Wb6} 20 \text{Qc7+ Kf7} 21 \text{d}1 \text{Qa5} 22 \text{Qb3 Qa1+} 23 \text{Qxa1 Qa2} and mate in C.Dieta-A.Dearnley, correspondence 1999.

16 \text{Qxb5 Qa5}

Black is toast in any case: 16...\text{wb6} 17 \text{Qf4 Ke7} 18 \text{Qxe6 f6} 19 \text{Qd6+ Kxd6} 20 \text{Qxd6 qa5} 21 \text{Qxg7+ Qd8} 22 \text{Qxf6+ Qc8} 23 \text{Qc3} forced Black to resign in Przybiski-S.Mierzejewski, correspondence 1974, and after 16...\text{Qc}5 17 \text{Qe4 Ke7} 18 \text{Qxe6! fxe6} 19 \text{Qxe6 Qf6} 20 \text{Qd6+ Qf8} 21 \text{Qxf6} White has a crushing attack.

17 \text{Qxe6}!!

Destroying the king’s shelter.

17...\text{fxe6} 18 \text{Qxe6+ Kh7} 19 \text{Qc4} 1-0

It’s mate after 19...\text{wa4} 20 \text{Wf6+ Ke8} 21 \text{Qc7+ Qd8} 22 \text{Qxf8}.

\textbf{Game 94}

\textbf{A.Vitolinsh-S.Yuferov}

\textbf{Moscow 1972}

1 e4 c5 2 \text{Qf3} \text{d}6 3 d4 \text{cxd4} 4 \text{Qxd4} \text{Qf6} 5 \text{Qc3 a6} 6 \text{Qg5 e6} 7 f4 \text{Qbd7} 8 \text{Qf3} \text{Wc7} 9 0-0-0 b5 10 e5 \text{Qb7} 11 \text{Qh3 dxe5} 12 \text{Qxe6? fxe6} 13 \text{Qxe6+ Ke7}
14 hxg5?
Another try is 14 hxg5, as we saw in the previous chapter.

14...axb5 15 hxg5 wxc6
15...wb6 is another defensive attempt: 16 d6+ d8 17 fxe5 c7 18 exf6 (we believe 18 xf6! gxf6, as played in V.Berlinsky-L.Dominguez, Turin Olympiad 2006, and then 19 wxe7 axa2 20 b3 is promising; for example, 20...c6 21 c4 wff2 22 d2 wff5 23 hd1 ha8 24 wdd6+ d8 25 exf6 a1+ 26 b2 e8a2+ 27 c3 b5 28 f7 is winning for White) 18...xd6 19 xd6 wxd6 20 wc4+ c6 21 d1 a4?? (21...e5 is good for Black) 22 fxg7 ecx4 23 gxb8w is good for White, who went on to win in S.Brenjović-V.Jakovljevic, Teslic 2006.

16 d6+ d8 17 fxe5 c7

18 wxe7
Instead 18 xf6 gxf6 19 wxe7 axa2 20 xb7 a1+ (20...fxe5? 21 d3 a1+ 22 d2 h1 23 c5 is a risky attempt by Black to win, D.Boros-E.Najer, Las Vegas 2003) 21 d2 w5+ is a draw.

18...xa2
18...xd5 19 xd5 wxd5 20 xd1

19 exf6 a1+ 20 d2 w5+
And not 20...wg2? when 21 c3 wb3+ 22 d3 wxh1 23 e8+ b8 24 wdd8+ a7 25 e3+ a6 26 d6+ c6 27 wa8+ b5 28 c7 is mate.
21 c3 a5+
Black must take the draw: 21...xd1? 22 xd1 wxd1 23 fxg7 gg8 24 e8+ c6 25 w6+ again leaves him facing mate.

22 d3 w5+
Accurate again, whereas 22...xd1+ 23 xd1 wxg5 24 xb7 leaves White with some chances.

23 c3 ½-½

---

Game 95
V.Rajlich-D.Sahovic
Belgrade 2001

1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 xd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 bd7 8 w3 f7 9 0-0 b5 10 e5 b7 11 wh3 dx5
12 \( \text{Nx}6 \text{fxe}6 \) 13 \( \text{Wxe}6+ \text{Kxe}7 \) 14 \( \text{Nxb}5 \) \\ \( \text{axb}5 \) 15 \( \text{Nxb}5 \) \( \text{Wc}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qd}6+ \text{Qd}8 \) 17 \( \text{fxe}5 \text{Qc}7 \)

So far, all as in the previous game.

18 \( \text{Qb}1? \)

Levy, back in the 1970s, thought this move was ‘interesting’. At first we believed that it offered White a substantial advantage and, indeed, Rybka’s inventor, Vasik Rajlich, has successfully used it at a high level.

18...\( \text{Qd}5? \)

Just look at our following analysis. How can this be bad for White? Consider lines like:

a) 18...\( \text{Kf}8 \) 19 \( \text{Wf}7 \text{exd}6 \) 20 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Wa}4 \) 21 \( \text{exc}6 \text{Qxc}6 \text{d}2 \) 22 \( \text{Kd}1+ \text{Wc}7 \) 23 \( \text{fxg}7 \text{Qxc}8 \) 24 \( \text{g}8\text{W} \text{Qxg}8 \) 25 \( \text{Qf}4+ \text{Qb}6 \) 26 \( \text{Wc}7+ \text{Qxa}2+ \) 27 \( \text{Wa}2+ \text{Qxa}2 \) 28 \( \text{Qxa}2 \text{Qc}4 \) 29 \( \text{Qxe}4 \) 30 \( \text{Qa}3 \) and wins.

b) 18...\( \text{Qxd}6 \) 19 \( \text{Qxd}6 \text{Qg}2 \) 20 \( \text{Qh}1 \text{Qxg}5 \) (20...\( \text{Qae}8 \) 21 \( \text{Qxd}7+ \text{Qxd}7 \) 22 \( \text{Qxd}7+ \text{Qb}8 \) 23 \( \text{Wd}6+ \) and \( \text{Qd}3 \) to come will win quickly) 21 \( \text{Qxd}7+ \) and mate follows.

c) 18...\( \text{Qhe}8 \) 19 \( \text{Qxe}8+ \text{Qxe}8 \) 20 \( \text{Wxc}6+ \text{Qxc}6 \) 21 \( \text{exc}6 \text{Qxf}6 \) 22 \( \text{Qxf}6 \text{Qxf}6 \) 23 \( \text{Qhe}1 \text{Qxg}2 \) 24 \( \text{Qxe}8 \text{Qxe}8 \) 25 \( \text{a}4 \text{Qc}6 \) 26 \( \text{a}5 \text{Qf}6 \) 27 \( \text{c}4 \text{g}5 \) 28 \( \text{b}4 \) and the three passed pawns should win.

d) Unfortunately I came crashing back to earth when I analysed this variation with chess expert Joel Yoffie. He has played only in about five tournaments in his life, but it took him all of 10 minutes to prove that all my work with Fritz was wrong! When I came home and started to analyse Yoffie’s idea I understood that White is in big trouble. For example, 18...\( \text{Qxd}6 \) 19 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( \text{Qa}4 \) 20 \( \text{exe}6 \text{Qhe}8 \!\) forces White to give up more material: 21 \( \text{Qxd}7+ \text{Qxd}7 \) 22 \( \text{Qc}4+ \text{Qc}6 \) 23 \( \text{Qc}4+ \text{Qb}7 \) 24 \( \text{f}7 \text{Qe}4 \) 25 \( \text{Qb}3+ \text{Qb}5 \) 26 \( \text{Qd}6 \text{Qxd}6 \) 27 \( \text{Qxb}5+ \text{Qc}7 \) and White’s four pawns don’t compensate for the rook, so Black has a winning position.

Returning to 18...\( \text{Qd}5 \):

19 \( \text{Qxe}7 \text{Qg}6 \)

19...\( \text{Qxa}2 \) is perhaps the best try, but then comes 20 \( \text{Qb}5+! \text{Qxb}5 \) 21 \( \text{Qd}6+ \text{Qc}8 \) 22 \( \text{Qxa}2 \text{Qe}8 \) (or 22...\( \text{Qc}3 \) 23 \( \text{Qd}3! \text{Qc}4 \) 24 \( \text{Qb}4 \text{Qxb}4 \) 25 \( \text{Qxb}4 \text{Qdxe}5 \) 26 \( \text{Qg}3 \) and the pawn on \text{g}7 is a goner, because 26...\( \text{g}6 \) runs into 27 \( \text{b}3 \text{Qb}6 \) 28 \( \text{Qc}3 \text{Qe}8 \) 29 \( \text{Qe}1 \text{Qbd}7 \) 30 \( \text{Qg}3 \)) 23 \( \text{e}6 \)
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1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 f6 5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 b6 8 d2 \(\text{W}x\text{b}2\) 9 \(\text{W}a1\) 10 e5

10 f5 c6 became the main line of the Poisoned Pawn. The text goes back to 1948!

10...dxe5 11 fxe5 \(\text{f}d7\) 12 \(\text{e}4\) h6

13 \(\text{h}5\)!

Tal introduced this sacrificial idea in a game against Tolush in 1956, although not in this exact position. Instead 13 \(\text{h}4\) is virtually the only move played today when this variation (10 e5) is tried: 13...\(\text{W}a4\) 14 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}6??\) (14...\(\text{W}xa2\) is essential and leads to highly unclear play) 15 \(\text{d}xe6!\) g5 16
\[ \text{and 1-0 was T.Radjabov-V.Anand, Rishon Le Zion (blitz) 2006. A bad day for a world champion.} \]

\[13...hxg5 \]

Here is an example of accepting the other bishop: \[13...axb5\] 14 cxb5 hxg5

\[15 \text{axc6+} \text{Black obtains enough for the queen}\]

\[16 \text{Exe5} \text{Exa4} 17 \text{Efxf6} \text{Exa5} 18 0-0 \text{Exe5} 19 \text{Bb3 Ec5+} 20 \text{Exc5 Exc5} 21 \text{Ec3 Ec3} 22 \text{Exe5 Exc2} 23 \text{Exb8} 0-0 24 Ec2 Ec1+ 25 Ed1 Ec2 26 Ed2 and 1/2-1/2, R.Garbarino-H.Saldano Dayer, Buenos Aires 1995.

\[14 \text{Bb3} \text{Exa2} 15 \text{Ec3 axb5} \]

Perhaps better is \[15...Ec6?! 16 Bxc6 bxc6 17 0-0 \text{Exe5} 18 Ec2 Wa4 19 Wxe5 Wc4 20 Ed3 f5??\] (20...Bb5 21 Ed6+ Ed6 22 Wxd6 Wb6+ 23 Eh1 Ea7 should win) 21 Ef5 Ea7?? (21...Ec7) 22 Exf8+, but by this point White was winning in M.Quinteros-J.Sunye Neto,J San Pedro de Figuy 1981.

\[16 \text{Wxc8+ Ec7} \]

\[17 \text{Ed6??} \]

A rare modern reference saw White prefer 17 0-0! and after 17...Wa7 18 Ed3 Exe5 (18...f5? 19 Wxf5 Exf5 20 Ed6 Wxd4+ 21 Exd4 Ea1+ 22 Ef2 Exe5 23 Wxb8 Eg4+ 24 Ef2 is good for White) 19 Ec5 Ed7 20 Ef5+ Exf5 21 Exd7+ Ef6 22 Exf7 Wg6 23 Wxf5+ Wh6 Black had successfully defended and White had to take the draw in A.Shabalov-A.Areschchenko, Port Erin 2006.

\[17...Ec6! 18 0-0 \text{Exe5!} 19 Ed5+ Exf5 20 Exf5+ Ed6 21 Ec7 Wg6 0-1 \]

---

**Game 97**

**A.Vitolinsh-B.Anetbayev**

**Riga 1975**

1 e4 c5 2 Ef3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Exd4 Ef6 5 Ec3 a6 6 Eg5 e6 7 f4 Ee7 8 Ef3 Ec7 9 0-0-0 Ed7 10 Wg3 b5

Better than 10...0-0 11 Ed3 b5 12 Wb1 b4 13 Ed5! exd5 14 Ef5 Ec8 15 Exg7 Eh8 16 exd5 Eg8 17 Ef5 Ec5 18 Exf6+ and the checkmate in two moves forced Black to give up in V.Koziak-V.Buturin, Lvov 1997. However, 10...h6 11 Eh4 g5!? is playable.

11 Ebxb5 axb5

12 Exb5

Not the only try; Konstantinopolsky's bold 12 Wb1!? is the alternative.
Black correctly avoids 13...\textit{d}d5 14 \textit{xd}5 exd5 15 \textit{x}e7 \textit{xe}7 16 \textit{x}g7 when White is winning, according to Gipslis.

\textbf{14 fxe5 \textit{xe}5 15 h\textit{he}1}

\textbf{17...0-0}

White wins too after 17...\textit{g}5+ 18 \textit{xb}5 0-0 19 \textit{xc}4.

\textbf{18 \textit{xe}7! 1-0}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Notes to this game are based heavily on those of Kasparov and Tsaturian in Informator 46.}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{1 e4 c5 2 f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd}4 \textit{f}6 5 c3 a6 6 \textit{g}5 e6 7 f4 \textit{e}7 8 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}7 9 0-0-0 \textit{bd}7 10 g4 b5 11 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 12 g5 \textit{d}7 13 f5}
\end{center}

For 13 a3 \textit{b}8! see Minic-Fischer in the introduction to Chapter Four.
13...\texttt{c5}

The solid 13...\texttt{xg5}+ is the other main approach for Black.

14 \texttt{f6} \texttt{gx6} 15 \texttt{gx6} \texttt{xf6} 16 \texttt{Wh5}

16 \texttt{g1}?! is Bela Perenyi’s highly interesting idea (see Game 21).

16...\texttt{g8}?!  

An attempt to innovate; the old reliable way is 16...\texttt{d7}. Here is one relatively recent example: 17 \texttt{h3} \texttt{b4} 18 \texttt{xd5 exd5} 19 \texttt{exd5 0-0-0} 20 \texttt{xc6 xe8} 21 \texttt{xe1 b7} 22 \texttt{x7d7 xe1} 23 \texttt{xe1} \texttt{xd7} 24 \texttt{e4 a5} 25 \texttt{xf7xb6} 26 \texttt{d1 c5} 27 \texttt{xc7+ xc7} 28 \texttt{d7 f7} 29 \texttt{b6} 30 \texttt{d8 c7} 31 \texttt{e8 b6} 32 \texttt{d8 c7} 33 \texttt{e8} and \texttt{1/2-1/2}, P.Spitza-V.Hefka, correspondence 2003.

17 \texttt{e5}!

This is Tsaturian’s improvement over 17 \texttt{h3}. Also possible is 17 \texttt{e1}?! \texttt{a5} 18 \texttt{h3 g6} 19 \texttt{b1 d7} 20 \texttt{d5 b4}? (20...\texttt{h6} 21 \texttt{f3 exd5} 22 \texttt{exd5+ d8} 23 \texttt{xd7 xd7} looks better to us) 21 \texttt{e5} with an attack, although the game eventually ended in a draw, P.Carlsson-V.Babula, European Team Championship, Crete 2007.

17...\texttt{dxe5}?  

Not good. Instead 17...\texttt{d5} 18 \texttt{d3 dxd3}+ 19 \texttt{dxd3} gives White a positional advantage, but even 17...\texttt{b4} 18 \texttt{h7} doesn’t help Black: 18...\texttt{g6} (or 18...\texttt{xc3} 19 \texttt{g8} \texttt{cxb2}+ 20 \texttt{b1 dxe5} 21 \texttt{b5+ axb5} 22 \texttt{xb5} \texttt{c6} 23 \texttt{d6+ d7} 24 \texttt{f8} and White wins) 19 \texttt{cb5}!! (in our opinion, this is the strongest move, improving over Kasparov and Tsaturian’s 19 \texttt{b5+}) 19...\texttt{xb5} 20 \texttt{cxb5} \texttt{b3+} 21 \texttt{b1 a5} 22 \texttt{d6+ d6} 23 \texttt{b5+}! (the main idea of this is to divert the queen from the a-file when \texttt{xd6} will mate Black) 23...\texttt{d8} 24 \texttt{c6+ c7} 25 \texttt{xf7+ b8} 26 \texttt{a4!} (forced but sufficient) 26...\texttt{xa3} (26...\texttt{xb5} 27 \texttt{cxb5} 27 \texttt{cxb5 \texttt{a4} 28 \texttt{a4} 29 \texttt{a4} 30 \texttt{a4} 31 \texttt{a4} and a careful advance of the f-pawn will finish matters easily enough.

18 \texttt{xb5}+

Now this looks like the best try for an advantage.

18...\texttt{xb5} 19 \texttt{cxb5} \texttt{b6}

Black avoids both the pitfalls: 19...\texttt{a5}? 20 \texttt{c6} and 19...\texttt{d3}+ 20 \texttt{d3 \texttt{b7} 21 \texttt{h1}.

20 \texttt{xe5}
20...\( \text{a6?} \)

Instead both 20...\( \text{g7?} \) 21 \( \text{dxa7} \) \( \text{xa7} \) 22 \( \text{g6} \) and 20...\( \text{h6+} \) 21 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{g5} \) 22 \( \text{c7+} \) \( \text{f8} \) 23 \( \text{xa8} \) are also winning, but the amazing move 20...\( \text{xa2!!} \), found by Fritz, seems to hold: 21 \( \text{b1}! \) (21 \( \text{c7+} \) \( \text{d7} \) 22 \( \text{dxe6+} \) \( \text{d6} \) 23 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{a5} \) looks hopeless for White) 21...\( \text{a5} \) 22 \( \text{c7+} \) \( \text{d7} \) (only a computer could possibly defend like this!) 23 \( \text{cb5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 24 \( \text{xb5+} \) \( \text{c6} \) 25 \( \text{a6} \) 26 \( \text{d4} \) with a complete mess. We invite our readers to draw their own conclusions, but we are stopping here to preserve our sanity.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{21 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{b7} \)}
\end{array}
\]

21...\( \text{c5} \) 22 \( \text{g7+} \) \( \text{xg7} \) 23 \( \text{xc5} \) wins material or mates, as does 21...\( \text{d7} \) 22 \( \text{bd6+} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 23 \( \text{xd6+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 24 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 25 \( \text{hg1} \) \( \text{g6} \) 26 \( \text{gxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 27 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 28 \( \text{wh6} \) \( \text{c5} \) 29 \( \text{h8+} \).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{22 \( \text{h6}! \)}
\end{array}
\]

22...\( \text{c6} \)

Alternatively, 22...\( \text{d8} \) 23 \( \text{bd6+} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 24 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{c5} \) 25 \( \text{g7+} \) \( \text{eg7} \) 26 \( \text{xd8+} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 27 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 28 \( \text{fxg7} \) wins, as does 22...\( \text{c5} \) 23 \( \text{g7+} \) \( \text{eg7} \) 24 \( \text{fxg7}! \) \( \text{xe5} \) 25 \( \text{g8e5} \) 26 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{f3} \) 27 \( \text{d6+} \).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{23 \( \text{bd6+} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 24 \( \text{xd6} \) 1-0}
\end{array}
\]
Chapter Seven

Miscellaneous Sacrifices

This chapter does not really need an introduction, since a brief note before each game or set of related games can do the task. So let’s pitch right in. I promised to discuss the following game in the notes to Stean-Browne, so I’ll take care of it now. Indeed, it’s no hardship, because this is one of the most beautiful games ever played in a World Championship match.

Game 99
B.Spassky-T.Petrosian
World Championship
(Game 19), Moscow 1969

1 e4 c5 2 d3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 f6
5 c3 a6 6 g5 bbd7 7 c4

It’s worth pausing a moment here to point out that White’s sixth and seventh moves can be inverted. I believe in that case that 7 g5 is undoubtedly White’s most testing move.

7...a5

After 7...e6 8 0-0, the reply 8...h6 was seen in Stean-Browne, whereas the move 8...c7? allows 9 xe6!, as in Keres-Sajtar. Both these games have been discussed earlier in this book. Otherwise, 7...h6 8 xf6 xf6 9 e2 is pleasant for White, while Gligoric considers 7...c7 and 7...g6 as playable, but dismisses 7...b5? 8 d5 xd5 9 xd5 as inferior.

8 xd2 h6?! 9 xf6 xf6 10 0-0-0 e6 11 e1

Spassky’s idea is simple. He will wait until Black castles short, then blast him with g2-g4. In the meantime he prepares a central advance to rush Black along.

11...e7? 12 f4 0-0 13 b3 e8 14 b1
df8 15 g4!

Routine but effective. This kind of line-opening sacrifice is more often played in the Open Sicilian by Black: for example, a ...b5 sacrifice in the
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By now Petrosian was probably regretting his eighth move.

15...\textit{d}xg4

Gligoric mentions 15...\textit{d}d7 16 h4 with g4-g5 to come.

16 \textit{W}g2 \textit{f}6 17 \textit{W}g1 \textit{d}7 18 f5

This thrust, stock in the Sozin, here has the added bonus of threatening to blow open the doors to Black’s home. Maybe Black should submit to passivity with 18...e5. The Armenian’s choice was unsuccessful, to put it mildly.

18...\textit{h}8 19 \textit{d}f1

Threatening 20 fxe6 and 21 \textit{xf}6.

19...\textit{d}b8 20 fxe6

If 20...\textit{xe}6 White can lop off the bishop then continue as he does in the game.

20...fxe6

21 e5! dxe5 22 \textit{e}4

A lovely breakthrough: f6 is crumbling, while 22...\textit{d}xe4? 23 \textit{xf}8+ mates.

22...\textit{h}5 23 \textit{W}g6! \textit{xd}4

Robbing the fans of an even nicer finish. Gligoric gives 23...\textit{d}f4 24 \textit{xf}4 \textit{exf}4 25 \textit{f}3 \textit{wb}6 26 \textit{g}5! \textit{c}6 27 \textit{f}6!, which is certainly strong.

24 \textit{g}5 1-0

This final position deserves a diagram. The end now would be 24...\textit{hxg}5 25 \textit{wh}5+ \textit{g}8 26 \textit{f}7+ \textit{h}8 27 \textit{f}3, so Petrosian resigned. Not even Fischer ever made such short shrift of ‘El Tigre’ as did Spassky here.

Game 100
R.Fischer-J. Rubinetti
Palma de Mallorca
Interzonal 1970

1 e4 c5 2 \textit{f}3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd}4 \textit{f}6
5 \textit{c}3 a6 6 \textit{c}4

Fischer’s pet line which now bears his name.

6...e6 7 \textit{b}3 b5 8 0-0 \textit{b}7?!

Chiefly as a result of this game, 8...\textit{e}7! is now generally accepted as the best defence. You can find discussion of that move elsewhere in this text, including in Nikolenko-Nagy in Chapter Two.

9 \textit{e}1

Fischer was not the first to play this move, but he was the first to demonstrate its full power.
9...\texttt{bd7} 10.\texttt{g5} 

Now Black is in a quandary. He cannot play 10...\texttt{e7} because of 11 \texttt{xe6!}. Instead in an earlier game K.Honfi-S.Tatai, Monaco 1968, cited by Wade and Blackstock in the English tournament book, Black chose 10...\texttt{c5} and was hit with 11 \texttt{d5!}. The Italian master calmly replied 11...\texttt{h6}, and eventually won the game! However, after 12 \texttt{xf6!} (rather than Honfi’s 12 \texttt{xb7}, but White might transpose to Fischer-Rubinetti with 12 \texttt{h4}) 12...\texttt{xf6} 13 \texttt{b4!} exd5 14 exd5+! White should be doing pretty well.

10...\texttt{h6} 11.\texttt{h4} 

Fischer is content to lie in wait, but objectively 11 \texttt{xf6} is probably stronger. King gives 11...\texttt{xf6} 12 \texttt{f3} as promising for White, while Ivkov in \textit{Informator} suggests 12 \texttt{a4} b4 13 \texttt{a2} \texttt{xe4} 14 \texttt{xb4}.

11...\texttt{c5}? 

Walking right into the trap. Kavalek gives 11...\texttt{g5!} 12 \texttt{g3} \texttt{e5} as playable. King continues here with 13 \texttt{xe6!? fxe6} 14 \texttt{xe6} \texttt{d7} 15 \texttt{d5} which he likes for White.

12 \texttt{d5! exd5} 

Instead 12...\texttt{b4} is Tal-Mukhin from Chapter One.

13 \texttt{exd5+} 

13...\texttt{d7} 

White wins after 13...\texttt{e7?} 14 \texttt{f5}.

14 \texttt{b4! a4} 15 \texttt{xa4 bxa4} 16 \texttt{c4} 

Fischer is following earlier analysis by Maric. White has two pawns and a massive initiative for his piece.

16...\texttt{c8} 17 \texttt{xa4} \texttt{d7} 18 \texttt{b3} \texttt{g5} 19 \texttt{g3} \texttt{h5} 20 \texttt{c5!} 

Here they come!

20...\texttt{dxc5} 21 \texttt{bxc5} 

21...\texttt{xd5?} 

I find it amazing that the final
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moves of this game are glossed over in every published commentary I have yet read. No one has yet asked the obvious question: 'Why not 21...\textcolor{red}{c}xd5?'

Clearly the answer is not 22 \textcolor{red}{c}6? \textcolor{red}{b}xb3 23 cxd7+ \textcolor{red}{b}xd7 24 \textcolor{red}{c}xb3 \textcolor{red}{c}xg3 which trades too many pieces. Surely Mikhail Tal would not have repeated this line if that was all he could achieve! I believe Fischer would have played 22 \textcolor{red}{c}2! when I don't see a good defence for Black. The main line runs 22...\textcolor{red}{c}xg3 23 hxg3 \textcolor{red}{g}7 24 c6 \textcolor{red}{g}4 25 f5! \textcolor{red}{a}xa1 26 f7+ \textcolor{red}{c}7 27 \textcolor{red}{d}5+ \textcolor{red}{d}6 28 \textcolor{red}{c}3! \textcolor{red}{b}4 29 \textcolor{red}{d}1+ \textcolor{red}{d}4 30 \textcolor{red}{e}4! \textcolor{red}{c}5 31 \textcolor{red}{d}5+ \textcolor{red}{b}6 32 \textcolor{red}{c}4+ and wins.

10 \textcolor{red}{f}5 \textcolor{red}{c}4 11 \textcolor{red}{c}xc4 \textcolor{red}{c}xc4 12 fxe6 fxe6

13 \textcolor{red}{b}xf6! gxf6 14 \textcolor{red}{h}5+ \textcolor{red}{e}8

Or 14...e7 15 \textcolor{red}{b}5+! exf5 16 \textcolor{red}{d}5+ with a mating attack.

15 \textcolor{red}{w}f7 \textcolor{red}{h}8

White wins too after 15...e7 16 \textcolor{red}{f}5! \textcolor{red}{e}8 17 \textcolor{red}{x}d6! \textcolor{red}{x}d6 18 \textcolor{red}{b}6+ \textcolor{red}{c}7 19 \textcolor{red}{e}d1+.

16 \textcolor{red}{w}xf6+ \textcolor{red}{c}7 17 \textcolor{red}{w}h8 \textcolor{red}{h}6 18 \textcolor{red}{c}xe6+ \textcolor{red}{x}e6 19 \textcolor{red}{w}xa8 \textcolor{red}{x}e3+ 20 \textcolor{red}{h}1 1-0

A Hobbesian game: nasty, brutish, and short.

More typical is the struggle in the following encounter. The sacrifice shatters Black’s kingside, but he has enough resources to scrape through.

The analogue for White of the standard ...\textcolor{red}{c}xc3 sacrifice by Black is a relatively rare bird in the Open Sicilian, and even rarer when it scores a victory; many prominent examples end in a draw. Rarest of all is an effective \textcolor{red}{a}xf6 when the black king’s address is still e8. The following is that most rara avis:

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 101}
\textbf{E.Lasker-V.Pirc}
\textbf{Moscow 1935}
\end{center}

1 e4 c5 2 \textcolor{red}{f}3 \textcolor{red}{c}6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textcolor{red}{x}d4 \textcolor{red}{f}6 5 \textcolor{red}{c}3 d6 6 \textcolor{red}{e}2 \textcolor{red}{e}6 7 0-0 a6 8 \textcolor{red}{e}3 \textcolor{red}{w}c7 9 f4 \textcolor{red}{a}5

Not a good idea. The Scheveningen was still an adolescent in 1935, but even so Pirc should have stayed on safer paths with 9...\textcolor{red}{e}7.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 102}
\textbf{L.Yudasin-Van Wely}
\textbf{Philadelphia 1994}
\end{center}

1 e4 c5 2 \textcolor{red}{f}3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textcolor{red}{x}d4 \textcolor{red}{f}6 5 \textcolor{red}{c}3 a6 6 a4 \textcolor{red}{e}6 7 \textcolor{red}{e}2 \textcolor{red}{c}6 8 0-0 \textcolor{red}{e}7 9 \textcolor{red}{e}3 0-0 10 \textcolor{red}{h}1 \textcolor{red}{c}7 11 \textcolor{red}{w}d2

Yudasin frequently avoids standard paths. This game is no exception.
11...d7 12 f4 $e8 13 $d3 $g4 14 $g1 $xd4 15 $xd4 $f6 16 $xf6 $xf6

The simplifications have been beneficial to Black. White faces the prospect of an inferior middlegame and ending due to his bad bishop. Thus he must act quickly.
17 $ae1 e5 18 fxe5 $xe5

19 $xf6 gxf6 20 $d5 $d8 21 $h6

Now if 21...$e6 there follows 22 e5 with a mating attack. Van Wely finds the only way out.
21...f5 22 $xf6+ $h8 23 $f1 $g6 24 h4

It's very natural to make luft with such a frail back rank, but we think Yudasin missed a stronger plan here. 24 $c4! does many good things: it stops ...$e6, it threatens $xf7, and it prepares $d5 followed by a queenside pawn roller. Indeed, 24...$f8 (24...$c8 25 $d5! $xc2?? 26 $xf7 works this time) 25 $d2! (25 $xf8+? $xf8 26 $d7 $xe4 dissipates all the pressure) 25...$e7 26 $d5 leaves Black with many problems to solve.
24...$e6

Intending to repulse the invading queen with ...$f8.

25 $g5

Yudasin analyses 25 $c3 $xf6 26 $d4 $g7 27 g4 d5! (once more the old saw about meeting a flank attack with action in the centre is affirmed) 28 exd5 (28 g5? dxe4 29 $xf6+ $g8 is very good for Black) 28...$b6 29 $c3 $xd3 30 cxd3 $c8 31 $xf6 $xf6 32 $xc8 $f1+ with perpetual.

25...$g7

Allowing a repetition. McDonald in Modern Chess Miniatures considers some alternatives: 25...$c8 26 g4 $c5 27 $h6! or, better, 25...$e7 26 g4 when Black should again submit to a repetition as in the game.

26 $h5+ $h8 27 $f6 $g7 $\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

Our next example illustrates a rare tactical theme I choose to call Paulsen's Coffin, having in mind the unfortunate predicament Louis Paulsen found himself in against Paul Morphy in their famous encounter at New York, 1857. One of the joys in writing a book like this is the unearthing of a treasure buried in some forgotten tome. The game
which follows is one such. It's so obscure that I don't know the full name of the winner! There were two players with the surname 'Gusev' playing in 1951. Nikolay Gusev has no games in my database which start 1 e4, so I assume the white player is Yury Gusev. (Yury and Nikolay? Coincidence or kismet?)

At any rate, this unknown masterpiece is most likely the greatest achievement in the career of a modest Soviet Master, squashing one of the three survivors (at the time of writing) of the great Candidates Tournament at Zurich in 1953. I found this game in Rolf Schwarz's 1966 compendium Die Sizilianische Verteidigung and have based my notes upon his. Any translations from the German are my own.

**Game 103**

**Y. Gusev - Y. Averbakh**

**Moscow 1951**

1 e4 c5 2 d4 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 c6 5 d3 g6 6 d2 g7 7 b3

A bit early for this. More frequently seen in this position are the moves 7 e3 and 7 0-0.

7...d6 8 0-0 e6 9 f4 f68?

White's unusual move order has caught his eminent adversary napping. The superior 9...wb8 will probably transpose to standard lines.

10 f5!

Instead 10 e3 0-0 would transpose to a main line. In that case 11 f5 d7 12 g4? ! c5 13 g5? xc3 is a favourable exchange sacrifice for Black, but this doesn't work in the game.

10...d7 11 g4 dxc5

With the white pawn storm already under way, Black was reluctant to 'castle into it', but castling was probably a better try.

12 g5 g8

Here 12...xc3? is, of course, well met by 13 gx6!.

13 d5!

White plans 14 f6! exf6 15 gxf6 xf6 16 g5!.

13...f6

Hideous, but 13...gxf5 14 exf5 h6 15 h4, leaving the horse on g8 'zugotl' (literally, move-dead), was also not appetizing.

14 e3 b6 15 c4

White at once sets off to exploit the weakness on e6.

15...f7 16 c3

Preparing wb3.

16...e8

To answer 17 wb3 with 17...a4. Now it was already possible to play technically with 17 a4, but this was Mr. Gusev's day!
17 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 18 \( \text{fxe6}+ \) \( \text{xf8} \)

Here 18...\( \text{xe6} \) 19 \( \text{wb3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{wa4+} \) \( \text{c6} \) 21 \( \text{g4+} \) \( \text{e6} \) 22 \( \text{gxf6} \) and wins is given by Schwarz. After the text, again White could switch fronts with 19 \( \text{a4} \), as perhaps Averbakh might have preferred if he had been White, but Cusev would not be distracted.

19 \( \text{xf6!} \) \( \text{xf6} \)

Instead 19...\( \text{exf6} \) 20 \( \text{xd6+} \) and 21 \( \text{xe5} \) is killing.

20 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 21 \( \text{h6+} \) \( \text{g8} \)

Now what?

24 \( \text{xe5!!} \)

"This position, diagrammed by Schwarz, caught my eye.

24...\( \text{xe5} \) 25 \( \text{xf1} \)

By now poor Averbakh was probably sorry he showed up for this contest.

25...\( \text{c8} \)

The other try is to put this rook on \( \text{c7} \), aiming to blockade the e-pawn on \( \text{e7} \). However, after 25...\( \text{c7} \) 26 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 27 \( \text{b3} \) White has a clear winning plan: put the bishop on \( \text{d5} \), the king on \( \text{g2} \), leave the rook on the f-file to answer ...\( \text{g5} \) with \( \text{xf5} \), tying down the black queen, and make a passed c-pawn whose advance will finish matters. (The advance \( \text{h4} \) if permitted will do no harm.) We won't deprive you of the pleasure you will get playing out this position against your computer by analysing any further.

26 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 27 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 28 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{bxc4} \) 29 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 30 \( \text{bxc4} \) \( \text{we7} \) 31 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{wa3} \) 32 \( \text{xf2} \)

Schwarz criticizes this move, calling it 'an aesthetic flaw which prolongs the game.' He prefers the direct 32 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{wb2+} \) 33 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xc3+} \) 34 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{wa3} \) 35 \( \text{c5}! \) \( \text{xc5} \) 36 \( \text{g7+} \), winning. I must disagree. Herr. Schwarz was a correspon-
idence player for whom shortening the game and saving postage was a serious consideration. Any OTB player will gladly milk this position for all its worth by repeating moves once or twice.

32...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{We}}7 33 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Af}}1 g5

Of course, 33 ....\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wa}}3 34 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Af}}7 is quite hopeless, but nothing helps.

34 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Af}}5

'A cold-blooded winning move', according to Schwarz. Now the black queen can only oscillate between d8 and e7 to keep guard of the mating squares f8 and g5.

34...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}4

Schwarz refutes 34...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd}}8 with 35 c5 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd}}2+ 36 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Af}}2 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd}}8 37 c6.

35 c5 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd}}8 36 c6 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{We}}7 37 c7 1-0

'And Black strikes his colours. A demonic combination!' On that matter Herr. Schwarz and I are in complete accord.

There are not many variations in any opening in which a queen sacrifice is thematic, and in most lines in which the queen is offered, it's Black who does the offering; think of the Open Ruy Lopez with \textcolor{red}{\textbf{We}}2 or Bronstein's sacrifice in the Sämiscb King's Indian. Nonetheless, the Najdorf features a couple of lines in which the white queen can surrender herself for a few bits of enemy pieces. But before we examine those, let's inspect a few odds and ends from the Dragon. First up is a rare positional sacrifice of the queen for a couple of minor pieces including the Dragon bishop:

\textbf{Game 104}
\textcolor{red}{\textbf{R.Nezhmetdinov-L.Chernikov}}
\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Rostov on Don 1962}}

\begin{enumerate}
\item 1 e4 c5 2 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}3 d5 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Qxd}}4 g6
\item 5 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Qc}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}7 6 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Qf}}6 7 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}4 0-0 8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}3 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}4

Suetin considers this dubious.
\item 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wxg}}4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Qxd}}4 10 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wh}}4

The idea. 10 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd}}1 is more natural.
\item 10...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wa}}5 11 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}6
\end{enumerate}

It seems White must resign himself to a draw by repetition after 12 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wh}}6 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}7 13 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wh}}4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}6, etc, but now
Nezhmetdinov reveals his plan:
12 \(\text{Qxf6}!!\)

White will get only two minor pieces for the queen, but he gains the bishop-pair and inflicts severe damage to the enemy pawn structure. Moreover, his minor pieces will have safe and aggressive squares from which to ply their trade; in particular the dark-squared bishop becomes a monster in the absence of its rival.

12...\(\text{Qe2}+!\)

A finesse which gains time. After 12...exf6? 13 \(\text{Qxd4}\) the combined attack of this bishop and the knight about to land on d5 will lead to a rout, and 12...\(\text{Qxb3}\) 13 \(\text{axb3}\) \(\text{Qxa1}\) 14 \(\text{Qxe7}\) is also quite hopeless.

13 \(\text{Qxe2}\) \(\text{exf6}\) 14 \(\text{Qc3}\)

14...\(\text{Qe8}?\)

Black omits the essential counterblow 14...d5!, which would permit him to develop and perhaps trade off one of White's more dangerous men.

15 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 16 \(\text{Qd4}\) \(\text{Qg7}\) 17 \(\text{Qad1}\)

The calm manner in which White masses his forces is most instructive.

17...\(\text{d6}\) 18 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 19 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qb5}\) 20 \(\text{Qc3}\) 28 \(\text{Qxf7}+!\)
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One last combination finishes things.

28...\texttt{exf7} 29 \texttt{\texttt{h8+}} \texttt{\texttt{xh8}} 30 \texttt{\texttt{xf7+}} \texttt{\texttt{h7}}
31 \texttt{\texttt{xd8}} \texttt{\texttt{xe4}} 32 \texttt{\texttt{c6}} \texttt{\texttt{xf4+}} 33 \texttt{\texttt{e2}}
1-0

Enough was enough. A beautiful example of sustained attack.

Theory has grouped all those 6 \texttt{g5} Najdorf lines in which Black plays an early ...\texttt{h6} under the convenient heading 'the Browne Variation', in honour of the six-time United States Champion who assumed the mantle of America's Najdorf guru upon the retirement of Bobby Fischer. Browne tried ...\texttt{h6} in many different positions, but probably his greatest success was in the position arising after 6 \texttt{g5} \texttt{e6} 7 \texttt{f4} \texttt{e7} 8 \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \texttt{\texttt{c7}} 9 0-0-0 \texttt{\texttt{bd7}} 10 \texttt{\texttt{d3}} \texttt{h6} 11 \texttt{\texttt{h3}} \texttt{\texttt{b6}}, as he established in several encounters with the Dutch CM Jan Timman in the 1970s.

The Browne Variation has a sound positional basis, the idea being to gain control of the e5-square with a well-timed ...\texttt{g5}, but when things go wrong, look out! Indeed, White is often able to offer his queen for a devastating attack, as in the following game played when Browne was just a schoolboy.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 105}
\textbf{S.Gligoric-M.Bobotsov}
\textbf{Hastings 1959/60}
\end{center}

1 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c5} 2 \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \texttt{d6} 3 \texttt{d4} \texttt{cxd4} 4 \texttt{\texttt{xd4}} \texttt{\texttt{xf6}}
5 \texttt{\texttt{c3}} \texttt{a6} 6 \texttt{\texttt{g5}} \texttt{e6} 7 \texttt{f4} \texttt{h6}

It later became the norm to play first 7...\texttt{e7} 8 \texttt{xf3} and only then 8...\texttt{h6}.
8 \texttt{\texttt{h4}} \texttt{e7} 9 \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \texttt{\texttt{c7}}

9...\texttt{g5} is the Gothenburg Variation, which we discussed in Chapter Two.

10 0-0-0 \texttt{\texttt{bd7}} 11 \texttt{\texttt{d3}}

So we have transposed to Browne's line should White retreat his bishop to \texttt{h4} in lieu of Timman's 11 \texttt{\texttt{h3}}. In this move order the text has, though, been superseded by 11 \texttt{\texttt{e2}}, which we'll see in our next game.

11...\texttt{b5}?

Without the insertion of ...\texttt{h6} and \texttt{\texttt{h4}} this is a perfectly good move, but here it is fatal! Correct is 11...\texttt{g5}!.

12 \texttt{e5} \texttt{\texttt{b7}} 13 \texttt{\texttt{xe6}}!

Yet another example of the weakening ...\texttt{h6} provoking a lethal strike on e6.

13...\texttt{\texttt{fxe6}} 14 \texttt{\texttt{g6+}} \texttt{\texttt{f8}}

On 14...\texttt{\texttt{d8}}, Rolf Schwarz gives 15 \texttt{\texttt{h3}} \texttt{dxe5} 16 \texttt{\texttt{xe6}} \texttt{\texttt{e6}} 17 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xd7+}} \texttt{\texttt{xd7}}}
18 \texttt{\texttt{xe7+ \texttt{c7}}} 19 \texttt{\texttt{d1}}, etc.

15 \texttt{exf6!} \texttt{\texttt{xf3}} 16 \texttt{\texttt{fxe7+}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g8}}} 17 \texttt{\texttt{gx f3}}
\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d6}}} 18 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xf6}} \texttt{gxf6}} 19 \texttt{\texttt{e8+ \texttt{xe8}}} 20
\texttt{\texttt{xe8}} \texttt{d5} 21 \texttt{\texttt{d4}}

Gligoric later claimed a quicker win with 21 \texttt{\texttt{f5}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xf4+}}} 22 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b1}} \texttt{\texttt{xf5}}} 23 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h1+}} \texttt{\texttt{f8}}} 24 \texttt{\texttt{g6!}}. At any rate, the rest of
this game is purely a technical exercise and requires no further commentary.

In an earlier round Tarjan had played 13 @he1 against Browne but only drew. The text is stronger.

13...g5 14 fxg5 @e5 15 @f3! b5

Can Black play better? A wiser choice is 15...hxg5! when White has two choices: 16 @xg5 @g6 17 @h3 was agreed drawn in A.Soltis-B.Zuckerman, Birmingham 1973, but my preference is 16 @xg5!? @h5 17 @h3 @xg5+ 18 @xg5 @xg5 19 @xh5, which is untested, but I would prefer to be White.

16 @xe5 b4

On 16...dxe5 Geller shows 17 gxf6! @xg3 18 fxe7 @g5 19 @xg5 hxg5 20 @h5 to be winning.

17 @xf7! bxc3

18 gxf6!

By now this should come as no surprise.

18...@xg3 19 fxe7 @g5 20 @xg5 hxg5 21 @xd6+ 1-0

This game was instrumental to Grefe’s sharing of the Championship
with Lubomir Kavalek that year.

**Game 107**

**Pedersen-Hallmeyer**

**Denmark 1973**

1 e4 c5 2 d5 d6 3 d3 cxd4 4 cxd4 g6 5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 b5

Polugaevsky’s move. White’s response is probably the simplest in this hellishly complex opening.

8 e5 dxe5 9 fxe5 f5 10 exf6 e6 11 e5 12 0-0

The immediate 12...a7 is also possible. The last word on this move seems to be Leko-Ghaem Maghami, Yerevan 2001. See the next game.

13 f3 a7 14 c6 f5+?!

14...dxc6 15 bxc6 d7 16 xd7+ xd7 17 f3 d6! is the right way, as pointed out by Geller. He considers 18 h3 best, but then 18...b4! 19 fxg7 (19 d5? xd5 20 fxg7 xd4+) 19...g8 20 xg7 xg7 21 xg7 22 xh2+ 22 xh2+ 22 xh2 bxc3 is assessed by him as ‘no worse’ for Black.

15 h1 d7

Or 15...xc6 16 e4 and the threats of fxg7 and d6+ leave Black in a mess, such as after 16...d4 17 d6+! xd6 18 fxg7.

16 xb8! xd1 17 axd1 gxf6 18 e4

Black has but one saving move...

18...c7?

But this is not it. Correct is 18...f5! 19 xf6+ xf6 20 c6+ e7 21 xf6 xf6 22 d7+ xd7 23 xd7 e7 24 e4 h6 25 d3 d8 with a virtually certain draw (analysis by Geller).

19 xf6+ e7 20 h5! g7

Black avoids mate by 20...xb8 21 g8+ xg8 22 xf7+ e8 23 g7.
This beautiful game, commended by the editors of *Informator*, is almost forgotten today. Sic transit gloria mundi!

Game 108
P.Leko-E.Ghaem Maghami
World Team Championship,
Yerevan 2001

1 e4 c5 2 d4 cxd4 3 cxd4 d6 4 f3 d5 5 c3 a6 6 g5 e6 7 f4 b5 8 e5 dxe5 9 fxe5 c7 10 exf6 dxf6 11 e2 e5 12 0-0 a7

12...e5 was, of course, Pedersen-Hallmeyer, our previous game.

13 d3 Bd7 14 e4 e5 15 Bf3 Bxb2
16 e3 b4

17 a4

So far, all this had been given by Geller in 1976. But in a game from Malmo 2007, 14-year-old Indian GM Parimarjan Negi played 17 Bb1! against Swedish IM Emil Hermansson. That game continued 17...Bc1 18 Bxc2 Bxb4 19 Bxb4! Bxe6 20 Bxe6! fxe6 21 f7+ Bf8 22 Bg5+ Be7 23 Be5 when Black resigned due to the impending mate.

17...Bb4 18 Bc1 Bxc2

19 Bf5

Geller gave 19 Bxb4 Bxb4 20 Bxg7 Bg8 21 Bf6+ Bd8 22 Bb6+ as winning, but any analysis engine will disagree, and obviously so did Leko. Yury did his best to uphold Geller's point of view, but 22...Bc8 23 Bxb4 Bxg7 24 Bf8+ Bd8 25 Bxg7 Bxe2 26 Be1 Bd1 looks drawish to us.

19...Bc7

20 Bxb4!

This is only the beginning!
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20...\texttt{xe}4 21 \texttt{xe}4 \texttt{xb}4 22 \texttt{fxg}7 \texttt{g}8

\textbf{[Diagram]}

23 \texttt{f}6+! \texttt{d}8 24 \texttt{xg}8! \texttt{c}5 25 \texttt{f}6!
\texttt{xe}3+ 26 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{c}8 27 \texttt{xd}7! 1-0

The most ruthless, and sufficient to induce resignation.

In chess, as in life, first impressions last. Paul Keres introduced a fascinating queen sacrifice against Fischer in Zurich 1959, but unfortunately he lost the game. Indeed, Fischer’s improvised defence was so effective that all but a few Hardy souls were deterred from exploring the line. One such intrepid individual was the Colombian GM Gildardo Garcia, who dared to test his ideas against Fischer’s successor as the American Najdorf guru, the Redoubtable Walter Browne.

\textit{Game 109}

\textbf{G. Garcia-W. Browne}

\textit{U.S. Open 1990}

1 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{c}5 2 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{d}6 3 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{cxd}4 4 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{f}6
5 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{a}6 6 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{e}6 7 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}7 8 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}7
9 0-0-0 \texttt{bd}7 10 \texttt{e}2

11 \texttt{x}f6 \texttt{xf}6

\textbf{[Diagram]}

Of course, not 11...\texttt{xf}6? 12 \texttt{xb}5! \texttt{axb}5 13 \texttt{xb}5 with 14 \texttt{xd}6+ to follow, leaving Black’s king a sitting duck in the centre.

12 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{b}7

\textbf{[Diagram]}

13 \texttt{xf}6? \texttt{xf}6 14 \texttt{xf}3 \texttt{xf}6 15 \texttt{xa}8 \texttt{d}5

At present White has a rook and two light pieces for the lady, but the king’s bishop is awaiting execution.
behind enemy lines.

16 \( \text{c6} \)!

This was Garcia's new idea. Keres played 16 \( \text{xd5} \) straightaway, but Garcia uses his bishop's dying breath to sabotage Black's harmony.

16...\( \text{e7?!} \)

Browne's punctuation in *Informator*. In hindsight he preferred 16...\( \text{f8} \) 17 \( \text{ce2} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 18 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xf4}+ \) 19 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{d6} \) 20 \( \text{hfl} \) \( \text{g6} \) intending \( \text{e5} \) with, he claimed, a slight plus for Black. The problem with this is the killing shot 21 \( \text{xe6}+! \) \( \text{xe6} \) 22 \( \text{xd5} \). Now if Black doesn't want to give back the queen and defend a lost rook and pawn ending, he must play something like 22...\( \text{e5} \) 23 \( \text{xf7}+ \) \( \text{e8} \) 24 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{f6} \) when he is holding on by his fingernails. Many moves look good, for instance 25 \( \text{c4} \) or even 25 \( \text{a3} \). I don't see a forced win for White, but I would not mind taking over his chair.

Flash forward 17 years to Las Vegas 2007, another big Swiss, the National Open, and Gildardo Garcia repeats the variation and gets the same position after 16 \( \text{c6}+ \). His young opponent, N.Yap, played 16...\( \text{f8} \) 17 \( \text{ce2} \) \( \text{g6} \), although after 18 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 19 \( \text{hfl} \) \( \text{g7} \) 20 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 21 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 22 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 23 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{xa5} \) 24 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 25 \( \text{a4} \) White had rescued the bishop with continuing pressure. Indeed, White later won, although Black may have missed a draw.

So what should Black do? Nunn and King both mention that Black can transpose to Keres-Fischer with the move order 15...\( \text{xd4} \)! 16 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{d5} \).

Nunn follows with 17 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{exd5} \) 18 \( \text{e1}+ \) \( \text{f8} \) 19 \( \text{e5} \) (instead of Keres' 19 \( \text{xd5} \) which is playable, though) 19...\( \text{g6} \) 20 \( \text{xd5} \) which he implies is about equal. The whole thing is food.
for thought, and inspiration to investigators everywhere.

We now return to Browne's
16...\(\text{\#}\text{e7}:\)

17 \(\text{\#he1}!\)

Nunn gives only 17 \(\text{\#ce2 \#c8}\) as good for Black.

17...\(\text{\#xf4+}\) 18 \(\text{\#b1 \#d6?!}\)

Instead 18...\(\text{\#d8}\) 19 \(\text{\#xe6! \#xd4}\) 20 \(\text{\#xd5}\) is dangerous, but Browne points out the better 18...\(\text{\#d8!}\) 19 \(\text{\#xe6! fxe6}\) 20 \(\text{\#xd5+ \#xd5}\) 21 \(\text{\#xd5}\) \(\text{\#e5}\) 22 h3, although White is clearly better.

19 \(\text{\#xd5 exd5}\) 20 \(\text{\#xd5!}\)

Now an avalanche descends upon Black's head.
20...\(\text{\#g5}\) 21 \(\text{\#xf6 \#xf6}\) 22 \(\text{\#xb5+ \#c5}\)
23 \(\text{\#d6 \#f5}\)

Or 23...\(\text{\#f2}\) 24 \(\text{\#e5+ \#b4}\) 25 a3+ and mate in two.
24 g4 \(\text{\#f4}\) 25 \(\text{\#ed1 \#e4}\) 26 \(\text{\#c3 \#f4}\) 27 \(\text{\#d5+ \#c4}\) 28 \(\text{\#c6+ 1-0}\)

Just in time to avoid the picturesque
28...\(\text{\#b4}\) 29 a3 mate.
Index of Variations

1 e4
1 d4 – 68
1...c5 2 d3 d6
   2...c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 f6 (4...e5 – 149; 4...g6 – 170) 5 c3 e5 6 cdb5 d6
   7 g5 a6 8 a3 b5 9 xf6 gxf6 10 c5 f5

11 xb5 (11 c3 – 146) 11...xb5
12 xb5 a4 13 b4
   13...xb4 – 147
   13...h4 – 148
2...e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 cxd4 a6 (4...c6 5 c3 c7 – 47; 5...d6 – 71) 5 c3
   (5 d3 – 125) 5...c7 (5...b5 – 19) 6 e2 (6 g3 – 8. 17) 6...b5 7 0-0 b7
   8 e1 f6 9 f3 d6 10 f4 bd7 11 dxb5 axb5 12 xb5
   12...a5 – 122
   12...b6 – 124
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3 d4 cxd4 4 ḡxd4 ḡf6 5 ḡc3 and now:

A: 5...a6
B: 5...ḡc6
C: Others

A) 1 e4 c5 2 ḡf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ḡxd4 ḡf6 5 ḡc3 a6 6 ḡg5
   6 ḡe2 e5 (6...ḡc7 – 57) 7 ḡb3 – 114
   6 f4 – 116
   6 ḡc4 e6 7 ḡb3 b5

[Diagram]

8 ḡg5 ḡe7 9 ḡf3 ḡc7 (9...ḡb6 – 54)
   10 e5 – 74
   10 ḡxf6 – 76
   10 0-0-0 – 77
8 0-0 ḡb7 (8...ḡe7 9 ḡf3 – 46; 9 f4 – 73) 9 ḡe1 ḡbd7

[Diagram]

10 ḡg5 h6
(10...ḡc5 – 26) 11 ḡh4 ḡc5 12 ḡd5
   12...b4 – 27
   12...exd5 – 165

6...e6

180
6...\textit{bd}7 7 \textit{c}4 e6 (7...\textit{wa}5 8 \textit{wd}2 e6 – 82; 8...h6 – 163) 8 0-0 (8 \textit{we}2 – 83)

8...h6 – 44
8...\textit{c}7 – 84

7 f4

7 \textit{d}3 – 134
7 \textit{f}3 – 143

and now:

A1: 7...\textit{e}7
A2: Others

A1) 1 e4 c5 2 \textit{f}3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{xd}4 \textit{f}6 5 \textit{c}3 a6 6 \textit{g}5 e6 7 f4 \textit{e}7 8 \textit{f}3

8...\textit{c}7

8...h6 9 \textit{h}4 \textit{e}7 (9...g5 – 64) 10 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}7 11 \textit{e}2 (11 d3 – 172)
11...b5 – 66
11...\textit{b}8 – 66, 173

9 0-0-0 \textit{bd}7

10 \textit{d}3

10 f5 – 10
10 \textit{e}2 – 176
10...\textit{b5} 11...\textit{xf6} (11...\textit{g2} - 39) 11...\textit{xf6} 12\textit{g5} \textit{d7}

13\textit{f5} (13\textit{a3} - 92) 13...\textit{c5}
14\textit{xf6} 15\textit{xf6} \textit{d8}
16\textit{g1} - 40
16\textit{h5} - 161

10...\textit{b5} 11\textit{he1} \textit{d7} 12\textit{g3}
12\textit{d5} exd5 (12...\textit{xd5} - 37, 38) 13\textit{f5} - 37

12...\textit{b4} - 15
12...\textit{0-0-0} - 145

A2) 1\textit{e4} \textit{c5} 2\textit{f3} \textit{d6} 3\textit{d4} cxd4 4\textit{xd4} \textit{f6} 5\textit{c3} \textit{a6} 6\textit{g5} \textit{e6} 7\textit{f4}

7...\textit{bd7}
7...\textit{b6} - 158
7...\textit{c7} 8\textit{f3} (8\textit{d3} - 58) 8...\textit{b5} 90-0-0 (9\textit{f5} - 140) 9...\textit{b4} 10\textit{e5} \textit{b7}
11\textit{cb5} - 60
11\textit{h3} - 138, 139

7...\textit{b5} 8\textit{e5} dxe5 9\textit{xe5} \textit{c7} 10\textit{xf6} (10\textit{e2} \textit{fd7} 110-0-0 \textit{b7} 12\textit{xe6} - 62;
12\textit{g4} - 62, 154) 10...\textit{e5}+ 11\textit{e2} \textit{g5} 120-0
12...\textit{e5} - 174
12...\(\text{a}7 - 175\)

8 \(\text{w}f3\)

8 \&c4 \(b5 (8...\text{w}b6 - 88) 9 \&xe6 \text{fxe6} 10 \&xe6 \text{w}b6 (10...\text{w}a5 - 86) 11 \&xd5 - 86\)
8 \&e2 \&c7 9 0-0-0 \&e7 (9...b5 - 35) 10 g4 - 118

8...\&c7 9 0-0-0 \(b5\)

10 e5

10 \&d3 b4 11 \&d5 exd5 12 \&he1 (12 exd5 - 33) 12...\&e7 13 exd5 - 31
10 \&xb5 axb5 11 \&dxb5 \&b8 12 e5 \&b7 (12...\text{a}5 - 153) 13 \&e2 - 151
10 \&xe6 - 136

10...\&b7 11 \&h3 \text{dxe5} 12 \&xe6 \text{fxe6} 13 \text{wxe6+} \&e7

14 \&xb5

14 \&xb5 - 139

14...\&xb5 15 \&xb5 \&c6 16 \&d6+ \&d8 17 fxe5 \&c7
18 \&xe7 - 156
18 \&b1 - 157

B) 1 e4 c5 2 \&f3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \&xd4 \&f6 5 \&c3 \&c6 6 \&c4

6 \&g5 \&d7 7 \&d2 \&c8 8 f4 \&xd4 9 \text{w}xd4 \&a5 10 e5 dxe5 11 fxe5 \text{e}6
12 0-0-0 \&c6 13 \&b5 \&xb5 14 exf6 \&c6 15 h4
15...\text{g}8 - 69
15...g6 – 70
6...e6 7...e3 a6 8...e2

8...e7
8...c7 9 0-0-0 a5 10...d3 b5
11 f4 – 30
11 a3 – 121
9...b3 0-0
9...c7 10 0-0-0 a5 11 g4 b5 12 g5 xb3+ 13 axb3...d7 14...f5 exf5
15...d5...d8 16 exf5...b7 (16...0-0 – 92) 17 f6 gxf6 18...e1...xd5 19...xd5...g8
20...f4 – 111
20 gxf6 – 113

10 0-0-0...c7
10...e8 – 28
11...h1...d7
11...b5 – 16, 28, 56
11...a5 – 56

12 g4

12...c5
12...a5 13 g5 xb3+ 14 axb3 b5 15 f4 b4 16...f5 exf5 17...d5...d8 18 exf5...e8
19 g6 – 108
19 \( \text{d4} \) – 110

13 \( \text{d5} \)

13 \( \text{g5} \) – 104

13...\( \text{b5} \)

14 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 15 \( \text{g5} \)

15...\( \text{fc8} \) – 80

15...\( \text{exf5} \) – 106

C) 1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 2 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 3 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 4 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d4}}}} \) \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c3}}}} \) \( \text{e6} \)

5...\( \text{g6} \) 6 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e3}}} (6...\text{e2} – 168)} \) 6...\( \text{g7} \) 7 \( \text{f3} \) – 94

6 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e3}}} \)

6 \( \text{f4} \) – 51

6 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c6}}} (6...\text{a6} 7 \text{g5} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d7}}} 8 \text{e3} \text{b5} 9 \text{a3} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b6}}} 10 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g1}}} 0 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d7}}} – 49; 10...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b7}}} – 51)} \n
7 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d7}}} 8 \text{h4} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e7}}} 9 \text{e3} \text{a6}} \)

10 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h5}}} (10 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e2}}} – 21; 10 \text{f4} – 23) 10...0-0 11 0-0-0 \text{c7} (11...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{xd4}}} – 25) 12 \text{f4} – 24}} \n
6 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e2}}} \text{a6} 7 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e3}}} (7 0-0 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e7}}} 8 \text{h1} – 133) 7...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c6}}} (7...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{bd7}}} – 52) 8 0-0 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e7}}} (8...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c7}}} – 166) 9 \text{a4} – 166}} \n
6...\( \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a6}}} 7 \text{g4} \)

7 \( \text{f4} – 41 \)

7 \( \text{f3} \text{b5} 8 \text{g4} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d7}}} (8...\text{h6} – 48) 9 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d2}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b6}}} 10 0-0-0 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d8}}} \)
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11 $\text{dx}b5 (11 \text{g}5 - 127)
11...axb5 12 $\text{xb}5
12...$\text{e}5 - 130
12...$\text{a}6 - 132

7.e5 8 $\text{f}5 \text{g}6 9 \text{g}5 \text{gxf}5 10 \text{exf}5 \text{d}5 11 \text{f}3 \text{d}4 12 0-0-0 $\text{bd}7 13 $\text{d}2$
13 $\text{x}d4 - 102$

13...$\text{c}7$
13...$\text{a}5 - 97$
13...$\text{xc}3 - 99$
13...$\text{d}6 - 101$

14 $\text{gxf}6 \text{xc}3 15 $\text{xc}3 \text{c}6 16 \text{g}3$
16...$\text{h}6+ - 95$
16...$\text{x}h1 - 96$
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7 WAYS TO SMASH THE SICILIAN

One of the main reasons the Sicilian is the most popular opening is because it promises an endgame and a decisive ending. White will often get a lead in development and will naturally want to use this as the basis for an attack. However, the Sicilian is a tough nut to crack and it’s not enough just to make it seem threatening – you must know exactly what you are doing and use the appropriate weapons.

Seven Ways to Smash the Sicilian introduces the sacrifices and studies the tactics that allow White to win. It’s impossible to play these Sicilian positions with either colour without an intimate knowledge of these sacrifices. Read this book and discover everything you need to know.

- An essential guide to destroying the Sicilian
- A feast of entertaining games and violent sacrifices
- Includes coverage of the main lines

Yury Lapshun is an International Master, a winner of many tournaments, and an experienced coach who has guided individuals and teams to national championships. US Master Nick Conticello won two Chess Journalist of America awards in 2003 and was named Organizer of the Year by the United States Chess Federation in 1996.
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