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+    Check
++   Double check
!    Good move
!!   Excellent move
?    Bad move
??   Blunder
!?   Interesting move
?!   Dubious move
OL   Olympiad
Ch.  Championship
Z    Zonal
IZ   Interzonal
1-0  Black resigns
1/2-1/2 Draw agreed
0-1  White resigns
How often have you stared at the acres and acres of books, articles and computer disks devoted to the ever-expanding mass of openings theory - and despaired? It seems that as we know more and more about chess, instead of shrinking the possibilities and pruning away variations that do not work, the universe of chess theory continues to grow as if fuelled by a cosmic Big Bang.

Surely, at some point, you must have wished that as Black you could choose just one single opening move against any White system and be confident that there was a method applicable to all openings to back this up. In the early 1970s Ray Keene (here a co-author) sought to do this with his book *The Modern Defence*. Then the suggestion was for Black to play 1...g6 and 2...g7 more or less irrespective of White’s opening moves. At the time, it seemed a universal panacea. Now, even the Modern Defence has exploded into a massive complex of super-highways and spaghetti junctions. Its ramifications go far beyond the immediate grasp of the enthusiastic amateur or club and county player.

What we have tried to do in this book is to provide a modern defence for the 1990s and the 21st century. We advocate the surprising move 1...c6 as the answer to every White opening! What are the advantages of this? First of all, the lines are unusual, so the White player will be thrown immediately upon his or her own resources. Secondly, 1...c6 is a pleasant blend of soundness and aggression. There are few Black defences in which White can be overrun with such devastating rapidity, as numerous Black wins in this book will testify. Finally, this defence enjoys the sanction of many top champions and grandmasters. Lines with ...c6 have been favourites with ex-world champion Vassily Smyslov, also with the two-times world championship challengers, Mikhail Chigorin and Efim Bogoljubow. Hard hitting British grandmaster Tony Miles has elevated 1...c6 to one of his main defences, while even such a classically minded player as Nigel Short, Britain’s own world championship challenger, has utilised versions of the ...c6 defence in his own games.
By playing ...\(\text{d}c6\) on move one, Black is able to play across many White systems and thus avoid the most dangerous lines. For example after 1 d4 \(\text{d}c6\) 2 c4 we recommend 2...e5, while against 1 d4 \(\text{d}c6\) 2 \(\text{f}3\) we now counsel transposition to the Chigorin Defence where White has forfeited the option of a very early \(\text{c}3\) (i.e. 1 d4 \(\text{d}c6\) 2 c4 d5 3 \(\text{c}3\)! ) which makes this line risky for Black in the main variations. Similarly, after 1 e4 \(\text{d}c6\) 2 d4, Black is by no means committed to 2...d5 when once again there can follow 3 \(\text{c}3\)! which renders this line equally risky for the second player. We prefer 1 e4 \(\text{d}c6\) 2 d4 e5, which is sound, reliable and full of counter-chances.

In conclusion, we would like to draw particular attention to the section in this book which starts 1 d4 \(\text{d}c6\) 2 d5 in which White takes up the challenge of playing a mirror image to Alekhine’s Defence (1 e4 \(\text{f}6\) 2 e5) on the other side of the board. This has been championed especially by Bogoljubow and Miles, who have notched up excellent results with it. Alekhine’s Defence has been popular since the 1920s, yet this parallel line, which we name Bogoljubow’s Defence, has, in comparison, been unjustly neglected. We regard it as fully the equal of Alekhine’s Defence and invite you, the readers, to join us at what might be termed the theoretical birth of a fascinating and hitherto under-analysed line which we hope will score heavily for you in your own games as Black.

Raymond Keene and Byron Jacobs,
London,
July 1996
1 Introduction to 1...\textit{\textprotect{\&}c6}: Strategic Themes and History

In this book we recommend an unusual but sound defence. This is based on the immediate development of Black's queen's knight against both kingside, queenside and even fianchetto openings. It has been patronised by Nigel Short, Jon Speelman and, particularly, Tony Miles, while in the past it has numbered such greats as Mikhail Chigorin, Aron Nimzowitsch and Efim Bogoljubow amongst its devotees. It has even been played by former world champion Smyslov against Garry Kasparov, a game where, after a fluctuating struggle, Smyslov held the draw (see page 38 for the full game).

A chief merit of the queen's knight's defence is that it immediately throws booked-up white players onto their own resources with the result that Black can often score quick and crushing knockouts, as many games from this introduction will show. A further, practical, benefit for Black players is that many players, when confronted with an unusual variation, will spend a great deal of time in the early stages of the game, thus leaving themselves short of time for the more critical positions later on.

Section A
Against the d-pawn

Game 1
Kaidanov-Miles
Palma 1989

1 \textit{\textprotect{\&}c6}

This is the essential move of Black's defence, whatever first move White chooses. In this specific line, Black challenges White to start an immediate hunt of the black queen's knight, with 2 d5, which can lead to thrilling tactics and combinations.
2   e4
White refuses the invitation
to join the hunt.
2   ...   e5
This is the move we mainly
recommend in the book, though
Nimzowitsch's favourite 2...d5
is certainly playable and exam­
pies of it will figure later in this
introduction.
3   d5
Now this space-gaining thrust
gives Black's defence its spe­
cific character. White could, of
course, play 3  \textsf{d}f3 transposing
to the Scotch Game (see games
23 and 24).
3   ...   \textsf{d}ce7
4   c4
Although White has played 2
e4, this move marks this varia­
tion out as a queenside opening.
4   ...   \textsf{g}6
5 \textsf{e}3 \textsf{b}4+
By developing the king's
bishop in this fashion Black
aims to weaken White on the
dark squares. In particular the
manoeuvre \ldots\textsf{a}5, followed by
\ldots\textsf{a}5 and \ldots\textsf{b}6, has been
known since the 19th century.
One example was 1 e4 \textsf{c}6 2
d4 e5 3 d5 \textsf{d}7 4 \textsf{f}3 \textsf{g}6 5
\textsf{e}3 \textsf{b}4+ 6 c3 \textsf{a}5 7 \textsf{d}3
\textsf{b}6, Williams-Kennedy, Lon­
don 1848.
6 \textsf{d}2 \textsf{f}6
7 f3 \textsf{e}7
8 g3
White wants to keep Black's
knight out of f4. However, the
desire to restrict the activity of

Black’s pieces on the kingside
frequently leads to White’s
pawn structure becoming over­
extended and unwieldy.
8   ...   0-0
9 \textsf{h}3?! c6!
Preparing to set the board
alight with tactical complica­
tions. The simple 9...d6, offer­
ing exchanges, would be quite
satisfactory, but perhaps a little
too stereotyped.
10 a3 \textsf{c}5
11 \textsf{f}1 b5!
Black has a clear initiative.
Offering a pawn, if only temporarily, to blast open the board whilst White's men are still asleep in their beds.

13 \( \texttt{\text{\(d\)}}x\texttt{\text{\(d\)}}d4 \texttt{exd4} \\
14 \texttt{\text{\(w\)}}xd4

Black was threatening to play \( ... \text{\(d\)}xe4 \) with devastation.

14 \( ... \) \texttt{bxc4} \\
15 \texttt{d6}

White can scarcely hope to survive after 15 \texttt{dxc6} \texttt{d5}. The text tries to seal things up.

15 \( ... \) \texttt{We5} \\
16 \texttt{\text{\(d\)}}e2 \texttt{a5}

Black, in contrast, is anxious to open as many lines as possible as quickly as possible, before White can consolidate his position.

17 \texttt{\text{\(e\)}}e3 \texttt{axb4} \\
18 \texttt{\text{\(x\)}}xc4 \texttt{\text{\(w\)}}h5 \\
19 \texttt{\text{\(g\)}}g2 \texttt{c5!} \\
20 \texttt{\text{\(w\)}}e3 \texttt{\text{\(a\)}}a6

With the entry of Black's bishop at long last into the game, Black's advantage is finally clear.

21 \texttt{\text{\(b\)}}b6 \texttt{\text{\(a\)}}ab8

This piece sacrifice is essentially desperation.

22 \( ... \) \texttt{\text{\(x\)}}xb6 \\
23 \texttt{bxc5} \texttt{c6} \\
24 \texttt{Ha5} \texttt{\text{\(e\)}}e5 \\
25 \texttt{\text{\(f\)}}f4 \texttt{\text{\(w\)}}g5 \\
26 \texttt{\text{\(d\)}}d4 \texttt{\text{\(b\)}}b8 \\
27 \texttt{Ha1} \texttt{h6} \\
28 \texttt{\text{\(x\)}}xa6

The only way to get castled is to give up a full rook, but this merely demonstrates the bankruptcy of White's position.

28 \( ... \) \texttt{\text{\(x\)}}xa6 \\
29 0-0 \texttt{\text{\(c\)}}c6 \\
30 \texttt{\text{\(c\)}}c4 \texttt{\text{\(a\)}}a5 \\
31 0-1

As an advertisement for Black's strategy this game is brilliant. There are few black defences available nowadays which can reduce White to rubble so rapidly.

For a full analysis of this line see chapter five.
Through the Looking Glass
And what if White accepts the challenge and chases Black's provocative knight? Two-times world title contender, Efim Bogoljubow, demonstrated Black's resources in this Mirror Alekhine Defence line.

Game 2
Weinitschke-Bogoljubow
Elster 1938

1 d4 ¤c6
2 d5 ¤e5
3 f4

White treats the opening as a kind of mirror image to Alekhine's defence, with Black's queen's knight being hounded to the other side of the board. However, the difference is that here White weakens his kingside by striving excessively to underline the reflective analogy.

3 ... ¤g6
4 e4 e5

This tactical resource emphasises the difference. The parallel move ...d5 is not an option in the Alekhine Defence, viz. 1 e4 ¤f6 2 e5 ¤d5 3 c4 ¤b6 4 d4 d5? 5 c5 when Black is already cramped and suffering severely. As we shall see in this game, White gets into trouble by trying to repeat this line move for move on the opposite wing.

4 ... e6 is seen in modern play, e.g. Gerusel-Miles, Porz 1982, a drastic miniature; 5 ¤f3 exd5 6 exd5 ¤c5 7 ¤d3 d6 8 ¤e2 ¤f6 9 ¤c3 0–0 10 ¤d2 ¤g4 11 ¤d1 ¤e8 12 h3 ¤f6 13 g4 ¤e4 14 ¤h2 ¤h4 15 ¤g5 ¤xg5 16 fxg5 ¤e7 17 ¤g3 (now Black wins material with an astounding stroke! See page 114 for an amusing parallel) 17...¤g1

18 ¤f2 ¤xf2+ 19 ¤xf2 ¤e4 20 ¤e3 ¤h1+ 21 ¤f1 ¤f3+ 22 ¤d1 ¤xg5 0–1.

5 f5

Optimistically hoping for a supine retreat, 5...¤e7, when White's space advantage would be immense. More cautious would be 5 dxe6 though after 5...fxe6 Black has the open f-file as a base for counter-attack. See page 114 for analysis.

5 ... ¤h4+

Naturally Black chooses a more active continuation, even though it involves the sacrifice of material.

6 ¤d2 ¤xe4

Not 6...¤f4 7 g3 or 6...¤ge7 7 ¤c3 to be followed by ¤f3, gaining time and space, when White's opening play would
have been justified. This carries the fight to the opponent.

7 fxg6
If 7 d3 Black can respond 7...\(\text{\texttt{W}}\)xg2+ 8 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)e2 \(\text{\texttt{W}}\)g5+ 9 c3 \(\text{\texttt{W}}\)h4 Ulrich-Bogoljubow, Elster 1937.

7 ... \(\text{\texttt{W}}\)xd5+
8 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)e1 \(\text{\texttt{W}}\)d1+
9 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)xd1 h\(x\)g6
10 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)c3 c6
11 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)f3 f6
12 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)d3

Black’s opening sacrifice has been a complete success. He controls the centre and his three pawns outweigh White’s extra piece. White now decides to return this piece, but this is a somewhat forlorn gesture.

14 h3 e4
15 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)xe4 dxe4
16 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)xe4 \(\text{\texttt{W}}\)f7

17 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)d2

Storing up trouble. White’s minor pieces become potentially exposed to the advancing black pawns. In order to make a game of it White had to play 12 \(\text{\texttt{D}}\)e2.
If 17 \( \texttt{d6} \) then simply 17...\( \texttt{g8} \) when Black’s king is safe.

17 ...
18 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{g5} \)
19 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{d6} \)
20 \( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{f5} \)
21 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{g6} \)
22 \( \texttt{f1} \) \( \texttt{f5} \)
23 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{c5} \)
24 \( \texttt{e4} \) \( \texttt{b6} \)

Black’s task is easy. He has an extra pawn, two bishops and better development.

25 \( \texttt{c4} \)
26 \( \texttt{ed1} \) \( \texttt{xd2} \)
27 \( \texttt{xd2} \) \( \texttt{e3+} \)

0-1

White resigns on account of 28 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{xe2+} \) 29 \( \texttt{f1} \) \( \texttt{xe3+} \) 30 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{xe3} \).

A splendid example of the dynamism concealed in the black opening.

For a full analysis of this line see chapter four.

**Ducking the Challenge**

What if White ducks out of the challenge with 1 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 2 \( \texttt{f3} \)? Bogoljubow used to play 2...\( \texttt{g6} \). Here, however, we recommend transposition to the Chigorin Defence, 1 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{d5} \) 2 \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \)!, but without giving White the option of the dangerous 1 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{d5} \) 2 \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 3 \( \texttt{c3} \)!

This unusual defence has the virtue that it can score remarkably quick wins against unprepared opposition. The Russian grandmaster Mikhail Chigorin was the first to adopt it, and he amassed a number of very rapid knockouts with it against unsuspecting opponents. In recent years, it has also proved popular with Nigel Short. Here are some of the classic examples by the line’s inventor.

**Game 3**

**Teichmann - Chigorin**  
*Cambridge Springs 1904*

1 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \)
2 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{d5} \)

Readers should note that in all games, we have standardised the opening sequence as 1 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 2 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{d5} \), even though several may have reached the critical positions by transposition via 1 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{d5} \) 2 \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \).

3 \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{g4} \)

Now Black has the position he wants. Here White could try 4 \( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{xf3} \) 5 \( \texttt{gxf3} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) 6 \( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{b4} \) 7 \( \texttt{cxd5} \) \( \texttt{xd5} \) 8 \( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{xc3} \) 9 \( \texttt{bxc3} \) though after 9...

\( \texttt{ge7} \), in the game Lasker-Chigorin, Has-
tings 1895, Black’s pair of knights give him good counterplay. Another possibility is 4 \( \text{c3} \) e6 5 \( \text{g5} \) e7 6 \( \text{xe7} \) gxe7 7 cxd5 \( \text{xd5} \) 8 e3 0-0 9 e2 xc3 10 bxc3 a5 11 wa4 b6 Hulak-Muse, Vinkovci 1993 when Black has a solid position. In fact, Black won both of these games. Finally, 4 e3 e6 5 \( \text{c3} \) b4 6 d2 ge7 7 d3 f5 8 xf5 xf5 9 cxd5 exd5 10 wb3 xc3 11 xc3 bb8 with a level position as in Steinitz-Chigorin, World Championship, Game 12, Havana 1889. See page 128 for our recommendations.

4 cxd5 \( \text{xf3} \)
5 dxc6 \( \text{xc6} \)
6 \( \text{c3} \) e6

7 \( \text{f4} \)
In the next game we shall look at the more testing 7 e4.

7 ... \( \text{f6} \)
8 e3 \( \text{b4} \)
9 wb3 \( \text{d5} \)
10 g3 0-0
11 d3 wg5

With this move Black seizes the initiative and maintains it until the end of the game. The point is that if 12 0-0, then 12...xc3 13 bxc3 \( \text{xe3} \) wins material.

12 wc2 f5
13 \( \text{e5} \)

Hoping that Black will snatch the bait on g2 but he does not oblige.

13 ... \( \text{f7} \)
14 0-0-0 \( \text{xc3} \)
15 bxc3 b5

Black’s attack spreads to the other wing and White is soon overwhelmed.

16 hgl \( \text{we7} \)
17 df1 wa3+
18 d2 b4
19 c4

After this, Black’s pieces pour in but clearly 19 cxb4 \( \text{xb4} \) is a disaster for White.

19 ... \( \text{a4} \)
20 wb1 \( \text{c3} \)
21 wa1 \( \text{d8} \)
22 g3 \( \text{d4}+ \)
23 e2 \( \text{c5} \)
24 $Wb1$
Not 24 dxc5 $Wxd3+$ or 24 $Ab1$ $Ab3$ spectacularly winning White's queen.

24 ... $Dxd3$
25 $Wxd3$ $Wxa2+$
26 $Af3$ $Ac2$
0-1

White's queen still goes, e.g.
27 $W_e2$ $A_e4+$ or 27 $W_d2$ $A_e4+$
28 $A_e2$ $Ff3+$. White therefore resigned. There are few openings in which Black can score quite so quickly and decisively.

Game 4
Pillsbury - Chigorin
St Petersburg 1896

1 $d4$ $Dc6$
2 $Af3$ $d5$
3 $c4$ $Ag4$
4 cxd5 $Dxf3$
5 dxc6
Or 5 gxf3 $Wxd5$ 6 e3 0-0-0! 7 $Dc3$ $Wh5$ 8 $A_d2$ $Af6$ 9 $f4$
$Wxd1+$ 10 $Dxd1$ e6 11 $Ag2$ when 11...$De7$, followed by ...

central fortress in Christiansen-Short, Monaco (blindfold) 1993. Black’s later plan is to expand with ...h6, ...f5 and ...g5.

6 $Dc3$ e6
A fascinating gambit occurs after 6...$Df6$ 7 $f3$ e5! 8 dxe5
$Wxd1+$ 9 $Dxd1$ $Dd7$ 10 $f4$
0-0-0 11 $Cc2$ $Cc5$ and ...$De8$, with full value for the pawn.

7 $e4$
This is the first divergence from the previous game.

7 ... $Ab4$
8 $f3$ $f5$
A risky and ambitious attempt to batter White’s centre into submission.

9  e5

Now Black overruns the board. White must gambit himself here with 9  c4! fxe4 10 0-0 exf3 11  xe6 fxg2 12  e1.

9  ...  e7
10  a3  a5
11  c4  d5
12  a4+  c6
13  d3  b6

Threatening an immediate win with ... b3, netting the White queen.

14  c2  a6

Now with a new threat of ...b5, winning White’s queen.

15  d1?

After this White is smashed. 15 b4! c4 16 b2 was the last chance.

15  ...  c4
16  f4  0-0-0
17  e3  d5
18  d2  b6
19  c2  xd4
20  c1  d3

Winning a piece. The rest is agony.

21  b3  c4

After 39  h7  d7+ 40  g7  dxg7 we have, as a contemporary note put it, ‘A very pronounced case of checkmate indeed.’

For our detailed analysis of this variation see page 124.
Section B
Against 1 e4

We have seen Bogoljubow and Chigorin in action against the opening move 1 d4. Both of these grandmasters were twice contenders for the World Championship. The man who put 1...c6 on the map against 1 e4 was the great chess thinker and strategist, Aron Nimzowitsch, author of My System and arguably world number two to World Champion Alekhine at the close of the 1920s and the opening of the 1930s. Here are some of his classic masterpieces with the defence he introduced and regularly championed.

We start with Nimzowitsch's most impressive win with 1...c6.

Game 5
Spielmann-Nimzowitsch
Stockholm 1920

1 e4 c6
2 d4 d5!?

The pure, Nimzowitschian interpretation of this defence which normally leads to intricate pawn chain play. When this defence is employed in contemporary chess 2...e5 tends to be preferred and it is the line we recommend too, on account of 2...d5 3 c3!. For our analysis of 2...e5 see chapter two.

3 e5

One might have expected the more fluid 3 c3!? from Spielmann which is, in fact, the best move.

3 ... f5

An even more provocative method of handling this provocative defence is 3...f6!?.

4 d2??

Better is 4 f3!?. The plan chosen by White diverts too many pieces from the protection of his centre (d4) and could have boomeranged seriously had Black played correctly on move 7.

4 ... e6
5 g3 g6
6 h4 h5
7 e2 (D)
7 ... e7?!

Inviting remarkable complications. Instead of this flank defence to White's pressure against his h-pawn it was possible to obtain a fine position by means of a central counter-attack, as suggested later by Nimzowitsch: thus 7...b4! 8 a3 c5 9 c3 c6 10 xh5
forced. The remarkable move, then, was Black’s 12th which prepared this combination. White could decline Black’s ‘passive’ sacrifice with 14 c3, allowing ...\textit{g}5 at last, but why should he? Is it obvious that Black obtains anything concrete for his sacrificed piece?

14 \textit{gxh}4 \textit{fxd}4

The compensation to date amounts to one pawn, but more is to come, since the foundations of White’s pawn centre have been destroyed. The threats at the moment (positively crude in comparison with the enchanting variations based on the power of his centralised knight pair which Nimzowitsch soon conjures up) are 15...\textit{b}4 16 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xc}2+ and 15...\textit{xe}5 16 \textit{xe}5 \textit{f}3+.

12 \textit{... \textit{ge7}!!}

Surely Black must now lose material?

13 \textit{g}3 \textit{f}5

13...\textit{g}5 would lose to the trap 14 \textit{xe}6, so the text is
17 $f1 \textit{Wh}xh4. In this case it would certainly be Black who would be justified in playing for a win. However, Nimzowitsch had observed a variation of truly shattering beauty.

$h3 \textit{g}5?!$

It was still possible to steer for an ending which promised a good possibility of victory ($16...\textit{Wh}xh3 17 \textit{Exh}3 \textit{Exe}5 18 \textit{Ef}4 \textit{Ef}e3+$). With the text Nimzowitsch subordinates his desire for the accumulation of points to his desire for the creation of beauty.

$e3$?

This is a plausible move which, however, loses spectacularly. The line conceived by Nimzowitsch ran as follows: $17 \textit{Wh}8+ \textit{Ed}7 18 \textit{Wxa8 Wh}1+ 19 \textit{Ed}2 \textit{Wxf2+ 20 Ed}3 (\textit{see following diagram})$ and now both $20...\textit{Ef}3$ and the amazing $20...\textit{Eb}3$ force a black win.

White’s best is $17 \textit{Ed}3!$, when Black should play quietly with $17...0-0-0!$ when his prospects are still not bad. He is ahead in development with two pawns for a piece and with White somewhat tied up.

$g1+$

Or $18 \textit{Ed}2 \textit{Wxa1 19 Wh}8+ \textit{Ed}7 20 \textit{Wxa8 Wxb2!}$ winning.

$\textit{Ee}2 \textit{Ef}4+$

No draw.

$\textit{Ee}2 \textit{Ed}4+$

$\textit{Ed}3$?

The losing error. It was essential to eliminate one of the
knights with the capture 22 \( \text{cxd4}. \) Admittedly the continuation 22...\( \text{cxd4+} \) 23 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 24 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xf4+} \) 25 \( \text{d3} \) \( c5 \) is unpleasant for White, but it was obligatory to continue thus if White wanted to resist.

\[
\begin{align*}
22 & \: \ldots \: \text{g5} \\
23 & \: \text{h3} \: \text{xe5} \\
24 & \: f1 \: 0-0-0
\end{align*}
\]

Now that Black has completed his development White is helpless. This position should be preserved for the benefit of posterity.

\[
\begin{align*}
25 & \: \text{b3} \: \text{b5} \\
26 & \: \text{xb5} \: \text{e4+} \\
27 & \: \text{c3} \: \text{xc2+} \\
28 & \: \text{b4} \: \text{c5+}
\end{align*}
\]

Again Ducking the Challenge
What to do if White side-steps the challenge with 2 \( \text{f3} \), hoping for 2...\( e5 \) 3 \( \text{b5} \) with a conventional Ruy Lopez? In chapter three we propose Tony Miles’s favourite 2...\( \text{d6} \). Nimzowitsch tried something play-

able, but riskier, in another game against the highly inventive Austrian grandmaster Rudolf Spielmann.

**Game 6**

**Spielmann-Nimzowitsch**

**New York 1927**

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \: \text{e4} \: \text{c6} \\
2 & \: \text{f3} \: \text{e6} \\
3 & \: \text{d4} \: \text{d5} \\
4 & \: \text{e5}
\end{align*}
\]

Transposing to a version of the French Defence where Black will experience problems in undermining White’s centre by means of ...\( c5 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
4 & \: \ldots \: \text{b6}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Since Black cannot make any progress without ...\( c5 \) I would try here 4...\( \text{a5} \)? and only after 5 \( \text{c3} \) would I continue with 5...\( \text{b6} \)’ (Alekhine).

\[
\begin{align*}
5 & \: \text{c3} \: \text{ce7}?!?
\end{align*}
\]

The start of a rather artificial manoeuvre designed to seize control of the f5-square. Black seems to have abandoned all
respect for the hallowed clichés concerning development.

6  

Hoping to exchange his light-squared bishop, but White forestalls this.

7  

8  

9  

'Black's position could, perhaps, have withstood the eccentricities committed so far, since they did not create any irreparable weaknesses in his own camp. However, this frightful weakening of f6 - given the absence of any stable and effective strong points for his own pieces - transforms his situation into a hopeless one' (Alekhine).

Nimzowitsch later recommended 9...\text{\textit{ge7}} as better, e.g. 10 \text{\textit{d2}} c5, and 11 \text{\textit{f1}} is impossible as the d-pawn hangs.

10  

And not 10...\text{\textit{xh4}?}  11 \text{\textit{b5+}} but 10...c5 looks stronger.

Protecting his g3-square and thus preparing to force the withdrawal of Black's knight by means of c3 and g4. If Nimzowitsch's plan was to restrain White's kingside pawns it has clearly been a failure.

11  

Or 12...cxd4 13 g4 hgx4 14 fxg4 \text{\textit{xh4}} 15 \text{\textit{f2}} winning outright. The advance of the text is characteristic of Nimzowitsch in that he renounces the attack against the frontal area of the white pawn-chain, preferring to transfer his onslaught to the base (c3 and b2).

Furthermore the struggle in this game has clearly been subdivided into two theatres of war by the very nature of the pawn-chain. 12...c4 ensures that Black will retain a valuable spatial advantage on the queenside if White fails to burst through on the opposite wing.

13  

14  

Protecting his g3-square and thus preparing to force the withdrawal of Black's knight by means of c3 and g4. If Nimzowitsch's plan was to restrain White’s kingside pawns it has clearly been a failure.

11  

Or 12...cxd4 13 g4 hgx4 14 fxg4 \text{\textit{xh4}} 15 \text{\textit{f2}} winning outright. The advance of the text is characteristic of Nimzowitsch in that he renounces the attack against the frontal area of the white pawn-chain, preferring to transfer his onslaught to the base (c3 and b2).

Furthermore the struggle in this game has clearly been subdivided into two theatres of war by the very nature of the pawn-chain. 12...c4 ensures that Black will retain a valuable spatial advantage on the queenside if White fails to burst through on the opposite wing.

13  

14  

Protecting his g3-square and thus preparing to force the withdrawal of Black's knight by means of c3 and g4. If Nimzowitsch's plan was to restrain White’s kingside pawns it has clearly been a failure.

11  

Or 12...cxd4 13 g4 hgx4 14 fxg4 \text{\textit{xh4}} 15 \text{\textit{f2}} winning outright. The advance of the text is characteristic of Nimzowitsch in that he renounces the attack against the frontal area of the white pawn-chain, preferring to transfer his onslaught to the base (c3 and b2).

Furthermore the struggle in this game has clearly been subdivided into two theatres of war by the very nature of the pawn-chain. 12...c4 ensures that Black will retain a valuable spatial advantage on the queenside if White fails to burst through on the opposite wing.
An unusual fianchetto of the Black queen's knight on the g7-square!

15 \( \text{\( \text{c}6 \)} \)

And that is the king's knight. Black has played six moves out of fifteen with his knights and not yet touched any of his other pieces.

16 \( \text{\( \text{Wg}2 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{e}7 \)} \)

On 16...\( \text{\( \text{a}7 \)} \) Alekhine gives:

17 \( \text{\( \text{g}xh\text{5} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{h}xh\text{5} \)} \) 19 \( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \) 20 \( \text{\( \text{xf}7+ \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \) 22 \( \text{\( \text{g}1 \)} \).

17 \( \text{\( \text{g}xh\text{5} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{g}xh\text{5} \)} \)

17...\( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \) is positionally correct but tactically faulty: 18 \( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \) 19 \( \text{\( \text{xf}7} \) and Black can resign.

18 \( \text{\( \text{g}1 \)} \)

18 \( \text{\( \text{h}7 \)} \) would have been very strong, with the threat of 19 \( \text{\( \text{f}6+ \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{xf}6 \)} \) 20 \( \text{\( \text{xf}6 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{xf}6 \)} \) 21 \( \text{\( \text{g}5 \)} \) neatly trapping Black's queen. If in reply 18...\( \text{\( \text{h}4 \)} \), then 19 \( \text{\( \text{h}4 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{h}4 \)} \) 20 \( \text{\( \text{g}5 \)} \) is still decisive.

The text should, in fact, win, but the correct follow-up is not easy to find. Alekhine gives the preparatory 19 \( \text{\( \text{e}2! \)} \), which maintains the option of sacrificing on f7, while eliminating any counterplay (e.g. checks on h4).

19 ... \( \text{\( \text{xf}7 \)} \)

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

Alekhine mentions four plausible alternatives which White had to analyse: 20 \( \text{\( \text{g}6+ \)} \), 20 \( \text{\( \text{e}4 \)} \), 20 \( \text{\( \text{f}5} \) and 20 \( \text{\( \text{e}2 \)} \). The strongest of these is 20 \( \text{\( \text{e}2 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{h}4+ \)} \) 21 \( \text{\( \text{d}1 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{g}8 \)} \) 22 \( \text{\( \text{f}4 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{f}7 \)} \) 23 \( \text{\( \text{g}6 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{e}7 \)} \) 24 \( \text{\( \text{h}8 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{h}8 \)} \) 25 \( \text{\( \text{g}6} \) and wins!

20 ... \( \text{\( \text{h}4+ \)} \)

21 \( \text{\( \text{e}2 \)} \)

22 \( \text{\( \text{g}6+ \)} \)

23 \( \text{\( \text{h}5 \)} \)

Spielmann had overlooked this, expecting only 23...\( \text{\( \text{h}5 \)} \) 24 \( \text{\( \text{g}7+ \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{e}8 \)} \) 25 \( \text{\( \text{g}6+ \)} \), which is most unpleasant for Black. After the text it is Black who is winning.
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This re-establishes material equality.

39 \ldots  \textit{\ldots}c2!

Avoiding the trap 39...\textit{\ldots}g1+ 40 \textit{\ldots}f2 \textit{\ldots}xa1 41 \textit{\ldots}d8+! \textit{\ldots}xd8 42 \textit{\ldots}xd8+ when White secures perpetual check.

40 \textit{\ldots}d8+ \textit{\ldots}xd8

41 \textit{\ldots}b8+ 0-1

In this case 41 \textit{\ldots}xd8+ \textit{\ldots}b7 is quite hopeless. Black threatens mate and the rook, while the g7-rook defends the black king from the checks.

Those notes to this game mentioned as stemming from Alekhine we have translated from his tournament book, in German, of New York, 1927. Exciting stuff, but we cannot honestly recommend readers to play this riskily as Black. For our recommendation against 2 \textit{\ldots}f3 see chapter three.

\textbf{The Main Test}

Also testing for Black are lines based on \textit{\ldots}c3 particularly, if Black insists on playing ...d5.
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Game 7
Brinckmann-Nimzowitsch
Niendorf 1927
(Notes based on those by Reti)

1 e4 \textit{c}6
2 \textit{c}3

In an absolute sense, this move is hardly a very strong one as Black can, with 2...e5, bring about the innocuous Vienna Game. Relatively, however, i.e. against Nimzowitsch, the move does have this advantage over an immediate 2 d4, that Black being anxious to play ...d5 plays the preparatory move 2...e6 whereupon his queen's bishop can no longer develop at f5.

2 ... e6
3 d4 d5

Also worth considering is 3...\textit{b}4 as Nimzowitsch played in two games against Maroczy: 4 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}e7 5 \textit{g}4 0-0 6 \textit{h}4 f5 7 f3 d5 8 e5 \textit{a}5 9 a3 \textit{x}c3+ 10 bxc3 \textit{e}8 11 \textit{h}3 \textit{c}4, Maroczy-Nimzowitsch, Karlsbad 1923 or 4 \textit{f}3 d6 5 \textit{f}4 \textit{g}e7 6 \textit{e}2 \textit{x}c3+ 7 bxc3 0-0 8 0-0 \textit{g}6 9 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}7 10 \textit{e}1 \textit{d}7 11 \textit{c}l b6 12 \textit{d}2 e5 Maroczy-Nimzowitsch, San Remo 1930. There is plenty of scope for originality in this line.

4 e5

This move can be made here with less hesitation than in the analogous variations of the French Defence, as Black cannot clean up White's centre with ...c5 so easily, on account of the knight at c6.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node at (0,0) {4 \ldots \textit{g}e7};
\node at (0,-1) {5 \textit{f}3 \textit{b}6};
\node at (0,-2) {6 \textit{e}2};
\node at (1,0) {4 \ldots \textit{a}6};
\node at (1,-1) {7 \textit{g}3 \textit{xf}1};
\node at (1,-2) {8 \textit{xf}1};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

White wants to have the possibility of consolidating his centre with c3, but thereby makes possible for his opponent the following strong move, which eventually leads to the exchange of Black's inactive queen's bishop for White's king's bishop, which has much more scope.

6 \ldots \textit{a}6
7 \textit{g}3 \textit{xf}1
8 \textit{xf}1

White has plans for attack, and therefore does not want to go back with his knight.

8 \ldots \textit{h}5!

Such manoeuvres are somewhat startling, and yet they are excellent, and aim at the domination of light squares. First there is a threat of ...h4; combined with an impregnable knight position on f5. We shall
see later that, positionally, the most important factor in this game is Black’s domination of the light squares, which has been made possible only by the exchange of White’s king’s bishop.

he has the advantage. But that is not the case. The real criterion by which to appraise close positions is the possibility of breaking through. In general, the player who can move freely over a greater area can probably place his pieces more advantageously for a possible breakthrough than his opponent, who is restricted in his movements.

As we know, this is the idea underlying the method of playing in restricted positions which owes so much to Dr Tarrasch. Tarrasch’s opposite, Nimzowitsch, now shows that one may be in a restricted position and yet have every possibility of breaking through. Thus, in the present position, the possibilities of White’s breaking through obviously lie in c4, and f4-f5. The first is scarcely a strong move, for White dominates more territory in the middle and on the kingside, but not on the queenside. In the present case it is a particularly doubtful

\[
9 \text{ } \text{g}5 \quad \text{w}c8 \\
10 \text{ } \text{w}d3
\]

White wants to meet the thrust ...\text{w}a6. Positionally more correct, however, would be to maintain the knight on g3 by h4.

\[
10 \quad \text{g}6 \\
11 \text{ } c3
\]

Even now White could still play h4, but then Black could seize the initiative on the queenside by gaining time with ...\text{b}b4 and ...c5.

\[
11 \quad \text{c}4 \\
12 \text{ } \text{e}2 \quad \text{e}7 \\
13 \text{ } \text{h}3 \quad \text{x}g5 \\
14 \text{ } \text{x}g5 \quad \text{e}7 (D)
\]

Much profit can be derived from a study of this position. White is in control of more territory, and so one might think
move, as White's d-pawn would become backward. The liberating move dictated by the position would therefore be f4-f5.

But there can be no question of making these moves, as White will obviously never be able to dominate the f5-square. Furthermore, Black has made a very good provision for the future in his seemingly artificial but really very profound manoeuvres (...\textit{g}6, ...h5-h4, ...\textit{e}7, but above all in the exchange of White's king's bishop).

Thus, while White has no serious possibilities of breaking through, and is therefore limited to making waiting moves behind the wall of his pawns, the second player has at his disposal the possibilities of breaking through afforded him by ...f6 and ...c5. Black alone, therefore, is able to take the initiative, and consequently he is in a superior position, in spite of his limited territory.

15 \textit{g}1 f6
16 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}7
17 \textit{h}2 c5
18 c4

Surprising, but as Brinckmann himself states in the Niendorf tournament book, he commits an act of violence in this move, realising that otherwise he will be gradually crushed through lack of counterplay. However, by opening up the game like this, he is playing into Black's hands.

18 \ldots \textit{c}7
19 \textit{c}xd5 c4
20 \textit{c}2 exd5
21 \textit{h}1 e0
22 \textit{c}3 fxe5
23 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5
24 dxe5 d4
25 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}5
26 \textit{d}6 d3

It would seem simpler for Black to keep his mass of pawns intact with 26...b5. However, White will reply with 27 \textit{d}2, and obtain counter chances on the kingside, where
he has the superiority.
27 \( \text{Wxc4+ Wxc4} \)
28 \( \text{Qxc4} \text{xf2} \)
29 \( \text{Qad1} \text{c8} \)
30 \( \text{Qe3} \text{d8} \)
31 \( \text{Qc4} \text{f5} \)

After an immediate 31...b5 there would follow 32 \( \text{Qd6} \). But now White must prevent ...b5.

32 a4

In reply to 32 e6 Nimzowitsch planned the beautiful reply 32...\( \text{Qe2} \). If then 33 \( \text{Qxd3} \), for example, there would follow 33...\( \text{Qxe1} \) 34 \( \text{Qxd8+ Qh7} \) and White has no defence against the threat ...\( \text{Qg3} \).

32 ...
33 \( \text{Qe4} \text{e2!} \)

White now has no defence against ...g5.

39 \( \text{Qd6} \text{e3} \)
0–1

However, the attempt to play more fluidly against \( \text{Qc3} \) had also proved to be dangerous.

Game 8
Wendel-Nimzowitsch
Stockholm 1921

1 e4 \( \text{Qc6} \)
2 d4 \( \text{d5} \)
3 \( \text{Qc3} \)

34 \( \text{Qf4} \)

White is now completely lost. After 34 \( \text{Qxe2} \text{dxe2} \) 35 \( \text{Re1} \), Black would win with 35...\( \text{Qd1} \) 36 \( \text{Qxe2} \text{g3} \).

34 ...
35 \( \text{Qg4} \text{d2} \)
36 \( \text{Qg6+} \text{f7} \)
37 \( \text{Qg4} \text{a6} \)
38 \( \text{Qf4} \text{e6} \)
One of the sharpest methods of combating Nimzowitsch’s special defence. With this move White offers a pawn sacrifice in order to destroy Black’s strong point on d5. In this case Nimzowitsch accepts the challenge.

3 ... dxe4

The alternative is the stolid refusal to give ground 3...e6. Later in the 1920s (as in the Brinckmann game we have just seen) Nimzowitsch gained many victories with this move, one other of which is sufficiently amusing to merit reproduction here: Mieses-Nimzowitsch, Kissingen 1928: 3...e6 4 exd5 exd5 5 e3 f5 6 d3 g7 7 ge2 b4 8 xf5 xf5 9 f4 g5 10 d2 e7 11 c1 f6 12 d1 c6 13 c3 h4 14 e3 d7 15 c2 f5 16 f4 0–0 0–0 17 0–0–0 hf8 18 df1 de8 19 fxg5 xg5 20 f4 e7 21 b1 xf4 22 xf4 e6 23 f2 f4 24 d1 g4 25 c1 f5 26 hf1 d6 27 h3 g5 28 e2 e4 29 ef2 fe8 30 d3 f5 31 g1 g3 32 d2 f5 33 a3 e6 34 a1 c6 35 f3 h5 36 a2 b5 (completing the encirclement)

37 a1 (see following diagram) 37...h4 checkmate, but to White’s queen rather than his king!

4 d5

And not 4 b5? d7 5 xe4 xd41 winning a pawn in broad daylight.
14 \texttt{xd}8 \texttt{xd}8 15 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{f}f8 16 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{f}f6 17 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{xe}6 18 \texttt{b}b3 1-0 Borngaesser-Louis, Bundesliga 1982) 9 \texttt{xd}1 \texttt{c}6 (9...\texttt{b}b4 10 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{e}7 11 0-0 \texttt{xc}3 12 bxc3 \texttt{xe}6 13 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{xe}6 14 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{h}6 15 fxe4 fxe4 16 \texttt{f}f2 with a powerful attack, P. Nielsen-Furhoff, Copenhagen 1991) 10 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{h}6 11 0-0 \texttt{f}f6 12 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}5+ 13 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{b}5 14 \texttt{b}b3 \texttt{e}3 15 \texttt{f}fe1 \texttt{e}7 16 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{xf}4 17 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{a}6 18 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{ad}8 19 \texttt{xd}8 \texttt{xd}8 20 \texttt{e}5 and the pawn on \texttt{e}6 remains a bone in Black’s throat, Apicella-Soetewey, Brussels Z 1993.

7 \texttt{f}3??

Much stronger is Bole­slavsky’s 7 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{f}f6 8 \texttt{we}2 \texttt{f}f5 9 0-0-0. White’s choice in the game permits Nimzowitsch to return his extra pawn for a lasting initiative. Our conclu­sion must be that the whole line with 3...dxe4 is suspect.

7 ... \texttt{f}5

8 fxe4 \texttt{f}4

9 \texttt{f}f2 \texttt{e}5

10 \texttt{f}f3

10 dxe6 \texttt{xe}6 would give Black a splendid development and leave White with a weak e-pawn.

10 ... \texttt{d}d6

‘A move dictated by the law of the blockade: passed and semi-passed pawns must be blockaded’ (Nimzowitsch). Nim­zowitsch regarded this position as approximately level and considered that White’s next moves should have been \texttt{d}d3, 0-0 and \texttt{e}e2, followed by the activation of his queenside majority c4-c5. As it is, White fails to spot this plan and indulges, instead, in a series of highly artificial man­oeuvres.

11 \texttt{h}4?

Black’s next is the first step in the plan to restrain White’s advance of c4.

11 ... \texttt{b}5

12 \texttt{h}5 \texttt{f}f8

13 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{d}7

14 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{b}4

15 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{f}6
Threatening White’s e-pawn and h-pawn. White has but one method of avoiding material loss.

16 $\text{axf6}$

Unpleasant but forced. After this exchange Black’s centre is strengthened and he is given the open g-file as a free gift in which to operate against White’s weak g-pawn. On top of this the absence of White’s queen’s bishop leaves him woefully exposed on the dark squares. From now on White is reduced to meeting Black’s threats and can form no positive schemes of his own.

16 $\text{...}$ gxf6  
17 $\text{bd2}$ $\text{g7}$  
18 $\text{h1}$ $\text{d7}$  
19 $\text{h6}$ $\text{g3}$  
20 $\text{h3}$ $\text{g8}$  
21 $\text{h4}$ $\text{c5}$  
22 $\text{h1}$ $\text{b8}$  
23 $\text{c3}?!$

A weird reaction to Black’s last move, which was obviously conceived as a prophylactic measure against 23 c3. Black now seizes the b-file in addition to his other treasures.

23 $\text{...}$ bxc3  
24 bxc3 $\text{g3}$  
25 $\text{c2}$ $\text{g8}$  
26 $\text{c4}$ $\text{d7}$  
27 $\text{xd6}$ cxd6  
28 $\text{f3}$

In control of all the open lines and all the dark squares and with White’s units strewn at random around the perimeters of the battle-field Black has an obviously winning position. The positional way to victory, pointed out by Nimzowitsch, was 28... $\text{d8}$ 29 $\text{f5}$ $\text{xf5}$ 30 $\text{e5}$ $\text{e8}$ 31 $\text{h3}$ $\text{g8}$! and White’s position is an uncoordinated shambles.

But, as so often, Nimzowitsch espies a combination which leads even more rapidly to the desired goal. And, as we might expect, this combination is laced with problem moves. It almost looks like a constructed situation rather than a game.
continuation. Black to play and win; it is certainly worthwhile trying to find Nimzowitsch’s beautiful win yourself before inspecting the remainder of the game.

28 ... \( \text{\textit{b5+}} \)
29 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{\textit{xc4+}} \)
30 \( \text{\textit{xc4+}} \)
31 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{gb2}} \)
32 \( \text{\textit{wc1}} \)

32 \( \text{\textit{h3}} \) looks like an adequate defence, but then comes the brilliant stroke 32...\( \text{\textit{xh4!}} \), e.g. 33 \( \text{\textit{gxh3+}} \) 34 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{\textit{fxg3+}} \) 35 \( \text{\textit{gxh3}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa1}} \). ‘Black wins the a-pawn and then decides the game in his favour by a direct attack with the rooks. Do not overlook that passed black a-pawn lurking in the background’ (Nimzowitsch).

32 ... \( \text{\textit{h4}} \)
33 \( \text{\textit{h4}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe2!}} \)
34 \( \text{\textit{xe2}} \) \( \text{\textit{gxg2+}} \)

As in his game versus Spielmann from Stockholm 1920 (page 18), Nimzowitsch harries the whole white army with his queen and knight. Meanwhile, the white king’s rook will not run away.

35 \( \text{\textit{d1}} \) \( \text{\textit{f1+}} \)
36 \( \text{\textit{d2}} \)

Or 36 \( \text{\textit{c2}} \) \( \text{\textit{d3+}} \) 37 \( \text{\textit{b2}} \) \( \text{\textit{a4}} \) with a ‘problem mate’ (Nimzowitsch).

36 ... \( \text{\textit{d3+}} \)
37 \( \text{\textit{e1}} \) \( \text{\textit{g3+}} \)
38 \( \text{\textit{f1}} \) \( \text{\textit{hxh4}} \)

With the shelter of his king completely swept away White is hopelessly lost. Black’s material investment amounts to a mere exchange and he will soon annex some more of White’s pawns.

39 \( \text{\textit{g1}} \) \( \text{\textit{g3+}} \)
40 \( \text{\textit{h1}} \) \( \text{\textit{h3+}} \)
41 \( \text{\textit{g1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe4}} \)
42 \( \text{\textit{c6+}} \)

Taking a circuitous route to the defence of the white king.

42 ... \( \text{\textit{f7}} \)
43 \( \text{\textit{c7+}} \) \( \text{\textit{g6}} \)
44 \( \text{\textit{g7+}} \) \( \text{\textit{h5}} \)
45 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) \( \text{\textit{e3+}} \)
46 \( \text{\textit{h2}} \) \( \text{\textit{f2}} \)
Or 47 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{We2} \) and White has no checks (Nimzowitsch).

47 ... \( \text{d}g4+ \)
48 \( \text{h}1 \) e4

The only danger Black has to avoid is an accidental stalemate. White’s advance of the a-pawn is an attempt to generate this accident.

49 \( \text{g}1 \) f5
50 a4 \( \text{xh}6 \)
51 a5 \( \text{g}5 \)
52 \( \text{b}1 \) f3
53 \( \text{b}2 \) f2
0–1

In spite of Nimzowitsch’s impressive victory in this game, this is another line which is objectively dubious for Black. For this reason, our main chapter on 1 e4 c6 2 d4, concentrates on 2...e5 as Black’s major reply.

A further idea, involving a gambit, also makes surrender of the centre with 3...dxe4 seem less than attractive.

5 f3
An adventurous gambit alternative to 5 \( \text{f}4 \). Also possible is 5 \( \text{d}d4 \).

5 ... exf3
Black demonstrates excessive confidence in his ability to defend the resulting position. More circumspect and better would have been 5...e3, refusing the poisoned chalice.

6 \( \text{x}f3 \) \( \text{x}f3+ \)
7 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \)
8 \( \text{f}4 \) a6
The threat was now 9 \( \text{b}5 \).

9 h3 \( \text{g}6 \)
If 9...\( \text{f}5 \), then 10 \( \text{xc}7 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 11 \( \text{xf}5 \) regains the pawn, though this could hardly have been worse than the text.

10 g4 \( \text{g}7 \)
After 11...0-0 12 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 13 \( \text{h4} \) White gains a huge attack against the black king, much as in the game.

12 \( \text{g3} \) 
13 \( \text{e2} \) 
14 \( \text{h4} \) 
15 \( \text{h5} \)

White's attack is on the point of crashing through. Now 16...hxg6 allows 17 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 18 \( \text{h7}+ \) \( \text{f8} \) 19 \( \text{h6} \), while 16...\( \text{xf4} \) 17 \( \text{xf4} \) fxg6 18

\( \text{c4}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) 19 \( \text{xh7}+ \) \( \text{h7} \) 20 \( \text{h1}+ \) \( \text{h6} \) 21 \( \text{xh6} \) is mate. In this variation 18...e6 is a superior parry to the check but after 19 \( \text{we3} \) the threats of \( \text{x} \text{e6}+ \) and \( \text{x} \text{d7} \) followed by \( \text{x} \text{e6} \) are impossible to meet.

Black's material advantage is completely irrelevant in the face of White's overpowering attack.

16 ... \( \text{x} \text{c3} \) 
17 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 
18 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{a5} \) 
19 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{h5} \)

A last vain effort to check the impetus of the attack. Now White finishes off effortlessly.

20 \( \text{gxf7}+ \) \( \text{x} \text{f7} \) 
21 \( \text{x} \text{h5}+ \) 1–0

Section C
Modern Times
The next two games show the attraction that the ideas of Nimzowitsch, Chigorin and Bogoljubow still exert over modern grandmasters.

Game 10
Piket-Christiansen
Monaco Blindfold 1993

1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 
Starting with Bogoljubow.
2 \( \text{e4} \) 
Avoiding the Chigorin.
2 ... \( \text{d5} \)
Finally Black transposes to Nimzowitsch's Defence.

3 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 
4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 
5 \( \text{f3} \)
5 ... fxe5

Normally Black would not release the tension so quickly, 5...\textdollar\textdollar d7 being the more orthodox move in this case.

6 dxe5

White has an interesting gambit with 6 \textdollar b5! exd4 7 \textdollar xd4 or 6 \textdollar b5 e4 7 \textdollar e5.

6 ... e6

7 \textdollar b5

This is a standard pin by White who is attempting to increase his control over the e5-square.

7 ... \textdollar c5

8 \textdollar d4 \textdollar xd4

9 cxd4 \textdollar h4

White’s somewhat dilatory play has allowed Black to seize the initiative. Black’s queen occupies a most threatening post.

10 \textdollar c3 \textdollar ge7

11 \textdollar e3 0–0

12 \textdollar c1 \textdollar g4

13 \textdollar d2 \textdollar f5

All Black’s pieces are in active play and there is no safe refuge in sight for White’s king.

14 \textdollar g5 \textdollar h5

15 \textdollar xc6 bxc6

16 h3 h6

17 \textdollar f4

This meets with an interesting refutation but, if instead 17 \textdollar f4 \textdollar h4! 18 hxg4 \textdollar xg2+ 19 \textdollar e2 \textdollar xg4+ then Black wins.

17 ... \textdollar f3!!

A beautiful thrust which leaves White’s position full of holes.

18 \textdollar xf3 \textdollar xg5

19 0–0 \textdollar xd4

White has no defence and
rapidly loses several pawns.

20 \( \text{wg4} \) \( \text{xe5} \)
21 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{g6} \)
22 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
23 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
24 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \)
25 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{af8} \)
26 \( \text{d}3 \)

Elegant to the last.

27 \( \text{xf3} \)
28 \( \text{xf3} \)
29 \( \text{h1} \)
29 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{xd3} \) is equally hopeless for him.
29 \( \ldots \) \( \text{h3}+ \)
0–1

A beautiful example of the dynamic counterplay and very swift imbalance Black can generate with this defence.

Game 11
Kasparov-Smyslov
Vilnius Ct 1984

1 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{c6} \)
2 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d}5 \)
3 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{g4} \)
4 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{xf3} \)
5 \( \text{gxf3} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
6 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \)

In the main body of the text (see page 120) we prefer 6...e6 which preserves Black's second bishop.

7 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{b}4 \)
8 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xc3} \)
9 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{d}6 \)

The whole point of playing this defence against Kasparov was to unsettle him with something unusual. In that sense this move is consistent. In the orthodox lines of the Chigorin Black normally plays 9...exd4 10 cxd4 and then ...\( \text{ge7} \) or ...\( \text{f6} \). The text plans to sidestep an exchange of queens based on \( \text{b}3 \).

10 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{b6} \)
11 \( \text{f}4 \)
A radical way of clarifying the central tension.

11 \( \ldots \) \( \text{exf}4 \)
12 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{ge7} \)
13 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{0}–\text{0} \)
14 \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{a}3 \)
With the threat of \( \ldots \Box xd4 \).

15 \( \text{\L} \text{e}2 \) \( f5 \)
16 \( 0-0 \)

16 \( \ldots \) \( fxe4? \)

Here Black misses the best path. According to Kasparov 16...\( \Box g6! \) 17 \( \text{\L} \text{x}c7 \) \( \text{\L} \text{ac}8 \) 18 \( \text{exf}5 \) \( \Box x\text{c}7 \) 19 \( \text{\W}d5+ \) \( \text{\L} \text{h}8 \) 20 \( \text{fxg}6 \) \( \Box e7 \) is unclear. Slightly better for White is 17 \( \Box c4+ \) \( \text{\L} \text{h}8 \) 18 \( \text{\L} \text{c}1 \) \( fxe4 \) 19 \( \text{\W}xe4 \) \( \Box d6 \), though Black’s position remains quite playable. White has the two bishops but his kingside is broken up.

17 \( \text{\W}xe4 \) \( \text{\W}xc3 \)
18 \( \text{\L} \text{e}3 \) \( \text{\W}a3 \)
19 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box d6 \)
20 \( \text{\W}xh7+ \) \( \Box f7 \)
21 \( \text{\A}b5 \) \( \Box xd4 \)
22 \( \text{\W}e4? \)

Faced by Smyslov’s ingenious defence Kasparov misses 22 \( \Box xd4 \) \( \text{\W}xd4 \) 23 \( \text{\A}g5 \) \( \text{\L} \text{e}6 \) 24 \( \text{\W}h3+ \) \( \Box d6 \) 25 \( \text{\L} \text{e}2 \) \( \Box d5 \) 26 \( \Box xd5+ \) which wins.

22 \( \ldots \) \( \text{\A}d8 \)

If 22...\( \Box xb5 \) 23 \( \Box c4+ \) \( \Box f6 \) 24 \( \text{\W}h4+ \) wins.

Settling for half a point.

23 \( \Box xd4 \) \( \text{\W}xd4 \)
24 \( \Box f5+ \)
25 \( \text{\W}f5+ \) \( \Box g8 \)
Not 25...\( \text{\W}f6 \) 26 \( \Box c4+ \) \( \Box e7 \) 27 \( \Box e1+ \) winning.

26 \( \text{\W}h7+ \) \( \Box f7 \)

It is perpetual after 27 \( \text{\W}f5+ \).

Section D
Practising What We Preach

The following games are included for two reasons:

a) to demonstrate to readers that we have actually played the 1...\( \Box c6 \) defence ourselves.

b) to show the beneficial effects of emulating a fine strategic example.

As a young player, I (RDK) was most impressed with the game won by Nimzowitsch in 1921 against the three consulting partners at Uppsala. In this game, Nimzowitsch castled queenside and then tore up the
opposing king’s fortress on the other side of the board by means of a patient pawn avalanche. Castling on the opposite sides of the board can often lead to ferocious attacks with a decisive result as the outcome. *Veneration - inspiration - emulation* was the motto!

This was my objective in choosing Nimzowitsch’s Defence, namely, to unbalance the position and make it strategically difficult for both sides. Indeed, it is noticeable in several of my early games how swiftly Black either managed to castle queenside or tuck his king away safely in the centre, and then annihilate the white king by launching an attack with doubled rooks on the h-file. I think this kind of lesson, as first preached by Nimzowitch, is most instructive for any aspiring player.

Game 12

**Charnley-Keene**

*London 1964*

1 e4 d6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 dxe5
4 c3 e6
5 d3

It looks sensible to challenge Black’s light squared bishop, but paradoxically, it is often Black who eventually seizes control of the light squares after this exchange.

5 ... \( \text{\textdagger} \text{xd3} \)
6 \( \text{\textw} \text{xd3} \) \( \text{\texte} \text{ge7} \)

7 \( \text{\textf} \text{g5} \)

An alternative here is 7 \( \text{\textf} \text{f3} \) h5 8 \( \text{\texte} \text{bd2} \) \( \text{\textf} \text{f5} \) 9 0–0 \( \text{\textw} \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{\texte} \text{e1} \) \( \text{\texte} \text{e7} \) 11 \( \text{\textf} \text{f1} \) 0–0–0 12 b4 f6 with a sharp position and chances for both sides as was seen in the game Pike-Keene, London 1964.

7 ... h6
8 \( \text{\texte} \text{xe7} \) \( \text{\textw} \text{xe7} \)
9 f4 \( \text{\textw} \text{d7} \)
10 \( \text{\textf} \text{f3} \) \( \text{\texte} \text{e7} \)
11 0–0 h5

A standard precaution, preparing ...\( \text{\textf} \text{f5} \) and discouraging White from a future g4. If White does insist on playing g4 ultimately, the insertion of ...h5 helps Black to gain compensating hold on the open h-file.

12 g3

Not 12 h3?, when 12...h4 paralyses White’s kingside pawns. With the text, White is trying to keep his kingside pawns in perfect order, hoping, one day, to achieve g4 with advantage.
Black plays on both wings. He maintains the choice of trading on d4 or implementing a general queenside pawn avalanche.

14...Af8c1 Aa7
Completing development and preparing to connect the rooks.
15 Abf1 bc5
16 Ah3 Ac4
Black opts for blockade.
17 Awc2 Abb7
18 Aa3 Ac5
19 Ad1 Ad7

The safest haven for Black’s king. It is interesting in this variation how often Black delays castling, or even omits it altogether.

20 g4
White had to undertake something, but now the opening of the h-file plays into Black’s hands. Conversely, if White did nothing, Black would simply have pressed forwards on the queen’s flank, by means of ...b4.

20...hxg4
21 hXg4 Ahh4
22 Acg3 Adxf3+
23 Wxf3 Ag6
24 Adg2 Ab4

Now Black has the initiative on both wings. If White ever tries to strike back, by means of f4-f5, then Black simply trades on f5 (...gx5) with further threats against White’s exposed king.

25 Acf2 Add4
26 axb4 Add8

The climax of Black’s attack. Black could simply have played 26...axb4, but the text sets an amusing trap.

27 Acxa5?
Falling head-long into the trap. White had to play the passive 27 Ah1.

27...Ah2+
28 Ag1 Ah8+3
29 Acg3 Ah4

Black’s manoeuvre has won a piece in broad daylight.
30 \texttt{Nc6\textsubscript{a1}}

This trick permits White to save his queen, but he remains a knight down with a hopeless position.

30 \ldots \texttt{Nxc6+}
31 \texttt{gxg3} \texttt{N\textsubscript{g}3}
32 \texttt{N\textsubscript{a}7} \texttt{Nc7}

Black emerges a piece ahead with an easy win.

33 \texttt{Nxb7+} \texttt{Nxb7}
34 \texttt{f1} \texttt{Nxb2}
35 \texttt{f5} \texttt{gxf5}
36 \texttt{gxf5} \texttt{h4}
37 \texttt{fxe6} \texttt{fxe6}
38 \texttt{Nc1} \texttt{g5}

0–1

Game 13

Hindley-Keene

Correspondence 1963

1 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c6}
2 \texttt{d4} \texttt{d5}
3 \texttt{e5} \texttt{f5}
4 \texttt{N\textsubscript{e}2} \texttt{e6}
5 \texttt{Ng3} \texttt{g6}
6 \texttt{c3} \texttt{f6}
7 \texttt{f4} \texttt{h6}

Reinforcing the blockade of f5.

It is important, when White has claimed so much of the centre with his pawns, to keep a firm grip over the blockading square f5.

8 \texttt{d2} \texttt{d5}
9 \texttt{f3} \texttt{d7}
10 \texttt{d2}

This development of the bishop is somewhat passive. It seems more sensible to develop White's king's bishop instead, either on e2 or b5.

10 \ldots \texttt{ce7}
11 \( \text{d}e2? \)

This is a catastrophic retreat. White’s threat of g4 is easily parried and now Black swiftly seizes the initiative.

11 \( \ldots \) h5
12 \( \text{d}g3 \) g4
13 \( \text{d}d3 \) xg3
14 hxg3 f5
15 f2

It is a choice between this humiliating king move to defend g3 or the supine exchange 15 xf5. The latter would, however, have been somewhat preferable.

15 \( \ldots \) 0–0–0
16 \( \text{b}3 \) c5

Now both White’s king and queen are in the firing line. It is fascinating to observe how quickly Black can obtain a winning position with this defence if White’s play is hesitant.

17 h2 h6
18 xg4 xg4+
19 f3

Hoping for 19...c4? 20 xc4 dxc4 21 xc4+ followed by xg4 when the worst is over.

19 \( \ldots \) h6
20 \( \text{b}5 \)

Now seeking relief in the exchange of queens, but Black transfers his attention to White’s exposed king.

20 \( \ldots \) f7
21 c4?

A final blunder which loses material. It would have been better to launch a hand-to-hand fight with 21 exf6 gxf6 22 dxc5 e5 though White is severely handicapped by the presence of his king in the middle of hostilities.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{21} \ldots \text{f}xe5 \\
\text{22} \text{cxd5} \text{f}5 \\
\text{23} \text{dxe6}
\end{array}
\]

This loses a piece but 23 xf5 xf5 was also very poor.

23 \( \ldots \) xd4+
24 f2 xb5
25 exf7 xd3
26 e2 e4
0–1

Game 14
Sandiford-Keene
Dulwich 1961

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1 \text{e}4 \text{c}6 \\
2 \text{d}4 \text{d}5 \\
3 \text{e}5 \text{f}6 (D)
\end{array}
\]

Nimzowitsch’s original idea, which is far more challenging than 3...xf5.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
4 \text{f}4 \text{f}5 \\
5 \text{e}2 \text{d}7 \\
6 \text{g}3 \text{g}4 \\
7 \text{e}2 \text{xe}2
\end{array}
\]
As so often in this defence, the trade of light-squared bishops furthers Black’s aims rather than White’s.

8 \( \text{\textit{\text{dx}}\text{e}2 \text{e}6 \)  
9 \( \text{\textit{\text{e}}3 \text{g}e7 \)  

Almost imperceptibly, Black has gained tangible influence over the centre and White’s remaining dark-squared bishop is seriously restricted by its own pawns.

10 0-0 \( \text{f}5 \)  
11 \( \text{\textit{\text{d}}2 \text{h}5 \)  

Once again, this strategically valuable advance of Black’s h-pawn plays a vital role.

12 \( \text{\textit{\text{g}}3 \)  

A common factor in this opening is that White simply cannot stand the presence of the black knight on f5 and therefore accepts doubled pawns in order to eliminate it. However, White’s doubled pawns on the g-file represent an attractive target for Black’s further attack, by means of ...h4.

12 ... \( \text{\textit{\text{x}}g3 \)  

Black no longer requires the f5-square for his knight. It is more important to fix White’s pawn on g3 as a weakness in preparation for the line-opening attack ...h4.

13 \( \text{\textit{\text{h}}xg3 \) \( \text{\textit{\text{e}}7 \)  
14 \( \text{\textit{\text{f}}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \)  

A vital step in connecting Black’s rooks. The king is safer on f7 than it would be after ...0-0-0.

15 \( \text{\textit{\text{a}}3 \) \( \text{\textit{\text{g}}6 \)  
16 \( \text{\textit{\text{d}}3 \) \( \text{f}7 \)  

The final attack commences. There is no need to risk the opening of the position after 18...dx4.

17 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{\textit{\text{x}}a3 \)  
18 \( \text{\textit{\text{x}}a3 \) \( \text{h}4 \)  

White’s demonstration on the other wing comes too late. There is really no defence to Black’s numerous options on the h-file.
An elegant move which gains control of the vital d5-square for Black's queen.

27 bxc6 $\text{dx}c6$

0–1

28 $\text{Bxc}6$ $\text{Wd}5$ is checkmate, while after 28 $\text{Bb}5$ $\text{De}7$ White also loses control of the long light-squared diagonal. The next game follows an identical thematic trend.

Game 15
Sugden-Keene
Dulwich 1961

1 $\text{e}4$ $\text{Cc}6$
2 $\text{d}4$ $\text{d}5$
3 $\text{e}5$ $\text{f}6$
4 $\text{Cf}3$ $\text{Cf}5$
5 $\text{Bb}5$ $\text{Wd}7$
6 0–0

Varying from 6 c4, which was played in the famous Nimzowitsch consultation game from 1921, referred to in the introduction to this section: 6...$\text{Bxb1}$ 7 $\text{Bxb1}$ 0–0 8 $\text{cxd5}$ $\text{Wxd5}$ 9 $\text{Cc6}$$\text{xc6}$ 10 0–0 e6 11 $\text{De3}$ $\text{De7}$ 12 $\text{We2}$ $\text{Dd5}$ 13 $\text{Bfc1}$ $\text{Wd7}$ 14 $\text{Cc4}$ $\text{Bb8}$ 15 $\text{Wd2}$ $\text{Cc8}$ 16 $\text{De1}$ $\text{De7}$ 17 $\text{Bd3}$ $\text{Hd8}$ 18 $\text{Cc2}$ f5 19 $\text{Cc1}$ g5 20 $\text{Dc5}$ $\text{Cc5}$ 21 $\text{Bxc5}$ $\text{Bg8}$ 22 $\text{We2}$ h5

offering a sacrifice to help open lines against White's king. Indeed, Black's pawn avalanche soon broke through in decisive fashion, Three Swedish Amateurs-Nimzowitsch, Uppsala 1921.

6 ... 0–0–0

Already the battle lines are set. Opposite castling will lead to a very sharp fight.

7 $\text{Cc3}$ e6
8 $\text{De3}$ a6 (D)
9 $\text{Cc6}$

This is a strategic blunder. White should either play 9 $\text{Le2}$ preserving his light-squared bishop or even 9 $\text{La4}$ when Black would hardly consider permitting the sacrifice 9...b5

9...
10 \( \text{dx}b5 \).

Black already has an excellent position. He owns the half-open h-file and has a potential attack against White’s king; ...g5 perhaps combined with ...\( \text{c}h6-g4 \). Meanwhile, as so often occurs, White’s remaining dark-squared bishop is an extremely feeble piece. White’s next move is an ambitious attempt to gain space and lock

Black’s pieces out of play, but weaknesses arise in its wake.

13 g4 \( \text{h}6 \\
Not 13...\( \text{h}3 \) 14 \( \text{f}3 \) fxg4 15 \( \text{hx}h3 \) gxh3 16 \( \text{g}4 \) regaining control with a good position. \\
14 h3 \( \text{e}7 \\
15 \( \text{h}f2 \) \( \text{f}7 \\
16 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \\
17 gxf5 gxf5 \\
18 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{h}8 \\

Black’s attack plays itself. The move ...g5 will soon smash White’s position.

19 \( \text{h}1 \) g5 \\
20 \( \text{f}2 \) g4 \\
This advance forces a decisive gain of material.

21 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \\
22 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}2+ \\
23 \( \text{x}h2 \) \( \text{h}3 \\
0-1 \\
There is no defence to ...g3.

Game 16

Tisdall-Jacobs

Gausdal 1996

1 d4 \( \text{c}6 \)}
2 d5

An earlier game of mine (BJ) from the same tournament, against the Russian grandmaster A. Ivanov, saw 2 \( \text{d}f3 \text{d}5 \text{3 g}3 \text{f}5 \) (3...\( \text{g}4 \) is a perfectly playable alternative and is perhaps more dynamic - see page 131) 4 \( \text{g}2 \text{e}6 \) 5 0-0 \( \text{f}6 \) 6 \( \text{bd}2 \text{e}7 \text{7 a}3 \text{e}4 \text{8 c}4 \text{0-0-9} \text{b}3 \text{f}6 \) (the tactical try 9...\( \text{c}3 \) 10 \( \text{e}1 \text{dxc}4 \) 11 \( \text{xc}4 \text{xd}4? \) backfires after 12 \( \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{b}2 \text{f}6 \) 14 \( \text{c}1 \) and White wins a piece) 10 \( \text{b}2 \text{a}5 \) 11 \( \text{c}1 \text{wd}7 \text{12 e}3 \text{fd}8 \) 13 \( \text{we}2 \) and White had a small advantage.

I spent a long time on this move convincing myself that Black’s position was okay after White’s reply. A strange-looking alternative which tries to make use of the unusual position of White’s queen is 6...\( \text{b}6 \)? when play can continue 7 \( \text{dxe}6 \) (this is a critical attempt to disrupt Black’s position by attacking his knight; if White continues quietly Black should not have problems, e.g. 7 \( \text{g}5 \text{c}5 \) 8 \( \text{d}2 \text{h}6 \) 9 \( \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 \) is fine for Black) 7...\( \text{xe}6 \) 8 \( \text{e}5 \text{c}5 \) and now 9 \( \text{we}4 \), preventing the knight from coming to \( \text{d}5 \) with the following possibilities:

The tempting alternative 4 \( \text{f}4 \) gains time and space but, again, as we have seen, White must be very wary of playing too many pawn moves while his development lags.

4 ... \( \text{g}6 \\
5 \text{f}3 \text{f}6 \\
6 \text{c}3
46 Introduction to 1...\( \mathcal{b} \)c6: Strategic Themes and History

a) 9...\( \mathcal{g} \)g8 might be playable but White has dangerous tries such as 10 \( \mathcal{d} \)g5 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe5 11 \( \mathcal{w} \)e4 \( \mathcal{d} \)xf3+ 12 \( \mathcal{w} \)xf3 \( \mathcal{w} \)xg5 13 \( \mathcal{w} \)xa8 \( \mathcal{c} \)7 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)e4 \( \mathcal{w} \)e5 15 0-0-0 0-0 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)xc5 \( \mathcal{w} \)xc5; 10 h4 \( \mathcal{b} \)b7 11 \( \mathcal{g} \)g5 \( \mathcal{d} \)e7 12 h5 \( \mathcal{f} \)f8 13 \( \mathcal{d} \)e4; or finally, 10 b4 \( \mathcal{e} \)e7 11 \( \mathcal{b} \)b5 c6 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)d6+ \( \mathcal{d} \)xd6 13 exd6.

b) 9...d5 fails to the accurate continuation 10 \( \mathcal{w} \)a4+! \( \mathcal{d} \)d7 (10...\( \mathcal{d} \)d7 11 \( \mathcal{w} \)c6) 11 \( \mathcal{b} \)b5 and Black is in trouble, e.g. 11...a6 12 \( \mathcal{d} \)xd7+ \( \mathcal{d} \)xd7 13 \( \mathcal{w} \)c6 and the e-pawn cannot be sensibly defended.

7 h4 h5

Wilhelm Steinitz, who was well-known for his love of constricted positions, would probably have rejoiced in Black’s position after 7...0-0 8 h5 \( \mathcal{d} \)h8, but I didn’t like the look of it.

8 \( \mathcal{g} \)g5 0-0

It looks as though Black’s h-pawn must be terribly weak but, as the game progresses, it becomes clear that this is not the whole story and that White’s weakness on g4 is also a very important feature of the position.

9 0-0-0 d6

Black is planning to close the centre with ...e5 and White decides to prevent this.

10 dxe6 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe6
11 \( \mathcal{d} \)d5

This move allows Black to force a favourable simplification. White would have done better to maintain the tension with a simple developing move such as 11 \( \mathcal{c} \)c4.

11 ... \( \mathcal{d} \)xd5
12 exd5 \( \mathcal{g} \)g4

From now until the end of the game White’s f-pawn proves to be an annoying weakness for him.

13 \( \mathcal{d} \)d3 \( \mathcal{f} \)f6
14 \( \mathcal{d} \)xf6 \( \mathcal{w} \)xf6
15 \( \mathcal{w} \)xf6 gxf6

The slight weakness of Black’s kingside pawn structure is compensated for by the active positioning of his knights.

16 \( \mathcal{d} \)d2 \( \mathcal{f} \)f4
17 \( \mathcal{f} \)f5 \( \mathcal{e} \)ae8
18 \( \mathcal{e} \)e1

18 g3 appears to tidy up the white position but then the black knights come into their own, e.g. 18...\( \mathcal{d} \)c2+ 19 \( \mathcal{b} \)b1 \( \mathcal{d} \)xf2 20 \( \mathcal{h} \)h2 (or 20 \( \mathcal{e} \)e1 \( \mathcal{d} \)xg3 21 \( \mathcal{g} \)g1 \( \mathcal{d} \)fh1! when Black’s knights are on very strange squares but it is not at all clear that White can exploit this) 20...\( \mathcal{g} \)g1! and the weakness of White’s back rank means that
Black will escape with an extra pawn.

18    ...     \[ \text{Exel+} \]
19 \[ \text{dxe1} \] \[ \text{e8} \]

20 \[ \text{d1} \]

\[ \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \]

The position is equal. Black's active knights fully compensate for the weakened pawns.

This game demonstrated a typical by-product of playing ...c6 - Tisdall used up nearly an hour on his first six moves, including 20 minutes on 2 d5. His comment on the opening after the game was: 'It looked terrible for Black but, actually, it's not at all bad'.

The moral to be drawn from this is that the white player runs terrible dangers if he underestimates Black's resources.
With this move, Black launches a swift central attack on the dark squares and immediately gives White a problem with the threat to his d-pawn. There are three ways that White can counter this early attack and the manner of response lays the foundation for the ensuing middlegame.

i) Capturing with 3 dxe5
By playing like this, White hopes that Black’s central knight will provide a target and help him to develop his pieces. White can attack this knight with moves such as \( \mathcal{D}f3 \), \( \mathcal{D}f4 \) or, most adventurously, \( f4 \).

Black, for his part, will try to maintain the knight on e5 and by doing so keep control of the central dark squares. If he is obliged to exchange this piece, he will be looking to simplify the position with further exchanges. An important theme for Black in this variation is the move \( \mathcal{B}b4+ \) which can often prove awkward for White. For example, if White drives the bishop away with \( c3 \), then he has taken the natural development square away from his queen’s knight. Alternatively, he could try \( \mathcal{D}d2 \), but then there is a danger that Black will exchange pieces and the position will become too simplified for White to hope for an advantage.

ii) Advancing with 3 d5
White gains space in the centre as well as some time by driving the black knight back. If White now continues (after 3...\( \mathcal{D}ce7 \)) 4 c4, we have a direct transposition into the lines which more commonly arise from the sequence 1 d4 \( \mathcal{D}c6 \) 2 c4 e5 3 d5 \( \mathcal{D}ce7 \) 4 e4, considered in chapter five. Here we consider attempts by White to avoid \( c4 \).
This plan should not be troublesome for Black as he has a very flexible position and can develop in King’s Indian fashion with ...g6 and ...f5 or play more adventurously by developing the bishop on a more active square such as b4 or c5.

iii) 3 d3 - The Scotch Game
By playing 3 d3, White transposes directly to the Scotch Game. This is an important option for White and so here we consider defences for Black against the two most popular ways of playing the Scotch for White.

An adventurous try from White, trying to take the initiative at a very early stage. White hopes to gain time and space by this advance but the drawback is that his position could become over-extended. Others:

a) 7 c4 is a simple alternative which incidentally threatens mate. Solomon-Miles, Melbourne 1991 continued 7...f6 8 f4 d6 9 d2 e7 10 0-0-0 (this, combined with White’s next move, constitutes an ambitious plan, but he is unlikely to get anywhere with the quiet 10 0-0) 10...0-0 11 h4 c6 (11...g6 immediately should also be fine, although White would then have more options - e.g. 12 g3 or 12 g3 - than he does in the game) 12 g3 e5 13 e2 g6 14 e3 xe3 15 xe3 f4 (Black has a slight initiative) 16 f1 e8 17 xf4 xf4 18 f3 e6 19 b3 a5 20 e3 a4 and Black’s chances are preferable.

b) With 7 d3 White leaves the c4-square free as he has a plan in mind to harry the black bishop, e.g. 7...d6 8 d2 e7 9 b4 b6 10 c4 0-0 11 0-0 e6 12 a4 (White continues with his plan, but his queenside structure is quickly becoming exposed and this soon tells against him) 12...c6 13 xb6 axb6 14 e2 b3 15 c2 xc2 16 xc2 b5 17 e3 bxa4 18 xa4 xa4 19 xa4 d7 20 d1 e6 21 c2
50 1 e4 d6 2 d4 e5
d5 (Black has completely equalised) 22 a5 (White should have reconciled himself to 22 exd5 as the text backfires on account of White’s weak back rank) 22...dxe4 23 dxe6 a8 24 h3 w5 25 wa2 (White tries a back-rank trick of his own, but the damage has already been done) 25...w8 26 d7 d5 27 d4 w5 28 w2 w6 29 b4 g6 30 c4 h5 31 w5 w4 d5 32 w6 d6 0-1 B. Martin-Miles, Auckland 1992.
c) 7 a3 is rather insipid. After 7...wxe3 8 wxe3 w5 9 a2 d5 10 w2 a7 11 e5! White must continue his strategy aggressively, otherwise his position will become exposed to a quick black counter-attack. For example after 11 w5 d5 Black already stands well.
11 ... 0-0

7 b6
An alternative scheme of development is 7...e7 8 w4 w6 eyeing the slight weakness on c3.
8 w2

9 a4
White must be careful not to waste too much time, due his slightly undeveloped state. For example 9 w4 0-0 10 a4 comes unstuck after the instructive reply 10...d5! 11 exd5 w5 13 w5 w3! Black wins, as 12 d4 follows if White captures the knight.
9 ... c6??
Black is trying to provoke White into over-extending himself - a common theme in this variation. For the less adventurously inclined, the simple 9...a6 was a perfectly sound alternative. The play now assumes a forcing nature.
10 w4 w7
11 e5!
White must continue his strategy aggressively, otherwise his position will become exposed to a quick black counter-attack. For example after 11 w5 d5 Black already stands well.
11 ... 0-0

9 a4
White must be careful not to
Again it is essential for White to continue actively as Black, although cramped, is poised to take the initiative with moves such as ...\(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) or ...\(\text{\texttt{f6}}\) when White will regret his lack of development.

12 ... \(\text{\texttt{we8}}\)

Black side-steps the pin and threatens to bring intolerable pressure to bear on the white e-pawn with ...\(\text{\texttt{g6}}\). White's continuation is thus forced.

13 \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xd6}}\)

14 \(\text{\texttt{exd6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d5+}}\!\)

This is much stronger than the attempt to round up the White e-pawn. After 14...\(\text{\texttt{f5+}}\) the logical conclusion of the game may well be a curious draw, i.e. 15 \(\text{\texttt{d2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e6}}\) (not 15...\(\text{\texttt{xd6}}\) 16 \(\text{\texttt{e1}}\) when the black queen is 'checkmated') 16 \(\text{\texttt{d3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xd6}}\) 17 \(\text{\texttt{e1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c4+}}\) 18 \(\text{\texttt{c2}}\) (not 18 \(\text{\texttt{d1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) and Black threatens ...\(\text{\texttt{e5}}\), ...\(\text{\texttt{b2+}}\) and possibly ...\(\text{\texttt{xd3+}}\) as well) 18...\(\text{\texttt{a3+}}\!\) (18...\(\text{\texttt{e5}}\) 19 \(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) 20 \(\text{\texttt{h4}}\) is extremely dangerous for Black) 19 \(\text{\texttt{b2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c4+}}\) with perpetual check.

15 \(\text{\texttt{d2}}\)

15 \(\text{\texttt{e2}}\) saves White the inconvenience of having to move his king, but leaves him stuck for a decent reply after 15...\(\text{\texttt{e5!}}\) striking all his weak points.

15 ... \(\text{\texttt{e6}}\)

15...\(\text{\texttt{e5}}\) looks tempting but White has a satisfactory reply with 16 \(\text{\texttt{g3}}\!\).

16 \(\text{\texttt{g3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f6}}\)

17 \(\text{\texttt{h6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f7}}\)

18 \(\text{\texttt{c4}}\)

Miles points out the amusing variation 18 \(\text{\texttt{e2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\)! 19 \(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{g8}}\)! (Black defends in true Steinitzian fashion) 20 \(\text{\texttt{f4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xf4}}\) and ...\(\text{\texttt{d5+}}\) will pick up a piece.

18 ... \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\!\)

19 \(\text{\texttt{f4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b5}}\!\)

White has been making all the running but has not succeeded in inflicting serious weaknesses on the black position. Now Miles bursts out to
exploit the exposed white queenside and the highly insecure position of his king.

20 \( \texttt{~b3} \)

White can accept Black's gambit with 20 axb5 cxb5 21 \( \texttt{x} \times b5 \) but after 21...\( \texttt{~b7} \) Black has excellent compensation. Not many players would be attracted to this white position with the king wandering around in mid-board.

20 ... \( \texttt{~b7} \)
21 \( \texttt{~f3} \) c5!

Opening further lines towards the white king and incidentally gaining time thanks to the threat of \( \texttt{Dxf4} \).

22 \( \texttt{g3} \) cxb4
23 cxb4 bxa4
24 \( \texttt{xa4} \) \( \texttt{b6!} \)
25 \( \texttt{wd3} \)
25 \( \texttt{xf7} \) \( \texttt{xf3} \) 26 \( \texttt{a2} \) \( \texttt{xg2} \) wins for Black.

25 ... \( \texttt{wh5!} \)

The contrast with the position of just a few moves ago is remarkable. The black forces have emerged from confinement and are now roaming the board freely. White has so many exposed points that it is only a matter of time before he has an accident.

26 \( \texttt{a5} \) \( \texttt{g4} \)
27 f4 f5!

When you have a good position it is often wise to continue improving it rather than grabbing material. Here Black is in no hurry to capture on g2, which might give White time to co-ordinate his forces, and instead fixes a further weakness on f4, locks the white dark-squared bishop out of the game and prepares to bring his rook to f6, menacing the white d-pawn.

28 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{g6} \)
29 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \)
30 \( \texttt{ae5} \) \( \texttt{af8} \)

The white d-pawn is now indefensible.

31 \( \texttt{c1} \) \( \texttt{xd6} \)
32 \( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{d5} \)

Black continues methodically, exchanging off White's better minor piece and further
exposing his king. White could safely resign here.

33 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{c6} \)
34 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f7} \)
35 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{c8} \)
36 \( \text{xf8}+ \) \( \text{xf8} \)
37 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{h6} \)
38 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c8} \)
39 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
40 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c6} \)

41 \( \text{c5} \)

A blunder, but White’s position was hopeless.

0-1

41...\( \text{a4}+ \) picks up the white queen.

Game 18
Kudrin-Miles
US Championship 1989

1 e4 \( \text{c6} \)
2 d4 e5
3 dx5 \( \text{xe5} \)
4 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b4}+(D) \)
5 c3

White can also consider other ways of blocking the bishop check:

a) 5 \( \text{d2} \) leads to an immediate simplification of the position which should leave Black without serious difficulties, e.g. 5...\( \text{xd2}+ \) 6 \( \text{bxd2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 7 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 8 c3 \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{d3} \) 0-0 10 0-0 \( \text{g6} \) 11 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d6} \) (Black has an easy game) 12 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g5} \) 14 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 15 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 g3 \( \text{c6} \) 17 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 18 \( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 19 f4 \( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{ae8} \) 21 \( \text{e1} \) f5 22 h3 \( \text{f8} \) 23 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 24 e5 \( \text{xe5} \) 25 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 26 fxe5 \( \text{e5} \) and Black went on to win in Zaninotto-Miles, Mendrisio 1989.

b) 5 \( \text{c3} \) is untested but a logical continuation for Black is 5...\( \text{xf3}+ \) 6 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{f6} \) which looks equal as 7 \( \text{g3} \) can be comfortably met by 7...\( \text{g6} \)

c) 5 \( \text{bd2} \) is the most dynamic of White’s alternatives, e.g. 5...\( \text{xf3}+ \) 6 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{e7} \) (6...\( \text{f6} \) followed by ...\( \text{e7} \) is another scheme of development) 7 a3 \( \text{a5} \) 8 b4 \( \text{b6} \) 9 \( \text{b2} \) 0-0 10 \( \text{c4} \) (10 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f6} \)
and Black is preparing to hit back in the centre with \ldots d5.)

10...c6 11 b3 White is now threatening g3 - on the previous move this would have been met by \ldots d4 - which would cause a serious weakness in the black kingside) 11...h4 12 g3 (White is trying to create an initiative on the kingside, but this weakness has long-term repercussions) 12...h6 13 d1 d6 (due to the weakness created by g3, it is now impossible for the white king to find a secure home) 14 d5? e6 15 h5 g6 16 e2 f5! 17 exf5 xf5 18 0-0 e8 (Black has smoothly completed his development while White has been driven back in confusion) 19 d1 e4 20 c3 d5 21 d4

21...xd4! 22 xd4 f3 (White’s over-ambitious plan of switching his rook to h5 has backfired and it now provides a target for Black) 23 xe5 (23 h3 w5 leaves White without a sensible reply) 23...xe5 24 w3 xd1 25 xd1 w7 26 e3 w3 and Black won easily, Gi. Garcia-Miles, Matanzas Capablanca Memorial 1995.

5 ... d6!? This is an imaginative alternative to the straightforward capture on f3.

6 bd2 Or 6 xe5 xe5 7 f4 d6 8 e3 w7 9 w3 c5 10 c4 xe3 11 xe3 (White seems to be making all the running but Black now finds a neat equalising blow) 11...d5 12 xd5 xf6 13 b3 wxe4 14 wxe4+ xe4 15 0-0 0-0 16 e1 c5 17 c2 e6 18 b4 d7 19 f5 d5 20 a3 df6 21 c4 c6 22 b5 d7 23 h3 h5 24 f2 fe8 and Black drew without difficulty, Popovych-Emms, London Lloyds Bank 1990.

6 ... xf3+ 7 xf3 e7

Black’s defence has reacted on the white player like a red rag to a bull and he now pro-
ceeds to charge at his opponent without any thought for the safety of his own pawn structure.

8 ... \( \text{c5} \)

9 \( \text{b4?!} \)

One of the attractive features of this variation for Black is that White often overextends himself while searching for an advantage. The black position looks underdeveloped and this often encourages aggressive white players to force the play more than is justified by the situation on the board. Black's position is very solid and is unlikely to be broken down by brute force.

9 ... \( \text{b6} \)
10 \( \text{f4} \) 0-0
11 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g6} \)
12 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d6!} \)

Suddenly Black has completed development and the early white advance with 9 b4 has just led to a weakening of the c3-square.

13 \( \text{exd6} \)

White continues to play is if he stands well, but a more prudent course would have been 13 0-0 with equality.

13 ... \( \text{e8}+ \)
14 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f6!} \)

This counterattack against c3 ensures that Black regains his material.

15 0-0 \( \text{cxd6} \)
16 \( \text{b5} \)
16 \( \text{xd6? e2.} \)
16 ... \( \text{d8} \)
17 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g4} \)
18 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{ac8} \)
19 \( \text{ac1} \)

The weakness of the c3-pawn forces White into this passive rook placement.

19 ... \( \text{e5} \)

The relative weaknesses appear to cancel each other out, but if anyone stands better, it is Black. As well as eyeing White's weak pawn on c3 (somewhat counterbalanced by Black's isolated pawn on the d-file), Black also has designs on occupying c4 with his knight. If
now, for example, 20 c4 to fight against that weakness, then 20...\text{\texttt{x}}xd4 21 \text{\texttt{w}}xd4 \text{\texttt{f}}f3+ wins White's queen.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
20 \text{\texttt{h}f1} \\
21 \text{\texttt{e}c7} \\
22 \text{\texttt{e}e4} \\
23 \text{\texttt{e}c1} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The weaknesses on c3 and d6 cancel each other out and so the position is complex but balanced.

24 \text{\texttt{h}h1} \text{\texttt{d}c8}

Having reinforced his central knight, Black now gradually increases the pressure against White's c-pawn.

25 \text{\texttt{h}d3} \text{\texttt{d}d7}

Black envisions a regrouping of his pieces with the knight coming to g4 and the bishop to c6.

26 \text{\texttt{a}a4} \text{\texttt{h}5}

Of course not 26...\text{\texttt{h}x}xa4 27 \text{\texttt{w}a2+}. The text combines play on both sides of the board.

27 \text{\texttt{f}4} \text{\texttt{g}g4}

28 \text{\texttt{e}e7} \text{\texttt{h}4}

A neat sacrifice which allows Black's pieces to converge on White's king from all sides.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
29 \text{\texttt{h}x}h4 \\
\text{\texttt{h}h5} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

30 \text{\texttt{g}g3}?

White blunders in a complicated position. Correct was 30 \text{\texttt{f}f3} \text{\texttt{w}x}h4 which should lead to a draw, e.g.:

a) 31 \text{\texttt{w}a2+} \text{\texttt{h}h8} 32 \text{\texttt{e}x}h4 \text{\texttt{f}f2+} and White would be advised to acquiesce in a draw by perpetual as 33 \text{\texttt{w}x}f2 \text{\texttt{x}x}f2 34 \text{\texttt{g}g6+} \text{\texttt{h}h7} 35 \text{\texttt{e}e}1 \text{\texttt{a}a}7 leaves Black with the better chances.

b) 31 \text{\texttt{c}c4+} \text{\texttt{h}h8} (not 31...\text{\texttt{h}h7} 32 \text{\texttt{c}c}2+ or 31...\text{\texttt{x}c}4 32 \text{\texttt{d}d5+} \text{\texttt{h}h8} 33 \text{\texttt{c}c}4 winning) 32 \text{\texttt{x}x}h4 \text{\texttt{f}f2+} 33 \text{\texttt{w}x}f2 (33 \text{\texttt{g}g1} \text{\texttt{e}e}4+ 34 \text{\texttt{x}e}3 \text{\texttt{e}e}3+ 35 \text{\texttt{x}e}3 \text{\texttt{x}c}4 and Black is holding the balance as 36 \text{\texttt{d}d}7 can be met by the clever 36...\text{\texttt{x}b}4) 33...\text{\texttt{x}x}f2 34 \text{\texttt{g}g6+} \text{\texttt{h}h7} 35 \text{\texttt{e}e}1 \text{\texttt{x}x}g6 and Black stands well.

c) 31 \text{\texttt{h}x}h4 \text{\texttt{f}f2+} 32 \text{\texttt{g}g1} and now Black can draw with 32...\text{\texttt{h}h3+}. Trying for more with 32...\text{\texttt{e}e}4+ 33 \text{\texttt{w}e}3 \text{\texttt{e}e}3+
34 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Axe3 d5}}}}} is dangerous after 35 c4.

30 \ldots \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Axc3!}}}}}

After this blow, which White must have underestimated, the black attack assumes decisive proportions.

31 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Axd7 Aeg3}}}}}
32 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{h3 d5!}}}}}

The immediate point is that 32 h\textit{xg4} fails to 32...\textit{h3+} 34 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{g1 Axd4+}}}. However, White believes that he has seen a flaw in Black's plan.

33 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{f3}}}}}

This is a neat concluding tactic from Miles. White's next is forced in order to cover the g1-square, as 31 gxf3 A\textit{g1} is checkmate.

34 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{c4+}}}

Vacating the back rank with tempo. White sacrifices his bishop to defend g1.

34 \ldots \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Axc4}}}}}
35 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{gxf3 A\textit{h3+}}}}
36 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{g2 A\textit{h2+}}}}

The point. Black regains the queen with two extra pieces. His last remaining task is to assuage White's fury, as he doubles his rooks on the 7th rank.

37 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{g3 A\textit{xd2}}}}

White is desperately trying for a trick based on his doubled rooks on the seventh rank. This is a forlorn hope but 38 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textit{g4 \textit{xc}7}}}}} is also completely prospectless.

38 \textbf{\textbf{\textit{Aee7}}}

A brilliant game, again revealing the hitherto undiscovered energy inherent in the unusual positions that develop from this uncharted variation.

The plan with \ldots \textit{e5} is not a modern invention, as the fol-
lowing game shows.

Game 19
Tarve-Keres
Tallinn 1969

1 e4  
2 d4  
3 dxe5  
4 f3  
5 e2

After 5 dxe5 wxe5 the position has become slightly simplified but Black must be careful that his queen does not provide too much of a target for the white pieces. Play can continue 6 d3 and now:

a) 6...c5 7 w2 d6 8 c3  
8 f6 9 d2 g4 led to complex play in Planinc-Lutikov, Skopje 1969: 10 f4 w7 11 0-0  
12 d5 w8 13 df1 xh1 14 c3 f8 (this is a strange move but if 14...0-0, then 15 wh5 yields what looks like a dangerous attack) 15 f5 c6 16 f6 g6 17 e7 f2 18 xf2 xf2 19 wxf2 e6 and White proved to have insufficient compensation for the material sacrificed, Planinc-Lutikov, Skopje 1969.

b) 6...b4+ 7 d2 f6 8 0-0  
d6 9 c4 w7 10 c3 c5 11 b4  
b6 12 a4 (this time Planinc has developed much more smoothly and Black has trouble co-ordinating his forces) 12...g4 13 w1 c6 14 g5 h6 15 h4 c7 16 f4 g5 (a rather desperate measure, but the threat of e5 was hard to counter) 17 fxg5 hxg5 18 xg5 d5 19 exd5 xh2+ 20 f2 (White’s pressure on the e- and f-files is so great that the disturbance of his king does not prove to be a problem) 20...e6

21 w2 (it is highly unusual for a king to walk directly into the path of a discovered check but once it relocates to the queen’s wing the pin against f6 will be decisive) 21...f5+ 22 d1 xd3 23 xf6 xe1+ 24 xe1+ f8 25 xh8 xc4 26 h1 b3+ 27 c1 d6 28 f6  
e8 29 h8+ f8 30 g7 1-0

5 ...  \textit{b4+}

The bishop check is often awkward for White in this variation. If he meets it by interposing a piece, there is a danger that his development will not flow smoothly or that the position will become simplified. However, if he counters with \textit{c3}, as here, then the natural development square for his queen's knight is taken away.

6  \textit{c3}  \textit{c5}
7  0-0  \textit{e7}
8  \textit{bd2}  \textit{d6}
9  \textit{b3}  \textit{b6}
10  \textit{h1}

White is hoping to develop play by continuing with an exchange of knight on \textit{e5} and then \textit{f4} to generate pressure on the \textit{f}-file. However, Black's next move cuts across this plan.

10 ...  \textit{xf3}
11  \textit{xf3}  0-0

Black has developed his pieces comfortably and has no problems. Meanwhile White is struggling to find anything constructive to do with his queen's bishop and, in attempting to activate this piece, he runs into difficulties.

12  \textit{d4}  \textit{g6}
13  \textit{e3}

White could prevent any incursions by the black knight with 13 \textit{g3} but then 13 ... \textit{h3} 14 \textit{g2}  \textit{xg2+} 15 \textit{xg2}  \textit{fe8} leaves Black with a very pleasant position as the white kingside has been weakened and his e-pawn is exposed.

13 ...  \textit{h4}
14  \textit{c2}  \textit{xf3}
15  \textit{xf3}  \textit{xf3}
16  \textit{gxf3}

White got himself very tangled up from the opening and has tried to solve his problems by baling out into an endgame. However, the black initiative persists despite the simplified nature of the position.

16 ...  \textit{f5}
17  \textit{g2}  \textit{d7}
18  \textit{xb6}
60 1 e4 \(\text{c6}\) 2 d4 \(\text{e5}\)

Every time White exchanges pieces he is helping Black to improve his position. Here he opens the a-file for the black rook to come into the game. It was better to sit tight with 18 \(\text{f}1\) fe1.

18 \(\ldots\) axb6
19 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{a}5!\)

This is very instructive play. Keres maximises the activity of his rook by keeping an eye on the white a-pawn while simultaneously threatening to switch to the kingside. In contrast 19...\(\text{a}e8\) 20 exf5 \(\text{x}5\) 21 \(\text{x}5\) \(\text{xf5}\) 22 \(\text{f}e1\) simplifies the position and leaves White with fewer problems to solve.

![Chess Diagram](image)

20 \(\text{d}5\)

This works out badly, but White’s position was already very difficult, e.g. 20 a3 fxe4 21 fxe4 \(\text{g5+}\) 22 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{b}5\) and Black wins due to the dual threats of \(\text{h}3\) and \(\text{xb}2\); 20 exf5 \(\text{x}5\) 21 \(\text{f}e1\) (White should perhaps reconcile himself to 21 \(\text{x}5\) \(\text{a}xf5\) although Black should then win with his extra pawn) 21...\(\text{e}6\) and White cannot cope with all the threats.

20 \(\ldots\) \(\text{f}xe4\)
21 fxe4 \(\text{c}6\)
22 \(\text{b}4\)

22 \(\text{xb}6\) \(\text{g}5+\) 23 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{h}3\)
24 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{h}5\) and the white f-pawn goes.

22 \(\ldots\) \(\text{a}3\)
23 \(\text{xb}6\)

The white knight cannot now retreat from the enemy camp but if instead 23 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{xc}3\) he is a pawn down for nothing.

23 \(\ldots\) \(\text{e}6\)

24 f4

One of White’s problems is that 24 c4, trying to secure the knight with c5, runs into 24...\(\text{h}3+\). If White tries to improve on this variation with 24 \(\text{fd}1\) then, amongst others, Black can play 24...\(\text{xc}3\) 25 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{h}3+\) 26 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{f}4\) and, despite his extra pawn, White is unlikely to be able to beat off the rampant black pieces.

24 \(\ldots\) \(\text{a}6\)
White is now losing his advanced knight.

25 f5 .gf7
26 gfd1 .hd8
27 .c8  .xc8
28 .xd6  .e8
29 .f3  .a3
0-1

Game 20
Hebden-Jadoul
Tärnby 1987

1 e4  .c6
2 d4 e5
3 dxe5  .xe5
4 .f3

4 f4 is a more aggressive way for White to handle the position. Black can then try:

a) 4... .c6 envisages an eventual follow-up of ...c5 (or ...b4-a5-b6) to exploit the weak dark squares. Possible now are:
   a1) 5 .e3 g6 6 .c3 .g7 7 .d2 .f6 8 .f3 0-0 9 0-0-0
       (White could try 9 e5 .e8 but then Black is poised to strike back with ...d6) 9...d6 10 h3
       .e8 11 .d3 was seen in Pop- 
       chev-Cvetkovic, Vrbas 1993.
       Now 11...b4 is equal according to Cvetkovic.

   a2) 5 .c4 .b4+ (not
       5...c5? in view of then 6
       .xf7+ 6 c3 .a5 7 .f3 .e7 8
       .e2 .b6 9 .bd2 d6 10 .d3
       .f6 11 .c4 0-0 12 .xb6 axb6
       13 .e8 14 .e1 h6 gave
       Black a solid position in the
       game Knaak-Przewoznik, Dort-

   b) 4... .g6 and now:

b1) 5 .f3 .b4+ (5...c5
       eyeing up the dark-square
       weakness as quickly as possible
       is more logical) 6 .c3 .c7 7
       .d3 d6 8 0-0 .xc3 (this opens
       up too many lines for White) 9
       .x3 .f6 10 .a3 c5 (10...xf4
       11 e5 and White’s bishops
       come into their own) 11 e5
       (White forces the position open
       anyway and effectively demonstrates exactly what Black must
       strive to avoid in this variation)
       11...dxe5 12 fxe5 .d7 13 e6
fxe6 14 ♖xg6+ hxg6 15 ♗d3 (Black's play has been a disaster) 15...0-0 16 ♗xg6 and White has an excellent position, Vogt-Hoi, Tæstrup 1990.

b2) 5 ♖e3 ♗h6 (a straightforward alternative to this interesting move is 5...♗b4+ 6 c3 ♖a5 intending ...♗b6) 6 ♗d2 f5 (this is a double-edged plan; Black is hoping to obtain superiority in the centre, but he must be very careful as his development lags) 7 ♗d3 fxe4 8 ♖xe4 ♗f6 9 ♖c3 c6 10 ♖d4 ♖f7 11 0-0-0 ♖e7 12 ♖f3 0-0 13 ♖xg6 (this is adventurous play from White but if he reconciles himself to 13 g3, then Black obtains a perfectly good position with 13...d5) 13...♖xg6 14 g4 ♖f7 15 ♖de1 ♖b4 with unclear play as in Roschina-Vlasov, Moscow 1994.

4 ... ♖xf3+
5 ♖xf3 ♖f6

6 ♖g3

6 ♖xf6 is much too simple to create any real problems for Black, e.g. 6...♖xf6 7 ♖d3 (7 ♖c3 ♖b4 8 ♖d2 0-0 9 ♖f3 d6 10 ♖b5 ♖xd2+ 11 ♖xd2 ♖e8 12 a4 ♖e6 13 a5 a6 14 ♖d4 c5 15 ♖e2 d5 16 exd5 ♖xd5 and Black has nothing to complain about, Vujadinovic-Mestrovic, Yugoslav Ch 1991) 7...d5 8 ♖d2 ♖e6 9 exd5 ♖xd5 10 a3 0-0-0 11 ♖e4 h6 12 ♖d2 f5 13 ♖c3 g6 14 0-0-0 ♖g7 15 ♖c4 ♖f4 16 ♖xe6+ ♖xe6 17 ♖e2 again with complete equality, Westerinen-Yermolinsky, Moscow OL 1994.

6 ... ♖g6

An alternative is 6...♗b4+ 7 ♖d2 ♖e6 8 f4 ♖g6 9 ♖d3 ♖xg3+ 10 hxg3 ♖c5 11 ♖d2 d6 12 ♖c4 a6 13 a4 ♖f6 14 ♖e3 ♖xe3 15 ♖xe3 ♖d7 16 ♖d5 ♖xd5 17 exd5 a5 18 ♖f2 ♖e7 19 ♖ae1+ ½-½ Hübnert-Hort, Oslo 1984.

7 ♖xc7

This is obviously risky, but it is the only way White can try to play for the advantage.

7 ... ♖d6!
Playing the position as a gambit is Black's best approach. 7...\textit{xe}4+ 8 \textit{e}3 gives White the chance to develop an initiative.

\begin{align*}
8 & \textit{c}4 \textit{f}6 \\
9 & \textit{c}3 \\
9 \textit{f}3? & \text{runs into the strange tactic 9...\textit{x}h2!}.
\end{align*}

9 \textit{e}5

This move is positionally well motivated but Black may do better to launch an attack as quickly as possible, e.g. 9...0-0 10 \textit{f}4 (simple development from White allows Black to achieve what he wants, e.g. 10 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}8 11 \textit{d}1 \textit{e}5 and Black will regain his pawn as the trick 12 \textit{f}3 \textit{x}h2 is always in the position) 10...b5 (it is imperative for Black to play as actively as possible) 11 \textit{x}b5 \textit{xe}4 12 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}8 and Black's lead in development easily compensates his pawn deficit.

\begin{figure}

\end{figure}

10 \textit{d}2?!

10 \textit{e}3 is a better test of Black's idea. White should not be concerned about Black capturing on c3 and then e4 as White would then have the two bishops in an open position and all the chances. Play can continue 10...0-0 11 0-0-0 \textit{d}6 when Black has some counterplay but White should be better.

10 ... 0-0

11 0-0-0

11 ... \textit{d}5?!

Jadoul plays this game with tremendous energy. A more restrained approach with 11...\textit{d}6 was possible but then White, as in the previous note, should stand slightly better. Jadoul is prepared to gambit most of his queenside in the interest of opening lines against the white queenside.

12 \textit{exd}5

After 12 \textit{xd}5 Jadoul gives a demonstration of the Black's chances with the variations 12...\textit{xd}5 13 \textit{exd}5 (13 \textit{xd}5 \textit{f}6 14 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}6 15 \textit{a}3 \textit{xf}2) 13...\textit{f}5 14 \textit{d}3 \textit{fc}8 15 \textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 16 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}5!
planning ...\texttt{c4}, ...\texttt{ac8} and ...	exttt{a5} and in both cases Black has promising play.

12 \texttt{... b5}

13 \texttt{\textsc{d}xb5?}

White is determined to take everything thrown at him, but this is a little too greedy. With the restrained 13 \texttt{\textsc{w}b3}! \texttt{b4} 14 \texttt{\textsc{d}a4} \texttt{\textsc{f}5} 15 \texttt{\textsc{d}d3} \texttt{\textsc{x}d3} 16 \texttt{\textsc{w}xd3} \texttt{\textsc{w}xd3} 17 \texttt{\textsc{c}xd3} \texttt{\textsc{d}xd5} White would have good endgame chances. A plan here is 18 \texttt{\textsc{c}c2}!? intending \texttt{\textsc{b}3}.

Instead 13 \texttt{\textsc{w}xb5} is also unnecessarily gluttonous. A possible variation is then 13...\texttt{\textsc{b}8} 14 \texttt{\textsc{w}a5} (14 \texttt{\textsc{w}a4} \texttt{\textsc{d}7} 15 \texttt{\textsc{w}a5} \texttt{\textsc{f}5} 16 \texttt{\textsc{w}a4} is a way to draw immediately) 14...\texttt{\textsc{f}5} 15 \texttt{\textsc{w}a4} \texttt{\textsc{d}xd5}! 16 \texttt{\textsc{d}xd5} \texttt{\textsc{x}b2}+ 17 \texttt{\textsc{b}1} \texttt{\textsc{a}3}+ 18 \texttt{\textsc{a}1} with a draw as 18 \texttt{\textsc{b}4}? \texttt{\textsc{xb}4} 19 \texttt{\textsc{d}xb4} \texttt{\textsc{xc}2}+! 20 \texttt{\textsc{w}xc2} \texttt{\textsc{x}b4}+ 21 \texttt{\textsc{c}1} \texttt{\textsc{g}5}+ 22 \texttt{\textsc{d}2} \texttt{\textsc{w}e}5 23 \texttt{\textsc{d}d1} \texttt{\textsc{b}7} is good for Black.

13 \texttt{... \textsc{f}5}

14 \texttt{\textsc{c}3}

14 \texttt{\textsc{d}3}? \texttt{\textsc{f}c8} 15 \texttt{\textsc{xf}5} \texttt{\textsc{xf}5}

16 \texttt{\textsc{w}b3} \texttt{\textsc{ab}8} leaves White without a decent move.

14 \texttt{... \textsc{f}c8}

15 \texttt{\textsc{w}a4} \texttt{a6}!

16 \texttt{\textsc{d}d4}

This wonderful sacrifice from Jadoul is a fitting conclusion to his imaginative play. Although Black is vastly behind on material, the white position is a wreck and he is unable to co-ordinate his forces in time to beat off the black attack.

17 \texttt{\textsc{b}xc3}

After 17 \texttt{\textsc{d}xf5} \texttt{\textsc{w}xf5} 18 \texttt{\textsc{b}xc3} \texttt{\textsc{e}4}! despite being the exchange and three pawns down, Black has a crushing attack. The co-ordination of Black’s forces creates a powerful impression.

17 \texttt{... \textsc{b}8}!

18 \texttt{\textsc{d}b3}

18 \texttt{\textsc{d}xf5} \texttt{\textsc{w}xf5} leaves White floundering hopelessly against a coming check on the c1-h6 diagonal, e.g. 19 \texttt{\textsc{d}d3} \texttt{\textsc{w}f4}+! 20 \texttt{\textsc{w}xf4} \texttt{\textsc{xf}4}+ 21 \texttt{\textsc{d}2} \texttt{\textsc{d}5} and Black wins.
White has managed to close down the action of the black rook on the b-file but his position remains a mess. Meanwhile, Black is guaranteed to regain much of his sacrificed material thanks to the threats against c3 and f2.

19...\\textit{wa}6

It is very difficult to find a way for White to defend, e.g.

19...\\textit{xf}2! 20\\textit{e}1 (if 20\\textit{xa}6 \xxc2 21\xde1 \xb3 22\xb3 \textit{g}5+ 23\textit{b}1 \xh1 24\xh1 \xc3, the white position is a disaster or 20\textit{d}3 \xd3 21\textit{xd}3 \xh1 22\xh1 \textit{xd}3 and again Black regains virtually all of his material and the white king is left defenceless) 20...\\textit{e}4! (it is surprising that Black should expend two moves simply capturing the white f-pawn, but now the weakness on the c1-h6 diagonal is again opened up and meanwhile White has not improved his position) 21\textit{xa}6 (there is nothing better) 21...\textit{g}5+ 22\textit{b}1 \textit{d}2 23\textit{d}3 \xc3+ and White will soon be mated.

19...\\textit{g}5+

20 \textit{b}2 \xc3

21 \textit{e}1 \textit{d}2

The invasion of White's queenside is complete. There is no defence to the massed black forces.

22 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}2+

23 \textit{b}1 \textit{c}3

0-1

Game 21
Howell-Miles
Isle of Man 1995

1 e4 \textit{c}6 2 d4 e5

With this move White avoids the inconvenience of the bishop thrust (4...\textit{b}4 is well met by 5\textit{d}4) and keeps his options open as to how to deal with
66 1 e4 \( \text{c6} \) 2 \( \text{d4} \) e5

Black’s central knight.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
4 \quad c5
\end{array} \]

This is the most logical move. Black develops a piece, does not yet commit the king’s knight and keeps the h4-d8 diagonal open to develop his queen.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
5 \quad f4
\end{array} \]

A more adventurous, but also more risky try is 5 f4, e.g. 5...\( \text{c6} \) 6 \( \text{c4} \) (incidentally threatening \( \text{xf7+} \)) 6...d6 7 \( \text{f3} \) e6 8 \( \text{xe6} \) fxe6 9 \( \text{a4} \) b6 10 \( \text{xb6} \) axb6 and the position was unclear in Akopian-Miles, Moscow 1990.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
5 \quad d6
\end{array} \]

5...\( \text{g6} \) 6 \( \text{g3} \) d6 7 h4 (7 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 8 0-0-0 0-0 9 \( \text{c4} \) is an alternative scheme of development) 7...h5 8 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{d7} \) (9...\( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 11 exd5 0-0 left Black permanently hampered by his weak kingside in Dolmatov-Gulko, Hastings 1989: 12 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 13 \( \text{xg4} \) \( \text{hxg4} \) 14 h5 \( \text{e5} \) 15 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 h6 \( \text{f5} \) 17 \( \text{hxg7} \) \( \text{g7} \) 18 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{h8} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 20 \( \text{f4} \) f6 21 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a8} \) 22 \( \text{xc5} \) dxc5 23 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{hxh1} \) 24 \( \text{hxh1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 25 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 26 \( \text{xa7} \) \( \text{g5+} \) 27 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{d2} \) 28 a3 \( \text{e2} \) 29 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{d1+} \) 30 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{xd1+} \) 31 \( \text{a2} \) and White went on to win) 10 f3 \( \text{e7} \) 11 \( \text{b1} \) 0-0-0 12 \( \text{ge2} \) (White has a space advantage but the black position is very solid) 12...\( \text{e5} \) 13 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 14 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 15 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{b4} \) (Black frees his position with exchanges) 16 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 17 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 18 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 19 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{b6} \) 20 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{b8} \) 21 \( \text{f2} \) f6 22 \( \text{xe6} \) axb6 23 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 24 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{de8} \) 25 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e5} \) 26 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{he8} \) 27 \( \text{dd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 1/2-1/2 Brinck-Claussen - Hoi, Tåstrup 1995.

Note how in these two games the black knight had very little to do on g6. Therefore Miles’s continuation, maintaining this piece in the centre, seems more logical.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
6 \quad \text{d2}
\end{array} \]
$1 \ e4 \ \text{d}c6 \ 2 \ d4 \ e5 \ 6 \ \text{f}6$

Others:

a) $6 \ldots \text{e}6$ led to intricate play in Kazhgaleev-Vlasov, Moscow 1994: 7 h4 a6 8 h5 f6 (this is a strange move; why not 8...h6 with a perfectly reasonable position?) 9 \text{d}5 c6 10 \text{e}3 \text{b}6 11 c3 a5 12 \text{f}3 0-0-0 13 \text{d}4 \text{f}7 14 \text{g}3 \text{h}6 15 \text{e}2 \text{he}8 16 0-0 g6 with a complex middlegame.

b) $6 \ldots \text{e}7$ 7 0-0-0 \text{e}6 8 \text{a}4 (the lack of pressure against the white e-pawn - 6...\text{e}7 instead of 6...\text{f}6 - allows White to gain the bishop pair) 8...\text{d}7 9 \text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 10 f3 0-0 11 \text{e}3 b6 12 \text{e}2 a5 13 a3 was Ulibin-Danailov, Ibercaja 1992. White is a little better.

In his recent book, An Opening Repertoire for the Attacking Player, Eduard Gufeld dismisses the defence 1...\text{c}6 by claiming a large advantage for White in this variation. However, he only considers 6...\text{e}7 and does not take into account our main line move $6 \ldots \text{f}6$.

$7 \ 0-0-0 \ \text{e}6$

$8 \ \text{a}4$

White takes advantage of a tactical feature of the position in order to gain the bishop pair.

$8 \ldots \text{b}6$

Miles is happy to allow White to gain the two bishops as in return the a-file will be opened which will allow him to generate pressure against the white king. He could also have tested White’s idea with 8...\text{xe}4, which leads to complex play, e.g. 9 \text{e}1 \text{xf}2 10 \text{xc}5 \text{h}1 (10...\text{xd}1 is better and leads to an unclear position after 11 \text{xe}6 \text{xe}6 12 \text{xd}1 0-0) 11 \text{b}5+! (more incisive than 11 \text{xe}6 \text{xe}6 12 \text{h}3) 11...\text{c}6 12 \text{xb}7 \text{b}6 13 \text{xd}6+ \text{f}8 14 \text{xe}5 \text{xb}5 15 \text{e}3 and White is winning.

$9 \ \text{f}3 \ 0-0$

$10 \ a3 \text{e}7$

The black opening has been a complete success. He is fully developed and has attacking
chances on the queenside.

11 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{x} \text{b}6 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{a}}x\text{b}6 \)
12 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{e}2 \)

12 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{...} \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{\textit{g}}6! \)

It looks strange to retreat the knight from its fine central position, but Miles wants to play \( \text{...d}5 \). This advance will clear the centre and allow him to feed pieces swiftly over to the queenside. White is already in big trouble.

13 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{b}1 \)

If 13 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{c}3 \) then 13...\( \text{\underline{\text{a}}a}5 \).

13 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}5 \)
14 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{\underline{\text{e}}x\text{d}5} \)

15 \( \text{\underline{\text{f}}c1} \)

This is too passive to give White chances of beating off the black attack. White could have tried for a tactical solution to his problems with 15 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{g}5 \) but this also looks unpromising, e.g. 15...\( \text{\underline{\text{f}}6 \) (15...\( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}4 \) gives White chances to defend) 16 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{f}}f7 \) and now White has various tactical tries but they ultimately fail: 17 \( \text{\underline{\text{h}}h6!} \) (17 \( \text{\underline{\text{c}}}4 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{f}6 \) (17...\( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}5 \) is very good for Black) 17...\( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}7! \) (this is more accurate than 17...\( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{g}x\text{h}6 \) which becomes messy after 18 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{f}5 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{c}5 \) 19 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{x}h6+ \) \( \text{\underline{\text{g}}}7 \) 20 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{xf7} \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{e}3 \) 21 \( \text{\underline{\text{b}}}4! \) 18 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{c}4 \) (forced) 18...\( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{g}x\text{h}6 \) 19 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}5 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}5 \) and Black stands well.

15 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{b}5 \)

The advance of this pawn will completely open the white king’s defences. White is already completely lost.

16 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{b}4 \)
17 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{\underline{\text{a}}x\text{b}4} \) \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{\underline{\text{b}}x\text{b}4} \)

18 \( \text{\underline{\text{\textit{}}}} \text{b}3 \)

Other tries also succumb
quickly: 18 \( \text{dxc3} \) \( \text{xa2} \) 19 \( \text{xa2} \) \( \text{xa2+} \) 20 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{e6} \) and White has no way to meet the threat of \( ... \text{b1+} \) or 18 \( \text{xb4} \) \( \text{a2+} \) 19 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{xb4} \) and the white king still not survive long.

18 \( ... \) \( \text{xc2}! \)
19 \( \text{xc2} \)
19 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{a2+} \) 20 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{fa8} \) with \( ... \text{a1+} \) and \( ... \text{f5+} \) on the cards.

19 \( ... \) \( \text{a3} \)

20 \( \text{c3} \)

After 20 \( \text{c3} \) one way to win is 20...\( \text{xb3} \) 21 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{a2+} \) 22 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{b3+} \) 23 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{ad8+} \) 24 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{fe8} \).

20 \( ... \) \( \text{f5+} \)

A well played game by Miles and an excellent advert for the black system.

Game 22
Campora-Miles
Seville 1993

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c6} \)
2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e5} \)

3 \( \text{d5} \)

\( \text{d5} \)

White's most usual continuation here is 4 \( \text{c4} \), transposing into the variation 1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 2 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 3 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 4 \( \text{e4} \), examined in chapter five. Here we consider attempts by White either to delay \( \text{c4} \) substantially, or to get by without it altogether.

4 \( \text{e3} \)

4 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 5 \( \text{h4} \) led to obscure play in Mortensen-Hoi, Ostrava 1992: 5...\( \text{h5} \) 6 \( \text{c3} \) (this looks better than 6 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 7 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 8 \( \text{bd2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 9 \( \text{b5+} \) \( \text{f8} \) 10 \( \text{e2} \) \text{a6} 11 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 12 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 13 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 14 \( \text{xe2} \) and Black had no problems, Ostojic-Kaufuss, Hessen 1991) 6...\( \text{b4} \) (this leaves the black h-pawn rather exposed and so 6...\( \text{e7} \) may be better) 7 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) \text{c6} 9 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 10 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 11 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f4} \) 12 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 13 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{c5} \) 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d6} \) with some counterplay for the pawn.
4 \hspace{1em} f5

The positioning of the white bishop on e3 acts as a target for this advance.

5 \hspace{1em} f3 \hspace{1em} \text{\textit{Qf6}}

6 \hspace{1em} \textit{c3}

Or 6 \text{d3} f4 7 \text{f2} g5 8 c4 (8 \text{h4}!) 8...\text{g6} 9 \text{c3} \text{b4} (Black is playing the position like a King’s Indian but, having not yet committed his bishop to g7, he finds a more useful role for this piece) 10 \text{b3} \text{e7} 11 0-0-0 \text{c5} 12 \text{xc5} \text{xc5} 13 \text{b1} d6 (having exchanged his inferior dark-squared bishop, Black has a very comfortable game) 14 \text{ge2} \text{b6} 15 \text{c2} \text{d7} 16 \text{a1} \text{e7} (there is no need for Black to castle and he wants to keep the g-file free for his rooks) 17 \text{c1} g4 18 \text{e2} \text{hg8} 19 \text{b3} \text{gxf3} 20 \text{gxf3}.

White is hoping for counterplay based on c5, but Black keeps everything under control with a clever pawn sacrifice: 20...\text{e3}! 21 \text{xe3} \text{fxe3} 22 \text{del} (now Black will lose his advanced e-pawn but his invasion along the g-file means that the white h-pawn is, in the long term, indefensible) 22...\text{f4} 23 \text{xe3} \text{g5} 24 a3 (White is very tangled up and the attempt to expel the black knight with 24 \text{e2} leaves the white rook entombed after the response 24...\text{g2}) 24...\text{ag8} 25 c5 \text{gl}+ 26 \text{xg1} \text{xg1}+ 27 \text{a2} \text{h1} 28 \text{b5} \text{xh2} 29 \text{a5} \text{c8} 30 \text{cxd6+ cxd6} and the black h-pawn proved to be the decisive factor, Paramos-Izeta, Spanish Ch. 1993.

6 \hspace{1em} \text{d6}

7 \hspace{1em} \text{d2} \hspace{1em} \text{g6}

8 \hspace{1em} 0-0-0 \hspace{1em} \text{g7}

9 \hspace{1em} \text{h3}

White is hoping to gain space on the kingside by advancing g4, but Black’s reply cuts across this plan.

9 \hspace{1em} \text{f4!}

10 \hspace{1em} \text{f2} \hspace{1em} 0-0

11 \hspace{1em} \text{b1} \hspace{1em} a6

12 \hspace{1em} \text{ge2} \hspace{1em} \text{d7}

13 \hspace{1em} \text{c1}
13 ... b5

This is perfectly playable but it leaves Black’s queenside a little exposed. An alternative plan was 13...c8, defending the d-pawn and planning to break with ...c5. White now conceives of a plan to manoeuvre his pieces around to the queenside in the hope of exploiting the slight Black weaknesses there.

14 a3 \(b8\)

Black employs an alternative method of defending his d-pawn in preparation for ...c5.

16 \(a5\) c5

Black has been angling for this break but White’s 19th move leaves him in control of the important d5-square. Therefore Black might have done better to wait with 16...h6, preventing the plan White now carries out. It is difficult to see how White can then improve his position before Black plays ...c5 on his next move.

21 ... \(h4\)

The bishop appears out of play here but if Black ever has the chance to play ...f2, it will have a wonderful diagonal to work on.

22 \(b4\) \(b7\)

Here White goes astray and the black position comes to life. White should have preferred 24 cxb5 axb5 25 \(d3\) (but not 25 \(xb5 \)xe4+ 26 fxe4 \(xb5\) when the unhappy position of the white king gives Black all the chances) 25...\(a7\) 26 \(h1\) preventing ...f2 and keeping the position balanced.

24 ... a5!

This is very sharp play from Miles. With the aid of a pawn sacrifice, Black’s whole position now comes to life.
72 1 e4 \( \triangleleft \)c6 2 d4 e5

25 \( \triangleleft \)a2 b4!
26 axb4 axb4
27 \( \triangleleft \)xb4

Instead 27 \( \triangleleft \)xb4 \( \triangleleft \)a7 threatens, amongst others, ...\( \triangleleft \)f2 and if 28 \( \triangleleft \)hf1 then 28...\( \triangleleft \)d8! and with the bishop coming round to b6 or a5, White has big problems.

27 ...
28 \( \triangleleft \)c3 \( \triangleleft \)d4

This fabulous outpost for the bishop is worth much more than the sacrificed pawn.

29 \( \triangleleft \)c2 \( \triangleleft \)c8
30 \( \triangleleft \)b5 \( \triangleleft \)c5

31 \( \triangleleft \)b3 \( \triangleleft \)a6

Black now always has the option of ...\( \triangleleft \)xb5 when the resulting opposite-coloured bishops position greatly favour the attacking player.

32 \( \triangleleft \)a1 \( \triangleleft \)e3
33 \( \triangleleft \)hd1 \( \triangleleft \)b7
34 \( \triangleleft \)xd6?

White, under heavy pressure, blunders and loses immediately. His best try was 34 \( \triangleleft \)b1 when Black has the pleasant choice between 34...\( \triangleleft \)xb5 at once, or keeping the tension with 34...\( \triangleleft \)b6, planning to increase the pressure with ...\( \triangleleft \)c5 or ...

34 ...

\( \triangleleft \)xb3

White had no doubt calculated 34...\( \triangleleft \)xb3 35 \( \triangleleft \)xc8 \( \triangleleft \)xd3 36 \( \triangleleft \)xd3 when Black is unable to recapture the knight on c8. Unfortunately he had overlooked 34...\( \triangleleft \)xb3 35 \( \triangleleft \)xc8 \( \triangleleft \)ab8! when the knight on c8 is lost as 36 \( \triangleleft \)xa6 gets mated after 36...\( \triangleleft \)xb2+ 37 \( \triangleleft \)c3 \( \triangleleft \)b3.

0-1
Transposition to the Scotch

Game 23
Hort-Xie Jun
Prague (Women v Veterans)
1995

1 e4 \textit{d}6
2 d4 e5
3 \textit{c}3

With this move White turns the game into the Scotch Opening. Although readers may consider the Scotch Opening to be outside the parameters of this book, transposition into this opening is an option for White if Black plays the move we consider most promising here, i.e. 2...e5. Therefore in this game and the next we recommend defences for Black against the two main variations of the Scotch.

3 ... exd4
4 \textit{x}d4 \textit{f}6
5 \textit{xc}6

In the next game we consider White’s alternative of 5 \textit{c}3.
forces) 25 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{c}6\) 26 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}4\) 27 \(\text{d}3\) a5 28 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 29 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{c}4\) (it looks as though this attacking plan will expose both kings but the key features are Black's central control and the excellent co-ordination of his forces which allow him to benefit from the opening of the position) 30 \(\text{b}xc4\) \(\text{e}3\) 31 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{a}8\) 32 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{a}8\) 33 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 34 \(\text{c}7\)

34...\(\text{a}3!\) 35 \(\text{g}6\) \(\text{xa}2+\) 0-1 Gavrilakis-Wahls, Haifa 1989.

b) 9 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{b}4\) (with this move Black plans to regroup with \(\ldots\text{c}5\) and \(\ldots\text{c}6\) but an alternative is 9...\(\text{g}6\)) 10 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{b}6\) 11 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{g}7\) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{d}6\) (Black must counter quickly in the centre and he is not afraid of 14 \(\text{xc}6\) as he gains the initiative after 14...\(\text{dxe}5\) 14 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{dxe}5\) and Black has a promising position as 15 \(\text{f}5\) runs into the tactic 15 \(\text{xc}4\) 16 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{c}5+\)) 10 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 11 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 12 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}5\) 13 \(\text{exd}6\) \(\text{xe}2+\) 14 \(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{xd}6\) 15 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{b}7\) 16 \(\text{b}1\) 0-0-0 17 0-0 \(\text{he}8\) 18 \(\text{fe}1\) \(\text{f}6\) and Black has a solid position, J. Polgar-Piket Aruba 1995.

\[\text{9} \quad \ldots \quad \text{wh}4\]

This is a tricky tactical move which threatens to invade the white position with a combination of \(\ldots\text{wd}4\) and \(\ldots\text{b}4+\). White's passive reply is more or less forced.

\[\text{10} \quad \text{a}3 \quad \text{c}5\]

\[\text{11} \quad \text{b}2\]

White has two other tries:

a) If White tries to expel the black queen from her post with 11 \(\text{g}3\)
he runs into the surprising tactic 11...\(\text{Q}xf2+\) which nets one of the white rooks and leads to complex play, e.g. 12 \(\text{Q}xf2\) (or 12 \(\text{Q}xf2\) \(\text{Q}d4+\) 13 \(\text{Q}g2\) \(\text{Q}xa1\) and it is difficult for White to justify his material deficit, e.g. 14 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 15 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}e3+\) 16 \(\text{Q}xe3\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 17 \(\text{Q}c3\) 0-0-0 18 \(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}h6\) 19 \(\text{Q}a5\) c5 20 \(\text{Q}xc5\) \(\text{Q}b7+\) 21 \(\text{Q}e4\) \(\text{Q}xe4+\) 22 \(\text{Q}xe4\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 23 \(\text{Q}xc6\) dxc6 24 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}xe8\) 25 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}e2+\) 26 \(\text{Q}h3\) \(\text{Q}b2\) 0-1 Tomczak-Lukacs, Bundesliga 1995) 12...\(\text{Q}e4+\) 13 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}xh1\) 14 \(\text{Q}g2\) \(\text{Q}xh2\) 15 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xd5\) (White has regained some material but his exposed king gives Black good play) 16 \(\text{Q}c2\) (16 \(\text{Q}c3\) c6 17 \(\text{Q}b2\) \(\text{Q}h6+\) 18 \(\text{Q}f4\) is unclear) 16...c6 17 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 18 \(\text{Q}c3\) 0-0 19 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}fe8\) 20 \(\text{Q}b2\) \(\text{Q}d3\) 21 \(\text{Q}h1\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 22 \(\text{Q}h3\) \(\text{Q}ad8\) 23 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}a6\) 24 \(\text{Q}d2\) d6 (Black breaks White's central blockade and opens lines for the rooks) 25 \(\text{Q}xd6\) \(\text{Q}xd6\) 26 \(\text{Q}f4\) \(\text{Q}xf4\) 27 \(\text{Q}xf4\) \(\text{Q}xh2\) 28 \(\text{Q}f5\) \(\text{Q}f1\) 29 \(\text{Q}f2\) \(\text{Q}h3\) 30 \(\text{Q}xh3\) \(\text{Q}xh3\) 31 \(\text{Q}xa7\) h5 32 f5 \(\text{Q}h1\) 33 \(\text{Q}d4\) \(\text{Q}h7\) 34 \(\text{Q}g2\) g6 and Black went on to win, M. Maric-Voiska, Subotica IZ 1991.

b) 11 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}e7\) and White must be careful as his position is somewhat underdeveloped. For example, after the over-ambitious 12 b4? Black hits back with 12...\(\text{Q}d4\) 13 \(\text{Q}a2\) \(\text{Q}xc4!\) 14 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}xe5+\) 15 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}d5\) 16 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xd5\) 17 bxc5 0-0 18 \(\text{Q}d3\) f5! (Black has an excellent position as the white king is so exposed) 19 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}h8\) 20 \(\text{Q}xd5\) cxd5 21 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}ab8\) 22 \(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}xh2\) 23 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}xg2\) 24 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xf2\) 25 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}f1+\) 26 \(\text{Q}c2\) f4 27 \(\text{Q}e7\) f3? (a mistake which allows White to draw; the simple 27...\(\text{Q}g1\) would have prevented White's next and left Black with good winning chances) 28 \(\text{Q}xg7\) \(\text{Q}f2+\) 29 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}f1+\) ½-½ Yakovich-Emelin, St Petersburg 1995.

\[\text{11... \(\text{Q}f4\)}\]

\[\text{12 \(\text{Q}f3\)}\]

White must be careful here. For example the natural 12 \(\text{Q}d2\)? loses immediately to the tactical trick 12...\(\text{Q}h3!\) 13 \(\text{Q}xh3\) \(\text{Q}e4+\).

\[\text{12... \(\text{Q}e6\)}\]

13 g3

White is anxious to expel the black queen but also possible is 13 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}d4\) 14 \(\text{Q}a2\) with an unclear position.

\[\text{13... \(\text{Q}g5\)}\]
This is a complex position and there are two other moves which should also be considered by Black. We give both of them as they demonstrate typical methods by which Black can exploit his active pieces in this variation:

a) 13...\texttt{h6} 14 \texttt{d1} (14 \texttt{d2} 0-0 15 \texttt{e4} \texttt{ab8} 16 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 17 \texttt{b4} \texttt{a4} 18 \texttt{c1} \texttt{e6} 19 \texttt{e4} - Black has developed all his pieces whereas White only has the queen in play so it is not surprising that Black opens the position and quickly gains a decisive advantage - 19...c5 20 \texttt{d3} f5 21 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xe4+} 22 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{be8} 23 f3 \texttt{xc4} 24 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 25 \texttt{e3} \texttt{xe4} 26 \texttt{fxe4} \texttt{xe4} and Black soon won, Ocytko-Al eksandrov, Wisla 1992) 14...\texttt{f6} (White's dark-square weaknesses become apparent after this pawn break) 15 \texttt{xf6} 0-0 16 \texttt{e2} \texttt{xf6} 17 0-0 (17 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6} hits \texttt{a1} and \texttt{f2} and wins immediately, but the move played does not help) 17...\texttt{xf2} 18 \texttt{xf2} \texttt{f8} 19 b4 \texttt{xf2} 0-1 Edvardsson-Carlhammar, Gausdal 1992.

b) 13...\texttt{e7} also looks promising, e.g. 14 \texttt{d2} 0-0-0 15 b4 (15 \texttt{g2} \texttt{d4} 16 \texttt{e4} d5! 17 \texttt{exd6} \texttt{xd6} 18 0-0 \texttt{he8} and Black wins due to the threat of ...\texttt{e2+}) 15...\texttt{d4} 16 \texttt{xd4}? (a blunder but the position was difficult for White anyway) 16...\texttt{xd4} 17 \texttt{e4} \texttt{c2+!} and the white rook on \texttt{a1} goes after

18 \texttt{xc2} \texttt{xe5+}, Gomez-Valdes, Cuba 1991.

14 \texttt{e2}

14 \texttt{xf7+} \texttt{xf7} 15 \texttt{gxf7} \texttt{gxf7} 16 \texttt{d1} \texttt{ae8} 17 \texttt{d2} \texttt{d4} 18 \texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 19 \texttt{f4} \texttt{hf8} and the white pawns are exposed in the endgame.

14 ... \texttt{e4}

15 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4}

16 \texttt{f4}?

With so many pieces undeveloped, this move is a luxury that White cannot afford. He had to play more actively with 16 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f2} 17 \texttt{b4} \texttt{e3} when the
line given by Blatny is 18 c5!  
\( \text{d}d3+ \) (not 18...\( xxf1 \) 19 \( xxf1 \)  
\( \text{d}d3+ \) when the white king  
charges up the board to good  
effect, e.g. 20 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 21  
\( \text{xe}3 \) \( d5 \) 22 exd6 cxd6 23 cxd6  
\( \text{xc}4+ \) 24 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 25 \( \text{c}5 \))  
19 \( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 20 \( \text{c}3 \) 0-0-0  
with an unclear position.  

\( \text{16} \ldots \text{b}b8! \)  
Now the black pieces become  
too active and White cannot  
cope with all the threats. Not so  
good is 16...\( \text{f}2 \) 17 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 18  
\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{b}6 \) as White now has the  
clever move 19 \( \text{e}1! \) threatening  
c5 and Black has nothing  
better than 19...\( \text{e}3 \) repeating  
moves.  

\( \text{17} \) \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{f}2+ \)  

\( \text{18} \) \( \text{d}1 \)  

\( \text{18} \ldots \text{xg}3! \)  
19 \( \text{g}1 \)  
This is a desperate attempt to  
stir up complications, but after  
19 hxg3 \( \text{f}2+ \) 20 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{xh}1 \) 21  
\( \text{f}3 \) c5! 22 b5 \( \text{b}7+ \) Black res-  
cues the knight with a winning  
position.  

\( \text{19} \ldots \text{xf}4 \)  
20 \( \text{xg}7 \) \( \text{e}7 \)  
21 \( \text{g}2? \)  
This loses the exchange but  
after 21 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{hg}8 \) Black is a  
pawn up with a good position  
and should win easily.  

\( \text{21} \ldots \text{h}6 \)  
22 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{g}7 \)  
23 \( \text{d}2 \)  
White is hoping to create  
chances of saving the game  
based on the temporary lack of  
co-ordination of the black  
forces but Xie Jun easily pre-  
vents White becoming too ac-  
tive.  

\( \text{23} \ldots \text{f}6 \)  
With her extra exchange  
Black concentrates on opening  
up files as quickly as possible.  
The resulting slight exposure of  
her king is of minimal impor-  
tance.  

\( \text{24} \) \( \text{xf}6+ \) \( \text{xf}6 \)  
25 \( \text{xf}6+ \) \( \text{xf}6 \)  
26 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{be}8 \)  
27 \( \text{f}1+ \) \( \text{e}7 \)  
Black's only remaining task  
now is to activate her dormant  
queen's bishop.  

\( \text{28} \) \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{d}8 \)  
29 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \)  
30 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{a}6 \)  
31 \( \text{h}5 \)  
31 c5 is perhaps an improve-  
ment but it does not help after  
31...d5 32 cxd6 cxd6 33 \( \text{xa}6 \)  
\( \text{xa}6 \) 34 \( \text{xa}6 \) \( \text{d}7 \) and Black  
wins.  

\( \text{31} \ldots \text{d}6 \)  
32 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
33 \( \text{hxe5} \) \( \text{dxe5} \)
34 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e7} \)

From the perspective of avoiding tactical traps, this has not been one of Hart's better games. However 35 \( \text{hxg7} \) \( \text{e6} \) 36 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{g8} \) 37 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{hxg2+} \) was also hopeless.

35 ... \( \text{hxg7} \)
0-1
After 36 \( \text{hxg7} \) \( \text{f5}+ \) picks up the knight.

Game 24
Golubev-Malaniuk
Alushta 1994

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c6} \)
2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e5} \)
3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{exd4} \)
4 \( \text{xd4} \)

There are a couple of gambit tries here for White which need to be considered:

a) The Göring Gambit is brought into play with 4 \( \text{c3} \). A safe line for Black here is 4...d5 5 exd5 \( \text{xd5} \) 6 cxd4 \( \text{g4} \) 7

\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b4+} \) 8 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 9 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 10 \( \text{xc6+} \) (10 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 11 \( \text{axb3} \) \( \text{ge7} \) leaves White with a feeble pawn structure) 10...\( \text{xc6} \) 11 \( \text{e2+} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 12 \( \text{xe2} \) 0-0-0 and many games have shown that Black has a very pleasant position.

b) 4 \( \text{c4} \) is an attempt to transpose to variations such as the Giuoco Piano or Two Knights Defence. One way for Black to avoid these is 4...\( \text{c5} \) 5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d3} \), e.g. 6 \( \text{b4} \) (White can play more safely by not expanding on the queenside, but then Black has a comfortable game) 6...\( \text{b6} \) 7 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 8 0-0 \( \text{d6} \) 9 \( \text{a4} \) a6 10 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{a7} \) 11 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 12 \( \text{xb5} \). ECO mysteriously assesses this position as clearly better for White, but, after the simple 12...\( \text{f6} \), this seems wrong, e.g. 13 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{dxe5} \) 14 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 15 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e4} \), Emmerich-Kaulfuss, Hessen 1988 or 13 \( \text{a6} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 15 \( \text{bd2} \) bxa6 16 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c5} \), Roeberg-Kaulfuss, Bundesliga 1994 and in both cases Black stands much better.

4 ... \( \text{f6} \)
5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b4} \)
6 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \)
7 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d5} \)
8 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{exd5} \)
9 0-0 0-0
10 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{c6} \)
11 \( \text{a4} \)

This variation has recently gained popularity. White concedes the centre, but gains ac-
tive piece play in return. This can manifest itself in the form of an attack with pieces on the kingside or an attempt to gain play in the centre with c4 (or perhaps c3 and e3, playing for a blockade).

In the following analysis we see White attempting to play along the former lines.

a) 11 \_e2 (White intends to route this knight around to the kingside via d4 and f5) 11...h6 12 h4 \_d6 (another way for Black to play is to break the pin with 12...e7) 13 d4 \_d7 14 c3 \_e8 15 \_c2 \_h5 16 \_e7 \_xe7 (Black has comfortably equalised and now takes the initiative on the kingside) 17 \_e2 \_f4 18 \_f3 \_g5 19 g3 c5 20 \_e2 \_f5 21 \_d1 \_h3+ 22 \_h1 \_ad8 23 \_g1 d4 24 cxd4 cxd4 25 \_c1 \_xg1 26 \_xg1 \_h3 27 \_e1 d3 28 \_a4 \_xc1 0-1 was Weinzettl-Dobrovolsky, Oberwart 1991) 13 \_d4 c5 14 \_f5

b) 11 \_f3 \_e7

(it is a perfectly reasonable idea for Black to allow the doubling of the f-pawns - with \_xf6 - but here he chooses to prevent this possibility while also breaking the pin on his knight) 12 \_ae1 \_e8 13 \_e2 (13 h3 \_e6 14 \_e2 \_d7 15 \_e7 \_xe7 16 \_d4 \_b4 17 \_xe6 \_xe6 18 \_xe6 fxe6 19 \_e3 \_f8 20 \_e5 \_b8 21 \_e1

14...\_xf5 (Black can save this bishop with 14...\_e5 15 c3 when the position is equal, Ljubojevic-P. Nikolic, Wijk aan Zee 1988) 15 \_xf5 \_b8 (it is a typical theme of this variation that the white queenside can become exposed) 16 b3 \_e5 17 \_b1 \_d6 18 \_g3 \_xg3 19 hxg3 \_f6 (Black has coordinated his forces and now stands better thanks to his central control) 20 \_e1 \_xel+ 21 \_xe1 \_e8 22 \_d2 \_e5 23 \_f4 \_c3 24 \_f1 g6 25 \_d3 \_g7 26 f3 a5 and Black has a useful initiative, Lutz-Yusupov, Munich 1992.)
was the continuation of the 5th game from the Deep Blue-Kasparov match in Philadelphia 1996. The position is fine for Black and Kasparov offered a draw. However, the Deep Blue team, perhaps unwisely, declined, as the position is an open one and thus should favour the computer's enormous calculating power: 24 \textit{c3} f5 25 \textit{d1}? (this move will cause White some headaches on the d-file) 25...\textit{e6} 26 \textit{w3} (Deep Blue still doesn't sense the danger that the pin on the d-file poses) 26...\textit{f7} 27 \textit{w3} f4 28 \textit{d2} \textit{w6} 29 g3 \textit{d5} 30 a3 \textit{h7} 31 \textit{g2} \textit{w5} 32 f3 e3 33 \textit{d3} e2 34 gxf4 e1\textit{w} 35 fxe5 \textit{wxc3}

This is the most thematic continuation for White, who hopes to mount an initiative against the black centre. Instead 13 c3 \textit{d6} is somewhat insipid, e.g. 14 b3 \textit{f4} 15 \textit{w2} (this blunder loses a pawn, but Black had nothing to complain about anyway) 15...\textit{xh2}+ (before White obligingly moved his queen to c2, this combination would have failed as after white captured the bishop with his king and White replied ...\textit{g4}+, White would have had the counter-stroke \textit{wxc4}) 16 \textit{h1} \textit{f4} 17 g3 \textit{d6} 18 f4 c5 and Black won easily, Lau-Piket, Leeuwarden 1993.
Or 13...\textbf{b}8 14 \textbf{c}c1 \textbf{e}6 15 \textbf{c}xd5 \textbf{e}xd5 16 \textbf{b}3 \textbf{d}6 (although, theoretically, Black has slightly the worse pawn structure, the activity of his pieces and their central outposts constitute more than enough compensation) 17 \textbf{c}c3 \textbf{b}4 18 \textbf{g}3 (here 18 \textbf{xd}5 runs into the tactic 18...\textbf{ax}h2+!) 18...\textbf{x}g3 19 hxg3 \textbf{d}xg2! 20 \textbf{xf}2 \textbf{d}4 21 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{xd}3 22 \textbf{xc}6 (White has maintained material equality but his kingside has been compromised) 22...\textbf{e}6 23 \textbf{b}7 \textbf{e}7 24 \textbf{b}4 \textbf{d}5 25 \textbf{xd}5 \textbf{xd}5+ 26 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{e}2 (Black’s plan of centralisation is complete) 27 \textbf{b}8+ \textbf{h}7 28 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{xa}2 29 \textbf{e}1 \textbf{f}3 30 \textbf{e}5 \textbf{xb}3 31 \textbf{g}4 \textbf{axf}2 0-1 was the game Schmaltz-Dubiel, Alttensteig 1994. After 32 \textbf{xf}2 \textbf{d}+ 33 \textbf{g}2 \textbf{xf}2+ the white queen is lost.

14 \textbf{c}xd5

Black also gained great activity after 14 \textbf{c}c1 \textbf{f}4 in Zarnicki-I. Sokolov, Oviedo 1993, viz. 15 \textbf{c}2 \textbf{g}4 16 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{e}6 17 \textbf{c}xd5 \textbf{d}x5 18 \textbf{c}c4 \textbf{d}6 19 \textbf{xf}6 \textbf{h}2+ 20 \textbf{h}1 \textbf{xf}6 21 \textbf{xd}5 \textbf{g}3 22 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{xd}5 23 \textbf{g}4 \textbf{e}5 24 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{h}2+ 25 \textbf{h}1 \textbf{h}5 0-1.

Both this game and the previous example demonstrate the excellent positioning of the black queen’s bishop on d5. Therefore White takes on d5 immediately to oblige Black to recapture with a piece. However this does not prevent Black from taking the initiative.

14 ... \textbf{c}xd5
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15 \textbf{c}c3

White has to be careful to complete his development without getting tangled up, e.g. 15 \textbf{c}c1 \textbf{f}4 16 \textbf{c}6 g5 17 \textbf{g}3 \textbf{d}7 and Black has the initiative.

15 ... \textbf{e}5

16 \textbf{e}1

Black’s last move set a trap which White fell for in Shvidler-Malaniuk, St. Petersburg 1993, viz. 16 \textbf{xd}5?? \textbf{xd}5 17 \textbf{xf}6 (White’s play is based on 17...\textbf{xf}6 18 \textbf{h}7+, but ...) 17...\textbf{b}7!. Now the queen is defended and White has no time to save his bishop due to the mate threat on g2.

16 ... \textbf{b}7

Black has excellent play for his pieces.

17 \textbf{d}2 \textbf{b}6

Also possible is 17...\textbf{d}6 18 \textbf{g}3 \textbf{x}g3 19 hxg3 d4 20 \textbf{b}5 \textbf{d}5, threatening mate, with a
good game.
18 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{xg3}\)
19 \(\text{hxg3}\) \(\text{e4}\)
20 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{dxe4}\)
21 \(\text{ad1}\) \(\text{ad8}\)

Here we have the same structure as occurred in the game between Kasparov and Deep Blue which we looked at in the note to White's 11th. Again Black stands very comfortably thanks to his extra central pawn and strong minor piece.

22 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{xd1}\)
23 \(\text{xd1}\) \(\text{a5}\)
24 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{b4}\)
25 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{e6}\)
26 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{b6}\)

More incisive here was 26...\(\text{b3}\), maintaining pressure against White's queenside. Now White succeeds in simplifying the position to force a draw.

27 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{a6}\)
28 \(\text{d8+}\) \(\text{h7}\)
29 \(\text{d7}\) \(\text{xa3}\)
30 \(\text{xb7}\) \(\text{xc3}\)

\(1/2-1/2\)
In this variation, Black offers an immediate transposition into standard open-game territory, with 2...e5, but Black declines with our recommended continuation of 2...d6.

With this move, Black prepares to develop his queen's bishop at g4 and his knight at f6 leaving him with a very flexible position. Depending upon how White lines up his forces, he can counter in the centre with ...e6 and ...d5, the direct ...e5 or perhaps capture the f3-knight and then play ...g6, heading for a type of Pirc Defence position.

The most natural continuation (from the above diagram) is

From this position White has three main strategies: to weaken Black's pawn structure with b5 and xc6, to break the pin on his f3-knight with e2 or finally, to develop with e3 and hope to find a more active role for the king's bishop. All of these strategies, and the correct ways for Black to counter them, are examined in the following games.

**Game 25**
Tseshkovsky-Miles
*Palma de Mallorca 1989*

1 e4 c6
84 1 e4 \( \text{c6} \) 2 \( \text{d}f3 \) d6  

2 \( \text{f}3 \) d6  
3 \( \text{d4} \) f6  
4 \( \text{c}3 \) g4  
5 \( \text{e}3 \) e6  

6 h3  

Putting the question immediately to Black’s bishop is White’s best. Others are less troubling:  

a) 6 \( \text{b}5 \) a6 7 \( \text{xc6} \) bxc6 is not an effective continuation for White, e.g. 8 h3 \( \text{h}5 \) 9 g4 \( \text{g}6 \) 10 \( \text{d}2 \) d5 11 e5 \( \text{d}7 \) (the black light-squared bishop has a wonderful diagonal to operate on) 12 \( \text{b}3 \) (White is probably hoping to take the initiative on the queenside with \( \text{a}5 \), but Black takes action first) 12...h5 (Black takes the opportunity to disrupt White’s kingside before he can build up a threatening position with f4) 13 \( \text{f}1 \) h4 (now if White defends his h-pawn with 14 \( \text{f}3 \) Black can reply 14...\( \text{xc2} \) 15 g5 \( \text{h}3 \) 16 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 17 e2 \( \text{f}5 \) 17 c3 18 \( \text{f}4 \) c5 19 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{xg6} \) \( \text{xg6} \) 20 f4 cxd4 21 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{e}4 \) and Black won easily, Jukic-Klinger, Vienna 1991.  

b) 6 \( \text{d}2 \) is not really to the point as White should be concentrating on building up an initiative on the light squares, e.g. 6...d5 7 e5 \( \text{d}7 \) 8 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 9 h3 \( \text{h}5 \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 12 \( \text{xe}2 \) f6 (Black has achieved a French Defence structure without being hampered by a constricted queen’s bishop) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 14 c3 (one point of Black’s play is that 14 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 15 c3 \( \text{xe}6 \) 16 cxb4 fxe5 leaves him with an excellent position) 14...\( \text{f}7 \) 15 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 17 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 18 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 19 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 20 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{ae}8 \) 21 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 22 \( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 23 \( \text{c}1 \) a5 with an equal game, Almasi-Klinger, Balatonbereny 1993.  

6 \( \text{e}2 \) is examined in game 27.  

6 ... \( \text{h}5 \)  

7 \( \text{b}5 \)  

This pin is how White used to handle this variation but in fact
line ‘b’ of the alternatives below is more testing.

a) 7 \textit{We}2

(White has brought his king to safety but his position, especially the central pawns, remains uncomfortably exposed) 18...\textit{Af}6 19 \textit{Id}1 \textit{Ec}2 20 \textit{Ec}1 \textit{Ee}4 21 \textit{g}5 \textit{Ee}7 22 \textit{Ec}3 (White has just managed to hold the centre together but now Black turns his attention to the kingside) 22...\textit{Wa}5 23 \textit{De}5 (this leads to an endgame a pawn down, but the alternative 23 \textit{b}4 \textit{Wf}5 24 \textit{Dh}4 \textit{Wh}7 25 \textit{Wg}4 \textit{Exg}2 26 \textit{Dxg}2 \textit{Wh}8 was worse) 23...\textit{Xg}2 24 \textit{Xg}2 \textit{Dxe}5 25 \textit{dxe}5 \textit{Wxe}5 26 \textit{Wf}3 \textit{Wf}5 27 \textit{Wxf}5 \textit{exf}5 28 \textit{Ec}1 \textit{Ed}3 and Black won, Gi. Hernandez-Miles, Seville 1994.

b) 7 \textit{d}5 is a dangerous move for Black who now has two possibilities:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) 7...\textit{Df}7 and now:
    \begin{itemize}
      \item a1) 8 \textit{Db}5+ \textit{c}6 9 \textit{dxc}6 \textit{bxc}6 (this is a natural recapture but it leaves Black with trouble co-ordinating his forces, so he should consider 9...\textit{Dxc}6 which leaves White with only a small
edge after 10 \( \text{e}2 \text{a}7 \) 10 \( \text{a}4 \text{c}7 \) (Black is hoping to get developed with ...\( \text{c}8 \) and ...\( \text{e}7 \), but this is all very slow and White cuts across this plan with a series of active moves)

11 \( \text{e}2! \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{g}4 \text{g}6 \) 13 0-0-0

13...\( \text{e}5 \) (examples of Black's problems can be seen from the variations: 13...d5 14 exd5 cxd5 15 \( \text{xd}5! \) exd5 16 \( \text{xd}5 \text{xd}5 \) 17 \( \text{b}6+ \text{e}7 \) 18 \( \text{xc}7 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 19 \( \text{d}1 \) and 13...0-0-0 14 \( \text{a}6+ \text{b}8 \) 15 \( \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 \) 16 \( \text{b}5 \) and White wins in both cases)

14 \( \text{c}4 \) (an earlier game, Apicella-David, Linares 1995, finished abruptly after 14 \( \text{h}4! \) \( \text{c}8? \) 15 \( \text{c}4 \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 \) 17 \( \text{d}5 \) 1-0)

14...\( \text{c}8 \) 15 \( \text{h}4 \text{b}6 \) 16 \( \text{xb}6 \text{xb}6 \) 17 \( \text{d}3 \) (White prepares a powerful exchange sacrifice)

17...d5 18 exd5 \( \text{xd}3 \) 19 \( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 20 \( \text{d}1 \text{g}6 \) 21 \( \text{d} \text{h}6+ \) 22 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 23 \( \text{e}4 \) b5 24 \( \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 25 dx\( \text{e}7+ \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 26 \( \text{d}7! \text{bxa}4 \) 27 \( \text{f}5+! \) gxf5 28 \( \text{a}3+ \)

allows Black to complete his development without trouble: 8...exd5 9 exd5 \( \text{xf}3 \) 10 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 11 \( \text{g}5 \text{e}7 \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) (Black frees himself with exchanges) 14 \( \text{xe}7 \text{xe}7 \) 15 \( \text{d}2 \text{g}6 \) (the position is equal) 16 g3 \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{g}2 \text{ae}8 \) 18 b3?! (weakening the long diagonal like this creates tactical opportunities for Black) 18...\( \text{h}5! \) (this advance provokes White into weakening his kingside)

19 h4 \( \text{g}5 \) 20 f4 \( \text{g}4 \) 21 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 22 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{df}6 \) 23 a4 \( \text{f}5 \) 24 \( \text{f}3 \) c6 and Black has an edge, Klovans-Miles, Groningen 1992.

b) 7...exd5 8 exd5 \( \text{e}5 \) (this is best as 8...\( \text{xf}3 \) 9 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 10 \( \text{e}2 \) gives White a free hand to develop a kingside initiative, e.g. 10...a6 11 0-0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 12 f4 \( \text{g}6 \) 13 g4 \( \text{d}7 \) 14 g5 0-0 15 h4 \( \text{e}8 \) 16 h5 \( \text{gf}8 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \) c5
18 dxc6 bxc6 19 h6 g6 20 \( \text{Q} \text{e}4 \) with powerful play, Golubev-Markowski, Biel 1995) 9 g4

9...\( \text{Q} \text{g}6 \) (this is preferable to 9...\( \text{Q} \text{xf}3+\) 10 \( \text{W} \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{g}6 \) 11 0-0-0 a6 12 \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{W} \text{e}2 \) 0-0 14 f4 h6 15 f5 \( \text{Q} \text{h}7 \) 16 \( \text{W} \text{f}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}8 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{b}1 \) when Black is left with an entombed bishop on h7 Spraggett-Mohr, Ubeda 1996) 10 \( \text{Q} \text{b}5+ \) (10 \( \text{Q} \text{xe}5 \) dxe5 solves many of Black’s problems by allowing him to develop his king’s bishop actively while 10 \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) is well met by 10...c5 11 \( \text{Q} \text{b}5+ \) \( \text{Q} \text{fd}7 \) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{ed}7 \) 11 \( \text{W} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}7 \) 12 0-0-0 a6 13 \( \text{Q} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd}3 \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xd}3 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{Q} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{dd}1 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}8 \) and the exchange of bishops has eased the congestion in Black’s position and he went on to win in 40 moves, I.V. Ivanov-Nesterov, Moscow 1995. Black has avoided weakening his kingside and will consolidate with ...\( \text{Q} \text{f}8 \). He can then begin counterplay on the queenside with ...b5. This is clearly the best way for Black to handle the variation which starts with 7...exd5.

7 ... a6
8 \( \text{Q} \text{a}4 \)

8 ... \( \text{Q} \text{d}7 \)

Not, of course 8...b5 9 \( \text{Q} \text{xb}5 \) axb5 10 \( \text{Q} \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{W} \text{d}7 \) 11 d5 and White wins.

9 d5 \( \text{Q} \text{a}5 \)
10 \( \text{W} \text{e}2 \) b5

Once again White has been thrown on his own resources in the opening and the absence of theoretical guidance means that Black has swiftly achieved a fully playable position.

11 \( \text{Q} \text{b}3 \) e5
12 a3

This looks like a terrible strategic concession, but White hopes to gain compensation on the open c-file.

12 ... \( \text{Q} \text{xb}3 \)
13 cxb3 \( \text{Q} \text{e}7 \)
14 b4 0-0
15 g4

White was clearly worried by the prospect of ...f5, liberating Black’s position but now
White’s whole position is beginning to look like a Swiss cheese with holes all over the place.

\[1 e4 \text{c}6 \ 2 \text{d}3 \text{d}6\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{White’s whole position is beginning to look like a Swiss cheese with holes all over the place.}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
15 \ldots \text{g}6
16 \text{d}2 \text{b}6
17 \text{b}3 \text{c}8
18 \text{a}4 \text{c}6
\end{array}\]

Paradoxically, Black is the first to utilise the open c-file.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
19 \text{dxc}6 \text{xc}6
20 \text{x}b6
\end{array}
\]

White is hoping to gain control of d5 in order to stabilise the situation.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
20 \ldots \text{xb}6
\end{array}
\]

A superb coup from Miles which must have come as a terrible shock to his opponent. Black speculates on being able to undermine White’s apparently impregnable knight on the d5-square.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
25 \text{exf}5
25 \text{gxf}5 \text{meets with the same response.}
25 \ldots \text{xf}5
26 \text{xc}1 \text{f}3
\end{array}
\]

Now 26 gxf5 xc1 27 xd5 would leave White with weak pawns everywhere.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
26 \text{xc}6 \text{xc}6
27 \text{f}3
28 \text{e}4 \text{h}8
29 \text{d}1 \text{a}8
\end{array}
\]

A marvellous retreat, which prepares to bring Black’s bishops into scything action against White’s king.
With a few deft strokes Black has forced the win of material. White now loses a piece.

33 \( \text{Nc1} \) \( \text{xd5} \)

A final throw, which Black refutes brilliantly.

34 \( \text{Ec4} \)

A wonderful riposte, which blocks the connection between White’s pieces and banishes any prospect of counterplay. If now 35 \( \text{Wxa8} \) Black wins with the

intermezzo 35...\( \text{Bxc1+} \).

35 \( \text{Bxc4} \) \( \text{bxc4} \)
36 \( \text{Wd7} \) \( \text{wa1+} \)
37 \( \text{Bf1} \) \( \text{cxb3} \)
38 \( \text{Wxd6} \)

Equally, if 38 \( \text{Wxd8+} \) then 38...\( \text{g8} \) is a simple win.

38 ... \( \text{g8} \)

0-1

Game 26
Doric-Mestrovic
Bled 1996

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c6} \)
2 \( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{d6} \)
3 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f6} \)
4 \( \text{Bc3} \) \( \text{g4} \)
5 \( \text{Be3} \)

This leads to positions where Black is a little cramped but has a very solid position and chances for long term counterplay. It is thus a good choice against an opponent who is impatient and may over-extend himself.

Black has two alternatives
here which both lead to complex play:

a) 5...a6 eliminates the problem of a white bishop check on b5 but is a little slow. Play can continue 6 h3 ∇h5

7 d5 (quiet development with 7 ∇e2 is not dangerous for Black, e.g. 7...e6 8 0-0 d5 9 exd5 ∇xd5 10 ∇xd5 exd5 11 ∇e5 ∇xe2 12 ∇xe2 ∇xe5 13 ∇f4 ∇e7 14 ∇xe5 0-0 15 ∇g4 f6 16 ∇f4 ∇c8 17 ∇fe1 ∇xg4 18 hxg4 ∇f7 19 ∇e3 c6 with a completely equal position, Luther-Miles, Hastings 1995/6) and now:

a1) 7...∇b8 (Miles has had no joy with the active 7...∇xf3 - see note ‘a2’ - so Black should consider this simple knight retreat) 8 a4 ∇xf3 9 ∇xf3 g6 10 ∇d1 ∇g7 11 ∇e2 0-0 12 0-0 c6 (Black has a type of position familiar from the Pirc Defence) 13 a5 ∇bd7 14 f4 ∇b8 (Black delays exchanging on d5 as, compared with Garcia-Miles below, this makes it more difficult for White to form a plan) 15 ∇a3 ∇c7 16 ∇d3 ∇fe8 17 g4 cxd5 (now that White has exposed his king Black feels more comfortable about opening the centre) 18 exd5 e6 19 dxe6 ∇xe6 20 g5 ∇ae8 21 ∇d4 ∇e4 22 ∇xg7 ∇xg7 23 ∇d4+ ∇g8 24 ∇g4 ∇xc3 25 ∇xc3 ∇xa5 26 ∇xe6 ∇xe6 27 ∇e3 ∇xe3 28 ∇xe3 ∇f5 (the open white king makes it very difficult for him to realise the advantage of the exchange) 29 ∇d3 ∇e6 30 b4 h6 31 gxh6 ∇h7 32 f5 ∇e7 33 ∇g3 ∇xh6 34 h4 ∇e5 35 ∇f4+ ∇h7 36 ∇g5 ∇c7 37 fxg6+ fxg6 38 h5 ∇xc2 39 ∇e7+ ∇h6 40 ∇xd6 ∇e4 41 hxg6 ∇g4+ ½-½ Yagupov-Hodgson, Linares 1996.

a2) 7...∇xf3 and now:

a21) 8 ∇xf3 ∇e5 9 ∇d1 c6 10 f4 ∇ed7 11 ∇e2 cxd5 (it may be better to avoid this exchange for the moment - see Yagupov-Hodgson above) 12 exd5 g6 13 ∇d2 ∇g7 14 a4 ∇a5 15 0-0 0-0 16 ∇a3 ∇ac8 (Black is struggling to create play while White has a plan to advance on the queenside) 17 ∇d1 ∇c5 18 ∇f3 ∇cd7 19 ∇b1 ∇c4 20 ∇e2 ∇cc8 21 b4 ∇c7 22 a5 e5 23 dxe6 fxe6 24 b5 ∇c5 25 bxa6 bxa6 26 ∇b6 and White has a clear advantage, G. Garcia-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

a22) 8 gxf3 ∇b8 9 f4 c6 (this opens up the position to White’s
advantage so Black would be better advised to try to complete his development with 9...e6 or 9...g6) 10 \( \text{\textit{g}} \text{2} \text{w} \text{c7} 11 \text{w} \text{d4 cxd5} 12 \text{d} \text{xd5} \text{d} \text{xd5} 13 \text{exd5} \text{d} \text{d7} 14 \text{c4} \text{f} \text{f6} 15 \text{c} \text{c1} \text{g6} 16 \text{c} \text{c} \text{d5} \text{dxc5} 17 \text{c} \text{xc5} \text{w} \text{d6} 18 \text{a} \text{a4+d} \text{d} \text{d7} 19 \text{d} \text{d7} 19 \text{c} \text{c6!}

19...\text{w} \text{b8} (19...\text{bxc6} 20 \text{dxc6} \text{c} \text{c8} 21 \text{w} \text{xa6} is hopeless for Black) 20 \text{b} \text{b6} \text{w} \text{c8} 21 0-0 \text{w} \text{b8} 22 \text{d} \text{d1} \text{d} \text{d8} 23 \text{d} \text{d6} \text{g} \text{g7} 24 \text{d} \text{dxe7} \text{d} \text{b7} 25 \text{d} \text{dxe7} 0-0 1-0 Onischchuk-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

b) 5...\text{g6} is playable. Black is again angling for a Pirc Defence but White gains free development for his pieces, e.g. 6 \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} 3 \text{d} \text{xf3} 7 \text{w} \text{xf3} \text{g} \text{g7} 8 \text{d} \text{b5} (this is a rather feeble continuation and more to the point is 8 0-0-0 0-0 9 \text{g} \text{g} \text{e4} \text{d} \text{xe5} 11 \text{w} \text{g2} \text{d} \text{d6} 12 \text{g} \text{g} \text{e5} \text{d} \text{xe5} 13 \text{w} \text{e2} \text{b} \text{b8} 14 \text{b} \text{b3} \text{w} \text{b4}

15 \text{d} \text{d2} \text{f} \text{e8} 16 \text{f} \text{e1} \text{d} \text{d7} and the position is about equal, Kornasiewicz-Angelov, Warsaw 1989.

6 \text{d} \text{b5}

This is the most dynamic continuation for White. Others:

a) The immediate 6 \text{d} \text{d5} is less worrying, e.g. 6...\text{e} \text{e7} 7 \text{e2} (7 \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} \text{d7} 8 \text{a} \text{a4} \text{g} \text{g} \text{g} \text{e6} 9 \text{a} \text{a6} 10 \text{g} \text{g} \text{e} \text{d7} 11 \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} 0-0 12 \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} \text{w} \text{c8} 13 \text{d} \text{d2} \text{d} \text{d7} 14 \text{d} \text{d5} \text{d} \text{d8} 15 \text{d} \text{d6} \text{w} \text{g5} 16 \text{d} \text{dxe7} \text{w} \text{d7} 17 \text{w} \text{g5} \text{f} \text{f6} 18 \text{d} \text{d3} \text{w} \text{g4} 19 \text{g} \text{g} \text{g6} \text{xf6} 20 \text{w} \text{d2} \text{w} \text{d7} 21 \text{w} \text{w} \text{w} \text{f7} 22 \text{d} \text{d1} \text{e} \text{e7} 23 \text{d} \text{d3} \text{w} \text{a8} 24 \text{f} \text{f3} and the exchange of two pairs of minor pieces has helped Black to activate his position and obtain equal chances, Damljanovic-Mestrovic, Yugoslavia 1989) 7...\text{d} \text{d6} 8 \text{d} \text{d2} \text{d} \text{d7} (although Black wants, in principle, to exchange pieces, this is a good piece and so he prefers, for the moment at least, to retreat it) 9 \text{d} \text{c4} \text{e} \text{e7} 10 \text{a} \text{a4} 0-0 11 0-0 \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} \text{h} 12 \text{a} \text{a5} \text{a} \text{a6} 13 \text{b} \text{b4} \text{d} \text{d7} 14 \text{g} \text{g4} \text{g} \text{g} \text{g}
92  1 e4 d6 2 d3 d6

(the plan to exchange dark-squared bishops with ...\(g5\) is a typical one for this variation) 15 \(\text{Nbl}\) \(e7\) 16 \(\text{Nxd7}\) \(\text{Nxd7}\) 17 b5 f5 18 bxa6 bxa6 19 f3 \(\text{xex3}\) 20 \(\text{Nf6}\) 21 \(\text{Nbd}\) g6 22 \(\text{Nbe}\) f4 23 \(\text{Nc4}\) \(\text{Nfb8}\) 24 \(\text{Nbb}\) g5 25 \(\text{Nbd}\) \(\text{Nxb}\) 26 \(\text{Nxb}\) g4 and Black had excellent kingside counterplay in the game Wedberg-Mestrovic, Biel 1990.

b) 6 \(\text{Nxe2}\) \(e7\) 7 0-0 0-0 8 d5 \(\text{Nbd}\) 9 \(\text{Nel}\) \(c8\) (Black carefully leaves the d7-square free for use by his knights) 10 f4 exf4 11 \(\text{Nxf4}\) \(\text{Nfd7}\) 12 \(\text{Nf3}\) \(\text{Nf6}\) 13 \(\text{Nbd2}\) \(\text{Nbe}\) (although White has a big lead in development, Black has very strong control over the central dark squares) 14 \(\text{Nde}\) \(e5\) 15 \(\text{Nf5}\) (this is playing into Black's hands and White would do much better to keep pieces on the board with a simple move such as 15 \(\text{Nae1}\) ) 15...\(\text{Nxf5}\) 16 exf5 \(\text{Ned7}\) (this is an excellent regrouping by Black - the natural 16...\(\text{Nbd}\) would leave his knights very statically positioned) 17 \(\text{Nae1}\) \(\text{Nf5}\) 18 \(\text{Nf6}\) 19 \(\text{Nbd}\) \(\text{Nbd7}\) 20 \(\text{Nh1}\) \(\text{Nfe}\) 21 \(\text{Nde}\) \(\text{Nxe}\) 22 \(\text{Nxe}\) f6 23 \(\text{Nh4}\) \(\text{Nf}\) 24 b4 (24 b3 is preferable to this weakening move) 24...a5 25 a3 axb4 26 axb4 \(\text{Nba}\) 27 \(\text{Nwe2}\) \(\text{Nea}\) 28 \(\text{Nc4}\) \(\text{Nbd}\) 29 \(\text{Nb}\) 30 \(\text{Nc}\) 26 and Black went on to win in the game Krieger-Mestrovic, Werven 1993.

6  ... \(\text{Nd7}\)

7  \(d5\)

Black side-steps the cunning trap 7...\(\text{Nf}\)? 8 \(\text{Nxe}\)! \(\text{Nxd}\) 9 \(\text{Nxd}\) \(\text{Nxd}\) 10 \(\text{Nxd}\) \(\text{Nxc}\) 11 \(\text{Nxf}\) \(\text{Nd}\) 12 0-0-0 \(\text{Nf6}\) 13 \(\text{Nh}\) and White emerges a pawn ahead in the endgame.

Black's play (...\(\text{Nbd}\) and ...\(\text{Ncb}\)) seems very retrograde but with a blocked position this is not of great importance. Furthermore, if White wants to play either of the natural advances c4 or f4, he will have some regrouping to do himself.
An alternative way for White to deploy his pieces is 8 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash w}} \text{d2} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash a}} \text{e2} \) 9 0-0-0 0-0 10 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash d}} \text{g1} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash f}} \text{6} \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash e}} \text{1} \) c5 12 f3 a6 13 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash f}} \text{1} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash c}} \text{8} \) 14 g4 b5 15 h4 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash e}} \text{8} \) Beshukov-Mestrovic, Ljubljana 1994.

White has a space advantage and attacking prospects on the kingside. However, Black has been careful not to weaken himself and so it will take White a long time to force a breakthrough on the kingside. Meanwhile Black will be able to generate queenside play. This is a typical position arising from 5...e5. White has an edge but the battle has only just begun.

8 ... \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash a}} \text{e7} \)
9 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash w}} \text{d2} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash f}} \text{6} \)

In an earlier game Mestrovic, an expert in this variation, unnecessarily weakened his kingside with 9...h6?! and quickly paid the penalty: 10 0-0-0 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f3} \) 11 gxf3! (Black was no doubt anticipating 11 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f3} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{5} \) when he has solved his opening problems) 11...a6 (following 11...\( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{5} \) White has the pleasant choice between 12 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash h}} \text{g5} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash d}} \text{g1} \) f6 15 h4 and 12 f4 exf4 13 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f4} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f4} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f4} \) 12 f4 exf4 13 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f4} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{5} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) (after 14...hxg5 White gains a big advantage with the same idea as in the game, viz. 15 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash d}} \text{g1} \) f6 16 h4) 15 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) hxg5 16 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash d}} \text{g1} \) f6 17 h4 0-0 18 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{4} \) g6 19 h5

(White now gains a winning attack on the kingside despite the absence of queens) 19...\( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash e}} \text{5} \) 20 hxg6 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g6} \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash f}} \text{5} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{7} \) 22 f4 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f4} \) 23 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash h}} \text{7}+ \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{8} \) 24 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash h}} \text{g1} \) and the black position has been completely invaded) 21 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g4} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash d}} \text{7} \) 22 f4 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash a}} \text{e8} \) 23 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash h}} \text{7} \) f5 24 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{g5} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash f}} \text{6} \) 25 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash h}} \text{1} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash g}} \text{7} \) 26 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f5} \) 1-0 Sveshnikov-Mestrovic, Ljubljana 1994.

10 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash h}} \text{3} \)

After 10 0-0-0 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f3} \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}} \text{f3} \) c5 12 g4 a6 13 \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash e}} \text{2} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textbackslash w}} \text{d7} \) 14 g5
\[ \begin{array}{l}
\Delta g4 15 \Delta xg4 \, \, \Delta xg4 \text{ the exchange of pieces has eased Black's cramp. The game Pavasovic-Mestrovic, Nova Gorica 1996 continued } 16 \, f4 \, \Delta d7 17 \, \Delta hgl \, \Delta h4 18 \, \Delta g3 \, \text{exf4 } 19 \, \Delta xf4 \, g6 20 \, \Delta b1 \, 0-0 21 \, \Delta e3 \, \Delta ae8 22 \, \Delta df1 \, 1/2-1/2.

10 \, ... \, \Delta h5

10...\Delta xf3 is, of course, perfectly playable but Mestrovic has a different idea in mind.

11 \, \Delta d3 \, 0-0

12 \, g4 \, \Delta g6

This bishop regrouping seems strange but Black is hoping to undermine the white centre with ...c6. The opposition of the black bishop and white queen will make this thrust particularly strong.

13 \, h4

Not 13 \, \Delta h4?, which fails to the standard tactic 13...\Delta xe4 14 \, \Delta xe4 \, \Delta xe4.

White is hoping to use the black bishop on g6 as a target for his kingside advance but the black position proves sufficiently resilient to cope with this attack.

13 \, ... \, h5

14 \, g5

White closes the position, speculating on the long-term weakness of the black h-pawn. An alternative strategy was to keep the position on the kingside open with 14 \, gxh5.

14 \, ... \, \Delta fd7

15 \, 0-0-0 \, \Delta a6

16 \, \Delta d2 \, \Delta ac5

17 \, \Delta xc5 \, \Delta xc5

18 \, \Delta we3

Given time White will now bring his knight on d2 round to g3 and win the black h-pawn. However, by opening the centre Black generates sufficient counterplay to avoid this.

18 \, ... \, c6

19 \, \Delta f1 \, \text{cxd5}

20 \, \Delta xd5

Of course 20 \, \Delta xd5 leaves the e-pawn en prise, but another way for White to play was 20 \, \text{exd5 } \Delta a5 (20...f5 21 \, gxf6 \, \Delta xf6 is dangerous for Black as lines}
on the kingside are opened) 21 \( \text{g3} \) (Black has very good piece play on the queenside, which makes it difficult for White to carry out his plan, e.g. 21 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 22 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{a4} \) and Black is very active) 21...\( \text{a4} \) 22 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{xa4} \) 23 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{b3} \) 24 axb3 \( \text{f6} \) and Black has the more active position in the endgame.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
20 \ldots \text{e6} \\
21 \text{g3} \text{f4} \\
22 \text{dd1} \text{f6} \\
23 \text{d5} \text{fxg5} \\
24 \text{xe7+} \text{xe7} \\
25 \text{hxg5}
\end{array}
\]

\[
25 \ldots \text{f7}?
\]

After this move White is able to co-ordinate his position. Black should have continued his dynamic play with 25...\( \text{xe2+} \)!

26 \( \text{xe2} \) (26 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 27 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{h4} \) is very good for Black) 26...\( \text{f7} \) (hitting a2 and f2) 27 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 28 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 29 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{h7} \) and the outside passed h-pawn should guarantee Black a good endgame.

The failure to exchange with 25...\( \text{xe2+} \) is a very common type of mistake. The black knight is a much better piece than the white bishop and so exchanging it seems illogical. However, this is a case where the tactical considerations (i.e. Black is able to continue his initiative) outweigh the positional ones (i.e. the black knight is better than the black bishop).

\[
26 \text{b1} \text{ac8}
\]

If Black tries to get back into the endgame in the last note with 26...\( \text{xe2} \) White can improve with 27 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 28 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{f2} \) 29 \( \text{xd6} \) and the vulnerability of the h-pawn will make it difficult for Black to play for the advantage.

\[
27 \text{b5}?
\]

Now everything is again okay for Black. White should have played 27 \( \text{xd6} \) and if 27...\( \text{h4} \) 28 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 29 exf5 \( \text{xe2} \) (29...\( \text{xf5} \) 30 \( \text{b3+} \) \( \text{f7} \) 31 \( \text{xf7+} \) \( \text{xf7} \) 32 \( \text{g4} \) and White is much better) 30 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 31 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 32 \( \text{xf2} \) with a draw in prospect.

\[
27 \ldots \text{h4}
\]

This pawn cannot be captured (28 \( \text{hxh4} \) \( \text{g2} \)) and now the white position collapses.

\[
28 \text{e2} \text{g2} \\
29 \text{b3} \text{b3} \\
30 \text{axb3} \text{xf2} \\
31 \text{c3} \text{d8}
\]

Black is a pawn ahead and the passed h-pawn is very strong. The game is effectively decided.
the weakening ...g6) 16 ∆f3 蝮5 17 6b1 6h8 18 6g4 6ad8 19 6d3 b5 20 6xd7 6xd7 21 6f5 6d8 22 6e2 6g6 23 6d3 6g7 24 f5 6e5 25 fxg6 hxg6 26 ∆f4 6a8 27 6g5 6de7 28 h4 with a complex position, Lyrberg-Malaniuk, Lyngby 1991.

7 ... 0-0

32 6c4+ 6f7
33 6df1 6f4
34 6xf7+ 6xf7
35 6d5 6xf1+
36 6xf1+ 6g6
37 6f5+ 6h5

0-1

Game 27
Rodriguez-Miles
Palma de Mallorca 1989

8 6e1

With 8 6d2 White hopes to mount a kingside attack by freeing a path for his f-pawn to advance, e.g. 8... 6xe2 9 6xe2 d5 10 e5 6d7 11 f4 f5 (Black cuts across White's immediate plans) 12 exf6 6xf6 13 6f3 6e7 14 6d2 6ae8 15 6ae1 6b4 16 b3 6b6 (Black regroups his knight to d6 in order to keep an eye on the important central light squares e4 and f5) 17 6e2 6c8 18 6d3 6d6 19 6b1 a6 20 c3 6b5 21 6c2 6e7 22 a4 6c6 23 6bd2 6df5 24 6d3 6d6 25 6f2 6xf4 26 6xe6 6g6 27 6xe8 6xe8 28 6e1 6xe1+ 29 6xe1 6c6 with an equal endgame, Adams-Miles,

8 ... d5

Black’s plan in this variation is to head for a French Defence structure but with his queen’s bishop outside the pawn chain.

9 h3

9 exd5 would lead to a completely equal position. White must keep the tension to have any hope of obtaining the advantage.

9 ... h5

10 e5 d7

Also possible is 10...e4 11 dxe4 dxe4 12 h2 g6 with an unclear position.

11 d2 d6

12 b3 g6

13 e2 d7

14 e2 b4

15 xg6 fxg6

In principle, such recaptures should be made towards the centre, i.e. 15...hxg6. Here, however, Black frees his position considerably by playing ...fxg6 and the open f-file proves to be an excellent route for his counterplay.

16 c3 a6

Black is now preparing the standard thrust ...c5. The earlier piece exchange has left White with a passive bishop, which he now tries to exchange.

17 g5 a3

White’s bishop is slightly hampering his other pieces and so Black declines to allow the exchange.

18 c2

White is insistent. He clears the c1-square in order to be able to offer the bishop exchange once again.

18 ... d8

19 b4

Suddenly White completely changes his plan. The logical follow-up to his previous play would have been 19 c1 e7 20 g5 but then Black continues 20...xg5 21 xg5 c5 and the opposition of the white queen and black rook on the c-file allows Black to gain more time.
This is a very important sacrifice for Black. White's last move cut off the black bishop at the expense of acquiring serious weaknesses on the queenside, particularly, the c4-square. The best way for White to cover this weakness is by playing $\text{d2}$ and so Black immediately eliminates this knight. Note that the other knight, on e2, is four moves away from being able to attack the c4-square.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

It may seem strange to exchange off Black’s wandering bishop on a3, but this piece was not going to be out of play for ever (Black will play ...$\text{a5}$ one day). Meanwhile White wants to create threats by advancing on the kingside with $\text{h4}$ and $\text{f4}$ and his own bishop is in the way.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.

Black has excellent compensation for the exchange as White has unpleasant weaknesses on both sides of the board. Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a3 are temporarily out of play, but the closed nature of the position means that White is unable to co-ordinate his forces successfully before Black can regroup.
tries to eliminate one of them with 28 g3 Black can con-
tinue 28...e7 29 xf5 xf5 and the white f-pawn is very
vulnerable.

28 e7
29 ch1

29 ... a5!
White is preparing to create
threats on the kingside with h5
and so Black opens a line on the
queenside to activate his own
rook.

30 bxa5 a8
31 g3 xa5
32 h5 f7!

Black's plan is to meet 33
hxg6 with 33...xg6. White can
then capture on h7 and even
check on h8, but the black king
will run away to f7 and maybe
e7, where it will be difficult to
get at. Meanwhile the white
king will come under a heavy
attack from the black pieces.

33 b1 b6
34 xg6
Not 34 xf5 gxf5 when
White has no possibility of
breaking through anywhere and
Black has all the play.

34 ... xg6
35 xh7

35 ... f7!!
Miles commences a brilliant
king march which decides the
game in his favour. He has re-
alised that his king will be
safely placed on d7 and that
immediate attacking attempts
do not succeed, e.g. 35...ce3+
36 g1 g4 (36...h4 hoping
for 37 xg6 f3 mate, is a nice
try but unfortunately fails to 37
h8+! and White wins) 37
h8+ f7 38 b4 and the
threats to invade on f8 leave
Black with a lost position, e.g.
38 xg3 39 f8+ g6 40
h6+ gxh6 41 xh6 mate.

36 h5

The main point of Black's
play is revealed after 36 h8
f7!! (36...ce3+ 37 g1 fails
as in the previous note) 37 c8
after (37 b4+ d7 Black's
king is safe and his own attack
will quickly be decisive)
37...\(\text{Rce}3+\) 38 \(\text{Rg}1\) \(\text{Rh}4!!\)

(now this really does work)
39 \(\text{Rb}4+\) (39 \(\text{Rxf}6\) \(\text{Rf}3\) mate)
39...\(c5\) winning. White therefore brings his rook back to fulfill a defensive role.

36 ... \(\text{Rce}3+!\)
37 \(\text{Rg}1\) \(\text{Wg}4\)

38 \(\text{Rf}1\)

Others:
a) 38 \(\text{Rg}5\) \(\text{Rx}f4\) winning.
b) 38 \(\text{Rh}3\) \(\text{Rg}3\) 39 \(\text{Rg}3\) \(\text{Rh}5\) 40 \(\text{fxe}3\) \(\text{Ra}8\) and ...\(\text{Rh}8\) is coming.

38 ... \(\text{Rgx}3\)
39 \(\text{fxg}3\) \(\text{Wxg}3+\)

40 \(\text{Rf}1\) \(\text{Wf}3+\)
41 \(\text{Rg}1\) \(\text{Wg}4+\)

42 \(\text{Rh}2?\)

After this White is lost. He should have played 42 \(\text{Rhl}\) \(\text{Rh}5\) 43 \(\text{Rc}1\) (forced) 43...\(\text{Rg}6\) 44 \(\text{f}5\) and now Black can choose between 44...\(\text{exf}5\), planning ...\(\text{f}4\) and 44...\(\text{Rxf}5\) 45 \(\text{Rg}5\) \(\text{Rh}1!\) with a clear plus in either case.

42 ... \(\text{Rd}1+\)
43 \(\text{Rf}1\) \(\text{Rd}3+\)
44 \(\text{Rf}2\) \(\text{Rd}1+\)
45 \(\text{Rf}1\) \(\text{Wf}3+\)
46 \(\text{Rg}1\) \(\text{We}3+\)
47 \(\text{Rf}1\) \(\text{Rxc}3\)
The black attack is now too hot for White to handle.

48 \( \text{We}1 \) \( \text{Wd}3+ \)
49 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{Ab}5 \)
50 \( \text{Ah}3 \)

Or 50 \( \text{Ad}2 \) \( \text{Wg}6+ \) 51 \( \text{Ag}5 \)
\( \text{Ab}1 \) 52 \( \text{Axg}6 \) \( \text{Axel+} \) 53 \( \text{Af}2 \)
\( \text{Ad}1 \) 54 \( \text{Ac}2 \) \( \text{Axg}6 \) 55 \( \text{Ax}c3 \)
\( \text{Ax}d4 \) 56 \( \text{Ax}c7 \) \( \text{Ax}f4+ \) and Black wins.

50 ... \( \text{Wxd}4+ \)
51 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Ab}2+ \)
52 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{Wd}3+ \)
53 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{Wf}5+ \)
54 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{De}2 \)

0-1

Game 28
Almasi-Miles
Groningen 1994

1 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{Ac}6 \)
2 \( \text{Af}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
3 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{Af}6 \)
4 \( \text{Ac}3 \) \( \text{Ag}4 \)
5 \( \text{De}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \)
6 \( \text{h}3 \)

White is planning to advance with \( \text{d}5 \) and this can also be played immediately, e.g. 6 \( \text{d}5 \)

exd5 7 exd5 \( \text{Ax}f3 \) and now:

a) 8 \( \text{gxf}3! \) \( \text{Df}5 \) 9 \( \text{De}5 \) \( \text{De}7 \)
10 \( \text{Wd}2 \) 0-0 11 0-0-0 \( \text{c}5 \) 12 \( \text{Dg}1 \) \( \text{De}8 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{Dd}7 \) 14 \( \text{De}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}5?! \) (this allows Black to consolidate his position on the kingside and so White should prefer instead 15 \( \text{h}4 \), which keeps his kingside build-up flexible) 15...\( \text{Df}6 \) 16 \( \text{Dg}5?! \)
\( \text{Wd}7 \) 17 \( \text{Wd}3 \) \( \text{Ab}5 \) (Black cleverly provokes White into advancing his queenside pawns to provide targets) 18 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{Wa}4 \) 19 \( \text{Df}1 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 20 \( \text{Wb}3 \) \( \text{Wxb}3 \) 21 \( \text{axb}3 \) \( \text{Ac}7 \) and Black has a small edge in the endgame, Timoshenko-Miles, Moscow 1990.

b) 8 \( \text{Ax}f3 \) \( \text{De}5 \) 9 \( \text{De}2 \) \( \text{De}7 \)
10 \( \text{De}3 \) (unless White is prepared to unbalance the position by committing his king to the queenside, he is unlikely to obtain an advantage, e.g. 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \text{De}3 \) \( \text{Df}7 \) 12 \( \text{Wd}2 \) \( \text{Dg}6 \)
13 \( \text{Db}5 \) \( \text{Df}6 \) 14 \( \text{Dd}4 \) \( \text{Ee}8 \) 15 \( \text{c}3 \)
\( \text{De}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{Ax}d4 \) 17 \( \text{Ax}d4 \) \( \text{Df}5 \)
18 \( \text{Ac}3 \) \( \text{Ac}5 \) and Black has a comfortable game, Grünfeld-
Miles, Biel 1995) 10...0-0 11 f4 \( \text{\#d7} \) 12 \( \text{\#d2} \) \( \text{\#c5} \) 13 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#d7} \) (this leaves Black cramped and a better plan is 13...\( \text{\#e8} \) when Black can follow up with ...\( \text{\#f8} \) and the d7-square is left free for the f6-knight to use, e.g. 13...\( \text{\#e8} \) 14 0-0-0 \( \text{\#f8} \) and Black has the options of bringing a knight to e4 or taking the initiative on the queenside with ...a6 and ...b5) 14 0-0-0 \( \text{\#e8} \) 15 \( \text{\#d4} \) \( \text{\#d8} \) 16 \( \text{\#h1} \) \( \text{\#xh1} \) 17 \( \text{\#xh1} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 18 g4 \( \text{\#xh1}+ \) 19 \( \text{\#xh1} \) h6 20 h3 a6 21 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#e7} \) 22 \( \text{\#xe7} \) \( \text{\#xe7} \) 23 b4 and White has a small advantage in the endgame, Dlugy-Miles, USA Ch 1989.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
6 \ldots \text{\#h5} \\
7 \text{\#d5} \text{exd5} \\
8 \text{exd5} \text{\#xf3} \\
9 \text{\#xf3} \text{\#e5} \\
10 \text{\#e2} \text{\#e7}
\end{array}
\]

White is hoping to create pressure against the black queenside by bringing his rook to b4.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
15 \text{\#a4} \\
16 \text{\#a3}
\end{array}
\]

16 \( \text{\#b4} \) b5 17 axb6 cxb6 was an alternative. With the text White is planning the advance b4-b5 and Black must act quickly.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
16 \ldots \text{\#g5}!\
\end{array}
\]

Miles finds a very aggressive plan based on allowing his queenside to become seriously compromised in order to obtain dark-square play in the centre.
and on the kingside. A solid alternative was 16...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textax}}e8 17 b4 \textit{\textbf{\textdd}}d7.}

17 \textit{\textbf{\textax}}xc5
After 17 f4 \textit{\textbf{\textax}}f6 White has weakened himself along the e-file.

17 ... \textit{\textbf{\textdx}}c5
18 \textit{\textbf{\textd}}e4 \textit{\textbf{\textd}}e7
19 \textit{\textbf{\textxc}}c3 \textit{\textbf{\textxe}}8
The immediate 19...b6 is bad for Black after 20 axb6 cxb6 21 d6 White cannot now capture on c5 as 20 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}xc5? \textit{\textbf{\textax}}xc5 21 \textit{\textbf{\textax}}xc5 \textit{\textbf{\textwe}}7 hits c5 and e2. However this pawn will prove indefensible for Black in the long run and so he must turn his attention to the kingside.

20 \textit{\textbf{\textff}}3

20 ... \textit{\textbf{\textdd}}6
Another way to play the position was 20...\textit{\textbf{\textde}}5 21 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}xc5 \textit{\textbf{\textax}}xc5 22 \textit{\textbf{\textxc}}c5 \textit{\textbf{\textwe}}7 23 \textit{\textbf{\textcc}}3 \textit{\textbf{\textad}}8 when Black is a pawn down but has good control of the dark squares. However, Miles is more ambitious.

21 \textit{\textbf{\textxc}}c5 \textit{\textbf{\textwh}}4

22 \textit{\textbf{\textbd}}b7 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}5
23 \textit{\textbf{\textbb}}3 \textit{\textbf{\textdf}}4
Although Black is two pawns down, the white forces are scattered and Black has dangerous play on the kingside. The immediate threat is ...\textit{\textbf{\textde}}xh3+. White may be able to consolidate his position with very accurate play, but the practical difficulties are immense.

24 g3!
An example of the difficulties facing White can be seen with the variation 24 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}1 \textit{\textbf{\textdd}}4! 25 \textit{\textbf{\textxe}}8+ \textit{\textbf{\textxe}}8 26 \textit{\textbf{\textwd}}2 \textit{\textbf{\textxf}}2+ 27 \textit{\textbf{\textix}}f2 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}1+ and the white queen goes. Almasi suggests that White would do better to defend with 24 \textit{\textbf{\textgd}}4 h5 25 \textit{\textbf{\textdd}}7 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}7 26 \textit{\textbf{\textcc}}6.

24 ... \textit{\textbf{\textwh}}xh3

25 d6?
This natural move appears to be completely crushing, but Almasi has overlooked a fiendish trap. Instead 25 \textit{\textbf{\textcc}}5 \textit{\textbf{\textad}}8 leaves Black with compensation but 25 \textit{\textbf{\textde}}3! would have placed
the onus on Black to justify his bold attacking concept, e.g. 25...\textit{ab}8 26 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 27 \textit{gxf}4 \textit{e}7 28 \textit{c}5 and White consolidates.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

25 \textit{e}6!!

With the rook about to enter the fray on h6 Black obtains a decisive attack.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

26 \textit{dxc}7

At first sight it looks as though 26 \textit{d}7 leaves Black with a hopeless position but Miles had prepared the brilliant counter 26...\textit{d}8!.

\begin{center}
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\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Then after 27 \textit{xd}8 (if in-

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

stead 27 \textit{e}1 then 27...\textit{h}6 28 \textit{gxf}4 \textit{g}6+ 29 \textit{g}4 \textit{xg}4+ 30 \textit{w}xg4 \textit{w}xg4+ 31 \textit{g}3 \textit{w}d7 32 \textit{xd}8 \textit{xb}2 leaves Black with a winning endgame) 27...\textit{h}6 White gets mated, e.g. 28 \textit{e}1 \textit{w}h2+ 29 \textit{fl} \textit{h}1+ 30 \textit{xe}1 \textit{h}1 is mate.

26 ... \textit{xc}7

27 \textit{wd}7 \textit{ae}8!

28 \textit{e}3

The back rank tricks continue after 28 \textit{wc}7 \textit{wxf}1+ 29 \textit{xf}1 \textit{e}1 mate.

28 ... \textit{xe}3

29 \textit{wxh}3 \textit{zh}3+

30 \textit{g}2 \textit{xf}3

0-1

Black emerges a piece ahead.
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Game 29
Ligterink-Miles
Wijk aan Zee 1984

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1 & e4 \\
2 & d3 \\
3 & d4 \\
4 & c3 \\
5 & b5 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
6 \( \text{bxc6+ bxc6} \)

The position is unbalanced and this promises an interesting middlegame battle. White has good control of the centre and the better pawn structure but Black has a very flexible position with the bishop pair and a useful open line on the queenside.

7 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \)

8 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{e}6 \)

9 \( \text{g}4 \)

Once White has forced the bishop to retreat, Black will find it difficult to castle quickly on the kingside as this will be met with a quick h4-h5 and a dangerous attack. However, this advance also has its negative side. Having advanced the g-pawn, White is unlikely to want to castle on the kingside himself but Black has a ready-made attack along the b-file if the white king ends up on c1. However, quiet play promises little, e.g.

a) 9 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \text{g}4 \) (it makes little sense to expand like this when the king is already committed to the kingside so more logical is 11 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 12 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{wb}8 \) 13 b3 \( \text{wb}7 \) 14 \( \text{fe}1 \) d5 15 e5 \( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{b}1 \) a5 17 c3 c5 and Black has good play on the queenside, Verőci-Mohr, Belgrade 1988) 11...\( \text{g}6 \) 12 e5 \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) d5 14 \( \text{a}4 \) c5 15 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 16 dx5 \( \text{xc5} \) 17 c4 f5 (Black exploits White’s advances on the kingside) 18 g5 \( \text{h}5 \) 19 \( \text{fd}1 \) c6 (White has managed to keep the kingside closed but Black has the advantage on all areas of the board) 20 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 21 h4 d4 22 \( \text{d}3 \) c5 and Black stands well, as in Ionescu-Tomescu, Drobeta 1993.

b) 9 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 10 \( \text{f}4 \) 0-0 11 \( \text{ad}1 \) h6 12 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 13 \( \text{we}3 \) \( \text{wb}6 \) (Black avoids a trick which remains in the position for the next few moves, viz. 13...\( \text{xb2} \) ? 14 \( \text{b1} \) and now 14...\( \text{xc2} \) 15 \( \text{fc1} \) traps the black queen, while 14...\( \text{a}3 \) is met by 15 \( \text{d}5 \)! and White wins
106 1 e4 \( \square c6 \) 2 \( \square f3 \) \( d6 \)

a piece) 14 \( \square h1 \) \( \square xf3 \) 15 gxf3 \( \square h7 \) (now Black really does threaten the b-pawn) 16 b3 d5 17 \( \square a4 \) \( \square a5 \) 18 \( \square g1 \) \( \square d7 \) 19 \( \square d3 \) \( \square d6 \) with a balanced position, Neumark-Hauke, West Germany 1988.

9 ... \( \square g6 \)

10 \( \square g5 \)

Or 10 \( \square h4 \) d5 11 \( \square xg6 \) hxg6 12 \( \square g5 \) \( \square e7 \) 13 \( \square xf6 \) \( \square xf6 \) 14 0-0-0 \( \square g5+ \) 15 \( \square b1 \) \( \square d6 \) 16 \( \square a4 \) \( \square b4 \) 17 b3 \( \square b5 \) 18 \( \square d3 \) \( \square b8 \) and Black has good play, S. Salov-Klinger, Zurich 1993.

10 ... \( \square e7 \)

11 0-0-0

Others:

a) 11 \( \square e3 \) encouraged Black to find an unusual plan in Matulovic-Radlovacki, Tivat 1995, e.g. 11 ... \( \square d7 \) (11...\( \square b8 \) would be a more normal continuation) 12 \( \square xe7 \) \( \square xe7 \) 13 0-0-0 \( \square b6 \) 14 \( \square d2 \) f6 (Black hopes, at the cost of leaving himself with a very poor pawn structure, to contain the white initiative by building a strong-point on e5) 15 f4 0-0 16 \( \square e2 \) e5 17 \( \square c3 \) \( \square ab8 \) 18 dxe5 \( \square xe5 \) 19 fxe5 dxe5 20 \( \square h f1 \) \( \square f7 \) 21 b3 g6 22 \( \square b1 \) \( \square a4 \) 23 \( \square g3 \) \( \square c5 \) 24 \( \square f3 \) \( \square f e 8 \) 25 \( \square e1 \) \( \square a3 \) 26 \( \square d3 \) \( \square c4 \) 27 \( \square f2 \) (White goes astray in the face of Black's continuing pressure; 27 \( \square d2 \) was the only move and left the position unclear) 27...\( \square f8 \) 28 \( \square a7 \) \( \square xd3 \) 29 \( \square xf8+ \) \( \square xf8 \) 30 bxa4 \( \square xe2 \) 31 \( \square c1 \) \( \square b4+ \) 32 \( \square a1 \) \( \square b8 \) 33 \( \square xb8+ \) \( \square xb8 \) 34 \( \square b1 \) \( \square d8 \) 35 \( \square b3 \) \( \square c4 \) 0-1.

b) 11 \( \square xf6 \) \( \square xf6 \) 12 0-0-0 \( \square b8 \) 13 \( \square e3 \) \( \square b6 \) 14 h4 h5 (this demonstrates why Black should not be too anxious to commit his king to the kingside in this variation) 15 g5 \( \square e7 \) 16 \( \square d2 \) d5 17 \( \square b3 \) dxe4 18 \( \square xe4 \) 0-0 (although Black's pawn structure is very poor it is difficult for White to keep the active black forces under control) 19 \( \square c5 \) \( \square b5 \) 20 \( \square c3 \) \( \square fd8 \) 21 \( \square h e 1 \) a5 22 a4 \( \square b 4 \) 23 \( \square e 3 \) \( \square ab8 \) 24 \( \square d 3 \) \( \square c 4 \) and Black retains a very active position, Weiss-Sommerbauer, Austria 1993.

c) 11 e5 \( \square d 5 \) 12 \( \square xd5 \) cxd5 13 \( \square xe7 \) \( \square xe7 \) (White's play has only developed Black's pieces for him and strengthened his centre) 14 0-0-0 c5 15 exd6 \( \square xd6 \) 16 dxc5 \( \square xc5 \) 17 \( \square d 4 \) \( \square c 8 \) 18 h4 h5 (this move again demonstrates why Black should defer kingside castling for as long as possible) 19 \( \square h 3 \) \( \square c 4 \) 20 \( \square d 2 \) hxg4! 21 \( \square c 3 \) \( \square xa2 \) 22
12 $f4$

Others:

a) 12 $h4$?! $\text{x}e4$! is now strong as 13 $\text{xe}4$ can be safely met by 13... $\text{xe}4$.

b) 12 $\text{xf}6$ $\text{xf}6$ 13 $h4$ $h5$ 14 $g5$ $e7$ 15 $d2$ 0-0 16 $c4$ $e8$ (Black wants to play ...$d5$, but if he does so immediately, the reply 17 $e5$, attacking $c6$ will be awkward) 17 $f4$ $d5$ 18 $e5$ $b4$ 19 $f5$ $\text{ex}f5$ 20 $\text{ex}f5$ $h5$ $xh5$ $c3$ 22 $bxc3$ $c5$ (both kings are exposed but the white one proves to be easier to get at) 23 $h1$ $e4$ 24 $d1$ $e6$ 25 $f4$ cxd4 26 cxd4 $e8$ 27 $d2$ (White already has to run for cover) 27... $e7$ 28 g6 $xg6$ 29 $xg6$ $b4$ 30 $e2$ $c4$+ 31 $e3$ $c3$+ 32 $f2$ $xf4$+ 33 $xf4$ $d2$+ 34 $e2$ $f8$+ 0-1 Jordan-Miles, Melbourne 1991.

12 ... $b8$!

This method of activating the queen is very typical for this variation.

13 $b1$ $b4$
White thinks he has found a clever method of dealing with the threat against his knight on c3 but this is, in fact, a blunder which loses immediately.

15 ... \textit{Wxc3!}

The black queen is trapped, but there is a simple resource.

16 \textit{Qxe4}

17 \textit{Qe1}

17 \textit{Qxc3} \textit{Qxc3+} regains the queen and Black has an extra piece.

The black queen is still trapped but White is unable to exploit this, e.g. 18 \textit{Qd3} (or 18 h4 \textit{Qd2+!} 19 \textit{Qxd2} \textit{Qxb3}+ 20 axb3 \textit{Qxb3}+ 21 \textit{Qa1} \textit{Qa3+}) 18...\textit{Wc4} and the queen escapes.

Game 30

Kharlov-Minasian

Moscow 1991

1 \textit{e4} \textit{Qc6} 2 \textit{Qf3} d6

White can try 2 \textit{Qc3}, offering a Vienna Game after 2...e5. Black can then take up White’s offer, decline with 2...e6 reaching a position discussed in chapter six (page 156), or even try 2...d6 3 d4 \textit{Qf6} 4 f4 (the only independent try) 4...e5 5 dxe5 \textit{Qg4!?} with unclear play, e.g. 6 \textit{Qd2} dxe5 7 f5 \textit{Qb4} 8 \textit{Qxd8+} \textit{Qxd8} 9 \textit{Qd3} \textit{Qd4} 10 \textit{Qge2} \textit{Qxe4!?} Klinger-Mestrovic, Sarajevo 1988.

2 ... d6

3 d4 \textit{Qf6}

4 \textit{Qbd2}

White deploys his pieces in a quiet but solid fashion. He lends support to the f3-knight (anticipating a ...\textit{Qg4} pin) and prepares to consolidate his central position with c3.

An active alternative, if White wants to avoid the standard 4 \textit{Qc3}, is 4 d5 \textit{Qb8} 5 \textit{Qc3} g6 (5...\textit{Qg4} is another perfectly reasonable continuation) 6 \textit{Qg5}
\( \text{g4} \) 7 \( \text{wd2!?} \) (an aggressive plan from White who wants to castle quickly and launch an attack) 7...\( \text{xf3} \) 8 gxf3 \( \text{bd7} \) 9 0-0-0 c6 10 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{xh6} \) 12 \( \text{wh6} \) \( \text{b6} \)

13 \( \text{h3} \) (White continues very actively, ignoring the threat to his f-pawn) 13...\( \text{e5} \) (better than 13...\( \text{xf2} \) 14 \( \text{hf1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 15 f4) 14 \( \text{hg1} \) \( \text{xf2}! \) (now that White has been forced to waste time with his king's rook, it is less dangerous for Black to accept this sacrifice) 15 f4 \( \text{c4} \) 16 e5 \( \text{h5} \) (White has a strong initiative, but his centre is collapsing) 17 exd6 \( \text{xf4} \) 18 d7+ \( \text{d8} \) 19 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xb2}! \) 20 \( \text{xxb2} \) \( \text{b4}+ \) 21 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 22 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e1}+ \) 23 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{b4}+ \) 24 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{d4}+ \) 25 \( \text{b1} \) f5 26 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{d1}+ \) 27 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 28 \( \text{h5} \) c5! 29 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{xb7}+ \) 30 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{h1}+ \) 0-1 Rohde-Miles, Chicago 1990. Black has defended the a8-rook, so 31...gxh5 will win easily.

4 ... \( \text{g4} \)
14 \( \text{wc2} \) (Black’s chances were clearly illustrated in the game Ostrowski-Przeworsnik, Mikolajki 1991, e.g. 14 \( \text{wd1} f5 \) 15 exf5 exf5 16 \( \text{wc2} f6 17 \text{wd3} eae8 18 f1 e8h8 19 \text{b3} f4 20 d2 e5 21 dxe5 dxe5 22 b4 d8 23 d4 d8 24 e1 f3 25 g3 xg3 26 e7 \( \text{wx} b2 27 f5 cxe7 28 b1 c5 29 c5 0-1 \) 14 \( \text{f5} \) 15 exf5 exf5 16 b3 c5 17 c5 dxe5 18 c5 d3 19 e3 d4 20 b1 e2 21 c3 (Black regains his pawn; if 21 dxe2, then 21...f4) 21...wcx3 22 bxc3 d1 23 d3 f4 24 a3 f6d8 25 edx8+ edx8 26 b4 e2 27 e4 f3 28 gxf3 xfx3 29 c3 d3 30 edx1 edx1 with a drawn endgame, Wahls-Miles, Biel 1990.

5 ... e6 6 d3 d5

As in previous examples, Black is heading for a French Defence with his bishop outside of the pawn chain.

7 e5 d7

8 h3

8 0-0 f6 (Black does not have the thrust \( ...c5 \) immediately available, so this is the natural way to attack the centre) 9 exf6 dxf6 10 h3 h5 11 d3 0-0-0 12 b5 d8 13 a4 d6 14 b4 g5 15 xg5 dxe6 dxe6 16 b5 d8 17 dxe5 h8g8 (17...dxe5 18 dxex5 was about equal but Black prefers to build up his position) 18 f3 e8 19 a7 dxb5 20 b1 a6 21 c4 dxe5 22 dxe5 dxe5 23 b2 d4 24 b1 f4 25 e4 d3 and Black stands well, Yudasin-Minasian, (20-minute game) Tilburg 1993.

8 ... h5

9 f1 f6

10 g3?!

White sees that he can displace the black king by sacrificing a pawn, but his compensation turns out to be insufficient. Better was 10 g4 f7 11 e2 with a balanced position.

10 ... xfx3

11 xf3 exe5

12 h5+
This looks very dangerous for Black but he does in fact win a pawn in relative safety.

12 ... \( \text{He7} \)

Not however 12...g6? 13 \( \text{Ax}g6+ \text{hxg6} \) 14 \( \text{Wxg6+ \text{He7} } \) 15 \( \text{Ag5}+ \) and now 15...\( \text{Fd6} \) might not be so bad if Black was merely losing his queen, but unfortunately 16 \( \text{Af5} \) is checkmate.

13 dxe5

13 \( \text{Ag5+ Af6} \) 14 dxe5 \( \text{Axe5} \) simply transposes back to the game.

13 ... \( \text{Axe5} \)

14 \( \text{Ag5+ Af6} \)

15 0-0-0

15 \( \text{He2 Fd7} \) 16 \( \text{Wh4 h6} \) 17 \( \text{He3} \) was another way for White to play but the two central pawns provide an excellent barrier for the black king.

15 ... \( \text{Dd7!} \)

This neat move allows Black to complete his development with ...\( \text{Ff8} \) and ...\( \text{Cc8} \) after which White will have nothing for the pawn. White has no good way to prevent this regrouping and so the game is essentially decided.

17 ... \( \text{He7} \)

18 \( \text{Axf6 gxf6} \)

18...\( \text{Ax}d3+ \) 19 \( \text{Ax}d3 \) gxf6 was also very good for Black.

19 \( \text{Wh5 f5} \)

Black avoids the simple trap 19...dxe4?? 20 \( \text{Bb5}. \)

20 \( \text{Gg3 Fg8} \)

16 \( \text{Wh4 h6} \)

17 \( \text{He4!?} \)

17 \( \text{Axf6 Fxf6} \) and 17 \( \text{He3} \)

\( \text{Ax}d3+ \) 18 \( \text{Ax}d3 \) \( \text{Dd6} \) leave White with virtually nothing for his pawn.

21 \( \text{Bb1 Ff8} \)

22 \( \text{Cc2 Fd6} \)

23 \( \text{We2 f4} \)

24 \( \text{Wb5+ Cc8} \)

25 \( \text{Ee2 a6} \)

26 \( \text{Wa4 Cc4} \)

27 \( \text{Dd4 Ab6} \)

28 \( \text{Wb3 Ff6} \)

29 \( \text{Dh3 e5} \)

30 \( \text{Af5 e4} \)

It is bad enough being a pawn down for nothing, but facing
two huge central pawns makes White's task hopeless.

31 g4 fxg3
32 hxg3

Black manages to avoid 32...\textit{xf7}? 33 \textit{xd6+ xxd6} 34 \textit{xe4!}, when White has chances to save the game, and the more drastic 32...\textit{gxg3}? 33 \textit{e7+}.

Black now won easily after 33 \textit{xd6+ xd6} 34 \textit{b4 xf2} 35 \textit{g7 hd8} 36 \textit{d4 xd4} 37 cxd4 \textit{c4} 38 \textit{e1 d2+} 39 \textit{c1 f3} 40 \textit{d1 e8} 41 \textit{g2 f6} 42 \textit{b3 c6} 43 \textit{c2 f4} 44 \textit{c3 h4} 45 \textit{g3 g5} 46 \textit{h1 e3} 47 \textit{c2 f4} 48 \textit{e1 f3} 49 \textit{g6 xel} 50 \textit{xe8 f3} 51 \textit{d3 e4!} 52 \textit{g6 e7} 0-1.
In this chapter we consider White plans which delay c4 or avoid it entirely. Broadly speaking, White can adopt three different approaches:

1) 2 d5 e5
Here White plays what could be described as a ‘mirror-image’ Alekhine’s Defence. He gains time and space in the centre, but must be careful not to become too carried away with thoughts of kicking the black knight around. Black remains solid and must be on the look-out for opportunities to exploit the slight dark square weaknesses which often appear in the white position.

2) 2 f3 d5 3 c4
With this sequence White transposes directly into the Chigorin Defence (1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6), but Black has side-stepped the dangerous 3 c3 line and obliged White to play the less testing 3 f3. White will usually obtain a strong centre and the bishop pair at the expense of a broken pawn structure and a slight lack of development. This unbalancing of the position ensures a dynamic middlegame.

3) 2 d3 d5 3 g3
This is not a critical test of Black’s opening. White develops quietly and hopes to break open the centre with c4 at a later date. However, Black can generate swift play with a combination of ...g4, ...d7 and ...0-0-0 and can look to the future with confidence.

Game 31
Lukacs-O’Donnell
Budapest 1991

1 d4 e6
2 d5 e5
3 f4
4...e5 has no independent significance since White’s best move is 5 dxe6. For a misguided attempt by White to avoid this simple transposition see the game Weinitschke-Bogoljubow, given in the introduction.

5 dxe6

5 fxe6

Of course, Black would not enter into this combative opening at all if he were inclined to play 5...dxe6 here. After 6 \( \text{Wx}d8+ \text{Wx}d8 \) 7 \( \text{f}3 \) Black’s...
position is sound but quite devoid of energy.

After the recapture by the f-pawn, the pawn structure is unbalanced and Black looks for counterchances not only along the key g1-a7 diagonal, but also on the half open f-file.

6 \( \text{d} \text{f} 3 \)

Or:

a) 6 \( \text{d} 3 \text{c} 5 \text{g} 3 \text{d} 6 8 \text{h} 4 \)
(White chooses an aggressive plan but the black position is too solid to be disrupted by such early violence) 8...\( \text{d} 7 \text{h} 5 \text{f} 8 \text{d} 2 \text{e} 7 \text{c} 3 \text{c} 6 \text{e} 2 \text{h} 6 13 0-0-0 0-0-0 14 \text{f} 3 \text{d} 7 15 \text{h} 4 \text{f} 6 16 \text{e} 5 \text{d} 5 17 \text{exd} 6 \text{cxd} 6 18 \text{xd} 5 \text{xd} 5 19 \text{c} 4 \text{xf} 3 20 \text{xf} 3 \text{f} 5 21 \text{h} 1 \text{b} 8 \) with a balanced position, Ballmann-Bus, Odessa 1990.

b) After 6 e5 Black could consider the immediate 6...d5, when 7 exd6 \( \text{xd} 6 \) leaves Black with better development and the white f-pawn rather exposed. These factors would easily compensate for the weak pawn on e6. Instead, in the game Miralles-Maeser, Switzerland 1994, Black delayed his central counter too long, viz. 6...\( \text{c} 5 \) 7 \( \text{f} 3 \text{h} 6 8 \text{d} 3 \text{h} 4 \) 9 \( \text{g} 3 \text{xf} 3+ 10 \text{xf} 3 \text{e} 7 11 \text{d} 2 \) and now 11...d5 lost a pawn after 12 exd6 cxd6 13 \( \text{b} 5+ \text{d} 7 14 \text{xb} 7 \text{d} 8 15 \text{xd} 7+ \text{xd} 7 16 \text{a} 8+ \) and White won easily.

However best of all, and certainly consistent with the double-edged nature of the entire opening is 6...\( \text{c} 5 7 \text{f} 3 \text{h} 6 8 \text{d} 3 0-0 9 \text{g} 3 (9 \text{xd} 6 \text{hx} 6 10 \text{c} 3 \text{b} 6 \) is unclear) 9...b6 10 \( \text{c} 4 \) (otherwise Black gains a smooth development with ...\( \text{b} 7 \) 10...\( \text{a} 6 ! \) and if now 11 \( \text{xa} 8 \text{xa} 8 \) Black’s attacking chances more than outweigh his small material investment.

6 ... \( \text{c} 5 \)

7 \( \text{c} 3 \)

7 e5 transposes into 6 e5 \( \text{c} 5 7 \text{f} 3 \)

7 ... \( \text{h} 6 ! \)

A solid alternative is 7...d6 8 \( \text{a} 4 \text{b} 6 \) (surely it is better for Black to play 8...\( \text{b} 4+ 9 \text{c} 3 \text{a} 5 \) when if White wants to gain the bishop pair he is obliged to weaken his queenside with 9 b4) 9 \( \text{xb} 6 \text{axb} 6 10 \text{e} 5 \text{e} 7 11 \text{exd} 6 \text{cxd} 6 12 \text{d} 3 0-0 13 0-0 \text{h} 6 14 \text{d} 4 \text{e} 5 15 \text{fxe} 5 \text{exe} 5 16 \text{e} 2 \text{xf} 1+ 17 \text{xf} 1 \text{c} 6 18 \text{e} 3 \) with a small plus for White, Ruban-Ermenkov, Miskolc 1990.
8 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c6} \) without \( \text{2 c4} \)

Decentralising like this does not help White’s cause. Better is \( \text{8 e5} \) 0-0! (not \( \text{8...g4} \) 9 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 10 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xf1} \) 12 \( \text{xf1} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{g3} \) when Black has only helped White to develop all his pieces) 9 \( \text{d4} \) (9 \( \text{g3} \) d5 10 exd6 cxd6 11 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 12 c3 \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Balogh-Kriz, Czech Republic 1993) 9...\( \text{b6} \) 10 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f5} \) (a dynamic attempt by Black to exploit his lead in development is \( \text{10...d5} \)\( ? \) 11 exd6 e5 with compensation) 11 \( \text{d3} \) d5 with an equal game.

8 ... \( \text{b4+} \)

A standard finesse instead of the immediate 8...\( \text{e7} \), to underscore the decentralisation of White’s knight. If, in response, 9 \( \text{c3} \) then, of course, 9...\( \text{xc3+} \) 10 bxc3 0-0 and Black has achieved as much as he can hope for from this opening.

9 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e7} \)

10 \( \text{c4} \)

White is anxious to prevent Black from breaking in the centre (e.g. \( \text{10 g3 d5} \)), but this move weakens his dark squares and doesn’t do anything for his development. However, \( \text{10 f5?!} \) is doubtful, e.g. \( \text{10...exf5} \) 11 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{gxh6} \) 12 \( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{h4} \) 13 \( \text{e5} \) (13 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) + 14 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e7+} \) is good for Black) \( \text{13...0-0} \) and White is insufficiently well developed to exploit Black’s exposed king.

10 ... 0-0

11 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b6} \)

The fianchetto development of Black’s queen’s bishop is a common strategic motif here.

12 \( \text{f5} \)

White pushes forwards, but preferable would have been a more solid course with 12 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 13 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 14 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{h8} \) when the position is unclear.

12 ... \( \text{b4+} \! \! \! \)

Not 12...\( \text{xf5} \) 13 \( \text{d5+} \).

13 \( \text{c3} \)

Others are not attractive, e.g. 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd2+} \) 14 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{b7} \) or 13 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g4+} \) 14 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e5} \).
13 \ldots \textit{Wf6}
14 \textit{Le2} \textit{De5}

Black does well to avoid White's main idea, which was 14...exf5 15 \textit{Lxh6} (15 \textit{Wd5+ \textit{Lh8} 16 \textit{Wxa8} \textit{Lxc3+} 17 bxc3 \textit{Wxh3+} 18 \textit{Ld1 \textit{Wxa1} 19 exf5 \textit{Dxf5} 20 \textit{Wxe7} \textit{Dxe3+} 21 \textit{Ld2} \textit{De5} is terrible for White) 15...\textit{Lxc3+} 16 bxc3 fxe4 17 \textit{O-O} \textit{Ld6} (not 17...\textit{Gxh6} 18 \textit{Wd5+ \textit{Lxe6} 19 \textit{Wxa8} exf3 20 \textit{Dxf3}) 18 \textit{Wxd6} cxd6 19 \textit{Dc1!} exf3 20 \textit{Lxf3} \textit{Lb8} 21 \textit{Lxh8} \textit{Lh8} 22 \textit{Lxf8+} \textit{Dxf8} 23 \textit{Da3} when Black is completely hamstrung in the endgame.

15 0-0

After 15...\textit{Dc3} 16 \textit{Dxh6} \textit{Gxh6} 17 \textit{Dxe5} \textit{Wxe5} 18 \textit{Wxd7} \textit{Wxc3} 19 bxc3 exf5 20 \textit{Lxf5} \textit{Wxe4} 21 \textit{Lxf8+} \textit{Dxf8} 22 \textit{Wg4+ \textit{Wxg4} 23 \textit{Lxg4} Black has a tiny edge in the endgame. The text leads to complications which are soon followed by mass simplification.

16 bxc3 \textit{b7}

Black will now win a pawn but it is not enough to win the game.

23 \textit{Lxg4} \textit{Dxc4+}
24 \textit{Lxh2} \textit{Gxe8}
25 \textit{Lh5} \textit{Dxe6}
26 \textit{Df1} \textit{Dxe1}
27 \textit{Dxe1} \textit{Lxe2}
28 \textit{Lb8} \textit{a6}
29 \textit{Dc7} \textit{b5}
30 \textit{O-O} \textit{Gf7}
31 \textit{Lc1} \textit{Lc6}
32 \textit{h4} \textit{Ld7}
33 \textit{Dd1} \textit{Ld7}
34 \textit{Lxe5} \textit{Lc6+}

Game 32
Shestopoverov-Bus
Krasnodar 1991

1 \textit{d4} \textit{Lc6}
2 \textit{d5} \textit{Lxe5}
3 \textit{e4} \textit{e6}
4 \( \text{d}f3 \)

If White is reluctant to commit himself to 4 f4, then other options are:

a) 4 \( \text{d}d4 \text{g}6 5 \text{c}3 \text{b}6 6 \text{f}3 \text{b}7 7 \text{h}4 \text{e}5 8 \text{c}4 \) (not 8 \( \text{dxe5 c}5 \) 8...h5 9 \( \text{g}5 \text{xf6} \) 10 g3 a6 11 \( \text{h}3 \text{d}6 12 \text{d}1 \) c5 13 \( \text{e}3 \text{b}5 14 \text{e}2 \text{a}5+ 15 \text{c}3 \text{f}8 16 \text{d}2 \text{d}6 17 \text{f}3 \text{g}8 \) Messarius-Remmeke, Germany 1992. Following some exotic manoeuvring on both sides a fairly normal, and more or less equal, position has arisen. For further analysis of 4 \( \text{d}d4 \), see the game Tisdall-Jacobs in the introduction.

b) 4 \( \text{c}4 \) is dubious as it weakens the dark squares. Di Stefano-Rossi, Zurich 1988 provided a good example of why this is not a good idea: 4...\( \text{c}5 \) 5 \( \text{f}3? \text{g}4 6 \text{d}4 \text{xf2! 7 xf2} \text{f6}+ 8 \text{e}3 \text{e}5 \) and White is already hopelessly lost.

4...\( \text{xf3}+ \)

4...\( \text{f6} \) is also possible, e.g. 5 \( \text{e}2 \text{xf3+} \) (5...\( \text{c}5 \) 6 \( \text{c}3 \) a6 7 0-0 \( \text{g}4 \) 8 \text{h}3 \text{h}5 is far less convincing for Black, Sämisch-Nimzowitsch, Baden-Baden 1925) 6 \( \text{xf3 e}5 7 \text{e}3 \text{b}4+ 8 \text{c}3 \text{e}7 9 \text{d}2 \text{g}6 10 \text{c}4 \text{f}6 11 \text{c}3 0-0 12 \text{e}2 \text{b}4 13 \text{d}2 \text{d}6 14 \text{h}3 \text{e}8 15 \text{g}4 \text{f}6 16 \text{h}4 \text{e}7 17 0-0-0 \text{c}5 18 \text{g}1 \text{a}6 19 \text{g}5 \text{b}5 with counterplay as in Fishdick-Przewoznik, Dortmund 1992.

5 \( \text{xf3} \text{f6} \)

6 \( \text{c}2 \)

Trading queens with 6 \( \text{xf6} \text{xf6} \) 7 dxe6 fxe6 8 \( \text{c}3 \) gives Black wonderfully free development after 8...\( \text{c}5 \) followed by ...\( \text{e}5 \) and ...\( \text{d}6 \)

6...

7...\( \text{c}5 \)

8...\( \text{xf3} \text{e}5 \)

9...0-0... \( \text{a}6 \)

10...\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \)

11... \( \text{a}4 \)

Black has obviously emerged from the opening with no problems. The only question is when to time his freeing thrust with ...\( \text{f5} \).
11 ... f5
Black can also consider preparing this thrust with ...\( \text{d}e7 \) and ...0-0.
12 exf5 \( \text{x}f5 \\
13 \text{e}4 \text{xe}4
This gives White the bishop pair and leaves Black with a rather inflexible position. A better continuation is 13...\( \text{a}7 \), intending ...\( \text{f}6 \) and Black has equal chances.
14 \( \text{x}e4 \) \( \text{f}6 \\
15 \( \text{f}3 \) O-O \\
16 b4 \( \text{a}7 \\
17 c4 \( d4 \\
In spite of White's bishops and mobile queenside pawns, the activity of Black's one remaining bishop still gives him sufficient counterplay to hold the balance.
18 \( \text{a}3 \) b6 \\
19 a5 \( \text{f}b8 \\
20 g4
In this position, there is little more that White can achieve on the queen's flank, given that Black's bishop controls a1. He therefore tries to gain space on the other wing.
20 ... h6 \\
21 h4 e4
Just in time. This comes at a moment when White's bishop cannot retreat and still maintain its attack on e4.
22 \( \text{c}2 \\
If 22 \( \text{g}2 \), then 22...\( \text{g}4 \) 23 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{f}8 \), when Black has nothing to fear.
22 ... \( \text{d}7 \\
23 \( \text{d}1 \) bxa5 \\
24 \( \text{xa}5 \) \( \text{f}8 \\
25 \( \text{e}3 \) \( c3 \\
26 \( \text{b}1 \) \( fb8 \\
27 \( \text{a}4 \\
If White now had time to consolidate with \( \text{b}3 \) then he might be getting somewhere, but the general activity of Black's pieces suggests that he will always have a saving clause. This now arrives in the form of a tactical trick to force a drawn endgame.
27 ... \( \text{c}5 \\
28 \( \text{xc}5 \) dxc5
For many years the automatic move in this position was 6...e5 but then there came the gradual realisation that opening the position really did help to reinforce White’s advantage of the bishop pair. The modern move is the more restrained 6...e6, which actually does achieve Black’s ambition of hampering the free play of the white bishops.

Transposition to Chigorin’s Defence

Game 33
Piza-Novak
Bratislava 1991

1  d4  c6
2  f3  d5
3  c4  g4

4  cxd5  xf3
5  gxf3

For White’s other main continuation, 5 dxc6, see the next game.

5  ...  xd5
6  e3  e6
agonal.

Here is a brief summary of the alternatives:

a) 8 d2 0-0-0 9 f4 xf6+ 10 xdx1 f6 11 g2 e7 12 c1 b8 13 e2 f5 14 hd1 h6 15 f1 e7 16 e2 g5 17 a5 d7 18 h1 d6 19 c2 c6 20 cc1 d5 21 g2 f5 with an equal endgame, Dumit­trache-Atalik, Bucharest 1995.

b) 8 f4 xd1+ 9 xd1 f6 (9...0-0-0 10 d2 f6 11 b5 e7 12 e2 f5 13 ac1 e7 14 d3 b8 15 hg1 g6 16 a4 h6 17 c5 hg8 18 b3 g5 19 fxd5 hxg5 with a balanced position, Karpov-Miles, Bugojno 1986) 10 g2 0-0-0 11 e2 e7

12 e4 (12 d2 h6 13 b5 b8 14 a3 g5 15 fxd5 hxg5 16 ag1 f5 17 c2 h5 18 b3 d7 19 g7 20 g2 dh8 21 d3 f6 22 e4 fxe4+ 23 fxe4 h3+ 24 e3 g6 25 d2 h4 26 f2 f3+ 27 d3 g4 28 d1 h4 29 fl xh2 30 xg4 xe3+ 31 xe3 xg4+ 32 d3 e5 and Black went on to win, Brunner-Short, Solingen 1986.

8 ... ge7

The knight is developed here rather than on f6 in order to provide back-up for the black knight on c6. Black wants to castle queenside without having his entire pawn-front shattered by an inopportune xc6.

9 f4 h4
10 f3 0-0-0
11 d2

12 e4 (12 d2 h6 13 b5 b8 14 a3 g5 15 fxd5 hxg5 16 ag1 f5 17 c4 e7 18 f3 d5 19 e5 h7 20 e4 f6 21 f3 h6 22 c2 h4 23 a3 d6 and the weak h-pawn is a permanent headache for White, Bareev-Kamsky, Tilburg 1991) 12...xe4 13 xe4 h6 14 d2 g5 15 fxd5 hxg5 16 ag1 f5 17 c2 h5 18 b3 d7 19 g7 20 g2 dh8 21 d3 f6 22 e4 fxe4+ 23 fxe4 h3+ 24 e3 g6 25 d2 h4 26 f2 f3+ 27 d3 g4 28 d1 h4 29 fl xh2 30 xg4 xe3+ 31 xe3 xg4+ 32 d3 e5 and Black went on to win, Brunner-Short, Solingen 1986.

Black fails to appreciate the knife-edged nature of this situation and plays a safety move which in fact amounts to a loss of a vital tempo. The correct way to proceed here is with

11 ... b8?
immense and immediate force, thus 11...g5 12 fxg5 h6 13 gxh6 \( \textit{hxh6} \) when Black’s lead in development and ability to operate with tactical threats involving \( \ldots \text{cxd4}, \ldots \text{hg8} \) and \( \ldots \text{e5} \) give him plenty of compensation for the pawn.

A more testing line is 12 fxg5 h6 13 \( \text{e4} \) hxg5 14 \( \text{c1} \) when Black’s best is 14...e5, starting an immediate tactical firefight in the centre.

12 \( \text{e1} \)

White is now threatening to win quite effortlessly by concentrating his forces directly against the black king with moves such as \( \text{e4-c5} \) and \( \text{wb3} \). Black cannot stand idly by and watch his own slaughter. He must generate instant counterplay.

12 \( \ldots \) g5
13 fxg5

For his part White cannot ignore Black’s demonstration. After 13 \( \text{e4} \) gxf4 14 \( \text{c5} \) fxe3 15 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) White’s attack should not be sound.

13 \( \ldots \) \( \text{g8} \)
14 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d5} \) (D)
15 a3?

With the board in flames White now conceives an attacking strategy that is appropriately elephantine. White should take his life in his hands with the exchange sacrifice 15 \( \text{xc6} \) bxc6 16 \( \text{a4} \), following with \( \text{e2} \) and \( \text{c1} \) when Black is in extreme jeopardy.

15 \( \ldots \) h6
16 b4
16 \( \text{xc6} \) is still possible.
16 \( \ldots \) hxg5
17 b5 \( \text{ce7} \)
18 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{c8} \)

White has gone to immense lengths to establish his knight on c5, but now Black has managed to arrange plenty of defenders around his goal-mouth and his own counterattack is due to start.

19 a4 g4
20 \( \text{g2} \)
Preparing an exchange sacrifice which gains control of the dark squares and leaves White’s king displaced.

21 e4 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\)

22 \(\text{\textit{xg5}}\)

It is more than likely that White had been relying here on playing 22 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) when Black appears to lose a mass of material but then he has the cunning riposte 22...\(\text{\textit{e3!!}}\) 23 \(\text{\textit{xe3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) when the pin on the d-file means that it is White who loses material.

22 ... \(\text{\textit{b4+}}\)

23 \(\text{\textit{f1}}\) \(\text{\textit{wg5}}\)

24 exd5 exd5

For all practical purposes the game is decided. White’s position is so completely disorganised that it is merely a matter of time before Black’s forces gather for the decisive punch. Having missed his own chance to sacrifice the exchange White has to watch helplessly as Black’s counter sacrifice gathers momentum.

\begin{align*}
25 & \text{h4} & \text{\textit{f4}} \\
26 & \text{\textit{c2}} & \text{\textit{d6}} \\
27 & \text{h5} & \text{\textit{f5}} \\
28 & \text{h6} \\
\end{align*}

Instead of struggling on with 28 \(\text{\textit{g1}}\) which could be met by 28...\(\text{\textit{xd4}}\) 29 \(\text{\textit{b2}}\) \(\text{\textit{c5}}\) for example, White tries the hopelessly optimistic text.

\begin{align*}
28 & \ldots & \text{\textit{e3+}} \\
29 & \text{\textit{e2}} & \text{\textit{xd1}} \\
30 & \text{h7} & \text{\textit{xf2+}} \\
31 & \text{\textit{xd1}} & \text{\textit{xd4+}} \\
32 & \text{\textit{c1}} & 0-1 \\
\end{align*}

Game 34
Granda-Morozevich
Amsterdam 1995

1 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{d5}\) 
2 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{\textit{c6}}\) 
3 \(\text{\textit{f3}}\) \(\text{\textit{g4}}\) 
4 cxd5 \(\text{\textit{xf3}}\) 
5 dxc6

This is one of the oldest lines in this opening and was frequently employed against Chigorin. White foregoes the advantage of the bishop pair,
but hopes to avoid any damage to his pawn structure and also speculates on being able to gain time by advancing the central pawns to attack Black's queen's bishop. On the whole, though, Black's free piece play has generated very good Black results in this line.

5 ... \textit{\textbf{\text{\textcolor{red}{A}xc6}}}

6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}c3}} \textbf{\text{e6}}

As we have already noted in the introduction an interesting alternative is the gambit 6...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}f6}}

7 \textit{f3} (planning \textit{e4}) 7...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}5}} 8 \textit{dxe5} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}xd1+}} and whether White recaptures with king or knight Black proceeds with the plan of ...	extit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}d7}}, ...	extit{0-0-0}, ...	extit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}c5}}, and, if necessary, ...	extit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}h}e8} and ...	extit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}6}} when White's tardy development and straggling pawns give Black plenty of compensation.

12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}xd2}} 0-0 13 0-0 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a}6}} with a completely equal position, Gonzalez-I. Ivanov, Manresa 1993.

b) 7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}f4}} has also not served White particularly well. This bishop is probably needed to defend either c3 or d4. For example: 7...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}f6}} 8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}3}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b}4}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}b3}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}d5}} 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}g3}} 0-0 11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}d3}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}g5}}, was Teichmann-Chigorin, Cambridge Springs 1904. For full notes to this game, see the introduction.

Alternatively, 7...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}e7}} 8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}3}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}6}} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}3}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a}6}} 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}b3}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}e7}} 11 0-0-0 0-0 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}5}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}x}d5} 13 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}xd5}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}c8}} and Black had no cause for complaint, Teichmann-Chigorin, Berlin 1897.

7 ... \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}b4}}

8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}3}}

Another try here for Black is 8...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}5}}! as played in the game Pillsbury-Chigorin, St Petersburg 1896. However the pawn sacrifice 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{A}c4}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}xe}4} 10 0-0, as recommended by Pollock in 1896, is highly risky for Black.
See the introduction for further analysis of this game.

Black’s queen check here is typical of situations where White has played f3. The idea is to loosen White’s entire central and kingside pawn structure and to reposition Black’s queen on h5 where it can target the soft spot on f3.

9  g3

Nevertheless, also possible is 9...\textit{h}h5 10  e2 0-0-0 e.g. 11  g2 (11  d3  a5 12 0-0  b6 13 e5 \textit{e}7 14  e4 with an unclear position) 11...  c5 12 e5 \textit{e}7 13 0-0 f6 (Black has strong pressure against the white centre) 14 f4  xg2 15  xg2  b6 16  f2  h6 17  d2  f5 18  f2 h5 19  c1  b8 20  a4  d5 and Black’s firm control over the central light squares gives him excellent chances, Moiseenko-Kobaliya, St Petersburg 1995.

10  e2

10  g2 0-0-0 11 a3  c5 12 \textit{e}2  b6 13  f4  a5+ 14  d2  b5 15  c3  f6 16 a4  g5 17 e5  d5 18  xd5 xd5 (as with the previous example, Black has encouraged White to advance in the centre and can now hope to exploit the weaknesses thus created) 19  d2  g6 20  e3  a6 21 a5  a7 22 0-0 h5 23  c1  d7 24  f2 h4 Houshan-Wittmann, Lucerne Ol 1982. The white kingside is weak and the pawn on d4 is a target. Black has all the chances.

10 ... 0-0-0

Setting the evil trap 11 0-0? \textit{x}d4 12 \textit{x}d4  c5 winning White’s queen.

11  e3  f5

Although this implies the sacrifice of a pawn this thematic thrust against White’s central installations is much better times here than on move eight, where Chigorin originally tried it.

12  b3  xxc3+

13  bxc3  fxe4
126 1 d4 c6 without 2 c4

14 ♪xe6+ ♧d7
15 ♪xe4

15 ... ♦e8?!
Black can gain more effective counterplay with 15...♕f6 16 ♪e5 ♪f7 with ...♕f8 to come.

16 ♪d3
Now White’s queen is out of the firing line on the e-file.

16 ... ♦e7
17 c4 ♦f5
Black’s knight eyes the weak e3-square.

18 ♦f4 ♧a4
19 ♦f2
Black still has good counterplay as the white king will never be able to find a safe haven.

19 ... ♦hf8
20 h4 ♪g6
21 ♦ab1 ♤f6
Black hopes for 22 ♦e5 ♦xe5 23 dxe5 ♦xe5 threatening both ...♕xg3+ and ...♕xc5+. However, White can defend well against the immediate threats to d4 by means of the following subtle retreat.

22 ♧d1 ♧d7
23 d5 ♪e7
24 ♦b3 ♤c5+
25 ♦g2 ♧f7
26 ♪d2 ♦fe7

His control of the e-file and the weak dark squares in White’s camp still give Black good compensation for his pawn. Note that Black avoids 26...♕xc4? 27 ♦c3.

27 ♦g5 ♤e5
28 ♦f4 ♦e3+
Black gets carried away with his initiative. The logical conclusion to the game was
28...\textit{h}5e7 29 \textit{g}5 \textit{e}5 with a draw by repetition.

29 \textit{xe}3 \textit{xe}3
30 \textit{xe}3 \textit{xe}3
31 \textit{c}2

There is no need to give another pawn away. After 31...\textit{h}6 White would have had a hard time converting his pawn advantage to a win.

32 \textit{xh}7

Now White is doing very well.

32 ...
33 \textit{b}1 \textit{xc}4
34 \textit{c}1 \textit{b}5
35 \textit{c}2 \textit{c}5
36 \textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5
37 \textit{xc}5 \textit{b}7
38 \textit{g}4 \textit{b}6
39 \textit{c}2 \textit{a}4
40 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}5
41 \textit{h}5 \textit{d}6
42 \textit{e}4 \textit{b}5
43 \textit{g}5 \textit{e}5
44 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}4
45 \textit{c}2 \textit{d}4
46 \textit{h}6 \textit{gxh}6

Game 35
H. Olafsson-Hjartarson
Reykjavik 1995

1 d4 d5
2 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}6
3 c4 \textit{g}4

4 e3

Others:

a) 4 \textit{a}4 was favoured by Alekhine. 4...\textit{xf}3 gives White a choice of recaptures:

a1) 5 \textit{exf}3 e6 6 \textit{c}3 \textit{ge}7 (much stronger than 6...\textit{b}4
with which Colle lost to Alek­-
hine in two games from Paris
1925 and Baden-Baden 1925) 7
\( \text{e3} \) (7 cxd5 exd5 is fine for
Black) 7...g6 8 cxd5 exd5 9
0-0-0 \( \text{wd7} \) 10 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11
\( \text{g5} \) f6 12 \( \text{f4} \) 0-0-0 13 \( \text{he1} \)
\( \text{f5} \) 14 g3 \( \text{b8} \) with a complex
position, Katisonok-Kava­
lerov, Leningrad 1990.

a2) 5 gxf3 e6 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b4} \)

7 cxd5 (7 e3 \( \text{ge7} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) 0-0
9 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 10 f4 \( \text{h4} \) 11 0-0-0
\( \text{e7} \) 12 \( \text{b1} \) c6 13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{h8} \)
14 \( \text{b3} \) a5 was about equal, Ki.
Georgiev-Morozevich, Tilburg
1993) 7...exd5 8 a3 \( \text{xc3} \+ 9
bxc3 \( \text{ge7} \) 10 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 11 h4
(11 \( \text{f4} \) 0-0 12 e3 was a solid
alternative to this ambitious try)
11...0-0 12 h5 \( \text{wd6} \) 13 h6 g6 14
e4?! \( \text{e6} \) 15 \( \text{h3} \) f5 16 0-0-0!
\( \text{f6} \) 17 exd5 \( \text{xd5} \) 18 \( \text{c4} \)
\( \text{bd8} \) 19 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{wd6} \) 20 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{ed7} \)
21 \( \text{e1} \) a6 and Black stands
well, Malaniuk-Morozevich,
Alushta 1994.

b) 4 \( \text{c3} \) is likely to trans­
pose back to the text after 4...e6.

4 ... \( \text{e6} \)

5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b4} \)

Or 5...\( \text{f6} \) 6 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 7 \( \text{xf3} \)
\( \text{b4} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 9 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{e4} \)
10 \( \text{c1} \) 0-0 11 a3 \( \text{xc3} \) 12
\( \text{xc3} \) e5 13 cxd5 exd4 14 \( \text{c2} \)
\( \text{e7} \) 15 e4 c6 16 \( \text{c4} \) cxd5 17
exd5 \( \text{c8} \) 18 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c5} \) 19 \( \text{b3} \)
\( \text{a5} \) 20 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 21 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
22 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c5} \+ 23 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xd5} \)
24 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 25 \( \text{c7} \) d3 26
\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{b5} \) 27 b4 \( \text{e8} \) 28 \( \text{e1} \)
\( \text{f8} \) 29 \( \text{xe8} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 30 \( \text{xd3} \)
and the complications have re­
sulted in a drawn endgame,
Raicevic-Z. Nikolic, Vrnja­

6 \( \text{a3} \)

6 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{ge7} \) (6...\( \text{xf3} \) 7 gxf3
\( \text{ge7} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) 0-0 9 a3 \( \text{a5} \) 10
0-0-0 \( \text{b8} \) 11 \( \text{c2} \) dxc4 12
\( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 13 \( \text{xc3} \) b5 with a
useful initiative on the queen­
side although White’s bishops
could later prove to be a power­
ful force, Maherramzade-Kam­
inski, Halle 1995) 7 \( \text{e2} \) 0-0 8
0-0 a6 9 a3 \( \text{a5} \) 10 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 11
\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 12 \( \text{xc3} \) dxc4 13
\( \text{\(1 \text{d4 \&c6 without 2 \text{c4} \ 129\)}} \)

\( \text{\(\text{\&xc4 \&d5 14 \text{\&d3 \&f5 15 \&d2 \&g6 16 \&ac1 \&fd8 17 \&e1 \&e4\) with a firm hold on the central light squares, Ye Rongguang-Manor, Thessaloniki Ol 1988.} \)

\( \text{\(6 \ldots \&xc3+\)} \)

\( \text{\(7 \text{bxc3} \)} \)

\( \text{\(7 ... \&ge7\)} \)

\( \text{\(7...\&f6 8 \text{cx}d5 \text{ex}d5 9 \text{h3 \&h5 10 \text{c4 0-0 11 \&b2 \&e4 12 \&a4 a6 13 \&c2 \&g6 14 \&d3 \&e8 15 0-0 is playable for Black, Spraggett-Perovic, Vienna 1990. Black has a normal queenside position with his bishop outside the pawn chain.} \)} \)

\( \text{\(8 \text{cx}d5 \text{ex}d5\)} \)

\( \text{\(9 \text{c4}\)} \)

\( \text{\(\)With Black's queen's bishop so active, the two bishops are not such a huge plus in this situation, so White tries to make the most of his slight central pawn majority. 9 \&b1 should be met by 9...\&b8 while 9 a4 0-0 10 \&a3 \&e8 11 \&b5 \&g6 12 \&xc6 bxc6 13 \text{h3 \&f5 with sufficient control over the light squares to compensate for the weakened black queenside.} \)} \)

\( \text{\(9 \ldots 0-0\)} \)

\( \text{\(10 \&d3 \&g6\)} \)

\( \text{\(11 \text{h3}\)} \)

\( \text{\(11 \ldots \&xf3\)} \)

\( \text{\(12 \text{gxf3}\)} \)

\( \text{\(\text{White avoids the natural 12 \&xf3 on account of 12...dxc4 13 \&xc4 \&xd4 14 exd4 \&xd4 forking a1 and c4.} \)} \)

\( \text{\(12 ... \text{dxc4}\)} \)

\( \text{\(13 \&xc4 \&f6\)} \)

\( \text{\(\)Black has everything he wants from the opening. Although White, as so often, has a big pawn centre and two bishops against two knights, Black's development is far superior and he can start to pound White both on the central files and on the kingside where White's pawns are shattered.} \)

\( \text{\(14 \&f1 \&ce7\)} \)

\( \text{\(15 \&b2 \&ad8\)} \)

\( \text{\(16 \&d3 \&h4\)} \)

\( \text{\(17 \text{f4} c5\)} \)

\( \text{\(18 \&c1 \text{cxd4}\)} \)

\( \text{\(19 \&xd4\)} \)
Just as White’s bishops appear to be co-ordinating Black eliminates White’s hopes by sacrificing the exchange. In subsequent play Black’s agile knights prove superior.

19 ... \( \text{Axd4} \)
20 exd4 \( \text{Wxf4} \)
21 \( \text{Cc4} \) \( \text{Af3} \)
22 \( \text{Gg2} \) \( \text{Gg6} \)

23 \( \text{Xg6} \)
Not 23 \( \text{Wxf3} \) \( \text{Gh4+} \), but the text only increases Black’s power on the f-file.

23 ... fxg6
24 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Wg5+} \)

A pawn down and with a shattered position further resistance is futile.

25 \( \text{Ff1} \) \( \text{Dd2+} \)
26 \( \text{Ge1} \) \( \text{Xc4} \)
27 \( \text{Wxc4+} \) \( \text{Hh8} \)
28 \( \text{Ff1} \) \( \text{Wf4} \)

36 ... \( \text{Gg3} \)
37 \textit{\texttt{d}d4} \textit{\texttt{d}xh3+}
38 \textit{\texttt{g}g2} \textit{\texttt{w}h2+} 0-1

Game 36
Radulov-Lorenz
Bad Mergentheim 1989

1 \textit{\texttt{d}d4} \textit{\texttt{d}c6}
2 \textit{\texttt{f}f3} \textit{\texttt{d}5}
3 \textit{\texttt{g}3}

Of White's third move alternatives which side-step the main lines, the kingside fianchetto is the most testing. 3 \textit{\texttt{g}g5} would actively assist Black, since he can strike out at the white bishop with \ldots \textit{\texttt{f}6} at some moment. 3 \textit{\texttt{f}f4} \textit{\texttt{g}g4} 4 \textit{\texttt{e}3} \textit{\texttt{e}6} 5 \textit{\texttt{b}b5} \textit{\texttt{d}d6} followed by \ldots \textit{\texttt{g}ge7} is not dangerous.

A curiosity was the strange encounter Langeweg-Dückstein, Zurich 1975 which finished abruptly after 3 \textit{\texttt{f}f4} \textit{\texttt{g}g4} 4 \textit{\texttt{e}3} \textit{\texttt{e}6} 5 \textit{\texttt{b}b5} \textit{\texttt{d}d6} followed by \ldots \textit{\texttt{g}ge7} is not dangerous.

However subsequent analysis demonstrated that 8 \textit{\texttt{d}xc6} \textit{\texttt{d}xd2} 9 \textit{\texttt{e}e2} \textit{\texttt{w}d5} 10 \textit{\texttt{a}a4} \textit{\texttt{xf}f3+} 11 \textit{\texttt{g}xf3} \textit{\texttt{w}xf3+} 12 \textit{\texttt{d}d3} \textit{\texttt{we}4+} 13 \textit{\texttt{e}e2} would be a draw by perpetual check. In this line though, Graham Burgess has pointed out that Black can try 9...\textit{\texttt{b}b5}!! and if 10 \textit{\texttt{a}a3} (10 \textit{\texttt{w}c2} is stronger but Black is still well on top) 10...\textit{\texttt{w}d5} 11 \textit{\texttt{axb}4} \textit{\texttt{d}xf3}.

A much better reply to 5...\textit{\texttt{b}b4+} is 6 \textit{\texttt{c}c3} when a possible line is 6...\textit{\texttt{f}f4} 7 \textit{\texttt{h}h5} 8 \textit{\texttt{a}a1} 0-0 9 \textit{\texttt{a}a3} \textit{\texttt{h}xc3+} 10 \textit{\texttt{h}xc3} \textit{\texttt{d}xc4} 11 \textit{\texttt{h}xc4} \textit{\texttt{g}g6} 12 \textit{\texttt{h}h2} \textit{\texttt{f}f3} 13 \textit{\texttt{w}xf3} \textit{\texttt{e}5}, Akesson-Morozevich, Lloyds Bank, London 1994 was also fine for Black) 7...0-0 8 \textit{\texttt{d}d3} \textit{\texttt{g}g6} 9 \textit{\texttt{h}h5} 10 \textit{\texttt{h}h2} \textit{\texttt{h}h4} 11 \textit{\texttt{g}4} \textit{\texttt{d}xf3+} 12 \textit{\texttt{w}xf3} \textit{\texttt{g}g6} 13 \textit{\texttt{h}hxg6} \textit{\texttt{hxg6}} 14 \textit{\texttt{c}xd5} \textit{\texttt{exd}5} 15 \textit{\texttt{f}f1} \textit{\texttt{e}e7} and Black stands well, van Wely-Morozevich, Tilburg 1993.

3 \ldots \textit{\texttt{g}g4}
4 \textit{\texttt{g}g2} \textit{\texttt{w}d7}

This gives the variation its distinctive flavour. Black plans to castle queenside, possibly
trade off White’s king’s bishop with ...\( \text{h}3 \) and where necessary he will resort to ...\( \text{f}6 \) to fence White out of the central zone.

5 0-0

Others:

a) 5 \( \text{h}3 \text{f}5 \)

b) 5 \( \text{c}4 \text{e}6 \text{0-0-0} \text{0-0-0} \text{7} \text{c}3 \text{dxc4} \text{(once the white queen's knight is committed to c3 it makes good sense for Black to make this capture)} \text{8} \text{w}a4 \text{b}8 \text{(not 8...\( \text{b}4 \), which led to a swift disaster in Kumar-Miles, Dublin Zonal 1993: 9 \( \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 \text{10} \text{w}a7 \text{c}6 \text{11} \text{f}4 \text{d}6 \text{12} \text{w}a8+ \text{c}7 \text{13} \text{b}5+ \text{b}6 \text{14} \text{w}a7+ \text{xb}5 \text{15} \text{a}4+ \) )} 6 \text{c}4 (6 \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 7 \text{dxe5} \text{0-0-0} 8 \text{c}3 \text{f}6 9 \text{f}4 \text{e}6 10 \text{d}2 \text{fxe5} 11 \text{xe}5 \text{c}7 12 \text{f}4 \text{c}6 13 \text{f}3 \text{e}4 14 0-0 \text{d}6 15 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 16 \text{d}4 \text{xg}2 17 \text{gx}2 \text{c}7 18 \text{e}3 \text{c}5 19 \text{c}2 \text{b}8 \text{d} and Black's excellent central control guarantees him the advantage, Kaenel-Landen-bergue, Switzerland 1993) 6...\text{dxc4} 7 \text{w}a4 \text{e}5 8 \text{dxe5} \text{xe}5 9 \text{w}xd7+ \text{xd}7 10 \text{c}3 (after this White never regains his pawn so 10 \text{b}2 looks better, but after 10...0-0-0 Black has nothing to complain of) 10...\text{c}6 11 \text{e}3 \text{b}4 12 \text{c}1 \text{gf}6 13 0-0 \text{b}6 14 \text{d}4 0-0 15 \text{xf}6 \text{gxf}6 16 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 17 \text{e}4 \text{f}5 18 \text{f}6+ \text{h}8 with a good extra pawn as in the game Landen-bergue-Hölzl, Bern 1990.

It is interesting that Landenbergue, although a noted ...\( \text{c}6 \) system specialist, was unable to demonstrate a convincing line when himself confronted with the opening.

b) 5 \( \text{c}4 \text{e}6 \text{0-0-0} \text{0-0-0} \text{7} \text{c}3 \text{dxc4} \)
the idea being to meet the cap-
ture 22...\(\text{Qxf4}\) with 23 \(\text{Qe1!}\) and
White stands well) 22...\(\text{Qxf4}\) 23
\(\text{gxf4\ Qhxf8}\) with an unclear pos-

c) 5 \(\text{Qe5\ Qxe5}\) 6 \(\text{dxe5}\) e6 7
\(\text{c4}\) c6 (Black has a solid position
although there is no reason for
White to go into self-destruct as
in this game) 8 \(\text{Wd4}\) f5 9 \(\text{Qc3}\)
c5 10 \(\text{Wd1}\) d4 11 \(\text{Qb5}\) a6 12
\(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 13 \(\text{Qd6+}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\) 14
\(\text{Wxd7+}\) \(\text{Qxd7}\) 15 exd6 \(\text{Qxd6}\)
with a winning position for
Black, Karlsson-Hector, Oslo
1994.

d) 5 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{Qh3}\) 6 0-0 \(\text{Qxg2}\) 7
\(\text{Qxg2}\) 0-0-0 8 b4 f6 9 \(\text{Qbd2}\) e5
10 b5 e4 11 bxc6 \(\text{Qxf3}\) 12 \(\text{Wxc6}\)
13 \(\text{Qb3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 14 a4
\(\text{Qf5}\) 15 a5 g5 (this is an impor-
tant prelude to Black's kingside
attack, as if 15...h5, 16 h4) 16
a6 b6 17 \(\text{Qe1}\) h5 18 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Wxe6}\)
19 \(\text{Qe1}\) h4 (Black suddenly has
a very powerful attack) 20 e4
hxg3 21 fxg3

\(\text{Qxg5}\) \(\text{Wg8}\) 24 exf5 \(\text{Wxg5+}\) 0-1
Mellado-Pascual, Barbera del
Valles 1995. This game is a fine
advertisement for Black's sys-
tem.

5 ...  
0-0-0

6 c3

White's problem is that 6 c4
can be met in standard fashion,
as we have seen, by 6...dxc4, so
White is somewhat short of ac-
tive alternatives. The text plans
a queenside pawn storm with b4
against the black king. Other
ideas are:

a) 6 \(\text{Qe1}\) f6 7 c4 (White's 6th
and 7th moves do not really go
together) 7...dxc4 8 \(\text{Qc3}\) e5
9 d5 \(\text{Qb4}\) 10 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 11 d6 \(\text{Qf5}\)
12 \(\text{Qxa7}\) \(\text{Wxd6}\) 13 \(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{Qc6}\) 14
\(\text{Qed1}\) \(\text{Wxa4}\) 15 \(\text{Qxd8+}\) \(\text{Qxd8}\) 16
\(\text{Qxa4}\) \(\text{Qc6}\) and White did not
have much compensation for his
pawn, Miles-Geenen, Moscow

b) 6 \(\text{Qf4}\) f6 7 c4 e6 8 cxd5
exd5 9 \(\text{Qc3}\) g5 10 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qh3}\) 11
\(\text{Wd4}\) h5 12 e4 (classic chess
theory says that a wing attack is

21...\(\text{Qxg3}\) 22 \(\text{Qf2}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 23
best met by central counterplay, but this thrust leaves White horribly weak on the h1-a8 diagonal) 12...dxe4 13 \( \text{Q}x\text{e}4 \) g4 14 \( \text{Q}h4 \) \( \text{W}d5 \) and White is in big trouble, Frois-Fioramonti, Haifa 1989.

c) 6 \( \text{Q}bd2 \) f6 7 b4 e5 8 dxe5 \( \text{Q}xb4 \) 9 exf6 \( \text{Q}xf6 \) 10 \( \text{B}b1 \) \( \text{B}he8 \) 11 c3 \( \text{B}c5 \) 12 \( \text{B}b3 \) \( \text{B}b6 \) 13 \( \text{Q}bd4 \) h6 14 \( \text{Q}f4 \) g5 15 \( \text{Q}xc6 \) \( \text{W}xc6 \) 16 \( \text{Q}e5 \) \( \text{W}e6 \) 17 \( \text{Q}xg4 \) \( \text{Q}xg4 \) 18 \( \text{Q}c1 \)

18...\( \text{Q}xf2+ \) 19 \( \text{Q}xf2 \) \( \text{Q}xf2 \) 20 \( \text{W}b3 \) (20 \( \text{Q}xf2 \) \( \text{W}f5+ \)) 20...\( \text{W}a6 \) 21 \( \text{B}xd5 \) \( \text{B}xd5 \) 22 \( \text{W}xd5 \) \( \text{Q}e4 \) 23 \( \text{B}b3 \) \( \text{Q}d6 \) 24 \( \text{B}b2 \) \( \text{Q}xe2 \) 25 \( \text{Q}xe2 \) \( \text{W}xe2 \) and Black won easily, Weindl-Arkhipov, Kecskemet 1992. Another classic Black win in this line.

6 ... f6

This is a key move for Black in this variation. It creates the options of a central break with ...e5 and kingside play with ...g5. The latter move can also prove useful for dislodging an annoying white bishop from f4.

7 b4 h5

Off though it may look 7...g5 is probably more accurate since White should now have played 8 h4 to slow down Black's kingside advance.

8 \( \text{Q}bd2 \) g5

If White tries to block the black onslaught with h4 in the future Black has ...\( \text{Q}xf3 \) followed by ...gxh4 splintering White's defences.

9 \( \text{Q}b3 \) e6

10 \( \text{B}b1 \) \( \text{W}h7 \)

The upshot of the opening is that Black already has an enor-
mous lead in the race to attack the opposing king. The black queen is already on a powerful diagonal (threatening ...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}b1}}) and has moved by express to an extremely threatening position on the h-file. If White invades with \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c5}}} at a later date Black can, in principle, remove it with \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xc5}}} if the knight becomes too threatening.}

11 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e3}}} h4}

12 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}xh4} \texttt{\texttt{f5}}}

13 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}}xg5 \texttt{\texttt{d6}}}

White relies on giving up the exchange on b1 to abate the black attack, but Black refuses to be deflected from his goal.

14 h4 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}}xg5}

15 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}}xg5 \texttt{\texttt{g7}}}

16 b5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}}b8}

17 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}}c1} \texttt{\texttt{d8}}}

18 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}d2}}

White is struggling both to open a line on the queenside against Black’s king and to stem Black’s tide on the other flank. The text, however, walks into a fresh sacrifice.

19 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}xg5}}

If 19 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}}xg5} then 19...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h2+}}} 20 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}h1} \texttt{\texttt{f4+}} is good enough.

19 ... \texttt{\texttt{g8}}

20 \texttt{\texttt{e3}}

If 20 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}d2} then 20...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}6} 21 \texttt{\texttt{e3} \texttt{\texttt{e4}}}}.

20 ... \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}6}}

21 c4 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e4}}}

22 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}c3} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}xh4}}

23 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}d1}}

If 23 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}}xh4} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}xh4} 24 \texttt{\texttt{f3}}, then 24...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}xg2+}} forces mate.

23 ... \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}}xg2}

0-1
In this chapter we consider the variations where White declines to play the obscure positions resulting from the critical 2 d5 and instead aims to steer the game into calmer, and perhaps more familiar, waters. In our opinion this is less testing for Black than the direct 2 d5, but these variations nevertheless require close study.

After 3 d5 \( \triangleleft \text{ce7} \), Black could, if so inclined, probably work his way into the main lines of the King’s Indian Defence or Modern by continuing with \( ... \text{d6} \) and \( ... \text{g6} \). However, transposing back into main lines is not consistent with the philosophy behind playing 1...\( \triangleleft \text{c6} \) and so here we consider alternative ways for Black to complete his development. However, many King’s Indian Defence and Modern Defence themes will feature in the games in this section.

The most obvious way for Black to do this is to capitalise on the fact that - compared with the King’s Indian - he has not yet committed himself to \( ... \text{g6} \) and \( ... \text{g7} \) and can therefore try to develop this piece more actively with \( ... \triangleleft \text{c5} \) or \( ... \triangleleft \text{b4} \). When White chooses to play a quick e4, his central dark squares can often become a little weak and Black should be looking for opportunities to exploit this. In this context, the more active development of the dark-squared bishop fits the bill well.

As any good King’s Indian player will tell you, when the position has been closed with White playing d5, Black should be looking for opportunities to snap away at the white centre with pawn breaks such as \( ... \text{f5} \), \( ... \text{c6} \) or even \( ... \text{b5} \). We see all of these ideas coming into play in
the following material.

Game 37
Farago-Speelman
Beersheba 1987

1 d4 2 c4 e5 3 d5 4 e4 5 i.e3 6 lbd2 lbc6 e5 7 lbce7 lbf6 8 f3 i.xc3+ 9 bxc3 d6 9 c5 0-0 and Black has a useful lead in development which counter-balances the strength of the white bishop pair.

6 ... lDf6

7 f3
This creates a dark-square weakness on the g1-a7 diagonal which Speelman rushes to exploit.

7 ...We7!
Less dynamic, but also perfectly playable for Black is 7...0-0 8 a3 i.e7 9 i.d3 d6 10 i.c2 i.h5 11 g3 i.g5 12 i.f2 i.h6 13 i.e3 if6 14 if1 i.e8 15 i.e3 i.e7 16 wc2 i.xe3 17 i.xe3 f5 with a fine game, lashvili-Z. Nikolic, Belgrade 1992.

8 i.e2

Others:

a) 8 i.xc1 led to a complex struggle in Shirazi-Miles, Chicago 1990, viz. 8...c6 9 i.h3 0-0 10 i.e2 a5 11 a3 i.c5 12 i.xc5 wc5 13 i.b3 wa7 14 d6 a4 15 a1 i.e8 16 c5 b6 17 0-0 bxc5 18 i.c4 wb6 19 wb2 h6 20 i.d2 i.a5 21 i.f2 i.a6 22 i.xa6 i.xa6 23 i.c2 i.f4 24 i.e3 i.e6 25 i.c4 wb5 26 i.d3 i.d4 27 i.c3 i.b3 28 wb2 i.d5! 29 exd5 cxd5 and Black went on to win.

b) 8 i.e2 a5 9 wb2 b6 10 i.e2 i.c5 11 i.c1 i.h5 12 g3 d6 13 i.d3 i.xe3 14 wc3 f5 15 exf5 i.xf5 16 i.f2 i.f6 17 i.d3 i.xd3 18 i.xd3 0-0 19 0-0 wb7 with an equal position, Collas-Bus, Cappelle la Grande 1992.

For 8 g3 see the game Kaidanov-Miles in the introduction.

8 ... 0-0
9  g3
9  a3  Axc5  10  Wb3  a5  11  Axc5  Wxc5  12  Wc3  a4  13  g3
d6  14  Ac1  c6  15  Ae2  Wa7  16
dxc6  bxc6  17  c5  d5  18  Ad3
Ah3  19  Ag1  Ae6  20  Ac1  Ad7
21  Ab4  Aac8  22  Af2  f5  and the
insecure position of White’s
king guarantees Black a good
game, Pisulinski-Gdanski, Bydgoszcz 1990.

9  ...  a5
10  Ah3  Ac5
11  Wb3  c6
12  0-0?

Black has an active position
and has certainly vindicated his
choice of opening. The incau-
tious text, however, makes
matters worse for White. He
should first play 12 Ac1. Now
Black breaks his chains on the
queen’s flank.

12  ...  b5!

13  cxb5
13  dxc6? bxc4 and ... d5 is
coming.

13  ...  cxd5
14  a4  d4

Black has achieved every-
thing he could hope for from the
opening. Although White has a
protected passed pawn on the
queenside Black has a mass of
central pawns combined with
excellent development. Mean-
while, White’s king’s fortress is
none too solid. The pawn moves
in front of White’s king repre-
sent a permanent weakness in
the defensive shield. As soon as
Black achieves the key advance
... d5 he will start to punch holes
in White’s carapace.

15  Af2  Ab4
16  Aad1
16  Ac4? runs into the tactical
trap 16 ... d5! and Black wins.

16  ...
17  Ac4  d5
18  exd5
18  Ab6 is met simply by
18 ... dxe4!  19  Axa8  Axa8  20
fxe4  Axe4 and Black has over-
whelming compensation for the
exchange.

18  ...
19  Wd3  Aad8
20 \( \text{xf5} \) e4
A bold and impatient attempt to convert his central advantage into immediate victory by overrunning White's king.

21 fxe4 \( \text{dxex4} \)
22 \( \text{xd4?} \)

After this White is in terrible difficulties as Black's king's bishop develops ferocious activity. The best chance to defend was 22 \( \text{xd4 cx5} \) 23 \( \text{c2 b3!} \) and now White cannot afford to lose the dark-squared bishop and so must reconcile himself to 24 \( \text{f2 cx4} \) 25 \( \text{xc4} \)

22 ... \( \text{xf2} \)
23 \( \text{xf2} \)

24 \( \text{c3?} \)

Now White loses by force. Others tries are:

a) 24 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 25 \( \text{xd4 b3} \) winning.

b) 24 \( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 25 \( \text{xd4 f3} \) 26 \( \text{c6} \) (or 26 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 27 \( \text{xd4 e1+} \) and Black wins)

24 \( \text{c3?} \)

25 \( \text{xc4} \)

26 \( \text{xc6} \) 27 \( \text{xd8 xd8} \) 28 \( \text{xd8+ xd8} \) 29 \( \text{xc6} \)

26 \( \text{xc6} \) 27 \( \text{xd8 xd8} \) 28 \( \text{xd8+ xd8} \) 29 \( \text{xc6} \) and now Black rounds up the dangerous passed pawn with 29 ... \( \text{e5} \) 30 \( \text{c2 bd6+} \) 31 \( \text{g2 xc6 \) with an easy win.

24 \( \text{xc4} \)

25 \( \text{xc4} \)

The diagonal pin against White's king is deadly, for example, 27 \( \text{fd2 xd4+} \) 28 \( \text{xd4 xd4} \) 29 \( \text{xd4 xd4+} \) 30 \( \text{xd4 f3+} \) and Black wins on material. A superb vindication of Black's opening against a strong opponent.
A natural alternative to this simple developing move is 5 g3, played not so much with the idea of fianchettoing the white king's bishop, but so as to present a discouraging palisade, represented by the white pawn on g3, to the black knight on g6. Nevertheless, this slow treatment does not face Black with any serious problems and he has two ways of continuing, both based on the free development of his king's bishop on c5:

a) 5...\(\text{h6}\) 6 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{c5}\) 7 \(\text{e2}\) h5 8 h3 d6 9 \(\text{bc3}\) \(\text{d7}\) 10 \(\text{w3}\) a6 11 a4 h4 12 g4 \(\text{h7}\) 13 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 14 \(\text{xc5}\) dxc5 15 \(\text{e3}\) b6 16 a5 \(\text{g5}\) 17 axb6 cxb6 18 f3 0-0 and the weaknesses in the white kingside give Black a very promising game, Knoll-Mestrovic, Werfen 1993.

b) 5...\(\text{c5}\) 6 h4 h6 7 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 8 \(\text{h3}\) d6 9 \(\text{f3}\) c6 10 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 11 \(\text{xf5}\) cxd5 12 cxd5 0-0 13 \(\text{ge2}\) \(\text{h7}\) 14 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{c8}\) 15 h5 \(\text{e7}\) 16 g4 f6 17 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{g5}\) 18 \(\text{xf5}\) fxg5 19 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 20 gxf5 \(\text{b6}\) 21 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{d4}\) 22 0-0 \(\text{xc3}\) 23 bxc3 \(\text{wa6}\) 24 \(\text{fc1}\) b6 Sitnik-Mestrovic, Portoroz 1996. Black has coped with the white kingside initiative and now stands better thanks to the weak pawns on a2, c3 and e4.

5 ... \(\text{c5}\)

Move-order is not staggering important here. In the game Koemetter-Welling, Velden 1995 Black scored a powerful win with the alternative 5...\(\text{f6}\) 6 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{c5}\), viz. 7 \(\text{e2}\) 0-0 8 0-0 d6 9 a3 a5 10 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{d7}\) 11 \(\text{e1}\) c6 12 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d4}\) (it is surprising how often d4 turns out to be a useful outpost for Black’s dark-squared bishop in this variation) 13 \(\text{g5}\) h6 14 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 15 b4 \(\text{g5}\) 16 \(\text{fc1}\) f5 (Black is playing in King's Indian style, but with a very powerful king's bishop on d4, instead of its familiar post on g7) 17 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{f4}\) 18 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{h3+}\) 19 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{xf2+}\) 20 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{xe4+}\) 21 \(\text{h1}\) \(\text{g3+}\) 22 hxg3 \(\text{h5}\) mate.

6 \(\text{e2}\) d6
7 0-0 a5
A useful precaution against possible queenside expansion from White based on a3 and b4. As seems to be the norm in this variation, Black’s king’s bishop is firmly entrenched on the dark squares and White has no easy way of dislodging it.

\[
\begin{align*}
8 & \text{c3} & \text{d6} \\
9 & \text{e1} & 0-0 \\
10 & \text{c2}
\end{align*}
\]

10 \text{d3} is well met by 10...\text{d4} when White would already be obliged to resort to the clumsy 11 \text{f3} in order to defend his e4-pawn. The text prepares the manoeuvre \text{e3}, finally challenging the dominance of Black’s active bishop.

\[
\begin{align*}
10 & \ldots & \text{d7} \\
11 & \text{g3} & \text{h6} \\
12 & \text{e3} & \text{b6}
\end{align*}
\]

Although this renounces any thought of prodding White’s centre with ...c6 in the future it is worthwhile gaining play in the soon-to-be-opened b-file if White’s insists on trading off Black’s bishop.

\[
\begin{align*}
13 & \text{xc5} & \text{bxc5} \\
14 & \text{a4}
\end{align*}
\]

White moves over to the defence on the queenside, preparing to block the b-file with \text{b5} at some distant date. However, if White instead seeks to keep his options open by means of 14 b3 followed by a3 and b4, Black’s counterplay on the other wing with ...\text{h7} and ...f5 still gives him the superior chances.

\[
\begin{align*}
14 & \ldots & \text{h7} \\
15 & \text{e3} & \text{e7} \\
16 & \text{g4} & \text{f5}
\end{align*}
\]
Achieving his dream advance. Now, after inevitable exchanges on f5 Black will secure all the play in the position, since he is able to press the white camp both on the b-file and the f-file.

17 $\textit{xf5}$ $\textit{xf5}$
18 exf5
19 $\textit{xf5}$ $\textit{xf5}$
20 $\textit{g4}$
21 $\textit{h4}$

To stop ... $\textit{g5}$.

21 ...
22 $\textit{e4}$

22 $\textit{b5}$ would have been more consistent with his 14th move but White feels that he needs his knight on the kingside for defensive purposes.

22 ...

Black immediately exploits the absence of White's knight from its blockading post.

23 $\textit{a1}$ $\textit{f7}$

White's next move is designed to shore up his queenside and prevent the annoying invasion ...$\textit{b3}$. Now, though, the pressure intensifies on the white position from Black's other desirable property, the f-file.

24 $\textit{b3}$ $\textit{f3}$
25 $\textit{d2}$ $\textit{d3}$
26 $\textit{b2}$ $\textit{f8}$

Black's alternating attacks are most attractive. His primary goal has now been achieved: one black rook has penetrated the white position.

27 $\textit{e2}$ $\textit{d4}$
28 $\textit{e4}$ $\textit{g6}$

29 $\textit{e1}$ $\textit{f4}$

Winning material; the threats of ...$\textit{fxe4}$ or ...$\textit{xh4}$ cannot be satisfactorily parried. White's next move is pure desperation.

30 $\textit{xc5}$ $\textit{xc5}$
31 $\textit{xe5}$ $\textit{fe4}$
32 $\textit{xe4}$ $\textit{xe4}$
33 $\textit{xc7}$ $\textit{e1+}$
34 $\textit{g2}$ $\textit{d3}$
35 $\textit{c8+}$ $\textit{f8}$
36 $\textit{xc5}$

Although White, on paper, has more than enough material compensation for his knight, the concentrated power of Black's
forces in direct attack against the exposed white king swiftly proved decisive.

36 \[...\] \[f1+\]
37 \[f3\] \[h1+\]
38 \[g4\] \[e4+\]
39 \[f4\] \[e3\]

Game 39
Stempin-Kuczynski
Warsaw 1990

1 \[d4\] \[c6\]
2 \[c4\] \[e5\]
3 \[d5\] \[ce7\]
4 \[c3\] \[g6\]
5 \[g3\]

In this variation White tries to restrict the activities of Black's queen's knight on g6 without committing himself immediately to the rigid e4, occupying the centre but at the cost of a general weakening of the dark squares.

5 \[...\] \[b4\]

In this situation 5...\[c5\] is somewhat less logical. Since White has not played e4 yet, he can always revert at some point to e3, defending the dark squares and blotting out Black's king's bishop. A wild example of this was Lugovoi-Karpachev, Smolensk 1992: 6 \[g2\] a6 7 \[h4\] h6 8 \[e4\] \[b4+\] (after all Black once again resorts to placing his bishop on b4) 9 \[f1\] f5 10 a3 \[f8\] 11 h5 \[e6\] 12 d6 \[c6\] 13 dxc7 \[xc7\] 14 \[c3\] \[f6\] 15 \[f3\] d6 16 \[h4\] \[e7\] 17 \[d5\] \[fxd5\] 18 cxd5 \[d7\] with an unclear position.

6 \[wb3\]

This is the type of formation where White would prefer to avoid doubled pawns. The text seeks to achieve this whilst simultaneously gaining a tempo against the black bishop. Against 6 \[c2\] Black has two methods of proceeding, either the restraint of White's queen-side pawns, combined with the retention of Black's king's bishop or an acquiescence in the
exchange of bishop for knight, with the expectation that Black will in return gain a lead in development and prospects of harassing the white queen. Here is one example of each:

a) 6...a5 7 a3 \( \text{\texttt{\#}e7 \#} \) 8 h4 d6 9 e4 h6 10 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}h3 \text{\texttt{\#}}xh3 \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xh3 \) \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f6 \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}e3 \text{\texttt{\#}}f8 \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}d7 \) 14 f3 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}c5 \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f2 \text{\texttt{\#}}fd7 \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}b1 \text{\texttt{\#}b6} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}d3 \text{\texttt{\#}}xd3 \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xd3 \text{\texttt{\#}}d7 \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}b5 \) \( \text{\texttt{\#}}a6 \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}h2 \) a4 21 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f1 \) 0-0 22 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}h3 \) c6 and Black's queenside play keeps the game in a state of dynamic equality, Barlov-Z. Nikolic, Yugoslav Ch. 1985.

b) 6...\( \text{\texttt{\#}}f6 \) 7 a3 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}x\text{\texttt{\#}c3+} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xc3 \) 0-0 9 h4 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}e4 \) 10 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}c2 \) f5 11 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}g2 \) d6 12 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}h3 \) h6 13 h5 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}e7 \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xe4 \) fxe4 15 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xe4 \) \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f5 \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}g2 \text{\texttt{\#}}g4 \) 17 f3 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xh5 \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}g5 \text{\texttt{\#}}f7 \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}h3 \text{\texttt{\#}}c8 \) 20 e4 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xh3 \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xh3 \text{\texttt{\#}}h5 \) 22 g4 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}e8 \) 23 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f2 \) b5 and Black has a slight initiative, Agrest-Miles, Münster 1993.

6 ... \( \text{\texttt{\#}}e7 \) 7 a3 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}a5 \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}c2 \) \( \text{\texttt{\#}}b6 \)

To meet the threat of b4 and c5 by White, Black could also play 8...\( \text{\texttt{\#}}x\text{\texttt{\#}c3+} \) 9 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}xc3 \) \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f6 \) reaching something similar to Agrest-Miles, quoted above.

9 h4 d6 10 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}a4 \)

White speculates on the variation 10...\( \text{\texttt{\#}}f6 \) 11 h5 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}f8 \) 12 h6 g6 13 \( \text{\texttt{\#}}g5 \) with a powerful pin, but Black's next move pre-empts this.

Strategically, Black faces difficulties in that White can blockade the kingside with g4 whilst possessing the long-term advantages of the bishop pair and mobile queenside pawns. Tactically, though, Black is in fine shape since White's ambitious and time-consuming manoeuvres on both flanks have
deprived his king of any permanently secure shelter. White's kingside is full of holes whilst, on the queenside, Black controls the only open line (the a-file) and can add further fuel to the flames with breaks such as ...c6 and ...c5.

16 \( \text{b}2 \) 0-0
17 \( \text{c}3 \) 0-0
18 0-0-0

There is a strong case here for sealing things up with g4. White takes a gamble by allowing Black to counter with ...f5. After 18 g4 \( \text{f}6 \) 19 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 20 \( \text{d}3 \) c6 21 0-0-0 \( \text{c}7 \) 22 \( \text{b}1 \), for example, White has the plan of \( \text{d}1 \) and f4 with all to play for. Indeed, the whole notion of a concerted attack against f3 by means of ...\( \text{f}6 \) may be too ambitious. Hence, White could certainly count on equality by playing g4. After the text, a hand-to-hand fight ensues.

18 ... \( \text{g}5 \)
19 \( \text{g}2 \) f5

20 f4

White loses patience and allows Black everything he is hoping for. He was doubtless concerned that against slower means Black would trade on e4 and follow up with moves like ...\( \text{g}4 \) and ...\( \text{f}6 \), fixing the White pawn on h5 as an irrevocable weakness for the endgame.

20 ... \( \text{e}4 \)
21 \( \text{xe}4 \) fxe4
22 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \)

23 \( \text{d}1 \)

Giving in without a fight and ceding Black global control of all the crucial light squares. White should at least have tried 23 \( \text{g}6 \) when matters are not yet clear.

23 ... \( \text{e}4 \)
24 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \)
25 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

Black does not need to defend what remains of his pawn centre. The light-square counterattack initiated by this move will prove more than adequate.
compensation for any slight material loss.

26 fxe5 w a4

27 a c3 w b3
28 e6

He may as well try to cement his ill-gotten gains in as much as the defensive 28 d2 allows 28...wx a3 29 bxa3 w c2+ 30 w e3 w x c3+ with a winning attack. In this line the humbly palliative 29 w d1 fails just as dismally to 29...w x c4 30 bxa3 w d3+ 31 w c1 w x c3+.

28 ... w x a3

This irruption is again equally fatal.

29 w d2 w c2+
30 w e3

Game 40
Komarov-Zagema
Dortmund 1992

1 d4 w c6
2 c4 e5
3 d5

Compared with the Budapest Gambit capturing on e5 is not worrying. Let us first examine what happens in the cognate gambit line: 1 d4 w f6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 w g4 4 w f3 w c5 5 e3 w c6 6 w c3 and now Black can recapture his gambit pawn with 6...w gxe5. In comparison after 3 dxe5 in the main game Black does not have to waste tempi in order to recapture his pawn. Here is one example 3 dxe5 w xe5 4 e3 w f6 5 w f3 w x f3+ 6 w x f3 d5 7 h3 w e6 8 w c3 w b4 (Black already has an active
position) 9 \( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 10 0-0-0
dxc4 11 e4 \( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{d}5 \)
\( \text{xd}2+ \) 13 \( \text{x}d2 \) c6 14 \( \text{f}4 \)
cxd5 15 exd5 c3 16 bxc3 \( \text{a}5 \)
17 dxe6 \( \text{xc}3+ \) 18 \( \text{b}1 \) fxe6 19
\( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 20 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 21 f3
\( \text{ad}8 \) 22 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 23 a3 \( \text{d}6 \)
24 g3 \( \text{b}6+ \) 25 \( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 26
\( \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) 29 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{a}2+ \) 30
\( \text{d}3 \) b5 0-1 Trivuncevic-Mestrovic, Ljubljana 1994.

An interesting alternative is
for Black to develop his king's
bishop before retreating the
knight. Play then has some
similarities to that typical of the
Bogo-Indian (1 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 2 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \)
3 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{b}4+ \)), e.g. 3 ... \( \text{b}4+ \) 4
\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{ce}7 \) 5 a3 \( \text{xd}2+ \) and now:

a) 6 \( \text{xd}2 \) d6 7 g3 (7 e4 \( \text{g}6 \)
8 \( \text{c}2 \) f5 9 exf5 \( \text{h}4 \) 10 g3
\( \text{xf}5 \) 11 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}2 \) 0-0
13 0-0 \( \text{e}8 \) 14 \( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 15
\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 16 f3 \( \text{f}7 \) 17 \( \text{e}3 \)
\( \text{d}7 \) with an easy game for
Black, Semkov-Rossi, Forli

1988) 7 ... \( \text{f}6 \) 8 \( \text{g}2 \) 0-0 9 \( \text{f}3 \)
a5 10 b4 \( \text{e}4 \) 11 0-0 \( \text{xd}2 \) 12
\( \text{xd}2 \) c6 13 \( \text{ac}1 \) axb4 14 axb4
\( \text{g}4 \) 15 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 16 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \)
17 c5 \( \text{xc}5 \) 18 \( \text{xc}5 \) wbd5 and
Black has successfully freed his

b) 6 \( \text{xd}2 \) d6 7 \( \text{g}5 \) (this
strange queen sortie hopes to
force a weakness with ... \( g6 \), but
Black proves that he does not
have to be so accommodating)
7 ... h6 8 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 9 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \)
10 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) (after 10 ... hxg5 11
\( \text{g}5 \) White regains the piece,
but the simple text move leaves
the white queen stuck) 11 g4
(this is necessary as Black was
threatening ... \( \text{h}5 \), snaring the
white queen) 11 ... \( \text{g}4 \) 12 \( \text{e}4 \)
\( \text{g}5 \) 13 \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{h}3 \) 0-0-0
15 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 16 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 17
\( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 18 e4 \( \text{g}6 \) 19 \( \text{g}1 \)
\( \text{h}5 \) 20 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 21 \( \text{g}3 \)
and the complications have re-
sulted in equality, Justo-

4 \( \text{c}3 \)

The pseudo-pin with 4 \( \text{g}5 \)
do not seem to serve any par-
ticularly useful purpose, e.g.
4 ... h6 5 \( \text{h}4 \) c6 6 e4 \( \text{a}5+ \) 7
\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}2+ \) 8 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 9
\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 10 \( \text{gf}3 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 11 a3
\( \text{xd}2+ \) 12 \( \text{xd}2 \) c5 13 f3 d6 14
\( \text{f}2 \) b6 15 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}3 \)
\( \text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 18 h4 h5 19
\( \text{e}3 \) f5 20 \( \text{d}3 \) f4 21 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}7 \)
and the black knights are more
useful than the white bishops in
this blocked position, Thaler-
4...d6

Hitherto we have examined variations where Black has played 4...\texttt{g6} with the plan of liberating his king's bishop either on c5 or b4. The text is an alternative in which Black allows himself the possibility of an immediate rupture of the centre based on \ldots f5. However, we must caution that this places a great deal more stress on Black's structure than the fluid piece development lines arising from 4...\texttt{g6}.

5 e4

5...f5 6 \texttt{d3} f5 7 exf5 \texttt{xf5} 8 \texttt{f3} \texttt{h6} (this exchange is positionally desirable but Black must now play with care as he has fallen behind in development) 9 \texttt{xh6 \texttt{g}xh6 10 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{f7 11 0-0-0 \texttt{h}4 12 \texttt{xh4 \texttt{x}xh4 13 g3 \texttt{h}6 14 f4 \texttt{g}4 15 \texttt{df1 0-0-0 and Black has safely co-ordinated his forces and can look to the future with confidence, Stojnic-Soln, Bled 1996.})

6 \texttt{d3}

An alternative is 6 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f6} 7 \texttt{d3} and now 7...f4 or even the adventurous move 7...h6 perhaps planning ...g5.

6...\texttt{f6}

7 \texttt{g5}

7 \texttt{f3} would transpose to the previous note. The text hopes for 7...fxe4 8 \texttt{xe4 \texttt{xe4 9 \texttt{xe4}} when Black is virtually paralysed.

7...f4

Black does not oblige and switches instead to an advance which is, as we have already seen, typical for Black's counterplay in this line.

8 \texttt{g3}

White essays a head-on assault and the game soon develops along the uncharted and tactically rich contours which all black players who employ this variation should desire. The more rigidly positional course is 8 \texttt{xf6 \texttt{g}xf6 9 \texttt{h}5+ \texttt{g}6 10 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{d}7 11 h3 with the plan of \texttt{g}4 to control the light squares. This is, perhaps, the way Karpov would have proceeded and White's grip on the light squares gives him the advantage.

8...\texttt{g6}

9 \texttt{h4}

In contrast to the basically strategic treatment outlined above, White's bull-in-a-china-shop approach here gives Black time to consolidate.
In view of the threat of \( \text{...} \text{hxh5} \), neatly bagging a pawn, White must now retreat.

9 \( \text{fxg3} \)  
10 \( \text{hxg3} \)  
11 \( \text{e7} \)  
12 \( \text{e3} \)  
13 \( \text{d2} \)  
14 \( \text{f3} \)

Of course 14 \( \text{e3} \) would lead to repetition.

14 \( \text{g4} \)  
15 \( \text{b4} \)  
16 \( \text{a3} \)  
17 \( \text{e2} \)  
18 \( \text{b8} \)

Black's queen's knight, after a wondrous series of gyrations, finally reaches home. Indeed, Black's entire game plan appears to be based on the systematic undevelopment of his pieces but, in the mean time, there have been compensations. By rushing his pawns forward on both flanks, White has exposed himself to severe counter-punches.

18 \( \text{h4} \)  
19 \( \text{xb4} \)  
20 \( \text{xa1} \)  
21 \( \text{xa6} \)  
22 \( \text{c6} \)  
23 \( \text{b5} \)

Black's counterplay takes on definite shape. What had once looked like a significant space advantage for White now resembles more a position shot through with gaps and weaknesses.

22 \( \text{dxc6} \)  
23 \( \text{bxc6} \)

For his troubles White does
at least create an instant passed pawn, though one that can be fairly easily blockaded.

23 ... cxb5
24 cxb5 c5
25 c4+

Black cannot now evade this check with 25...h8 on account of 26 g6+ hxg6 27 hxg6+ with an immediate win for White.

25 e6
26 e6+ f6
27 f5

It is worth considering here 27 a2 to slow down Black’s occupation of the centre.

27 d4
28 d4 exd4
29 e2 d5

With White’s forces scattered around the perimeters, his king stuck in the centre, and with Black now possessing a passed pawn of his own, it is evident that White’s entire strategy has collapsed.

30 d4 b6
31 a1 c5

This would also have been the answer to 31 c6.

32 e3 b4+
33 d1

33 d2 xd2+ 34 xd2 xe4+ is hopeless.

33 ...

If immediately 33...xe4, 34 a6 keeps White afloat. However, 33 g4 looks quite decisive.

34 a6

If 34 c1 c3 35 c2 d4, 36 xc3! but 34...e7 still leaves White with the insuperable task of holding his passive legions together.

34 ...
35 f5 d3+
36 c1 a3+
0-1

A scrappy game in which the advantage swung to and fro. Its chief merit lies in its demonstration of the resilience of Black’s position. Even though White appeared to be driving Black back on all fronts Black’s
position remained sound and was quite capable of delivering a decisive counter-punch when White's pawn structure became bloated and unwieldy after his early and ruthless attempt to gain space on all fronts.

Game 41
Juraczka-Palos
Oberwart 1991

1 d4 2c6 2 c4 e5
3 2f3

This transposes to a version of the English Opening in which Black has a comparatively easy time.

3 ... e4
4 2g5

An alternative is 4 2fd2, but Black can still gain excellent counterplay, e.g. 4...f5 5 e3 2f6 6 2c3 2b4 7 2e2 0-0 8 0-0 2xc3 9 bxc3 d6 10 2a3 2e8 11 c5 d5 12 2b1 2e7 13 c4 c6 14 2c1 2c7 15 cxd5 cxd5. Here Black can consolidate his queenside most effectively by means of the manoeuvre ... 2d7-c6 and meanwhile he is ready to advance powerfully on the other flank. Sugden-Keene, Cambridge 1969 continued 16 f4 exf3 17 2xf3 2g6 18 2b5 2d7 19 2c3 2c6 20 2c1 2e7 21 2d3 2e4 22 2xe4 fxe4 23 2g5 2d7 24 2b2 2b5 25 2ff2 2c4 26 2c2 2g4 27 2h3 2f8 28 2xf8+ 2xf8 29 c6 bxc6 30 2b8 (at long last White, with his threat of 2a3, appears to have gained palpable counterplay but unfortunately for him Black is ready with a swift tactical refutation) 30...2f7 31 2f2 2xf2 32 2xf2 2h4+ 0-1.

White's problem in this game was the inflexibility of his central and queenside pawns. Nevertheless, if White seeks to preserve his pawns intact with 7 2c2 0-0 8 a3 2xc3 9 2xc3 then Black can still gain his fair share of the centre with 9...d5 10 b3 2e7 followed by ...c6 and ...2e6 is quite satisfactory for Black. The long-term aim is to strike at White's kingside with ...f4 and the closed nature of the position renders White's advantage of the two bishops somewhat nugatory.

4 ... 2b4+
5 2c3

Any other move would lose the knight on g5, but as it is now Black can smash White's pawns.

5 ... 2f6
6  e3

6 d5 is more combative than the text, but Black is still able to gain good play by wrecking White's pawn structure, e.g. 6...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}} \texttt{c3+} \) 7 bxc3 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}} \texttt{b8} \) 8 g3 d6 9 g2 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}} \texttt{7} \) 10 c5 f5 11 cxd6 cxd6 (White has managed to dissolve the doubled c-pawns, but the weakness on the c-file remains) 12 0-0 h6 13 g3 0-0 14 e3 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}} \texttt{7} \) 15 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}} \texttt{2} \) e5 with a good game, van den Donk-Lemmers, Netherlands 1994.

It is also worth pointing out a trap that has claimed many victims. After 6 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}} \texttt{3}? \) Black can in fact snatch the white pawn on d4 with 6...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}} \texttt{x} \texttt{d4} \) since 7 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}} \texttt{b4} \) is foiled by 7...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash c}} \texttt{2+} \), snaring White's queen.

6  ...  \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}} \texttt{c3+} \)
7  bxc3  d6
8  h4  h6
9  h3  g5

An ingenious move, utilising the potential pin on the h-file to lock White's knight out of play.

10  \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}} \texttt{1} \)  g4
11  \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}} \texttt{2} \)  h5

Maintaining the theme of dominating White's knight.

12  g3  f5
13  \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash f}} \texttt{4} \)

At last White's knight emerges, but the resultant positions is inimical to White's bishops. Black now proceeds to besiege White's weak pawn on c4.

13  ...  \( \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}f4} \)
14  exf4  b6
15  e3  a5
16  e2  a6
Black has to neutralise White’s possibility of $\text{Wa4}$ before annexing the c4 pawn. Black now has a classic won position, with a blockade that robs White of any possibility of active counterplay.

$17 \hspace{1em} \text{h}b1 \hspace{1em} \text{c5}$

$18 \hspace{1em} 0-0 \hspace{1em} \text{Wd7}$

$19 \hspace{1em} \text{xb5} \hspace{1em} \text{xb5}$

$20 \hspace{1em} \text{cxb5} \hspace{1em} \text{c4}$

$21 \hspace{1em} \text{d5} \hspace{1em} \text{Wxb5}$

$22 \hspace{1em} \text{Wd4} \hspace{1em} 0-0$

$23 \hspace{1em} \text{h5} \hspace{1em} \text{Wac8}$

$24 \hspace{1em} \text{Wxg4} \hspace{1em} \text{fxg4}$

$25 \hspace{1em} \text{Wxe4} \hspace{1em} \text{We8}$

$26 \hspace{1em} \text{Wh1} \hspace{1em} \text{We7}$

$27 \hspace{1em} \text{f5} \hspace{1em} \text{Wh7}$

$28 \hspace{1em} \text{f3} \hspace{1em} 0-1$

The final blunder since Black can now play $...\text{Wxe3}$. It is notable that when thrown on their own resources and unable to follow established theory, so many white players succumb so quickly.
In this chapter we consider the viability of opening 1...\( \text{d}c6 \) against moves other than 1 \( \text{d}4 \) or 1 \( \text{e}4 \).

The main point of the interpretation of ...\( \text{d}c6 \) that we suggest in this book is to angle for a quick ...e5. Therefore, although 1...\( \text{d}c6 \) is perfectly playable against 1 \( \text{c}4 \), Black then does best to continue with a quick ...e5 transposing to lines of the English. An in-depth analysis of these variations is beyond the scope of this book, but in this chapter we suggest methods for Black to combat White’s various options.

The encounter chosen for our stem game is an old one, but it is one that has been overlooked in many anthologies and excellently demonstrates many of the themes of this particular variation.

Game 42
Capablanca-Bogoljubow
Nottingham 1936

1 \( \text{c}4 \)

In this particular game White diverts play into lines of a strict English Opening with the fianchetto of the white king’s bishop exerting pressure against Black’s queen’s flank.

In the following analysis we consider 1...\( \text{d}c6 \) against other White openings:

a) 1 \( \text{b}3 \) was popularised by Larsen in the late sixties and early seventies. However, ceding the centre so early to Black is not to everyone’s taste. Black can meet this move comfortably with 1...\( \text{d}c6 \) 2 \( \text{b}2 \) e5, e.g. 3 e3 d6 4 \( \text{b}5 \) (against other continuations, Black can successfully adopt a King’s Indian formation where the white bishop on b2 plays a minimal role in proceedings, e.g. 4 \( \text{e}2 \) g6 5 d4 \( \text{g}7 \) 6 d5 \( \text{c}e7 \) 7 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 8 c4 0-0 9 \( \text{bc}3 \) c6 10 g3 cxd5 11 cxd5 \( \text{d}7 \) and Black has the initiative, Minasian-Wolff, Glendale 1994; or 4 c4 g6 5 g3 \( \text{g}7 \) 6 \( \text{g}2 \) h5 7 h3 h4 8 g4 f5 9 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 10 gxf5 \( \text{xf}5 \) 11 d3 g5 and Black has very good play, Bagirov-Gelfand, Amsterdam 1989) 4...\( \text{d}7 \) 5 \( \text{e}2 \) a6 6 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{xc}6 \) 7 0-0 \( \text{g}5 \) (an excellent move which drives White into a passive position as 8 \( \text{g}3 \) h5 9 f4 \( \text{g}6 \), threatening ...h4 is very un-
10...\(\text{c6}\) (Adams suggests that White's best is 10 f4! exf4 11 \(\text{xf4}\) dxc4 12 bxc4 \(\text{d6}\) 13 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 14 \(\text{c3}\) which is unclear) 10...0-0-0 and Black has a good game, Minasian-Adams, Debrecen 1992.

b) 1 f4 \(\text{c6}\) is perfectly playable. If White now heads for a king pawn opening with 2 e4, Black should change plan and play 2...d5 and if 3 e5 then 3...\(\text{f5}\) with an improved version of Nimzowitsch's original treatment.

Better for White is 1 f4 \(\text{c6}\) 2 \(\text{f3}\) when Black can play 2...d5 (also possible is 2...d6, intending ...e5), e.g. 3 g3 (3 e3 \(\text{g4}\) 4 \(\text{b5}\) e6 5 0-0 \(\text{ge7}\) 6 b3 d4 7 e4 a6 8 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{b4}\) and Black stands well, Parr-de Coverly, Hastings 1995) 3...\(\text{g4}\) 4 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{d7}\) 5 \(\text{c3}\) 0-0-0 6 h3 \(\text{xf3}\) 7 \(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 8 d4 \(\text{e4}\) with active play, Tu Hoang Thong-Kagan, Melbourne 1994.

c) 1 \(\text{f3}\) is often an indication that White wants to play an English Opening, but without allowing Black the option of the ...e5 variations. Against such a player, 1...\(\text{c6}\) is a good reply. Now (after 1 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{c6}\)) 2 c4 e5 or 2 g3 e5, Black gets the variations which White may be trying to avoid. If White changes tack with 2 e4 d6 or 2 d4 d5 then Black has again obliged White to enter channels with which he may be unfamiliar.

d) 1 g3 \(\text{c6}\) is obviously perfectly playable for Black and is likely to transpose into lines of the English Opening.

e) 1 \(\text{c3}\) is often used as a transpositional device. For example 1 \(\text{c3}\) d5 2 e4 and now 2...d4 and 2...dxe4 have independent significance, but 2...e6 and 2...c6 transpose respectively into the French Defence and Caro-Kann Defence.

However, our key defence still holds good. 1 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c6}\) and now 2 e4 can be met by 2...e6 3 d4 \(\text{b4}\).
Furthermore, after 2 d4 e6 White really has nothing better than 3 e4 b4 with the same position.

An interesting example of play from this position is: 4 d5 (4 a3 a6 5 bxc3 d6 6 w4 g4 wxf6 7 w3 g6 8 w3 g6 hgx6 9 f4 b6 10 d3 a5 11 d3 a5 12 0-0 c5 with a solid position for Black and chances to play against White's weakened pawn structure, Angqvist-Hjelm, Stockholm 1992) 4...d6 5 d2 (5 b5 a6 6 e2 g7 7 w3 d3 0-0 8 a3 a5 9 0-0 e5 10 d5 b8 11 d2 d7 12 b4 b6 13 g4 d4 14 b3 a7 15 a4 w8 16 c3 f5 and Black has active play as in Stertenbrink-Dausch, Bundesliga 1984) 5...g7 6 a3 a5 7 d3 0-0 8 0-0 g6 9 h3 b6 10 e2 (10 d5 exd5 11 dxe5 is pleasant for Black) 10...h4 11 xh4 w4 12 e3 e5 13 c3 f5! 14 exf5 exf5 15 xf5 xf5 16 w2 (better is 16 dxe5 xe5 17 xb6 axb6 maintaining an equal position) 16...exd4 17 exd4 a8 18 ad1 h8 19 f1 h6 20 f3 d5 21 e2 w8 22 c1 w6 23 e2 g5 24 h1 g6 25 g1 w5 26 w7

(see following diagram)

26...xf3! (the tactical culmination of Miles's patient manoeuvring) 27 e8+ (27 gxf3 w3h3+ 28 h2 wxf3+ 29 g2 w3g2 is mate, while 27 f2 d4! 28 gxf3 xf3 29 w6

\[ \text{xf2 30 xf2 e5 is also hopeless for White} \]

27...h7 28 w6 xh3+ 0-1 David-Miles, Linares Z 1995.

f) 1 b4!? is the only move we feel a slight reluctance to recommend 1...c6 against. We leave it to readers to decide if 2 b5 e5 3 b2 c4!?

(see following diagram)

26...xf3! (the tactical culmination of Miles's patient manoeuvring) 27 e8+ (27 gxf3 w3h3+ 28 h2 wxf3+ 29 g2 w3g2 is mate, while 27 f2 d4! 28 gxf3 xf3 29 w6

Having staked his claim in the centre, Black will now aim...
to gain space on the kingside with ...f5 which can also act as a prelude to a potential kingside attack.

We have now entered the realms of the English Opening. The following notes and variations are not intended to be definitive, but to suggest sensible choices for Black against the various possible schemes of development by his opponent.

3  g3

After 3  g3 a good line for Black is 3...f5, e.g. 4 d4 e4 and now:

a) 5  g5  b4 6  h3  f6 7 e3  xc3+ 8 bxc3 d6 9  e2 0-0 10 0-0  e7 11 f3  d7 12 fxe4  xe4 13  c2  f6 with a promising kingside initiative, Uibilava-Kurajica, Las Palmas 1994.

b) 5  g5  e7 6  xe7  xe7 7  d2 (7  g1  f6 8 e3 d6 9 h4 c6 10  h3  e6 11  e2  f7 12  g5 0-0 13  b3  b6 with a good game for Black, Vaganian-Pr. Nikolic, Barcelona 1989) 7  f6 8 e3 0-0 9  e2 d6 10 0-0 c5 11  b3 b6 and Black again stands well, Gulko-A.V. Ivanov, USA Ch. 1989.

3  ...  g6

4  g2  g7

5  d3

An alternative here for White is 5 e3 when Black can try to gain space on the kingside with 5...f5 and now:

a) 6 d4 e4 7  ge2  g7 8  f4  e7 9 h4 d5 10 b3 c6 11  a3  h6 12  f1  xf4 13  xf4  e6 14  d2  f7 with an equal game, Korchnoi-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1992.

b) 6  ge2  f6 7 0-0 0-0 8 d3  e7 9 e4 d6 10  xf5  xf5 11  e4  xe4 12  xe4 c6 13  b3  f7 14 f4  exf4 15  xf4  e6 and Black has no problems, Sher-Hodgson, Isle of Man 1995.

5  ...  d6 (D)

6  d2

The main point of this move is to defend White’s queen’s
158 1...\textit{c6} against Flank Openings

Knight against possible Black tactics based on \ldots\textit{f5} and \ldots\textit{e4}. Once the knight is defended, White can launch a quick strike on the queenside by means of \textit{b1} and \textit{b4}.

After 6 \textit{f3} Black can again aim for his usual kingside expansion with 6..\textit{f5}, e.g. 7 \textit{b1} a5 8 a3 \textit{f6} 9 0-0 0-0 10 \textit{b4} axb4 11 axb4 h6 12 b5 \textit{e7} 13 \textit{b2} \textit{e6} 14 \textit{a1} \textit{c8} (14...\textit{b8} 15 c5 \textit{d7} 16 \textit{a4} dxc5 17 \textit{a3} g5 18 \textit{a1} \textit{g6} 19 \textit{d2} \textit{e7} 20 \textit{c3} \textit{f6} 21 \textit{a7} b6 22 \textit{a6} \textit{fd8} 23 \textit{d1} \textit{f7} 24 \textit{b7} \textit{xb7} 25 \textit{xb7} \textit{e8} 26 \textit{c4} e4 27 \textit{e3} f4 0-1 Urban-Soffer, Budapest 1993) 15 c5 \textit{d7} 16 cxd6 cxd6 17 \textit{a4} d5 18 \textit{d2} \textit{e8} with a complex game, Ivanchuk-Topalov, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

6  f5  
7  \textit{b1} \textit{f6}  
8  \textit{b4} 0-0  
9  \textit{b5} \textit{e7}  

Here Alekhine recommended 9...\textit{d4} 10 \textit{e3} \textit{e6}.

10 \textit{c2} h6  
The long range intention is to march forwards on the king's flank with \ldots\textit{g5} and \ldots\textit{f4}.

11 e3 \textit{a6}  
An interesting decision which was criticised at the time. It seems that the queenside is White's domain and it is folly by Black to provoke a skirmish there. The point, though, is to disturb White's planned onrush of pawns on the queenside by gaining counterplay on the open a-file.

12 \textit{a4}  
Here 12 \textit{bxa6} \textit{xa6} 13 \textit{xb7} \textit{xb7} 14 \textit{xb7} \textit{a8} exposes White's rooks to all sorts of unpleasant tactics. That would also be the reply if White were to capture on b7 over the coming moves.

12 \ldots  c5  
13 \textit{bxa6} \textit{xa6}  

14 \textit{ge2} \textit{c6}  
15 \textit{d5} \textit{xd5}  
16 \textit{xd5+} \textit{h7}  
17 h4  
Capablanca liked this kind of manoeuvre which both inhibits \( \ldots g5 \) and prepares long term pressure against Black's kingside.

17 \[ ... \quad \textit{We8} \]

18 \[ \textit{Of1} \]

White's idea is to plant his king on g2 where it would stay in perfect safety, but Bogoljubow's clever play never gives Capablanca time to carry out this manoeuvre. In view of that the uncomplicated 18 \( \textit{Og2} \) is stronger to be followed by \( \textit{O}b5 \) and a5 when White retains some pressure against Black's b7-pawn.

18 \[ ... \quad \textit{Oe7} \]

After this there is no way that White can avoid the exchange of his strong bishop.

19 \[ \textit{a5} \quad \textit{Oxd5} \]

20 \[ \textit{cxd5} \quad \textit{Of7} \]

21 \[ \textit{We4} \quad \textit{f4!} \]

Without this White would slowly consolidate and eventually break into Black's position via the b-file. The long range strategy for White would be \( \textit{Og2} \) followed by doubling rooks on the b-file and then \( \textit{Ob6} \). Just in time, though, Bogoljubow activates the inherent dynamism of his position and launches a power counter-attack along the light squares.

22 \[ \textit{gxf4} \quad \textit{Og4} \]

23 \[ \textit{Og1} \quad \textit{Of3} \]

24 \[ \textit{e4} \quad \textit{exf4} \]

25 \[ \textit{Oxf4} \]

Although this looks extremely promising the pawn capture under-estimates Black's chances. Alekhine recommended instead 25 \( \textit{O}b5 \).

25 \[ ... \quad \textit{Oe5} \]

26 \[ \textit{Oe6} \]

This seems crushing and it is hardly surprising that Capablanca could not resist playing it. It should be noted on the other hand that 26 \( \textit{O}xg6 \quad \textit{O}g8 \)

27 \( h5 \) fails to 27...\( \textit{O}h2 \).

26 \[ ... \quad \textit{Oaa8} \]

Black cannot move his rook from f8 since, for example, 26...\( \textit{O}e8 \) fails to the tactic 27...
160 1...\(\texttt{c6}\) against Flank Openings

\(\texttt{\textit{xc6}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{xc6}}\) \(28\) \(\texttt{\textit{c1+}}\).

\begin{align*}
27 & \texttt{dxf8}+ \texttt{\textit{xf8}} \\
28 & \texttt{\textit{b5}}
\end{align*}

In his haste to exchange queens Capablanca overlooks a defensive resource. \(28\) \(\texttt{e3}\) \(\texttt{h2}\) \(29\) \(\texttt{g2}\) \(\texttt{g2+}\) \(30\) \(\texttt{xg2}\) \(\texttt{e5}\) \(31\) \(\texttt{f1}\) \(\texttt{d7}\) would be correct when Black has compensation for his pawn, but nothing more.

\begin{align*}
28 & \ldots \texttt{\textit{xe4!}} \\
\text{Capablanca had probably only expected} & \text{28...\(\texttt{\textit{e2+}}\) 29 \(\texttt{e2}\) \(\texttt{xf2+}\) 30 \(\texttt{d1}\) \(\texttt{xg1+}\) 31 \(\texttt{c2}\) when White's king has escaped immediate danger and the b7-pawn falls after which White has a dangerous passed a-pawn.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
29 & \texttt{\textit{xb7}} \\
\text{Suddenly Capablanca has to fight for a draw.} & \ldots \texttt{\textit{xd3+}} \\
30 & \texttt{\textit{g2}} \texttt{\textit{e4+}} \\
31 & \texttt{f3}
\end{align*}

The saving grace which deflects Black's bishop. If instead \(31\) \(\texttt{h3}\) then \(31...\texttt{f5+}\) follow-
ed by \(...\texttt{d7}\) evading the queen exchange and leaving White's king hopelessly exposed.

\begin{align*}
31 & \ldots \texttt{\textit{xf3+}} \\
32 & \texttt{\textit{h3}} \texttt{\textit{xd5}} \\
33 & \texttt{\textit{xf7+}} \texttt{\textit{xf7}} \\
34 & \texttt{\textit{gf1}} \texttt{\textit{e6+}}
\end{align*}

Now Black has all the chances but White can ultimately save himself with \(\texttt{f4}\), trading off one of Black's dangerous bishops.

\begin{align*}
35 & \texttt{\textit{g2}} \texttt{\textit{f5}} \\
36 & \texttt{a6} \texttt{\textit{e4+}} \\
37 & \texttt{\textit{h3}} \texttt{\textit{g7}} \\
38 & \texttt{\textit{b6}} \texttt{\textit{f5+}} \\
39 & \texttt{\textit{g2}} \texttt{\textit{e4+}} \\
40 & \texttt{\textit{h3}} \texttt{\textit{e7}}
\end{align*}

Also inadequate for a win is \(40...\texttt{g5}\) \(41\) \(\texttt{hxg5}\) \(\texttt{hxg5}\) \(42\) \(\texttt{g4}\).

\begin{align*}
41 & \texttt{\textit{f4}} \texttt{\textit{f7}}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
42 & \texttt{\textit{xe5}} \\
\text{The final liquidation which ensures a draw.} & \ldots \texttt{\textit{xf1}} \\
43 & \texttt{\textit{xd6}} \texttt{\textit{f3+}} \\
44 & \texttt{\textit{h2}} \texttt{\textit{g5}} \\
45 & \texttt{\textit{hxg5}} \texttt{\textit{hxg5}} \\
46 & \texttt{\textit{xc5}} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}
\end{align*}