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Introduction to the First Edition

This book is aimed primarily at club-level players with a playing strength of up to about 2200 Elo (or 200 ECF). When I was a young player at school I was always looking out for new repertoire books. I wanted something which would give me all I needed to know about the opening, without being too time-consuming, as I had plenty of other things to do with my time. I guess you could say I was not a very serious chess student and in fact I delighted in getting my opponents on unfamiliar ground, when my natural ability would get a chance to shine through.

The problem I found with the repertoire books of the time was they attempted to cover too much material. Main-line variations would be covered in just a few pages, so justice was never done to the lines recommended. In the end I would have to consult a more specialized work on one of the suggested variations to find out the true story behind it and waste valuable time in the process. Meanwhile, I would suffer a few painful reverses, as my lack of understanding was exposed on the board.

The aim of this book is to provide a complete repertoire for the boy I used to be. The variations chosen are a little offbeat, but they fit together very nicely. The three main systems, the Barry Attack, the 150 Attack and the Colle-Zukertort, can be used against virtually any defence Black plays against 1 d4. These contain the meat and bones of the book and, once mastered, will provide a complete repertoire for White against most defences. I have used all three successfully myself.

I have chosen systems that I believe will have the greatest psychological impact. There is a school of thought that says "you should play the man, not the board". If you accept this, then you can learn a lot about an opponent from their choice of opening variation. For example, King's Indian players tend to be well booked-up. They often accept structural weaknesses in return for attacking chances. The Barry Attack is likely to annoy King's Indian players, who will be thrown onto their own resources from an early stage in unfamiliar positions where the usual plans just don't work.

With reference to the material itself, wherever possible, I have tried to place the emphasis on understanding what is occurring through explanation, rather than by weighty variations. This is because, for the most part, the variations I recommend are flexible and the move-orders are often quite interchangeable. In such situations, understanding what you are trying to achieve is of far greater importance than remembering specific moves.

I have included a number of non-grandmaster games in the material. This is because I feel it will be useful for the reader to have a number of examples
where Black defended less than perfectly, just as might happen in your average weekend tournament or local club match. These variations, although not objectively critical, should help to build your confidence in the recommended openings and aid you in understanding the various tactical motifs. Having confidence in your opening repertoire is in many ways as important as memorizing theory, because if you hit a snag, believing in your pet line will give you the self-assurance to solve any problems your opponent might set for you.

The astute reader will notice that Black has possibilities of achieving greater flexibility and therefore perhaps better chances of equality by utilizing a clever move-order, such as 1 d4 Ćf6 2 Ćf3 c5 or 1 d4 d5 2 Ćf3 Ć xf6 3 e3 and then 3...Ąg4 or 3...c5. While it is possible to play a Colle-Zukertort system against these moves, Black has better chances than normal. Therefore, to make the repertoire more effective, I have included chapters on the Anti-Benoni, Classical Queen’s Indian and Black’s alternatives after 1 d4 d5 2 Ćf3. These variations give White the best chance of an opening advantage and can be added to the repertoire, as and when the reader feels ready, thus giving maximum flexibility.

To save the reader time, I have tried to give only one recommendation per move for White, unless I felt it was prudent to give other examples of play to help you understand the main ideas. When I have given two possible continuations, they are usually of equal merit and it is up to you to decide which suits your personal style. Above all, I have offered variations that are likely to lead to the most fun for White as, after all, apart from for hard-nosed professionals, that is what playing chess is all about!

Aaron Summerscale
London, November 1998

Updater’s Notes

The original A Killer Chess Opening Repertoire was one of my favourite opening works because it outlined a remarkably seamless attacking repertoire which wasn’t too theoretical. Therefore I was happy to accept the task of updating it. It proved a greater challenge than I expected but I hope you enjoy the result.

What Has Changed?
Summerscale’s book has been holding up amazingly well for more than a decade – mainly because it emphasized understanding through well-annotated example
games rather than by providing reams of analysis. It also helps greatly that – with a very few exceptions – the lines recommended were very robust and not easily shaken by a novelty or two. Nevertheless, experience with the featured lines has grown and it’s now high time to update the theory. I have done my utmost to retain the spirit of the original work – even the exact wording has been left unchanged wherever reasonable. The original edition was a practical opening manual – not a detailed theoretical survey – and I have tried to keep it that way, giving no more detail than is necessary on a non-professional level. However, there is no way to deny that opening theory is rapidly expanding and that even low-theory lines are becoming more deeply explored – in particular lines which used to be described as ‘unclear’ or ‘unbalanced’. This is reflected in the update of this book. I realize it must give a denser and more theoretical impression than Summerscale’s original work, but hope that nobody feels intimidated by the added information. Most lines can still be played with very little memorization.

The reader may ask whether the main games – some of them now rather dated – are still the best examples of play. My answer is a firm yes. For the book’s primary purpose, these games are extremely instructive. They may not show how a well-prepared professional faces these systems today (that information can be found in the notes) but in many cases they demonstrate typical reactions from an opponent who was hoping to face a main line and was slightly surprised by a system he had never taken very seriously.

Inevitably, most of Summerscale’s proposed repertoire has a bit less surprise value today than it had a decade ago. That’s the price of being the subject of a popular opening manual. But from Black’s viewpoint these systems (with the exception of the 150 Attack) are still annoying sidelines to which he only reluctantly pays attention – and only after he has completed his study of the main lines.

The Main Changes
The only main game I removed (or rather demoted) was Khalifman-Lobron, PCA Qualifier, Groningen 1993, whose place was taken by Game 46, Meister-Seuffert, Germany tt 2007/8. This was not a particularly dramatic change as the original game was a short draw which is now included in its entirety in the notes to the new game.

Six entirely new main games were added, mostly replacing what was given as sidelines in the original work:
• Game 14, Brousek-Rivest, corr. 2003
• Game 19, Dgebraudze-Cekro, Belgian Ch, Aalst 2005
• Game 34, Jobava-Zaragatski, Bad Zwesten 2005
• Game 41, Khenkin-L.Milov, Bad Homburg 2006
• Game 58, Korchnoi-Schlieref, Bad Wörishofen 2004
• Game 63, Belozerov-Sterliagova, Samara 2003
Even in these games you will find that I have retained most of Summerscale’s original annotations and included them in the relevant places in the new structure.

In addition I expanded a lot of notes from the original book and restructured them into new main games. The original annotations were mostly kept unchanged but some new game fragments and prose were added where it seemed appropriate.

My other contributions are dotted throughout the text, where some updating was useful or necessary. Obviously, any game references more recent than 1998 were not in the original book, and on the whole I have tended to update the analysis rather than the strategic commentary, as in many cases there was little to add to the original work in this respect, except where an entirely new line or plan is being recommended. Finally, the entire chess content (both old and new) was subjected to a systematic ‘blundercheck’ by Rybka 3, with the text amended when this threw up any important discoveries that also stood up to human scrutiny.

Sources
In addition to various electronic sources – most prominently Mega Database 2009 and Correspondence Database 2009 – a great number of books were consulted. Most had only a few pages or even a few lines that were relevant. The most important exception was Starting Out: d-Pawn Attacks by Richard Palliser (Everyman 2008) which covers several closely related topics. His Starting Out: The Colle Attack (Everyman 2007) was also quite useful.
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Sverre Johansen
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1 Barry Attack

Introduction

Why does the average club player as White need something offbeat against the King’s Indian? Aren’t the main lines good enough? To answer this, let us look at a main-line variation of the King’s Indian.

1 d4 ♗f6 2 ♗f3 g6 3 c4 ♘g7 4 ♘c3 0-0 5 e4 d6 6 ♘e2 e5 7 0-0 ♘c6 8 d5 ♘e7 9 ♘e1 ♘d7 10 ♘e3 f5 11 f3 f4 12 ♗f2 g5 (D)

This is one of the critical main lines of the Classical King’s Indian after 12 moves. And objectively, it does indeed put Black’s play to a severe test. But for many players, White’s position will represent a chess nightmare. Black has an automatic and very powerful long-term kingside attack. As if this weren’t enough, there are plenty of books telling Black exactly how to proceed, either to deliver mate or create enough chaos to make the issue completely unclear. Perhaps the worst thing is that Black seems to have all the fun. If you haven’t got hours, days or maybe even weeks to study this one line, then you could be in trouble.

Why should White have to subject himself to this sort of onslaught in the search for an opening advantage? Isn’t it time to put the ball back in Black’s court? The Barry Attack avoids not only the King’s Indian, but the Grünfeld as well. It is a ‘plug and play’ opening which can be learnt in a few hours. The basic idea is simple, if a little crude. No more mister nice guy; it’s time for blood!

For those who need a reminder of what it can be like to take White in the above diagram, I include the rest of the short and (for White) very painful game Perruchoud-Tischer, Biel 1990:

13 ♘b5 b6 14 b4 a6 15 ♘c3 ♘g6 16 a4 ♘b8 17 ♘d3 ♗f6 18 a5 bxa5 19 ♗xa5 h5 20 c5 g4 21 b5 g3 22 hxg3 fxg3 23 ♘xg3 h4 24 ♘f2 ♘h5 25 bxa6 ♘g5 26 ♘e1 ♘f4 27 ♘xf4 ♘xf4 28 ♗f2 ♘h2 29 a7 ♘g3 30 a8♕ ♘h1 ♘xf2 0-1
Absolutely typical! Just as White was busying himself taking his opponent's queenside pieces and queening his passed pawn, Black launched a lethal mating attack. Enough of this pain and suffering! It's time for the Killer Barry Attack.

Game 1
Pira – Hebden
Seville 1987

1 d4 ♘f6 2 ♘f3 g6 3 ♘c3 d5 4 ♘f4 ♗g7 5 e3 0-0 6 ♘e2 (D)

Welcome to the wonderful world of the Barry Attack. The outlook for the moment is calm and there is not a pawn-storm in sight! Well, certainly not against the white king anyway. White has a crude, almost barbaric plan from this position: shove the h-pawn up the board and attempt to tear the black king limb from limb! There are a few circumstances when, as you might expect, this is not justified: specifically, when Black plays 6...c5 and continues to attack the centre and queenside aggressively. Then it is time to show your opponent that you are not just a mad hacker and hone those endgame skills to exploit the small but persistent advantages that arise. One of the main plus-points of the Barry Attack is that this time there are almost no books for Black to go running back to check.

6...c5

The year 1987 was a particularly important one for the Barry Attack, for it was the year that Mark Hebden was introduced, somewhat painfully, to its delights. After his defeat in this game, Hebden, a renowned King's Indian specialist, went home and had a long, hard look at the opening. As we shall see, today he is one of the world's leading exponents of the Barry Attack – he obviously came to the conclusion "if you can't beat them, join them!"

6...c6 7 h4, 6...♗g4 7 ♤e5 and 6...b6 7 ♤e5 are all important alternatives, which we shall examine later.

7 ♤e5 b6?!

7...♗c6 is critical – it is important for Black to put as much pressure on White's centre as possible, so as to dissuade White from his kingside attack.

8 h4 ♤a6 9 ♤f3

The light-squared bishop plays a very important role in supporting White's kingside attack, so naturally White avoids its exchange.

9...♗b7 10 h5 ♤bd7 11 hxg6 fxg6

This gives Black some central light-square weaknesses (particularly e6) but is safer than the other recapture, which is extremely dangerous for the health of the black king.
If 11...hxg6 then 12 ♗g4 with the idea of ♘f3-h3, or the calmer 12 ♗e2, intending a more methodical transfer of forces to the h-file.

12 ♗g4 ♘xg4 13 ♘xg4 (D)

One thing you will often notice about the Barry Attack is that although White tends to build up a powerful attacking position, like here, he leaves no real weaknesses for Black to exploit. Indeed, if you look at the diagram you will see that it is Black who has the weak points for White to target.

13...♕f5 14 ♗h3 ♘f8 15 g4 ♘xf4

Sometimes Black will have to sacrifice in order to get meaningful counterplay and to stem the tide of the white attack. Here, this proves to be insufficient, but the alternatives were not much more attractive. If 15...♕f6 then 16 ♗h6 gives White a strong kingside attack, at no risk.

16 exf4 cxd4 17 ♗e2 g5 18 ♗h5 ♗d6 19 ♗f7+ ♗h8 20-0-0 ♗xe5 21 fxe5 ♗xe5 22 ♕xd4 ♗g7 23 ♘xg7+ ♗xg7 (D)

Black struggles on from here valiantly, but is ultimately lost, not only because of the material disadvantage, but also due to the passivity of his pieces.

24 ♗de1 ♕e8 25 ♖h5 ♘g6 26 ♗f3

26 ♕e5 would confirm the hopelessness of Black’s cause. From here on White slightly misplays his position, but clearly his opening and middlegame play was a resounding success.

26...h6 27 ♕e5+ ♗g7 28 ♖eh1 d4 29 ♖1h2 ♖c8 30 f4 ♕xf4 31 ♖f5 ♗g6 32 ♕xg6 ♘xg6 33 ♗xf4 e5 34 ♖f5 ♖c5 35 ♖fh5 ♕e4

Black has done a great deal to improve the positioning of his pieces, but has not been able to redress the weakness of his pawn-structure.

36 ♖xh6+ ♕g5 37 ♖h8 ♘xg4 38 ♘f8 ♗f3 39 ♔d2 e4 40 ♖d8?! ♕c4?

Failing to make the most of his chances, which would be quite real after 40...e3+ 41 ♕d3 ♕g3. Now White gets on top again.

41 ♗b3 ♕c7?! 42 ♖xd4 ♕g3 43 ♖h8 ♗f2 44 ♕e8 ♗g7 45 ♖xe4
White simplifies to a won rook and pawn endgame.

\[45...\text{dx}e4\ 46\ \text{dx}e4\ \text{fx}d+\ 47\ \text{c}3\ \text{xf}3\ 48\ \text{e}8\ \text{e}c7+\ 49\ \text{b}2\ \text{fd}4\ 50\ \text{c}4\ \text{f}5\ 51\ \text{c}3\ \text{b}5\ 52\ \text{e}e2\ \text{fd}4\ 53\ \text{d}d4\ \text{bxc}4\ 54\ \text{bxc}4\ \text{e}d7+\ 55\ \text{c}e5\ \text{fd}3\ 56\ \text{xe}6\ \text{c}7+\ 57\ \text{d}d5\ \text{f}f4\ 58\ \text{c}5\ \text{f}f5\ 59\ \text{e}e2\ \text{d}d7+\ 60\ \text{c}c6\ \text{h}h7\ 61\ \text{d}d6\ 1-0\]

Again, it is no coincidence that shortly after this game, Hebden became one of the Barry Attack's strongest advocates.

**Early Deviations for Black**

The Barry Attack is a somewhat unusual opening and as such, may encourage irregular responses from Black. As we shall see in this section, this approach by no means guarantees Black success.

**Game 2**

**R. Scherbakov – Hoang Thanh Trang**

_Cheliabinsk 1989_

1 d4 \text{gf}6 2 \text{gf}3 g6 3 \text{c}c3 d5 4 \text{f}f4 \text{g}7

Black can also play:

a) 4...c6 is considered in Game 3 as it is closely related to the 4...\text{g}7 5 e3 \text{g}4 lines.

b) 4...a6 makes sense if Black wants to delay ...\text{g}7 until White can no longer go for \text{wd}2 and \text{h}6 ideas. However, after 5 e3, Black should transpose to the main game with 5...\text{g}7 rather than 5...b5 as in Sharbat-Darbanvai-ghani, Kish 2005, which went 6 \text{e}e5 \text{b}7 7 \text{h}4 \text{g}7?! 8 h5 \text{bd}7 (8...\text{ex}h5

9 \text{x}h5 \text{gx}h5 10 \text{wx}h5 \text{xe}5 11 \text{xe}5 \text{f}8 12 \text{g}7 \pm 9 \text{g}4 \text{c}5?! 10 \text{f}6 \text{f}8 11 \text{g}5 \text{h}5?! 12 \text{x}h5! \text{gx}h5 13 \text{xf}7! \text{xf}7 14 \text{wx}h5+ \text{g}8 15 \text{h}3 \text{wb}6 16 \text{d}d7 \text{c}8 17 \text{d}d5 \text{b}7?! 18 \text{xe}7+! 1-0.

c) 4...\text{h}5?! isn't at all easy to meet but 5 \text{g}5 h6 6 \text{h}4 g5 7 \text{g}3 \text{x}g3 8 hxg3 \text{g}7 9 e4?! dxe4 10 \text{exe}4 \text{f}5 11 \text{d}d3 \text{g}6 (11...\text{wd}5) 12 \text{c}5 \text{x}d3 13 \text{xd}3 b6 14 \text{e}e4 \text{c}6

15 d5 was better for White in Ortega-Petrescu, Saint Vincent 2006.

5 e3 (D)

\[B\]

5...a6

The main moves, covered in later games, are 5...\text{g}4, 5...c6 and 5...0-0. Other rare alternatives are:

a) 5...\text{bd}7?? 6 \text{b}5 ++ has been a quick point-collector on the British tournament circuit.

b) 5...\text{h}5? is an attempt to harass the white bishop but wastes too much time. 6 \text{g}5 h6 7 \text{h}4 g5 (7...c6 8 \text{e}e5 \text{wb}6 9 \text{b}1 \text{f}6 10 \text{d}d3 \text{e}6 11 \text{b}4 \text{bd}7 12 \text{f}4 \text{xe}5 13 \text{f}xe5 \text{d}7 14-0-0 ± Hebeden-Feller, Cappelle la Grande
2005) is the most consistent continuation of Black’s somewhat dubious plan, which he began on move 5, to bag the bishop-pair. With accurate play, White is able to exploit Black’s loss of tempi. After 8 \( \text{Q} e5 \)! Black has a choice:

b1) 8...\( \text{Qf}6 \) is a little illogical, because the whole point of Black’s play has been to exchange off White’s dark-squared bishop. If Black fails to achieve this, he has simply weakened his kingside for no apparent reason. White has a clear edge after 9 \( \text{Ag}3 \text{xf}5 \) 10 \( \text{Qd}3 \text{xd}3 \text{c}6 \) 12 \( \text{h}4 \) g4 13 h5 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 14 \( \text{W}e2 \text{a}5 \) 15 \( \text{Q}x \text{d}7 \text{xd}7 \) 16 0-0-0, Wirthensohn-Bloessel, Lenk 1992.

b2) 8...\( \text{Qxe}5 \) 9 \( \text{dxe}5 \text{Qg}7 \) (after 9...\( \text{g}x \text{h}4 \) 10 \( \text{W}x \text{h}5 \) Black has no compensation for his kingside pawn weaknesses) 10 \( \text{Ag}3 \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{h}4 \) ! (the most incisive move – Black is made to pay for his over-ambitious kingside pawn advances) 11...\( \text{Ag}8 \) 12 \( \text{hx}g5 \text{hx}g5 \) 13 \( \text{e}4 \pm \) (Black is given no respite and now faces the unenviable choice of opening the centre for White’s better-placed forces, or closing it, and thus leaving his knight on \( g7 \) woefully misplaced) 13...\( \text{dxe}4 \) (13...\( \text{d}4 \) 14 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( b6 \) ?!) 15 \( \text{W}d2 \) \( f6 \) 16 \( e \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 \) 17 0-0-0 \( \text{c}5 \) 18 \( \text{Q}c3 \text{e}7 \) leads to a large advantage for White after 19 \( \text{Q}b5 \) 14 \( \text{W}x \text{d}8+ \text{x}d8 \) 15 \( \text{Q}x \text{e}4 \text{f}5 \) 16 0-0-0+ \( \text{e}8 \) 17 \( \text{Q}x \text{g}5 \text{x}g3 \) 18 \( \text{Q}x \text{e}6 \text{x}h1 \)? 19 \( \text{d}8 \# \) (1-0) J.Pribyl-Penzold, 2nd Bundesliga 1991/2. An unusual mating position!

c) 5...\( \text{xf}5 \) 6 \( \text{e}2 \text{c}6 \). Black often has difficulties in the Barry Attack with the development of his light-squared bishop. On \( g4 \) it can be attacked by \( \text{Q}e5 \), while on \( f5 \), as here, it can be a target for White’s kingside pawn advances. The awkward positioning of Black’s bishop led to an advantage for White in Suetin-Borisenko, USSR Ch, Kiev 1954 after 7 \( \text{Q}e5 \) \( \text{Q}fd7 \) 8 \( g4 \text{e}6 \) 9 \( \text{d}3 \text{c}5 \) 10 0-0-0 11 \( \text{b}5 \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}3 \text{f}6 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \text{f}7 \) 14 \( \text{c}3 \text{xd}4 \) 15 \( \text{xd}4 \text{c}7 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 \) 17 \( \text{e}1 \text{b}6 \) ?! 18 \( \text{d}3 \text{b}7 \) 19 \( \text{e}5 \text{e}6 \) 20 \( \text{g}2 \text{c}8 \) 21 \( \text{w}e2 \text{e}4 \) 22 \( \text{Q}xe4 \text{dxe}4 \) 23 \( \text{Q}xe4 \text{xe}4 \) 24 \( \text{W}x \text{e}4 \text{xd}4 \) 25 \( \text{Q}x \text{g}7 \text{xg}7 \) 26 \( \text{a}d1 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 27 \( \text{Q}c5 \text{c}8 \) 28 \( \text{d}7 \text{h}8 \) 29 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 30 \( \text{a}4 \). White has kept the initiative.

6 \( \text{Q}e2 \text{bd}7 \) 7 \( \text{Q}e5 \text{c}6 \)

In Blatny-Litavsky, European Ch, Ohrid 2001 Black produced the amazing blunder 7...\( b6 \) ?! 8 \( \text{Q}c6 \) 1-0.

8 \( \text{h}4 \) (D)

This is the basic attacking set-up in the Barry Attack. The advance of the \( h \)-pawn works best if Black adopts a slow plan, typically when he avoids the advance...c5.
8...\text{\textit{f}}e4

Black tries to defuse the oncoming attack using the accepted method of piece exchanges, but she suffers a lack of coordination since her king is still in the centre. Although the black king is safer in the middle, White nevertheless finds a clever way to create problems on the kingside.

9 \text{\textit{e}}xe4 \text{\textit{d}}xe4 10 h5 \text{\textit{d}}xe5 11 h6! (D)

A nice intermezzo. The move h6 can be a major irritant if Black has not castled kingside, and justifies White’s early kingside pawn advance.

11...\text{\textit{w}}a5+ 12 \text{\textit{w}}d2 \text{\textit{w}}xd2+ 13 \text{\textit{x}}xd2 \text{\textit{d}}xh6 14 \text{\textit{g}}xe5 f6 15 \text{\textit{d}}xh6 fxe5 16 \text{\textit{a}}ah1 \text{\textit{e}}e6 17 \text{\textit{g}}xg6

The dust has settled and material equality has been restored. Black is saddled with the worse bishop and, more importantly, a damaged pawn-structure. Against a grandmaster, Black is simply lost, with no way to defend her weaknesses in the long term. To her credit, Black struggles on valiantly for 30 moves, but the result is not in doubt.

17...\text{\textit{d}}d7 18 \text{\textit{g}}g7 \text{\textit{a}}ag8 19 \text{\textit{g}}xg8 \text{\textit{g}}xg8 20 g3 exd4 21 exd4 \text{\textit{f}}8 22 \text{\textit{e}}e3 \text{\textit{f}}5 23 \text{\textit{d}}d2 \text{\textit{d}}d6 24 \text{\textit{e}}e3 \text{\textit{g}}g6 25 \text{\textit{h}}h5 \text{\textit{f}}f5 26 \text{\textit{h}}h4 e5 27 dxe5+ \text{\textit{g}}xe5 28 \text{\textit{f}}f4 \text{\textit{d}}d8 29 \text{\textit{g}}4 \text{\textit{g}}g6 30 \text{\textit{h}}xg6 \text{\textit{h}}xg6 31 \text{\textit{x}}xe4+ \text{\textit{f}}f6 32 f4 \text{\textit{d}}d1 33 \text{\textit{d}}d4 \text{\textit{d}}b1 34 \text{\textit{d}}d6+ \text{\textit{g}}g7 35 \text{\textit{x}}xg6 \text{\textit{d}}xb2 36 \text{\textit{h}}xg3 \text{\textit{h}}xa2 37 \text{\textit{g}}g7+ \text{\textit{f}}f6 38 \text{\textit{b}}b7 \text{\textit{d}}a4 39 c4 \text{\textit{a}}a3+ 40 \text{\textit{d}}d4 \text{\textit{a}}f3 41 \text{\textit{e}}e4 \text{\textit{c}}c3 42 g5+ \text{\textit{g}}xg6 43 \text{\textit{d}}d4 \text{\textit{f}}f3 44 \text{\textit{e}}e5 \text{\textit{e}}e3+ 45 \text{\textit{d}}d6 \text{\textit{e}}e4 46 c5 \text{\textit{x}}xf4 47 \text{\textit{a}}xh6+ 48 \text{\textit{h}}xg5 49 \text{\textit{f}}f6 49 \text{\textit{e}}e5 \text{\textit{a}}c4 50 \text{\textit{d}}d5 \text{\textit{c}}c1 51 \text{\textit{e}}e6+ 1-0

5...\text{\textit{g}}4 and a Move-Order Finesse

Game 3
Blatny – Fette
Vienna 1991

1 d4 \text{\textit{f}}f6 2 \text{\textit{f}}f3 g6 3 \text{\textit{c}}c3 d5 4 \text{\textit{f}}f4 \text{\textit{g}}7

It’s worth noting that in order to avoid the kind of things that happen in this game, the cunning move-order 4...c6 5 e3 \text{\textit{g}}4 6 \text{\textit{e}}e2 \text{\textit{xf3}}! is becoming increasingly popular. Black is very solid and can expect to play a quick ...e5, e.g.: 7 \text{\textit{xf3}} \text{\textit{g}}7 8 0-0 \text{\textit{bd7}} 9 \text{\textit{wd2}} 0-0 10 \text{\textit{ad1}} 11 \text{\textit{a}}a4 \text{\textit{wa}}6 12 \text{\textit{c}}c3 (12 b3 \text{\textit{fe8}} 13 \text{\textit{b}}b2 e5 14 dxe5 \text{\textit{xe5}} 15 \text{\textit{xe5}} \text{\textit{xe5}} 16 \text{\textit{f}}f3) 17 \text{\textit{f}}f3 Seipel-Gutman, Lippstadt 1999) 12...\text{\textit{fe8}} 13 \text{\textit{c}}c7 \text{\textit{ac8}} 14 \text{\textit{g}}3 e5 = Lamoureux-Hebden, Neuchâtel 2003. A natural counter-finesse is to avoid the pin with 5 \text{\textit{wd2}}, planning a direct attack with \text{\textit{h}}h6 and \text{\textit{h}}4-\text{\textit{h}5}. A few examples:

a) 5...\text{\textit{h}}6 6 \text{\textit{e}}e5 \text{\textit{g}}7 7 f3 \text{\textit{fd7}} 8 \text{\textit{xd7}} \text{\textit{xd7}} 9 e4 \text{\textit{dxe4}} 10 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{f}}f6
11 0-0-0 \( \text{dxe}4 12 \text{fxe}4 \text{g}4 13 \text{e}2 \text{xe}2 14 \text{wx}e2 \text{wa}5 15 \text{wb}1 0-0 16 \text{h}4 \pm \text{Palliser-Weisbuch, Port Erin 2007.}

b) 5...\text{g}7 6 \text{h}6 \text{hxh}6?! (6...0-0?! 7\text{h}4 \text{f}5?! \{7...\text{xh}6?!\} 8 \text{xxg}7 \text{xxg}7 9\text{h}5 \text{b}5 10 \text{hxg}6 \text{xxg}6 11 \text{e}5 \text{wd}6 12 \text{h}6+ \text{g}8 13 \text{e}3 \text{xe}4 14 \text{xd}3 \text{f}5 15 \text{g}4 \pm \text{Hebden-L.Aubert, French Team Ch 1991}\}
7 \text{wx}h6 \text{wa}5 8 \text{g}5 \text{b}5! 9 \text{e}4 \text{gxe}4 10 \text{gxe}4 \text{dxe}4 11 \text{e}2 \text{f}6 12 0-0 \text{f}6 13 \text{f}3 (\text{Hebden-D.Howell, Southend 2008}) and now Palliser’s suggestion 13...\text{wb}4! leads to unclear play.

5 e3

Since the original edition of this book, an alternative attacking system starting with 5 \text{wd}2 – the ‘Tarzan Attack’ – has appeared on the tournament scene. White plans \text{h}6, 0-0-0 and a lightning attack down the h-file. After some initial successes – by Hebden among others – it now seems its sting has largely been removed. We shall not go into any detail on this, and just note that Black has another option to worry about.

5...\text{g}4 (D)

6 \text{e}2

This move is standard, but Hebden’s little-tested 6 \text{wd}3 still deserves serious attention. By taking advantage of the fact that Black has not yet castled, White avoids the problematic exchange on f3 (as discussed in the note to 4...\text{g}7):

a) 6...\text{xf}3? 7 \text{wb}5+ \text{bd}7 8 \text{gxf}3 wins a pawn for White.

b) 6...0-0 7 \text{e}5 and now:

b1) 7...\text{e}6 8 \text{e}2 c5 9 0-0 \text{bd}7 10 \text{f}3 \text{ec}8 11 \text{b}5 \text{b}6 12 a4 \text{cx}d4 13 \text{xb}6 \text{xb}6 14 \text{ex}d4 a5 = Wirthensohn-Cvitan, Pontresina 2000.

b2) 7...c5 8 \text{g}4 \text{g}4 9 \text{e}2 \text{f}6 10 0-0 \text{cx}d4 11 \text{ex}d4 \text{c}6 12 \text{f}3 \text{c}8 13 a3 \text{e}6 14 \text{e}2 \text{b}6 = Brenke-Greenfeld, Lippsstadt 2004.

c) 6...c6 7 \text{e}5 \text{f}5 8 \text{wd}2 \text{bd}7 9 \text{h}4 \text{h}5 10 \text{f}3 \text{ec}8 11 \text{e}2 \text{b}5 12 \text{dx}d1 (White shows that he too does not yet need to commit his king; the c3-knight, which was possibly White’s worst-placed piece, manoeuvres to f2, from where it will assist with the kingside attack) 12...0-0 (Black decides he has run out of useful waiting moves, but in any case, he cannot put off castling indefinitely) 13 c3 \text{e}8 14 \text{f}2 \text{d}6 15 \text{g}4 \text{hxg}4 16 \text{exg}4 \text{d}4 17 \text{e}4 (this is the culmination of White’s plan which he began on move 12; the g4-knight is a key attacking piece) 17...\text{f}5 18 \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 19 \text{dxe}5 \text{c}4 20 \text{xc}4 \text{dxc}4 (despite Black’s piece exchanges, his kingside remains chronically weak; White now mops up with ease) 21 \text{g}2 \text{d}5 (21...\text{e}8 22 \text{h}5 \text{gxh}5 23 \text{h}6 \text{f}7 24 \text{g}1) 22 \text{g}6 \text{c}8 22...\text{e}3 23 \text{g}1 \text{f}7 24 \text{e}6)
23 \( \text{g}1 \text{d}2+ 24 \text{f}1 \text{d}3+ 25 \text{g}2 \text{e}7 26 \text{h}3 \text{e}6 27 \text{xe}6 \text{f}8 28 \text{ad}1 \text{e}8 29 \text{xc}6 \text{e}2 30 \text{d}6+ \text{g}8 31 \text{d}5 1-0 \text{Hebden-Bates, British Ch, Hove 1997.}

6...c6  
Other moves transpose elsewhere:

a) 6...0-0 – Game 6.

b) For 6...\( \text{xf}3! \) 7 ...\( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) see the note to Black’s 4th move above.

7 \( \text{xe}5 \text{xe}2 8 \text{xe}2 \text{bd}7 \)

8...\( \text{h}5 \) is another move which makes sense before kingside castling: 9 \( \text{h}4 \text{xf}4 \) (better than 9...\( \text{xd}7 \)?) 10 \( \text{h}2! \text{h}6 11 0-0 \text{e}4 12 \text{xe}4 \text{dxe}4 13 \text{h}5 \pm \text{S.B.Hansen-Sutovsky, Malmo 2003) 10 exf} \text{h}5 11 0-0-0 \text{d}7 12 \text{b}1 (12 \text{he}1 \text{f}6 13 \text{d}3 \text{h}6 14 \text{g}3 0-0 15 \text{f}3 \text{c}8 16 \text{a}4 \pm \text{Beikert-Banikas, French Team Ch 2002) 12...e}6 13 \text{g}3 (13 \text{d}3 \text{w}e7 14 \text{g}3 \text{xe}5 15 \text{fxe}5 \text{b}5 16 \text{w}e3 \text{c}8 17 \text{g}5 \text{b}4 \text{is uncertain, Yusupov – Vachier-Lagrave, Bundesliga 2007/8) 13...\text{xe}5 14 \text{fxe}5 \text{a}5 15 \text{he}1 \text{b}5 16 \text{we}3 \text{b}6 17 \text{d}2 \text{a}5 and White’s chances appeared preferable in Miguel Aparicio-Kasparov, Lima simul 1993.

9 0-0-0 0-0

Alternatively, 9...\( \text{a}5 \) is a more logical continuation of Black’s plan to delay castling for as long as possible. In practice, play has continued 10 \( \text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 11 \text{c}4 \text{dxe}4 12 \text{xe}4 \text{e}6 13 \text{h}4 \text{f}6 14 \text{e}5 \) (White aims for a small endgame advantage, but could also play for a kingside attack with 14 \( \text{we}2 \) followed by \( g4 \) and \( h4-h5 \)) 14...\( \text{xe}5 15 \text{xe}5 0-0 16 \text{f}3 \text{f}d8 17 \text{g}4 \text{d}5 18 \text{d}4 \text{b}5 19 \text{g}5 \pm \text{Blatny-Lutz, Altensteig 1991. White’s advantage lies in his control of the dark squares and the difficulty Black has in striking back at White’s centre.}

10 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{a}5 \)!

10...\( \text{h}5 \) is covered in Game 6 and 10...\( \text{c}8 \) in Game 10. Black can also play:

a) 10...\( \text{e}4 11 \text{xe}4 \) (maybe 11 \( \text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 12 \text{h}5 \) is more effective) 11...\( \text{dxe}4 12 \text{h}5 \text{xe}5 13 \text{dxe}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 14 \text{hxg}6 \text{hxg}6 15 \text{g}4 \text{xa}2 16 \text{c}3 \text{fd}8 = \text{S.Pedersen-E.Mortensen, Aars 1999.}

b) 10...\( \text{xe}5 11 \text{e}5 \) and now:

b1) 11...\( \text{a}5 12 \text{h}5 \text{b}5 13 \text{f}3 \text{b}4 14 \text{b}1 \text{e}8 15 \text{hxg}6 \text{hxg}6 16 \text{g}4 \text{c}5 17 \text{g}5 \text{h}5 18 \text{g}7 \text{g}7 19 \text{wxd}5 \pm \text{Stefanova-Moreno, Quito 1997.}

b2) 11...\( \text{b}5 12 \text{h}5 \text{b}4 13 \text{a}4 \text{w}5 14 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 15 \text{c}5 \text{xa}2 16 \text{a}6! \text{xa}6 17 \text{d}1 \text{f}8 18 \text{xb}4 \text{a}5 19 \text{d}3 \text{f}8 20 \text{d}2 \text{a}4 21 \text{e}1 \) (White has somewhat the better chances) 21...\( \text{e}5 ? 22 \text{dxc}5 \text{xc}5 23 \text{h}4! \) ± \text{Sulava-Rogulj, Šibenik 2006.}

11 \( \text{h}5 \) (D)

![Chess Diagram]

White’s idea is very simple: prise open the h-file and mate!
11...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}xe5} 12 dxe5 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e4
Black has no defensive resources after 12...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh5 13 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh5 gxh5 14 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh5.
13 hxg6 (D)
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g6 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

13...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xc3
Instead:
\begin{itemize}
  \item a) 13...fxg6 gives White another avenue of attack: 14 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xe4 dxe4 15 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}c4+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f7 (15...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h8 16 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh7+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh7 17 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h1+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h6 18 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh6 +–) 16 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh7 +–.
  \item b) 13...hxg6 14 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g4 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xc3 15 bxc3 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}fd8 16 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h4 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f8 17 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h7 e6 18 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}d3! (White safeguards his king before beginning the final attacking phase; later games have also seen White winning after 18 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h6, but the flashy 18 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xg7+? should be avoided in view of 18...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xg7 19 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g5 f5!, when a draw is likely) 18...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xa2 19 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}d2 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}a3 20 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h3 a5 21 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f3 (White has a brutal plan in mind: transfer the bishop to f6 and mate!) 21...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}d7 (21...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e7 22 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h6 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh6 23 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h8#) 22 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g5 a4 (Black’s plan of pushing the a-pawn looks a little slow, but he is at a loss for any meaningful counterplay) 23 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f6 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xf6 24 exf6 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e8 25 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h8+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f8 26 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h3 1-0 Blatny–Peek, Groningen 1990.
\end{itemize}
14 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h5
Quite amusingly, White is just ignoring Black and getting on with the business in hand.
14...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xa2+ 15 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}b1 fxg6 16 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xh7+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f7 17 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h6 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g8 18 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h4 g5 19 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xg7 gxh4
19...\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xg7 loses to 20 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f5+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g8 21 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e6+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f7 22 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h7.
20 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f6+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e6 21 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}xe7+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f5 22 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}h7+ \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e6 23 e4 (D)
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e7 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

1-0
Black is defenceless against the threats of \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}c7# and \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f5+, also followed by mate.

5...c6: Black delays ...0-0

Game 4

Hodgson – Wolff

New York 1990

1 d4 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f6 2 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f3 g6 3 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}c3 d5 4 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}f4
\texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}g7 5 e3 c6 6 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}e2 \texttt{\textipa{\textbab{}}}b6 (D)
Black also has tried:

a) 6...\(\texttt{g}5\) 7 \(\texttt{a}e5\) \(\texttt{d}f6\) 8 h3 0-0 9 0-0 \(\texttt{a}f5\) 10 \(\texttt{d}d3\) \(\texttt{bd7}\) 11 \(\texttt{x}f5\) \(\texttt{gxf5}\) 12 \(\texttt{f}4\) \(\pm\) Porrasmaa-Golod, European Clubs Cup, Rethymnon 2003.

b) 6...b5 7 a3 a5 8 0-0 0-0 9 h3 (9 \(\texttt{d}e5!?)\) 9...b7 10 \(\texttt{wd3}\) \(\texttt{bd7}\) = Armstrong-Civin, Queenstown 2006.

White attempts to set up a bind on the queenside, making it harder for Black to achieve the freeing advance ...c5. This more or less obliges Black to seek counterplay in the centre via ...e5. If White can prevent this, he will have a positional advantage.

\(8...\texttt{bd7}\) 9 0-0

9 h3, aiming to avoid the problems White is presented with in the main line, is interesting and still untested.

9...\(\texttt{h}5\) 10 \(\texttt{g}5\) h6

10...e5? is a move Black would like to play, but it has a tactical drawback:
11 \(\texttt{x}e5\) \(\texttt{xe2}\) 12 \(\texttt{xd}7\) \(\texttt{xd}1\) 13 \(\texttt{xb}6\) axb6 14 \(\texttt{fxd}1\) wins a pawn for White.

11 \(\texttt{h}4\) g5 12 h3 \((D)\)

If Black is trying to delay castling, then this is probably his most logical choice. By attacking the pawn on b2, Black more or less forces a weakening of White's queenside, which makes queenside castling less attractive and more difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, as White shows in this game, the queen is misplaced on b6 if White switches plans and instead decides to attack on the queenside.

7 a3! \(\texttt{g}4\)

After 7...\(\texttt{wxh2}\)?? 8 \(\texttt{a}4\) Black loses his queen and after 7...\(\texttt{f}5\) White can choose between 8 b4, as in the main game, and 8 \(\texttt{wd2}\) since 8...\(\texttt{wxh2}\) 9 \(\texttt{b1}\) \(\texttt{xc2}\) 10 \(\texttt{xc2}\) \(\texttt{xc2}\) 11 \(\texttt{xb7}\) is good for White.

8 b4

This is an intelligent way for White to keep his dark-squared bishop, a key piece in the fight for control of e5.

12...\(\texttt{e}6\)

White meets 12...gxh4 with 13 hgx4 \(\texttt{e}f6\) 14 \(\texttt{hd4}\) and 12...\(\texttt{xe}3!?\) by 13 gxh4 gxh4 14 \(\texttt{hd4}\) \(\texttt{hf6}\) 15 \(\texttt{f}5\).

13 \(\texttt{d}2\) \(\texttt{f}4\) 14 \(\texttt{g}3\) \(\texttt{xe}2+\) 15 \(\texttt{xe}2\) \(\texttt{f}5\)
Black discourages e4 in the long term and prepares counterplay on the kingside.

16 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 17 \( \text{Qa5} \)

White is slightly better because of his bind on the queenside and the awkwardly-placed bishop on e6.

17...\( \text{Wc8} \) 18 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{b6} \)

Black feels compelled to evict the knight from e5, but creates a potential weakness on c6 in the process.

19 \( \text{Qb3} \) 0-0 20 \( \text{Qac1} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 21 \( \text{f4} \)

White prevents ...\( \text{e5} \) and fixes a possible weakness on f5.

21...\( \text{Qf6} \) 22 \( \text{fxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 23 \( \text{Qd2} \)

Play is now concentrated on the battle for control of e5.

23...\( \text{We6} \) 24 \( \text{Qce1} \) \( \text{Qd7?!} \) 25 \( \text{Qf3} \)

Because Black cannot realistically achieve the freeing advance ...\( \text{e5} \), he instead opts for queenside counterplay.

27 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{axb4} \) 28 \( \text{AXB4} \) \( \text{Qa2} \) 29 \( \text{Wd1} \)

\( \text{Qh6} \)

As White controls the centre, Black must seek counterplay on the flanks.

30 \( \text{Wb1} \) \( \text{Qa3} \) 31 \( \text{Qfe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 32 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 33 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{(D)} \)

This is the culmination of White’s plan: he has complete control of the e5-square, and his knight is superbly placed there.

33...\( \text{g4} \)

Black has lost the strategic battle and so tries to muddy the waters.

34 \( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{Qxg4} \) 35 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{Qfa8} \)

35...\( \text{Qxe3} \) 36 \( \text{Wc1} \) \( \text{+-} \).

36 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qa2} \)

36...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 37 \( \text{Qxg4} \) \( \text{fxg4} \) 38 \( \text{Wf5} \) \( \text{±} \).

37 \( \text{Qxg4} \)

White trades in his positional advantage for a material one.

37...\( \text{fxg4} \) 38 \( \text{We4} \) \( \text{g3} \) 39 \( \text{Wg4+} \) \( \text{Qh8} \)

40 \( \text{Qxg3} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 41 \( \text{We5+} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 42 \( \text{Qxg7+} \) \( \text{Qxg7} \) 43 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 44 \( \text{Qxf2} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 45 \( \text{Qh1+} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 1-0

After 46 \( \text{Qh6} \) White is completely winning.

Game 5

Hebden – Ernst

Lloyds Bank Masters, London 1991

1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 2 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 3 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 4 \( \text{Qf4} \)

\( \text{g7} \) 5 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 6 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) \( \text{(D)} \)

This is the other main option.
Black seeks to delay castling and at the same time exchange off one of White’s most influential pieces.

7 \text{\textit{Qxe5 Qxe5}}

There is no lack of alternatives:

a) For 7...0-0 8 h4 Qxe5 9 \text{\textit{Qxe5}}, see note ‘b1’ to Black’s 8th move.

b) 7...e6 8 Qd2 Qe4 9 Qxe4 Qxe4 10 Qc4 0-0 11 h4 b6 12 Qd6 e5 13 dxe5 Qxe5 14 Qxe4 ± Ortega-Baldí, Porto Mannu 2007.

c) 7...Qf8 8 Qd2 Qd6 9 Qf3 Qe6 10 Qg3 f5 11 h4 h6 12 Qd3 Qf8 13 Qc2 Qb6 14 c4 ± Genocchio-Mogranzini, Montebelluna 2006.

d) 7...Qe4 8 Qxe4 dxe4 9 Qc4 Qb6 10 0-0 Qxc4 11 Bbxc4 Qa5 12 c3 (12 f3!?) 12...0-0 13 a4 c5 14 b4 cxb4 15 cxb4 Qxb4 16 Qc2 ± Hebden-Apicella, Paris 1988.

e) 7...Qb6 8 h4 h6 9 Qd2 Qe6 10 f3 Qfd7 11 0-0-0 (11 Qxd7 Qxd7 12 0-0-0 ±) 11...Qxe5 12 Qxe5 Qxe5 13 dxe5 Qd7?! (Okhotnik-F.Portisch, Zalakaros 2006; 13...Qc7!!?) 14 f4 ±.

f) 7...Qb6 8 Qa4 Qa5+ 9 c3 Qxe5 10 Qxe5 0-0 11 0-0 Qd7 12 b4 Qd8 13 Qxg7 Qxg7 14 f4 h5 15 Qc5 (15 f5?!?) 15...Qf6 16 Qf3 Qc7 = Silva-Emmenecker, French Team Ch 2006/7.

8 Qxe5 Qe6

Black has also tried:

a) 8...Qa5 9 Qd2 Qe6 10 h4 h5 11 f3 Qf8 12 a4 c5 13 Qb5 (13 dxc5?) 13...Qxd2+ 14 Qxd2 ± W.Schmidt-Loder, Germany tt 2006/7.

b) After 8...0-0 White can choose between an aggressive option and a solid one:

b1) 9 h4!? Qa5 (9...Qe4!!?) 10 Qd2 b5 11 a3 Qe6 12 h5 Qfc8 13 hxg6 hxg6 14 Qd3 Qd8 15 f3 a6 16 0-0-0 c5 17 dxc5 Qxc5 18 g4 Qae8 19 Qd4 Qg5c6 20 Qe2 ± Barsov-Van der Weide, Wijk aan Zee 1997.

b2) 9 Qd2 b5 10 f3 a5 11 0-0 is a safer approach: 11...Qa6 12 Qd1 Qb6 13 Qf2 Qad8 14 c3 Qd7 15 Qxg7 Qxg7 16 e4 Qb7 17 Qg4 c5 18 e5 Qxd4 19 Qxd4 f6 20 f4 ± Nybäck-Kiik, Helsinki 2001.

9 g4 h6 10 Qd2 Qd7 11 Qf3 0-0 (D)

\[ 
\text{\textit{Diagram:}} 
\]

12 0-0-0

This leads to a real bloodbath, with both sides going all-out for the kill, and is certainly the most uncompromising approach. 12 Qd1 b5 13 Qf2 is perhaps a more circumspect way to attack the black king, without giving Black such a large target to aim at. The plan is h4 and business as usual. In this position, White would continue to delay castling, since, for the moment, his king is undoubtedly safer in the centre than on the queenside.

12...b5 13 h4 a5 14 g5

This gives rise to a typical scenario when players have castled on opposite
wings. Each side has a quickly-advancing pawn-storm on ‘his’ flank. This type of position is not for the faint-hearted, as winning or losing often depends on a single tempo.

14...\(\text{Qh5}\) 15 \(\text{Qxg7 Qxg7}\) 16 \(\text{Qd1}\) h\(xg5\) 17 h\(xg5\) \(\text{Qh8}\) (\(D\))

Good enough, but your computer will quickly point out that 31 \(\text{Qgh2!}\) is a more clinical win.

31...\(\text{e6}\)

31...\(\text{Wxa3+}\) 32 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Wc3+}\) 33 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Wc4+}\) 34 \(\text{Qf2}\) and the king escapes the checks.

32 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{exf5}\) 33 \(\text{gxf7++}\) \(\text{Qxf7}\) 34 \(\text{Wxf5+}\) (\(D\))

18 \(\text{We1}\)

18 \(\text{f4}\) would allow 18...\(\text{Qg3!}\), exchanging the offside knight.

18...\(\text{Wd6}\) 19 \(\text{f4}\) a4 20 \(\text{Qd1}\) b4 21 \(\text{Qh4}\) c5 22 dxc5 \(\text{Wxc5}\) 23 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qac8}\) 24 \(\text{Qg2}\) d4 25 f5

It is essential for both sides to open lines against the enemy king as soon as possible, even at the cost of material.

25...\(\text{Qxf5?!}\)

25...\(\text{Qxf5}\) 26 exd4 \(\text{Qa5}\) 27 \(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) is unclear after 28 \(\text{We5+}\) or 28 \(\text{Qe3}\).

26 exd4 \(\text{Wd5}\) 27 \(\text{Qe3!}\) \(\text{Wxa2}\) 28 \(\text{Qxf5+}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) 29 \(\text{We5+}\)!

A clever intermezzo, forcing the king to an inferior square, before re-capturing the bishop.

29...\(\text{Qg8}\) 30 \(\text{Qxf5}\) a3 31 bxa3

It is fair to say that White has won the race to expose the enemy king; the black monarch is caught in no man’s land, with nowhere safe to run.

34...\(\text{Qe7}\)

Black’s other attempt at defence, 34...\(\text{Qf6}\) 35 \(\text{Qg6+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 36 \(\text{Qe2+}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 37 \(\text{Qg7+}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) 38 \(\text{Qxf6+}\), is no better for him.

35 \(\text{Qe4+}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 36 \(\text{Qg5+}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 37 \(\text{Qe7+}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 38 \(\text{Qxb4+}\) \(\text{Qa8}\) 39 \(\text{Qa4+}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 40 \(\text{Qb5+}\) \(\text{Qa8}\) 41 \(\text{Qa5+}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 42 \(\text{Qb4+}\)

White has been teasing Black for the last few moves, letting him know who’s boss, and now comes in for the kill!

42...\(\text{Qa8}\) 43 \(\text{Qe5}\)
Although more complicated, 43 \( \text{Re}7 \) is perhaps a quicker way to finish Black off: 43...\( \text{W}a1+ \) 44 \( \text{D}d2 \text{xxc2+} \) 45 \( \text{D}xc2 \text{wa2+} \) (45...\( \text{M}c8+ \) 46 \( \text{D}b3 \text{wd}1+ \) 47 \( \text{D}a2 \text{xc2+} \) 48 \( \text{D}xc2 \text{wx}c2+ \) 49 \( \text{D}b2 \text{wc}4+ \) 50 \( \text{D}b3 \) also wins for White) 46 \( \text{D}d1 \text{wa}1+ \) 47 \( \text{D}d2 \text{wa}2+ \) 48 \( \text{D}e3 \) \( \text{+-} \).

43...\( \text{h}7 \) 44 \( \text{D}e2 \text{Ma}7 \) 45 \( \text{D}xh5 \text{xa}3 \) 46 \( \text{D}b2 \text{xb}2+ \) 47 \( \text{D}xb2 \)

Black has managed to survive to the endgame, but unfortunately for him, it is completely lost.

47...\( \text{Mc}3 \) 48 \( \text{h}5 \text{Mc}4 \) 49 \( \text{M}d2 \text{Mc}7 \) 50 \( \text{M}b3 \text{Mc}7 \) 51 \( \text{M}d3 \) 1-0

**Main Line: 5...0-0 6 \( \text{D}e2 \) \( \text{g}4 \)**

**Game 6**

**Hebden – L. Williams**

**British Ch, Swansea 1995**

1 \( \text{d}4 \text{D}f6 \) 2 \( \text{D}f3 \text{g}6 \) 3 \( \text{c}3 \text{d}5 \) 4 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 5 e3 0-0 6 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}4 \) (D)

As Black often has a problem with his light-squared bishop, it may appear logical to solve this by exchanging it, the drawback being the acceleration of White’s attack.

7 \( \text{D}e5 \text{xe}2 \) 8 \( \text{xe}2 \text{c}6 \)

The number of alternatives that Black has tried hints that he has a difficult task keeping the balance:

a) 8...\( \text{e}6 \) 9 \( \text{h}4 \text{c}5 \) 10 \( \text{dxc}5 \text{D}h5 \) 11 \( \text{D}h2 \text{wx}h4?! \) (11...\( \text{D}d7?! \) ) 12 0-0-0 \( \text{b}4 \) 13 \( \text{D}d3 \text{wc}4 \) 14 \( \text{D}d6 \) (14 \( \text{g}4 \) is also promising) 14...\( \text{D}d8 \) 15 \( \text{D}xh5 \text{gx}h5 \) 16 \( \text{D}xh5 \pm \) Hebden-Lane, Hastings Masters 1990.

b) 8...\( \text{D}h5 \) was met by 9 0-0-0 in Bozinović-Rogulj, Velika Gorica 2006 but 9...\( \text{D}xf4 \) 10 \( \text{exf}4 \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{h}4 \text{c}5 \) 12 \( \text{h}5 \text{cxd}4 \) 13 \( \text{hxg}6 \text{fx}g6 \) 14 \( \text{D}xh4 \text{D}h7 \) 15 \( \text{D}g4 \) (15 \( \text{e}3 \) is probably better) 15...\( \text{D}f3 \) gave Black good chances. White should consider the greedy 9 \( \text{b}5! ?. \)

c) After 8...\( \text{D}bd7 \) 9 0-0-0 Black has tried:

   c1) 9...\( \text{M}c8 \) 10 e4 \( \text{D}b6 \) 11 \( \text{b}1 \text{c}5 \) 12 \( \text{D}xh5 \text{fx}d5 \) 13 \( \text{exh}5 \text{xd}5 \) 14 \( \text{g}3 \text{cxd}4 \) 15 \( \text{M}d4 \text{e}6 \) 16 \( \text{c}4 \text{bb}6 \) 17 \( \text{D}d2 \text{wb}4 \) 18 a3 \( \text{D}a6 \) (18...\( \text{D}c6!? \) ) 19 \( \text{D}xh5 \) !? \( \text{bb}6 \) 20 \( \text{M}d7 \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{=} \) 19 \( \text{D}d6 \text{bb}3 \) = Bosch-I.Sokolov, Dutch Team Ch 1995/6.

   c2) 9...\( \text{c}5 \) 10 \( \text{h}4 \) and here:

   c21) 10...\( \text{M}c8 \) 11 \( \text{f}3 \text{e}6 \) 12 g4 \( \text{D}xe5 \) 13 \( \text{xe}5 \text{cxd}4 \) 14 \( \text{exd}4 \text{h}5 \) 15 \( \text{g}xh5 \text{D}xh5 \) 16 \( \text{M}d1 \) \( \text{h}6+ \) 17 \( \text{bb}1 \text{bb}7 \) 18 \( \text{D}e2 \text{f}6!? \) 19 \( \text{f}4 \text{xf}4 \) 20 \( \text{xf}4 \text{xf}4 \) 21 \( \text{xf}4 \text{wc}7 \) 22 \( \text{D}d2 \text{wg}7 \) 23 \( \text{D}d3 \) -- Abergel-Ni Hua, Cannes 2004.

   c22) 10...\( \text{cxd}4 \) 11 \( \text{exd}4 \text{e}6 \) 12 g4 \( \text{c}8 \) 13 \( \text{M}d3 \text{xe}5 \) 14 \( \text{xe}5 \text{c}4 \) 15 h5 \( \text{M}e7 \) 16 \( \text{h}xg6 \text{fx}g6 \) 17 \( \text{M}e3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 18
b1 ± L.B.Hansen-Seger, Bundesliga 2001/2.

c23) 10...e6 11 g4 c8 12 f3 cxd4 13 exd4 exf3 14 bxc3 d5 a5 15 d2 c8 16 d3 d6 17 d1 e8 18 h5 (18 h5 is also possible) 18...wxa2 19 hbb1 waf3 20 h1 waf7 is unclear, Malaniuk-Nezorov, Kstovo 1997.

d) Black’s other main option is 8...c5. This is an interesting hybrid of the ...g4 and ...c5 systems, which White should seek to exploit immediately by 9 w5 cxd4 10 exd4, when Black has a fairly wide choice:

   d1) 10...wb6 11 wxb6 axb6 leaves Black with permanently weak pawns, and White with at least a small advantage.

   d2) 10...b6 weakens Black’s control of the light squares on the queenside. For example: 11 0-0 Cbd7? 12 Cc6 w8e8 13 Cc5 w±.

   d3) 10...wc8? 11 Cxd5 Cxd5 12 wxc5 w±.

   d4) 10...Cc6 is critical, but is not ultimately sufficient for equality. 11 wxb7 Cxd4 12 0-0-0 Cc8 12...Cg5 13 Cxd4 Cdf4 14 Cc6 ±) 13 wxa7 (although it may appear dangerous for White to open lines towards his own king, he has a material advantage and Black is hard-pressed to keep the queens on) 13...Cb5 14 Cxb5 Cc5 15 Cc6 w8a (avoiding the endgame is no better: 15...w8e8 16 Cxe7+ {16 a4!?} 16...Cxe8 17 Cc5 --) 16 Cxe7+ Cxe7 17 wxe8 Cxe8 18 Cc5 Cxex2 19 Cc4 Cb7 19...dxc4 20 Cdb8; 19...Cc5 20 Cb1 --) 20 Cb1 Cxb2 24?! (the last throw of the dice) 21 Cb2 Cc4 22 Cxd5 Cc3+ (22...Cxb2+ 23 Cc1 (+--) 23 Cc1 Cc2+ 24 Cd1 Cxb2 25 Cc5 Cd4 26 Cxa2 Cb4 27 Cc2 Cxc3 28 Cxc3 Cxh1 29 Cc6 Cfe6 29 h3 Cc1 30 Cc5 Cg7 31 Cbc3 h5 32 Cc2 += Hebden-McDonald, British Ch, Eastbourne 1991. The bishop versus knight endgame is won for White, while if Black keeps the rook, then he simply pushes his c-pawn.

We now return to the position after 8...c6 (D):

\[Diagram:\]

9 h4

This is the prescribed medicine whenever Black adopts a slow system. 9 0-0-0 led to a nice attacking win for White in Vescovi-O.Jakobsen, Copenhaagen 1995: 9...Cg5 10 g4 Cxf4 11 exf4 e6 12 Cc4 Cg7 13 h4 Cxe5 14 fxe5 Cc5 15 b3 Cf6 16 dxc5 b5 17 Cc2 Cxa2 18 Cc3 Cg8 19 f4 Cf8 20 Cc4 Cc7 22 h5 a5 23 hxg6 fxg6 24 f5 axb4 25 Cxg6 Cxc5? (25...hxg6 is a good deal more resilient) 26 Cxh7 C7 27 Cc3 Cxc2+ 28 Cc1 Cc3+ 29 Cc3 Cc4 30 Cc8+ 1-0.

9...Cbd7

Or:
a) 9...h5 10 f3 b5 11 ʘd1 ʘb6 12 ʘf2 c5 13 ʘd2 a5 14 ʘfd3 ʘa6 was unclear in Porrasmaa-Bosboom, Hoogeveen 1999. White could have considered early queenside castling but the evaluation would have been the same.

b) 9...h6?! 10 h5 g5 11 ʘxg5 (we also see this theme in other lines, most notably Game 8) 11...hxg5 12 h6 ʘxh6 (12... ʘh8 13 h7+ ʘg7 14 ʘf3 ʘe8 15 ʘe2 ʘe6 16 ʘg3 ++) 13 ʘxh6 ʘg7 14 ʘh5!? (14 ʘh1! intending 0-0-0 and f4 gives White a strong attack for free) 14... ʘxh5 15 ʘxh5 e6 16 0-0-0 ʘf6? (16... ʘd7 is a desperate attempt to survive, based on 17 ʘxd7? ʘh8) 17 ʘh1 +- Welling-M. Müller, Dresden 2001.

c) The active 9... ʘa5 resulted in the usual bloodbath in Blatny-Trapl, Cham 1991: 10 h5 c5 11 hxg6 fxg6 12 ʘf3 ʘc6 13 ʘh3 ʘxe5 14 dxe5 ʘh5 15 0-0-0 d4 16 ʘe6+ ʘh8 17 ʘe4 c4 18 g4 dxe3 19 fxe3 ʘxa2 20 gxh5 ʘa1+ 21 ʘd2 ʘad8+ 22 ʘe2 ʘxd1 23 ʘxd1 ʘxb2 24 ʘg5 ʘxc2+ 25 ʘd2 ʘf5 26 ʘxf5 ʘxf5 27 ʘe6 ʘg8 28 ʘd8+ ʘf7 29 ʘg5+ ʘxg5 30 ʘxg5 ʘxe5 31 ʘd7 ʘd6 32 hxg6+ hxg6 33 ʘxb7 a5 34 ʘf4 ʘb4 35 ʘc7 c3 36 ʘe5 1-0.

10 0-0-0 (D)

This position is a major crossroad in the Barry Attack, as it can be reached via many different and highly plausible move-orders, and play can branch out in several directions from here.

10... ʘh5

This move is necessary in order for Black to slow down White’s attack. However, as the course of the game shows, while White’s dark-squared bishop is useful, it is not essential in the attack against the black king.

For Black’s alternatives 10... ʘa5, 10... ʘe4 and 10... ʘxe5, see Game 3 and its notes. 10... ʘc8 will be discussed in Game 10.

11 g4 ʘxf4 12 exf4 e6

After 12... ʘxe5 13 fxe5 f6, White should probably secure his space advantage with 14 f4. Instead 14 exf6 ʘxf6 15 g5 (15 h5) 15... ʘf7 16 h5 didn’t make much of a dent in Black’s position in Rogers-Ye Jiangchuan, Calvia Olympiad 2004. He could now have continued 16...e5?!, with a good game.

13 h5 f6?

Black panics in a difficult position. After 13... ʘe7, White still has a strong attack, but Black is by no means completely lost.

14 ʘxg6! (D)

14... ʘe8

If 14...hxg6 White cleans up as follows: 15 ʘxe6+ ʘh7 16 hxg6++ ʘxg6 17 f5+ ʘg5 18 ʘe3+ ʘxg4 19 ʘh3+ ʘf4 20 ʘe2+ ʘe4 21 ʘd3#.
A masterful switch-over to bring the queen into the centre of the action.

22...\text{h}x\text{h}3 23 \text{h}x\text{h}3 \text{a}6 24 \text{w}d6

The white queen rules supreme in the heart of the black position.

24...\text{w}f7 25 \text{w}c7 \text{w}e7
25...\text{d}f8 fails to 26 \text{w}e5+.

26 \text{g}1

The black queenside pawns are going nowhere, so White can afford the time to improve the position of his worst-placed piece.

26...\text{e}8 27 \text{f}3 \text{g}8 28 \text{x}b7
\text{b}8 29 \text{x}c6 1-0

White is two pawns to the good and Black has no hope.

**Main Line: Black plays \ldots \text{b}6**

**Game 7**

Munched – Rogers

*Hong Kong 1984*

\(1 \text{d}f3 \text{d}f6 2 \text{d}4 \text{g}6 3 \text{c}e3 \text{d}5 4 \text{f}4
\text{g}7 5 \text{e}3 0-0 6 \text{e}2 \text{b}6 (D)\)

In the 1980s, 6...\text{b}6 was a popular way to counter the Barry Attack.
However, it was soon discovered that this method is flawed, as White is given too free a hand on the kingside.

7 \text{\varepsilon}e5 c5

Black has another important option in 7...\text{\textit{b}}7, which is dealt with in the next two games.

8 h4 \text{\textit{b}}7

8...\text{\textit{a}}6 would lead back to Game 1. Black can also react to the threat of h5 by moving his own h-pawn:

a) 8...h6 9 \text{\textit{d}}2 \text{\textit{b}}7 10 0-0-0 \text{\textit{f}}d7 11 \text{\textit{g}}g4 \text{\textit{h}}7 12 \text{\textit{d}}3 \text{\textit{f}}5 13 \text{\textit{e}}5 \text{\textit{c}}6 14 \text{\textit{x}}e6 \text{\textit{x}}e6 15 \text{\textit{b}}5 \pm Janz-Uhlmann, 2nd Bundesliga 2001/2.

b) 8...h5 9 \text{\textit{d}}2 (9 g4 cxd4 10 exd4 hgx4 and now the calm 11 \text{\textit{d}}2 looks better than 11 \text{\textit{x}}g4?! \text{\textit{x}}g4?! \{11...\text{\textit{x}}g4! 12 \text{\textit{x}}g4 \text{\textit{c}}6 gives White problems\} 12 \text{\textit{x}}g4 \text{\textit{c}}6 13 \text{\textit{e}}2 \text{\textit{e}}4 14 \text{\textit{x}}e4 dxe4 15 c3 e5 = Izeta-Ubilava, Toledo 1991) 9...\text{\textit{a}}6 10 \text{\textit{f}}3 e6 11 0-0-0 b5 12 dxc5 b4 13 \text{\textit{b}}1 \text{\textit{a}}5 14 a3 \text{\textit{f}}d7 15 \text{\textit{x}}d7 \text{\textit{x}}d7 16 \text{\textit{b}}4 \text{\textit{x}}c5 17 \text{\textit{d}}6 \pm Chatalbashev-Djuric, Antalya 2002.

9 h5 \text{\textit{c}}6

The alternative is 9...\text{\textit{b}}d7, by which Black puts less pressure on the white centre, but hopes that the knight will be better placed to protect the black king. White’s chances are to be preferred after 10 hxg6 hxg6 (after 10...fxg6, 11 \text{\textit{d}}2! is probably best; for example, 11...\text{\textit{x}}e5 12 dxe5 \text{\textit{d}}7 13 \text{\textit{g}}4 \text{\textit{x}}e5 14 \text{\textit{e}}6+ \text{\textit{f}}7 15 \text{\textit{d}}5 is much better for White) 11 \text{\textit{d}}2 (11 \text{\textit{b}}5 will most likely transpose into the 9...\text{\textit{c}}6 line) 11...\text{\textit{e}}4 (as mentioned before, the c3-knight is often White’s worst-placed piece, so he has no objections to exchanging it) 12 \text{\textit{x}}e4 dxe4 13 \text{\textit{g}}4! (D).

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
& \\
\hline
& \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

This manoeuvre is well worth remembering. The arrival of the knight on h6 will often cost Black his dark-squared protector. 13...\text{\textit{e}}8 14 \text{\textit{h}}6+ \text{\textit{x}}h6 (14...\text{\textit{f}}8 15 \text{\textit{c}}4) 15 \text{\textit{x}}h6 e5 16 dxe5 \text{\textit{xe}}5 17 \text{\textit{w}}c3 (as can clearly be seen, Black is ruing the loss of his king’s bishop) 17...\text{\textit{d}}6 18 \text{\textit{b}}5 \text{\textit{e}}7 19 \text{\textit{d}}1 (in this position, it only remains for White to arrange the transfer of his queen’s rook to the h-file for his attack to be decisive) 19...\text{\textit{f}}6 20 \text{\textit{e}}2 \text{\textit{c}}8 21 \text{\textit{h}}1 \text{\textit{g}}4+ 22 \text{\textit{f}}1 (Black is utterly defenceless against the threat of \text{\textit{h}}8+) 22...\text{\textit{d}}6 23 \text{\textit{h}}8+ \text{\textit{g}}7 24 \text{\textit{h}}1 \text{\textit{f}}6 25 \text{\textit{a}}8 \text{\textit{c}}4 26 \text{\textit{d}}4 \text{\textit{b}}4 27 \text{\textit{e}}5+ \text{\textit{e}}5 28 \text{\textit{f}}7+ 1-0 Izeta-Barbera, Spanish Ch, Madrid 1992.

10 hxg6 (D)

10...hxg6

10...fxg6 is probably the better re-capture. After 11 \text{\textit{b}}5 \text{\textit{e}}5?! 12 dxe5 \text{\textit{c}}7 13 \text{\textit{g}}5 \text{\textit{f}}5 14 0-0-0 \text{\textit{c}}5 15 \text{\textit{h}}3 (the incisive 15 \text{\textit{c}}5! has the points 15...\text{\textit{c}}5?! 16 e4 and 15...\text{\textit{e}}5
16  ₩d7!) 15...h5 16  ₩xe5  ₩xe5 17  ₩f4  ₩f5 18  ₩e4 White had a dangerous initiative in Rogers-Zsu.Polgar, Dortmund 1985 but possibly the more direct 11  ₩d2  ₩c8 12 0-0-0 is even stronger; for example, 12...exd4 13 exd4  ₩b4 14  f3  ₩h5?! 15  ₩h6  ₩c7?! 16  ₩xg7  ₩xg7 17  ₩a3 and White wins, Belli Pino-Farley, Moscow Olympiad 1994.

11  ₩b5  ₩c8

One of the main choices that Black has to make in the Barry Attack is whether to exchange on e5. This exchange removes one of White’s attacking pieces but, at the same time, often forces Black’s best defensive piece to give way. For example, 11... ₩xe5 12 dxe5  ₩h5 (other knight moves are met by ₩g4-h4, with a devastating attack) 13  ₩xh5! (D).

This thematic exchange sacrifice blows open the black king’s defences. After 13...gxh5?! (he should perhaps try 13...d4, but at best this leads to a very unpleasant ending for Black) 14  ₩xh5 f5 White has two promising continuations:

a) 15  ₩g6 c6 (more or less forced, due to the threat of  ₩h6; e.g., 15...a6 16  ₩h6  ₩f7 17  ₩e6) 16  ₩xe6+  ₩f7 17 0-0-0  ₩e7 18  ₩xe7  ₩xe7 ± (Black has reached an endgame the exchange up, but White has collected more than enough extra pawns) 19  ₩xd5  ₩xe5 (19... ₩xd5 20  ₩xd5  ₩f7 21  ₩d7 ++) 20  ₩xe5  ₩xe5 21  f4  ₩h8 22  ₩e7+  ₩f7 23  ₩xf5  ₩xf5 24  ₩d6  ₩f8 25  ₩c4+  ₩e8 1-0 Murshed-P.Thipsay, 1984.

b) 15 exf6  ₩xf6 (Black also experiences significant problems in defending his king in this variation) 16 0-0-0 e6 17  ₩g5  ₩f5 18  f4  ₩f6 19  ₩h1  ₩xg5 (the black rook on f5 is out on a limb; for example, 19... ₩f7 20  ₩h7+  ₩f8 21  g4) 20 fxg5  ₩f5 21  ₩f1  ₩h7 22  ₩f7+  ₩h8 23  ₩xb7 1-0 Rogers-Canfell, Utrecht 1988.

12  ₩xc6  ₩xc6 13  ₩f3  exd4 14  exd4 b5

Black’s bid for counterplay seems pathetically slow, but it is hard to suggest a decent alternative, or a way of preventing White’s usual attacking plan.
15 g4 b7 16 0-0-0 we6 17 wh3 e8 18 h6 h5
Taking advantage of the pin, but only delaying the inevitable.
19 xg7 xg7 20 wh4 f6 21 xg6 wxc4 22 xf8 wxf4+ 23 b1 1-0
Black is losing a whole rook. It is no coincidence that Ian Rogers started to play the Barry Attack himself shortly after this storming game!

Game 8
Hebden – Birnboim
Rishon le Zion 1992

1 d4 f6 2 f3 g6 3 c3 d5 4 f4 g5 5 e3 0-0 6 e2 b6 7 e5 b7 8 h4 (D)

and material was equal with White’s attack undiminished in Breivik-Agdestein, Norwegian Team Ch 2005.
e) 8...e5 9 h5 c6 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 b5 w8c8 12 xxc6 xc6 13 w3 cxd4 14 exd4 b5 15 g4 b4 16 d1 a4 17 e3 d8 18 wh3 ± Ortega-Calzetta Ruiz, Porto San Giorgio 2008.
d) 8...fd7 (Black’s main problem in this line is that he finds himself unable to put enough pressure on White’s centre to deflect him from his kingside assault) 9 h5 dxe5 (D) (9...c6?! 10 a6 dxe5 11 xxe7 b5 12 h6 h8 13 dxe5 xxe5 14 xd5 xd5 15 xxd5 d8 16 0-0-0 ± f8?? 17 b4 xd1+ 18 xd1 1-0 Barsov-Mirzoeva, Abu Dhabi 2000).

8...h6
Black has these alternatives:
a) For 8...bd7 see the next game.
b) 8...e8 9 h5 f6 10 xg6! hxg6 11 hxg6 f5 12 d3 e6 13 g4! fxg4 (after 13...c6 White decides with 14 g5! followed by wh5 or wh7 and then wh5) 14 wxg4 wd7 15 0-0-0 (15 e5?!) 15...e5 16 wh5 xf4 17 exf4

Now both recaptures give White a potent attacking position:
d1) 10 dxe5 d7 (10...e6?! 11 hxg6 fxg6 12 d3 d7 is line ‘d12’, bypassing a sharper option for both sides, and quite dismal for Black) and then:
d11) 11 hxg6 fxg6?! (despite the obvious risks, 11...hxg6 might be a
better try) 12 \( \text{d}3 \) (the beauty of White's plan in this type of position is that, despite its crude simplicity {queen to the h-file and mate!}, Black has an arduous task to prevent it) 12...e6 13 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{h}3 \). White has completed his plan and Black is faced with insurmountable problems, although he fought admirably for the remainder of the game: 14...\( \text{xd}3+ \) 15 cxd3 \( \text{f}7 \) 16 \( \text{b}5 \) (White conceives a clever idea to bring his knight to g5, via d4 and f3) 16...\( \text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{fc}8 \) (17...\( \text{b}4+ \) 18 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{xb}5 \) 19 \( \text{xc}7+ \) winning) 18 \( \text{e}2 \) (18 \( \text{wh}7?! \) \( \text{h}8 \) 19 \( \text{xc}7+ \) —) 18...\( \text{a}6 \) 19 \( \text{d}4 \) c5 20 \( \text{f}3 \) (with the knight's arrival, Black's position collapses) 20...\( \text{h}6 \) 21 \( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 22 \( \text{g}5+ \) \( \text{e}8 \) 23 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 24 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 25 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 26 \( \text{xh}8 \) 1-0 Rogers-J.Pribyl, Tallinn 1985.


A thematic sacrifice – at the cost of the front e-pawn White weakens the black kingside. The game concluded 11...\( \text{f}xe6 \) (11...\( \text{c}5 \)!!? is possible, as Black's central control will compensate for his damaged kingside structure) 12 h\( xg6 \) h\( xg6 \) 13 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \)? (Black has to try 13...d4, which is far from clear; 13...e5? 14 \( \text{xg}6 \) \( \text{ex}4 \) 15 \( \text{h}7+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 16 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{e}6 \) 17 \( \text{d}5 \) is a disaster for Black) 14 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 15 0-0-0 \( \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{xd}3+ \) 17 c\( xd3 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 18 \( \text{dh}1 \) \( \text{wd}7 \) 19 \( \text{h}3 \) 1-0. Black is defenceless against the threat of \( \text{hxg7+} \).

d2) 10 \( \text{xe}5 \) and now there is a further split:

d21) 10...f6 11 \( \text{g}3 \) e6 12 h\( xg6 \) h\( xg6 \) 13 \( \text{d}3 \) ± Wockenfuss-Kjetzae, Bad Wiessee 2000.

d22) 10...\( \text{d}7 \) 11 \( \text{xg}7 \) \( \text{xg}7 \) 12 \( \text{d}2 \) (with the removal of Black's dark-squared bishop, White can now lay siege to the very squares that this piece defended) 12...\( \text{f}6 \) (12...\( \text{h}8 \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{f}6 \) 14 g4 ± Weinzettl-Hertel, Seefeld 2001) 13 f4 c5 14 g4 \( \text{c}8 \) 15 g5 \( \text{xh}5 \) 16 \( \text{xh}5 \) gxh5 17 0-0-0 (as so often happens in the Barry Attack, Black is left with a permanent weakness on the h-file, and an insecure king) 17...\( \text{f}5 \) 18 \( \text{xh}5 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 19 \( \text{dh}1 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) 20 \( \text{e}2 \) (one of the recurrent themes in the Barry Attack is the improvement of White's worst-placed piece, usually the knight on c3; when this unit is included in the attack, it is often too hot to handle) 20...cxd4 21 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 22 \( \text{xd}4+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 23 \( \text{xh}8+! \) \( \text{xh}8 \) 24 \( \text{h}7+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 25 \( \text{h}8+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) 26 \( \text{h}7+ \) \( \text{g}6 \) 27 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) 28 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{xh}5 \) 29 \( \text{h}7+ \) 1-0 J.Pribyl-Mi.Horvath, Prague 1987.

d23) 10...\( \text{xe}5 \) 11 dxe5 c5 12 \( \text{d}2 \) e6 13 h\( xg6 \) fx\( g6 \) 14 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 15 f4
(White has a very straightforward and effective plan: to mount pressure on Black’s kingside by doubling on the h-file; Black was possibly feeling the tension, as he goes completely off the rails over the next couple of moves)

15...\textsc{w}d7? 16 0-0-0 \textsc{c}c6?? 17 \textsc{e}e4 1-0 Hebden-Likavsky, Cappelle la Grande 1992. Black must lose material after \textsc{f}f6+.

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

9 h5 g5 10 \textsc{x}g5 \textsl{(D)}

10...\textsc{h}xg5 11 h6

Now Black has to decide whether to retreat or to stand and fight.

11...\textsc{h}h8

Black tries to hang on to his extra material, but his avarice will lead to his demise. It is more sensible to return the piece with 11...\textsc{x}xh6 12 \textsc{x}xh6 \textsc{g}g7 13 \textsc{h}h3. This has fared poorly in practice, but may not be as bad as its reputation. The analysis is as follows:

a) 13...\textsc{e}e4 14 \textsc{x}xe4 \textsc{x}xe4 15 \textsc{c}c4 \textsc{c}c8 1-0 Laszlo-Kanyadi, Debrecen Ch 1994. Black did not want to wait for 16 \textsc{w}h5 (or 16 \textsc{h}h7+!), with a mating attack.

b) 13...\textsc{b}bd7 14 \textsc{g}g3 \textsc{h}h7 15 \textsc{d}d3 f5 (15...f6 16 \textsc{w}h5) 16 \textsc{e}f3 g4 17 \textsc{h}h2 \textsc{h}h8 18 \textsc{e}e2?! (18 \textsc{x}xg4! fxg4 19 \textsc{x}xh7 smashes through) 18...e5 (18...e5 would have muddied the water) 19 \textsc{f}f4 \textsc{w}f6 20 \textsc{x}xg4 fxg4 21 \textsc{x}xg4 \textsc{f}f7 22 \textsc{g}g6+ \textsc{g}g7 23 \textsc{e}e5+ \textsc{f}f8 24 \textsc{dx}d7+ \textsc{dx}d7 25 \textsc{f}f3 1-0 J.Christensen-M.S.Hansen, \textsc{a}hus 1990.

c) 13...\textsc{h}h8! 14 \textsc{g}g3 \textsc{h}h1+ 15 \textsc{f}f1 \textsc{h}h7 16 \textsc{w}f3 f6 17 \textsc{e}e3 \textsc{d}d7 18 0-0-0 \textsc{d}f8 is given as ‘unclear’ by Norwood, but surely Black’s more exposed king and weakened pawn-structure must give White some advantage.

12 \textsc{h}7+ \textsc{g}7

This is critical, but White gets more than sufficient compensation for the piece.

The alternative is to capture the annoying h-pawn by 12...\textsc{x}h7? but this move is simply unplayable. 13 \textsc{a}a6! is the refutation: 13...\textsc{c}c8 (13...\textsc{a}x6 14 \textsc{w}h5++) and now 14 \textsc{w}h5! forces a speedy mate (e.g., 14...\textsc{f}f5 15 \textsc{d}d3!)
\[ \text{wc8 16 } \text{g6!?)}. \text{This trap is still waiting to be sprung.} \]

13 \text{d3}

White's attack is quite slow-burning, although incredibly difficult to stop. As usual, White's plan is to bring his queen to the h-file and go for the kill.

13...\text{a6}

Black has tried to improve with 13...e6 but after 14 \text{f3} (the untested 14 f4! may be even stronger; e.g., 14...g4 15 \text{dxe4} and White is clearly better) White's chances are still preferable:

a) 14...\text{fd7} 15 \text{h5 f6} 16 f4 \text{xe7} 17 \text{xg5+ e8} 18 \text{h5 dxe5} 19 fxe5 \text{d7} 20 0-0-0 a6 21 e4 and in Breivik-Candela Perez, Linares 2005 it was clear that White had more than enough compensation for his piece.

b) After 14...\text{e8} White has reached promising positions with 15 \text{h3} and 15 0-0-0 but Rybka suggests 15 \text{e5}. Capturing the rook leads to mate in two so Black's main options are 15...\text{f8} 16 \text{xg5 e7} 17 0-0-0 \text{bd7} 18 \text{f4} and 15...g4 16 \text{g5+ f8} 17 \text{xg4 e7} 18 \text{f4 f8} 19 g4, when White has a very promising long-term attack against Black's centralized king in both cases.

14 \text{f3 xd3} 15 \text{cxd3 wd6} 15...e6 16 \text{h3} +--; 15...\text{c8} 16 \text{xd5 xd5} 17 \text{h5} +--.

16 \text{f5 d8} 17 \text{xg5+ f8} 18 \text{e2}

Despite Black's extra piece, he is in a hopeless position. The pawn on h7 is a monster and the black king has no effective escape-route.

18...a6 19 \text{h6 bd7} 20 \text{ah1 we6} 21 \text{h4 (D)}

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

White is winning.

21...\text{exe5}

22 \text{g4} was the threat.

22 \text{dxe5 e8} 23 \text{exf6 exf6} 24 \text{g3 e7} 25 \text{xc7+ d7} 26 \text{g3 e8 1-0}

Black decided that he had seen enough, since White has regained his sacrificed material with interest, whilst all of Black's problems remain.

\textbf{Game 9}

\textbf{Hebden – Donchev}

\textit{Cappelle la Grande 1994}

1 \text{d4 f6 2 f3 g6 3 c3 d5 4 f4 g7 5 e3 0-0 6 e2 b6 7 e5 b7 8 h4 bd7 9 h5 (D)}

9...\text{exe5}

Black has also tried:

a) 9...a6 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 \text{g4 dxe5} 12 dxe5 \text{e4} 13 \text{f3 f5} 14 \text{exf6 xf6} 15 \text{xe4 dxe4} 16 \text{h3 d5} 17 \text{d1} gave White a decisive initiative in the game Kogan-Kobese, Almassora 2000.
b) 9...c5 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 b5
c8 12 xd7 xd7 13 xe5 14 wh4 f6 15 dxe5 ef7 16 g3 ± Chat-


c) 9...e4 may have been dealt a
dearth-blow in Hodgson-W.Schmidt,
European Team Ch, Haifa 1989, which
continued 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 xe4 dxe4
d4 (this is the crucial difference:
the white knight proves to be an
excellent attacking piece) 12 e8 13
d6+ ef8 14 c4 e6 15 g4 d5
(Black attempts to relieve the tension
by swapping bishops; however, White
skilfully negotiates the exchange of
his light-squared bishop on his own
terms) 16 b5 a6 17 g5 f6 18 xd7
d7 19 xf6! xf6 20 f4 e7?
(20...g7 is an attempt to cling on,
based on the point 21 e4 f7! 22
d6 g8!) 21 d4 g7 22 e5!
a4 (22...xe5 23 h7+) 23 f7+ d8 24 xg7 c8 25 0-0 (I really
like this calm move after all the pre-
ceeding tactics – White makes his king
safe before commencing the final as-
sault on the black king) 25 b8 26
c4 b7 27 c5 1-0. White has an extra

pawn, a strong attack and the better-
placed pieces, so Black under-
standably called it a day.

10 dxe5

10 xxe5 has also been played suc-
cessfully, but the text-move is more
forcing.

10...e4

10...d7 is the other move to have
been used in practice. It transposes
to note ‘d1’ to Black’s 8th move in the
previous game.

11 hxg6 hxg6 12 d3 e8

The capture on c3, 12...xc3 13
bxc3, doesn’t seem to improve Black’s
chances significantly. Here is a sample
variation: 13...d7 14 f3 e6 15
g3 (with the idea of h2) 15...f5 16
xf6 xf6 17 0-0 e5 (17...e6 18 e5
xe5 19 xg6 f5 20 g4 ++) 18
xe5 xe5 19 xg6 + xc3 20
h8+ xh8 21 h7#.

13 f3 e6 14 b5

As this move doesn’t lead to much
for White, I recommend taking the
pawn by 14 xe4 dxe4 15 xe4
xe4 16 xe4 ±. White is a pawn to the
good and retains attacking chances
against the black king; e.g.:

a) 16 f5 17 f3 xe5 18 h3 (18
0-0-0!?) 18 f7? (18...g7 is more
resilient) 19 xe5 xe5 20 0-0-0 ±
with the idea of tripling major pieces
on the h-file.

b) 16 fd8 17 g5 xe5 (after
17 xe5 18 h4 f8 19 h7 White
has a slight advantage) 18 xe5 xe5
19 xe7 xb2 20 xd8 axa1 21
xc7 ±.

c) 16 ad8 17 0-0 (White could
try 17 g3!? or 17 g5?) 17...f5 18
\[ \text{a4 } \text{x}e5 \text{ 19 } \text{a}d1 \text{ a}5 = \text{ Arencibia-Herrera, Santa Clara 2000.} \]

14...\text{x}e5 15 \text{c}7 \text{c}7 16 \text{c}7 \text{g}7

As Black has a firm stance in the centre, the loss of his dark-squared bishop is not a serious problem and he is able to neutralize White's kingside initiative.

17 0-0-0 \text{h}8 18 \text{x}e4 \text{dxe4} 19 \text{f}4 \text{f}6 20 \text{x}h8 \text{x}h8 21 \text{d}8 \text{xa}2 22 \text{c}7 \text{a}1+ 23 \text{d}2 \text{a}5+ 24 \text{c}3 \text{e}5

The game is now equal.

25 \text{xe5} \text{fxe5} 26 \text{xe7} 27 \text{g}5 \text{e}6 28 \text{c}4 \text{h}2 29 \text{e}2 \text{h}5 30 \text{d}8 \text{h}7 31 \text{b}4 \text{d}7 32 \text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 33 \text{f}6 \text{e}6 34 \text{g}7 \text{a}6 35 \text{d}2 \text{b}5 36 \text{cxb5} \text{axb5} 1/2-1/2

Game 10

Hebden – A. Fox

Hastings 1994/5

1 d4 \text{f}6 2 \text{f}3 g6 3 \text{c}3 \text{d}5 4 \text{f}4 \text{g}7 5 e3 0-0 6 \text{e}2 \text{c}6

This is a flexible system for Black, who keeps his options open. Black retains the possibility of queenside expansion and of developing his bishop to g4. Meanwhile 7 \text{e}5 can be answered by 7...\text{f}d7!. The main drawback is Black's lack of pressure on the centre, so a flank attack becomes a more attractive option for White.

7 h4 (D)

7...\text{g}4

This really doesn't help Black, as it leads to the type of position we have seen before under 6...\text{g}4. I have given it detailed coverage, as it is the sort of move that for many players will be an automatic response, and besides, having suffered myself as White in so many classical King's Indian mating attacks, it is always nice to see Black getting a taste of his own medicine! The other possibilities are:

a) After 7...\text{b}6 8 a3 play can develop along the same lines as in Game 4, Hodgson-Wolff, except this time it will be harder for Black to harass the white bishop.

b) 7...\text{c}5?! is a rare and provocative move. Black argues he can spend a tempo playing ...\text{c}5, because h4 achieves little for White if he castles kingside. 8 \text{e}5 \text{c}6 9 h5 (9 \text{d}2?!) 9...\text{cxd}4 10 \text{exd}4 \text{b}6 11 \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 12 \text{a}4 \text{d}8 13 \text{f}1 led to a mess in Mitkov-A.Kovačević, Yugoslav Team Ch, Cetinje 1991 – I'm afraid I shall use the old standby for once and call this position completely unclear. 13 \text{c}3?! and 13 0-0?! are playable continuations for the less bloodthirsty.

c) 7...\text{h}5 8 \text{e}5 \text{bd}7 9 f3 c5 10 \text{d}2 \text{cxd}4 11 \text{exd}4 \text{a}5 12 \text{g}1 \text{b}5 13 \text{xb}5 \text{b}6 14 \text{a}4 \text{e}5 15 \text{xe}5 \text{e}4 16 \text{f}xe4 \text{xe}5 17 0-0-0 \text{b}8 18
\( \mathit{b3} \pm \) Roselli Mailhe-Lopez Falcon, Montevideo 2007.

d) 7...\( b5 \) is an attempt to take the game down unexplored channels. After 8 \( \mathit{\mathit{c}e}5 \) Black has tried:

d1) After 8...\( \mathit{\mathit{e}e}89 \mathit{h5} \mathit{g5} \) in Welling-Rybenko, Saint Vincent 2004, White accepted the challenge with 10 \( \mathit{\mathit{f}xg5}?! \mathit{f6}11 \mathit{h6} \mathit{\mathit{h}h8}12 \mathit{\mathit{f}f4} \mathit{fxe5}13 \mathit{dxe5} \) and developed a promising kingside attack: 13...\( \mathit{\mathit{c}c7}14 \mathit{\mathit{d}d3} \) (it's possible that White should contest f7 by 14 \( \mathit{\mathit{h}h5}?! \)) 14...\( \mathit{\mathit{f}f7}15 \mathit{\mathit{w}w}h5 \mathit{\mathit{g}g}f8?! \) (15...\( \mathit{\mathit{e}e}6 \) or 15...\( \mathit{\mathit{w}e}8 \) is more robust) 16 0-0-0?! (16 \( \mathit{\mathit{x}xh7} \mathit{\mathit{d}d}xh717 \mathit{\mathit{w}g}6 \mathit{\mathit{f}f7}18 \mathit{h}h7 \mathit{\mathit{e}e}819 \mathit{\mathit{g}g}g8+ \mathit{\mathit{f}f8}20 \mathit{\mathit{h}h}h6 \pm \) 16...\( \mathit{\mathit{d}d6} \), with an unclear position.

d2) 8...\( \mathit{b}b49 \mathit{\mathit{a}a}4 \mathit{\mathit{f}fd}710 \mathit{h}h5 \mathit{\mathit{d}xe5}11 \mathit{\mathit{x}xe5} \mathit{f6} \) and now:

d21) 12 \( \mathit{\mathit{g}g}3?! \) was chosen when this position was seen in practice, but I feel Black equalizes comfortably with 12...\( \mathit{e}5 \), viz. 13 \mathit{h}xg6 \mathit{h}xg6 14 \( \mathit{\mathit{c}c}5 \mathit{\mathit{w}w}e715 \mathit{\mathit{d}d}2 \mathit{a}516 0-0-0 \mathit{\mathit{d}d}717 \mathit{\mathit{x}xd}7 \mathit{\mathit{x}xd}7 \) and Black had sufficient counterplay in G.Buckley-Fogarasi, Guildford 1991.

d22) 12 \( \mathit{x}xb8 \) is my recommended improvement. It may seem strange to give up the bishop-pair and take an undeveloped knight. The key point is that White has an outpost on c5 and therefore capturing on b8 removes a possible defender of that square and provides the extra tempo that White needs to induce additional weakness on the black kingside. After 12...\( \mathit{x}xb8 \) 13 \mathit{h}xg6 \mathit{h}xg6 14 \( \mathit{\mathit{d}d}3 \mathit{\mathit{w}e}8 \) (14...\( \mathit{f}f5 \) 15 \( \mathit{f}f4 \) gives White a clear positional advantage because White's minor pieces are evidently superior to their black counterparts) 15 \( \mathit{\mathit{f}f}3 \mathit{e}516 \mathit{\mathit{g}g}3 \pm \) White has the upper hand due to his outpost on c5 and kingside attacking chances. A sample continuation is 16...\( \mathit{f}f517 0-0-0 \mathit{\mathit{d}d}718 \mathit{\mathit{c}c}5 \mathit{exd}419 \mathit{\mathit{d}d}4 \mathit{\mathit{x}xd}4?20 \mathit{\mathit{w}w}h4 \pm \).

8 \( \mathit{\mathit{e}e}5 \mathit{\mathit{x}xe}29 \mathit{\mathit{w}w}e2 \) \( \mathit{\mathit{D}} \)

Play has now merged with Game 6.

9...\( \mathit{\mathit{b}d}7 \)

For alternatives, see Game 6.

10 0-0-0 \( \mathit{\mathit{c}c}8 \)

For Black's alternatives 10...\( \mathit{\mathit{w}a}5 \), 10...\( \mathit{\mathit{e}e}4 \) and 10...\( \mathit{\mathit{x}xe}5 \), see Game 3 and its notes, while 10...\( \mathit{\mathit{h}h}5 \) was covered in Game 6.

11 \( \mathit{\mathit{h}h}5 \) \( \mathit{\mathit{e}e}8 \) 12 \( \mathit{h}xg6 \mathit{f}xg6 \) 13 \( \mathit{\mathit{f}f}3 \)

14 \( \mathit{g}4 \mathit{b}515 \mathit{\mathit{h}h}6 \)

Lightning is about to strike from a seemingly clear sky. Black is hard-pressed to meet the immediate threat of 16 \( \mathit{g}5 \).

15...\( \mathit{\mathit{d}d}716 \mathit{\mathit{x}xg}7 \mathit{\mathit{x}xg}717 \mathit{\mathit{g}g}5 \)

18 \( \mathit{g}x\mathit{f}6+ \mathit{\mathit{x}xf}619 \mathit{\mathit{x}xe}5 \mathit{f}xe520 \mathit{\mathit{x}xh}7+ \) \( \mathit{\mathit{D}} \)

Many players would take their material advantage and run, but Hebden is a real killer!
20...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textx{2}xh7}} 21 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textw{f7+}}}} \textit{\textcolor{black}{\text{\textx{h6}}}} 22 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textx{h1+}}}} \textit{\textcolor{black}{\text{\textx{g5}}}} 23 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textx{g1+}}}} 1-0}

\textbf{Main Line: Black plays ...c5 – Introduction}

Game 11

\textit{P. Bank – J. Jensen}

\textit{Århus 1993}

1 d4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textc{f6}}} 2 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textc{f3}}} g6 3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textc{c3}}} d5 4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textf4}}}} g7 5 e3 0-0 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\texte2}}} c5 (D)}

This is widely believed to be Black's best answer to the Barry Attack. Barry exponent Mark Hebden plays it himself as Black, Joe Gallagher recommended it in his book \textit{Beating the Anti-King's Indians} and John Nunn, a highly respected theoretician, also uses this line.

7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\texte5}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textc6}}} 8 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textw{d2}}}}

I have included this game to serve as a warning to any bloodthirsty hackers who insist on trying to mate their opponent's king no matter what! Unfortunately, this tunnel-visioned approach just does not work when Black counterattacks vigorously in the centre and on the queenside.

8...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\texta5}}} 9 h4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textd7}}} 10 0-0-0? \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textdxe5}}} 11 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textdxe5}}} d4

It is Black's ability to play disruptive central breaks like this, in conjunction with a queenside attack, which makes overt aggression by White less viable.

12 exd4 cxd4 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textb1}}} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textxa2}}}

This is a very sad sight for any Barry player. Black's queenside attack looks far stronger than the white kingside effort, the pawn on e5 is weak and Black is a pawn up, to boot.

14 h5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textf5}}} (D)

15 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textd3}}}

This time, it is White who attempts to relieve the mounting pressure on his position with exchanges. In this example, it is a case of too little, too late!

15...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textxd3}}} 16 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textxd3}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textac8}}}

The black attack more or less plays itself.

17 hxg6 fxg6 18 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textd2}}}

This grovelling retreat, while preventing the threat of ...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\text{\textb4}}}, blocks the last escape-square of the white king.
Instead, 18 \( \texttt{h3} \) is answered by 18...h5
\( \texttt{?} \).

\( 18... \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{g}xe5}} 19 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}5}} \texttt{a6} \)

\( \textbf{(D)} \)

\textbf{0-1}

White had seen enough. Black has threats of \( \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c4}} \) and \( \texttt{\textsf{d}d3} \) to name but two, and for once, the kingside counterattack is going nowhere. The factors which differentiate this game from those preceding are an increased danger to the white king and greater influence for Black in the centre.

\textbf{Main Line: 6...c5 7 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{e}e5}}}

Game 12

\textbf{Hebden – Nunn}

\textbf{Hastings 1997/8}

\( 1 \texttt{d4} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{f}f6}} 2 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{f}f3}} \texttt{g6} 3 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c3}} \texttt{d5} 4 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{f}f4}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{g}g7}} \texttt{5} \texttt{e3} 0-0 6 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{e}e2}} \texttt{c5} 7 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{e}e5}} \)

\( \textbf{(D)} \)

With this move White keeps his options open and waits to see whether Black can develop counterplay.

\( 7... \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd4}} \)

Black has a wide range of alternatives to this capture and in our next couple of games we shall examine 7...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c6}}. Alternatively:

a) 7...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b6}} transposes to the 6...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b6}} variation covered previously.

b) 7...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{w}b6}} 8 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}a4}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{w}a5}+} 9 \texttt{c3} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd4}} 10 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b4}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{w}d8}} 11 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd4}} \texttt{?}. White has a queenside space advantage and the better bishops.

c) 7...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{w}a5}} (this active move avoids the problems of the main line, but the queen can be slightly more exposed here) 8 0-0 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c6}} 9 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}d2}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{f}f5}} 10 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}d1}} (with a threat) 10...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd4}} (10...\texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}ad8}}? 11 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xc6}} \texttt{bxc6} 12 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd5}} +-) 11 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd4}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}d7}} 12 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}d7}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}xd7}} 13 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{h}h6}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}ad8}} 14 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}xg7}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{x}g7}} (a subtle positional struggle now ensues, where White exploits the small superiority gained from having the better bishop) 15 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b5}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b8}} 16 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}d3}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c6}} 17 \texttt{a3} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b6}} 18 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b5}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}a5}} 19 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{f}f1}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{g}g4}} 20 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}a4}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c7}} 21 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{e}e1}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{f}f5}} (this bishop is the root of Black’s problems – although it is actively posted here, Black has difficulties negotiating White’s pressure on the e-file; Black would like to play ...\texttt{\textsf{e}e6}, but this would leave the bishop out on a limb) 22 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}ac1}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c6}} 23 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{b}b5}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{a}a5}} 24 \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{c}c5}} \texttt{\textsf{\textbf{d}d6}}
25 \text{W}f4 \text{A}c6 26 \text{W}e3 \text{A}b6 (White’s central pressure has induced Black to misplace his rook) 27 \text{W}c3 \text{D}c6 (27...\text{A}xb5 28 \text{D}e6+ --) 28 a4 \text{A}c8 29 \text{W}d2 \text{D}xd4 (Black unsuccessfully resorts to tactics in a difficult position) 30 \text{D}d7! (this wins the exchange and the game) 30...\text{D}xc2 (30...\text{D}f3+ 31 \text{g}xf3 \text{D}xd7 32 \text{A}xe7 \text{A}d6 33 \text{W}d4+ \text{D}g8 34 \text{W}f4 +=; 30...\text{D}xb5 is the most stubborn move) 31 \text{D}xb6 \text{W}xb6 32 \text{A}xe7 \text{W}f6 33 \text{A}xb7 \text{W}xb2 34 \text{A}a6 \text{W}a3 35 \text{A}xf7+ \text{D}xf7 36 \text{A}xc8 \text{D}d4 37 \text{A}c7+ 1-0 Hebden-Rötšagov, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

8 exd4 (D)

8...\text{D}fd7

Nunn varies from the plan used in his earlier game with Hebden (see Game 13). Practice has seen two other approaches for Black here, apart from moves which transpose to variations we have already examined:

a) 8...\text{D}bd7 puts insufficient pressure on White’s centre and again allows White to pursue a more aggressive plan. After 9 h4 \text{D}xe5 (9...\text{D}e4??) 10 \text{D}xe5 a6 11 h5 b5 12 a3 \text{D}e6 13 \text{W}d2 \text{D}d7 14 f3 \text{D}b7 15 f2 (15 g4!!?) 15...\text{A}ac8 (15...\text{W}b6 is a better attempt to disrupt White’s attack; although Black has played natural moves, his queenside counterplay simply lacks bite; meanwhile, White can assemble his forces at his own leisure on the kingside) 16 \text{A}d3 \text{D}d7 17 \text{A}h4 \text{A}f5 18 \text{A}xf5 \text{W}xf5 19 g4 \text{W}d7 20 \text{A}ah1. White has established an impressive attacking position and starts to move in for the kill; the daunting task facing Black can be shown by the following variations, illustrating White’s attacking plan:

   a1) 20...\text{gxh}5? (Black cracks under the pressure of White’s attack) 21 \text{A}xf6 \text{A}xf6 22 \text{D}xh5 \text{A}fd8 23 \text{A}xh7 \text{A}g7 24 \text{A}xg7+ 1-0 M.Přibyl-Přibyl-ova, Prague 1989. After 24...\text{W}xg7 25 \text{W}g5+ it’s mate next move.

   a2) 20...a5 21 h\times g6 f\times g6 (21...h\times g6 22 \text{W}f4 b4 23 \text{A}xf6 \text{A}xf6 24 \text{A}xf6 exf6 25 \text{A}h8+ \text{A}g7 26 \text{A}h7##) 22 \text{A}xf6 \text{A}xf6 23 \text{A}xh7 with the point that 23...\text{W}xg4?? loses to 24 \text{A}xg7+ \text{A}xg7 25 \text{W}h6+ \text{A}f7 26 \text{W}h7+ \text{A}e8 27 \text{W}g8+ \text{D}d7 28 \text{W}xd5+ \text{D}c7 29 \text{W}e5+ \text{D}b6 30 \text{W}xf6+ --.

   b) 8...\text{e}6 seems unnecessarily passive:

   b1) 9 0-0 is a quiet approach which promises White a modest advantage. 9...\text{D}fd7 10 \text{A}e1 \text{D}xe5 11 \text{D}xe5 \text{A}h6 (Black tries to retain his better bishop) 12 \text{A}b5 \text{A}c6 13 \text{A}d6 \text{A}e8 14 \text{A}g3 and White is a little better due to the control of his dark squares, one of the consequences of Black’s 7th move, Balashov-Gufeld, Moscow 1969.
b2) 9 \( \texttt{wd2} \) \( \texttt{dfd7} \) 10 \( \texttt{df3} \) \( \texttt{dc6} \) 11 \( \texttt{dh6} \) \( \texttt{df6} \) 12 \( \texttt{dxg7} \) \( \texttt{exg7} \) 13 0-0-0 (this is a fully viable, sharp approach to the position: White aims for a quick slaughter) 13...\( \texttt{d7} \) 14 \( \texttt{de5} \) \( \texttt{e8} \) 15 \( \texttt{h4} \) \( \texttt{db4}?! \) 16 \( \texttt{db1} \) (a useful precautionary move) 16...\( \texttt{b5} \) 17 \( \texttt{h5} \) \( \texttt{e7} \) 18 \( \texttt{hxg6} \) \( \texttt{fxg6} \) 19 \( \texttt{wh6+} \) \( \texttt{dg8} \) 20 \( \texttt{g4} \) (White summons the reserves) 20...\( \texttt{e8} \) 21 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) 22 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{dxex5} \) 23 \( \texttt{dxex6+!} \) \( \texttt{h8} \) 24 \( \texttt{xc8} \) \( \texttt{dc4} \) 25 \( \texttt{he1} \) \( \texttt{f7} \) 26 \( \texttt{e6} \) \( \texttt{xf2} \) 27 \( \texttt{xe2} \) \( \texttt{f4} \) 28 \( \texttt{h2} \) \( \texttt{ec7} \) 29 \( \texttt{xf8#} \) (1-0) G.Mohr-Rotshtein, Maribor 1994. Note how Black’s counterplay never really got going in this game.

9 \( \texttt{df3} \) \( \texttt{df6} \) 10 \( \texttt{de5} \) \( \texttt{dfd7} \) 11 \( \texttt{df3} \)

When asked afterwards why he had repeated moves like this, Hebden replied “I was just teasing him”. Psychological warfare is part and parcel of any killer’s chess repertoire.

11...\( \texttt{df6} \) 12 \( \texttt{wd2} \) (D)

12...\( \texttt{g4} \)

12...\( \texttt{ce4} \) 13 \( \texttt{dxex4} \) \( \texttt{dxe4} \) 14 \( \texttt{de5} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 15 \( \texttt{ce4+} \) (15 \( \texttt{dc4}?! \)?) 15...\( \texttt{e6} \) 16 \( \texttt{g4} \) is unclear.

13 \( \texttt{ce5} \)

13 \( \texttt{he6} \) \( \texttt{ec6} \) 14 \( \texttt{dxg7} \) \( \texttt{dxg7} \) 15 0-0-0 \( \texttt{ec8} \) 16 \( \texttt{de5} \) \( \texttt{xe2} \) 17 \( \texttt{dxe2} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) 18 \( \texttt{h4} \) \( \texttt{dxex5} \) 19 \( \texttt{dxe5} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) was equal in Hebden-G.Buckley, British League (4NCL) 2004/5. After 20 \( \texttt{d4} \) Black sharpened the struggle with 20...\( \texttt{xc3} \)? 21 \( \texttt{bxc3} \) \( \texttt{wa5} \) but quite possibly it was still equal.

13...\( \texttt{xe2} \) 14 \( \texttt{dxex2} \)

As per usual, the drawback Black faces with the exchange of his problem bishop is the acceleration of White’s attack.

14...\( \texttt{he5} \)

After 14...\( \texttt{ec6} \) 15 0-0-0 \( \texttt{ec8} \) 16 \( \texttt{bl} \) \( \texttt{b6} \) 17 \( \texttt{wd2} \) \( \texttt{dxex5} \) 18 \( \texttt{dxex5} \) \( \texttt{dxex4} \) 19 \( \texttt{dxex4} \), chances are fairly balanced if Black plays 19...\( \texttt{dxex5} \) 20 \( \texttt{dxe5} \) \( \texttt{dxex4} \) 21 \( \texttt{wd4} \) \( \texttt{wc6} \) 22 \( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{fd8} \) rather than 19...\( \texttt{dxex4} \)? 20 \( \texttt{xg7} \) \( \texttt{xg7} \) 21 \( \texttt{he1} \) ± Hebden-Mitchell, Caleta 2005.

15 \( \texttt{ec3} \) \( \texttt{ac6} \) 16 0-0-0 \( \texttt{ec8} \) 17 \( \texttt{f4} \)

White cements his knight on e5. 17 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 18 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) 19 \( \texttt{dxex5} \) \( \texttt{dxe5} \) 20 \( \texttt{dxe5} \) \( \texttt{wa5} \) 21 \( \texttt{bl} \) \( \texttt{dxex5} \) 22 \( \texttt{ag5} = \)

Hebden-Gormally, Southend 2006.

17...\( \texttt{f6} \)

17...\( \texttt{e6} \) 18 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 19 \( \texttt{h4} \) \( \texttt{h5} \) =.

18 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{wa5}?! \)

Based on a miscalculation. 18...\( \texttt{de4} \) is at least OK for Black.

19 \( \texttt{a3} \)

This is a clever prophylactic move, which anticipates Black’s following exchange sacrifice.

19...\( \texttt{dxex5} \)? 20 \( \texttt{fxe5} \) \( \texttt{xc3} \) 21 \( \texttt{exf6} \)

\( \texttt{f8} \) (D)

22 \( \texttt{bl1} \)

If Black was dreaming of 22 \( \texttt{bxc3} \) \( \texttt{wa3+} \) 23 \( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{xc3+} \) 24 \( \texttt{c1} \) \( \texttt{a1} \)
with a draw, he was certainly in for a rude awakening. Perhaps the earlier repetition had lulled him into a peaceful frame of mind.

22...\(\text{Nxc2} 23 \text{d}d2 1-0
White will win a piece.

Game 13
Hebden – Nunn
Hastings 1996/7

1 d4 \(\text{Qf6} 2 \text{Qf3} \text{g6} 3 \text{Qc3} \text{d5} 4 \text{f4} 5 \text{g7} 5 \text{e3} 0-0 6 \text{e2} \text{c5} 7 \text{e5} \text{c6} 8 0-0 \text{cxd4} 9 \text{exd4} \text{b6} 10 \text{Qxc6} \text{bxc6} (D)

11 \text{Qa4} \text{wa5} 12 \text{c3}

The nice thing about White’s position is that he can clamp down on the pawn-break that would most improve Black’s position, namely ...c5. This only gives Black one other meaningful pawn-break, ...e5. However, even when Black achieves this, he is still left with the worse pawn-structure.

12...\(\text{Qd7}

Psakhis suggested 12...\(\text{a6}!? 13 \text{Qc5} \text{Qh5}! (13...\text{Qxe2} 14 \text{Qxe2} \text{Qh5} 15 \text{Qe5} f6 16 b4 \text{Qb5} 17 \text{Qxb5} \text{exb5} 18 \text{Qc7} \text{Qac8} 19 \text{Qe6} \text{Qf7} 20 \text{Qfe1} \pm \text{Abergel-Lanzani, San Marino 2006}) 14 \text{Qg5} (14 \text{Qxa6} \text{Qxf4} 15 \text{Qe1} e5 16 b4 \text{Qc7} is unclear) 14...\text{Qxe2} 15 \text{Qxe2} \text{Qfe8} =. Still White’s position looks more comfortable after 16 f4.

13 b4 \(\text{wd8} 14 \text{wd2}

14 \text{Qg5} is an alternative approach. White entices the black kingside pawns forward in an attempt to exploit the resulting weaknesses. 14...f6 15 \text{Qh4} \text{Qb6} 16 \text{Qc5} g5?! 17 \text{Qg3} e5 18 a4 \text{Qe7} 19 dxe5 fxe5 (although the black pawn-structure in the centre is solid, his kingside weaknesses give cause for concern) 20 \text{Qe1} \text{Qd7} 21 \text{Qxd7} \text{Qxd7} 22 c4 \text{Qe6} 23 \text{Qc1} d4 24 c5 (White prepares a light-square bind) 24...\text{Qh8} 25 \text{Qc4} \text{Qf5} 26 \text{Qd3} \text{Qf7} (White has a clear positional advantage; as so often happens in such cases, the clearest way to exploit this is tactical) 27 \text{Qxe5!} \text{Qxe5} 28 \text{Qxe5+} \text{Qg8} 29 \text{Qd2} h6 30 \text{Qxd4} (there is not much Black can do about the coming invasion on the dark squares) 30...\text{Qf5} 31 \text{Qc4} \text{Qe6} 32 \text{Qf1} \text{Qfe8} 33 \text{Qb2} \pm as \text{Qc3} will follow, Antoshin-Balashov, Moscow 1967.
14...e5
Or:

a) 14...a5 15 a3 e8 16 fef1 axb4 17 axb4 e5 18 dxe5 xxe5 19 xxe5 xe5 20 b2 b7 21 d3 and White has somewhat the better prospects thanks to his stronger bishop, Saldano Dayer-Romon Poves, La Roda 2006.

b) 14...e8 15 h6 h8 16 f4 a5 17 b5 cxb5 18 xb5 a6 19 ab1 xb5 20 xb5 e6 21 d3 c7 22 f5 exf5 23 xd5 d6, Salvador-Zezulkin, Lodi 2005. White should now have seized his chance with 24 dxf5! gxf5 25 xf5. Then Black has nothing better than giving back a piece by 25...h5 26 xh5 when White has the stronger minor pieces and two connected passed pawns for the exchange.

15 h6

This is an important theme, because White assures himself of the better bishop. White is seeking to accumulate small advantages, à la Steinitz, which can be an effective way of increasing a positional edge.

15...xh6 16 xh6 (D)

16 e8

16...f6 17 e3 exd4 18 cxd4 a5 19 b5 b7 20 ac1 e8 21 d2 e7 22 fef1 ± Hebden-Lalic, Port Erin 1999.

17 fe1 b8 18 dxe5 xe5 19 wd2 a5 20 f1 axb4 21 cxb4 f6 22 xe5 xe5 23 e1 g7 24 c5

White occupies an excellent outpost. Now the main question is who can make more of their passed pawn.

24 f5 25 a3 d4

If Black is to stay in the game, he must play actively. This move is correct, but needs to be followed up accurately, and in practice this increases the chance of an error, even in a high-level game such as this.

26 f4 d7?

26...g4 keeps the game equal.

27 xd7 xd7 28 e5!

This is the problem: Black must lose a pawn.

28...c5 29 xc5 f5 30 d5 d3 31 xd3

With his extra pawn, White holds a large advantage.

31 a1+ 32 f1 xa3 33 d4+ f6 34 d6 xb4 35 xf6+ h6 36 xf4? 37 d4

Now White is winning.

37...e3+ 38 h2 1-0

Black has no good answer to h4#.

Game 14
Brousek – Rivest
corr. 2003

1 d4 f6 2 f3 g6 3 c3 d5 4 f4
5 e3 0-0 6 e2 c5 7 e5 c6 8 0-0 (D)
This is a more sensible approach than we saw in Game 11, if a little sedate. Instead of wielding the axe, White plays for a small positional advantage.

8...cxd4

Black has also tried:

a) 8...\(\text{b6}\) loses a pawn to 9 \(\text{a4}\).

b) 8...\(\text{f5}\) is Gallagher’s recommendation and indeed is a very solid option, although uninspiring for Black. After 9 \(\text{xd2 cxd4 10 exd4}\) Black has:

b1) 10...\(\text{b6}\) 11 \(\text{xc6}\) leads to positions similar to this or the previous game, depending on Black’s recapture.

b2) 10...\(\text{e4}\) 11 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) (if 11...\(\text{dxe4}\), then 12 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{bxc6}\) 13 c3 \(\pm\)) is an attempt by Black to benefit from the fact that White has no knight to land on c5, and so reach an improved version of Game 13. However, there is a tactical drawback, in that the bishop on e4 is woefully short of squares after 12 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{bxc6}\) 13 g4! \(\text{b6}\) 14 c3, when Black must lose material due to the threat of f3.

b3) 10...\(\text{d7}\) 11 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 12 \(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{xc2}\) (12...\(\text{xe5}\) 13 \(\text{ad1}\) e6 14 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xd2}\) 15 \(\text{xd2}\) \(\text{e4}\) 16 \(\text{fd1}\) is slightly better for White due to his control of the d-file) 13 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{f5}\) 14 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{e6}\) 15 \(\text{fd1}\) \(\text{xd5}\) 16 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{b6}\) 17 \(\text{xb6}\) axb6 18 \(\text{b5}\) \(\pm\) Hebden-Fernandez Garcia, Linares Zonal 1995. In conjunction with Black’s queenside pawn weaknesses, White enjoys the advantage of the bishop-pair.

9 \(\text{exd4}\) \(\text{b6}\) 10 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 11 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{b6}\) 12 a4

White threatens simply to gain space on the queenside with a5, when the black queen will be embarrassed for decent squares. In the original edition of this book, analysis stopped here with the conclusion ‘\(\pm\)’.

12...\(\text{a5}\)!

This suggestion by Prié might be enough to hold the theoretical balance. Other continuations give White a pleasant edge:

a) 12...\(\text{h5}\) 13 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{d6}\) 14 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{e6}\) 15 a5 h6 16 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 17 \(\text{d2}\) g5 18 f3 a6 19 \(\text{d3}\) \(\pm\) Hebden-Gladyszev, Marseilles 2006.

b) 12...a5 13 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{e6}\) 14 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{f8}\) 15 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{d7}\) 16 \(\text{g7}\) \(\text{g7}\) 17 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{c7}\) and after 18 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{ac8}\) 19 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{d6}\) chances were balanced in Fierro Baquero-Burijovich, Buenos Aires 2005. It seems that natural development by 18 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{f6}\) 19 \(\text{d3}\) ensures a small edge; e.g., 19...\(\text{g4}\) 20 g3 \(\text{f6}\) 21 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{d7}\) 22 \(\text{c3}\) \(\pm\).

c) After 12...a6 13 a5 \(\text{d8}\) 14 \(\text{e2}\) White’s position is visually pleasing and although he hasn’t proved much in any of the examples, it isn’t hard to find alternative tries:
c1) 14...\textit{f5} 15 \textit{e5} (Rybka prefers the somewhat loosening 15 \textit{g4}?!)
15...\textit{e4} 16 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe5} 17 \textit{dxe5} \textit{xe4} 18 \textit{c3} \textit{wc7} 19 \textit{f3} \textit{f5} 20 \textit{wd4} \textit{ac8} = Brousek-Peli, corr. 2007.

c2) 14...\textit{d7} 15 \textit{wd2} (here Rybka's 15 \textit{f3} \pm is easier to trust) 15...\textit{ac8} 16 \textit{fe1} \textit{e6} 17 \textit{h6} \textit{xh6} 18 \textit{wh6} \textit{e8} 19 \textit{ad3} \textit{f6} 20 \textit{we3} \textit{d6} 21 \textit{a4} \textit{xa4} 22 \textit{xa4} \textit{c6} = Hebden-Tukmakov, Neuchâtel 2003.

We now return to the position after 12...\textit{wa5} (D):

13 \textit{e5}?!?

Objectively this may offer no more than the alternatives but one advantage of White’s marginally more comfortable position is that it’s relatively easy to find playable alternatives to those defused by theory.

a) It’s food for thought that two years later Brousek deviated from this game with 13 \textit{wd2} a6 14 \textit{d3} \textit{h5} 15 \textit{h6} \textit{e8} 16 \textit{xg7} \textit{xe7} 17 \textit{fe1} \textit{f5} 18 \textit{e2} \textit{ad8} 19 \textit{f3} \textit{e6} 20 \textit{e4} \textit{xd2} 21 \textit{xd2} and chances were equal in Brousek-Hybl, corr. 2005.

b) Prië’s analysis focused on 13 \textit{e1}, when 13...a6 14 \textit{f1} \textit{e8} 15 \textit{e5} \textit{f5} 16 \textit{a3} (16 \textit{f3}?! \textit{ac8} 17 \textit{g4} \textit{d7} 18 \textit{a3} \textit{c6} 19 \textit{e2} \textit{h6} 20 \textit{c3} \textit{d7} 21 \textit{b4} \textit{wb6} 22 \textit{g3} \textit{e5} \textit{f} Breivik-Gullaksen, Oslo 2005) 16...\textit{e4} 17 \textit{gxg7} \textit{xc3} 18 \textit{wd2} \textit{yg7} 19 \textit{wc3} \textit{xc3} 20 \textit{xc3} e6 seems to be dead equal (21 \textit{cc7}?! \textit{e8} 22 \textit{xb7} \textit{xc2} may even be better for Black).

13...a6 14 \textit{d3} \textit{g4} 15 \textit{wd2} \textit{ac8} 16 \textit{fb1}

16 \textit{a3} also appears quite promising.

16...\textit{fd8} 17 \textit{wf4} \textit{e6} 18 \textit{b4} \textit{wb6} 19 a5 \textit{wa7}?! 20 \textit{a4}

This position nicely illustrates what White can hope for when playing 12 a4. His queenside grip is just on the verge of turning into something tangible. Black needs to improve over his last few moves if he wants to demonstrate that his position is playable.

20...\textit{ad7} 21 \textit{gxg7} \textit{yg7} 22 \textit{e5} \textit{xc5} 23 \textit{bxc5}

White is close to winning, not so much because of his terrible threats – they are actually quite modest – but because of Black’s lack of any active play.

23...\textit{c6} 24 \textit{e5}+ \textit{f6} 25 \textit{e3} \textit{d7} 26 \textit{b6} \textit{dc7} 27 \textit{c4} \textit{wa8}

Black is helpless. He cannot play 27...\textit{dxc4} due to 28 \textit{e4} and 27...\textit{f7} 28 \textit{cxd5} \textit{xd5} 29 \textit{c2}! is just as hopeless.

28 \textit{xc6} 1-0
2 150 Attack

Introduction

The 150 Attack is a system for White against all Modern and Pirc Defence players. We shall examine all the ways Black can reach his desired set-up, whether it be from a Barry Attack move-order (1 d4 .capture f6 2 .capture f3 g6 3 .capture c3 .capture g7 4 e4 d6 5 .capture e3), or otherwise. I used to play the Pirc Defence in order to lure White onto unfamiliar territory from an early stage. I suspect that, like myself, the majority of club players who try the Pirc or Modern Defence do so because they are intimidated by the more usual mainline openings. By opting out, Black has greater opportunities to confuse White with his various move-orders, which are hard to pin down.

What White needs is a simple, yet effective response, which can be used against any black system. The 150 Attack fits the bill perfectly. White negotiates the course of events on his own terms. I feel the 150 Attack is putting Black off playing the Pirc/Modern Defences at all levels. It has been successfully adopted by the world’s elite, such as Kasparov, Anand, Topalov and Leko, to name just a few. To whet your appetite, here is an attractive white victory, from a super-grandmaster clash.

Game 15
Leko – Beliavsky
Madrid 1998

1 d4 d6 2 e4 .capture f6 3 .capture c3 g6 4 .capture f3

We shall concentrate on this knight development as our primary move-order is 1 d4 .capture f6 2 .capture f3 g6 3 .capture c3, which commits the knight to f3 straight away. If Black uses a 1...g6 or 1...d6 move-order he must also be prepared for lines where White plays an early f3 or f4.

4... .capture g7 5 .capture e3 (D)

This is White’s basic set-up in the 150 Attack. The 150 Attack supposedly got its name because it was widely used by a lot of medium-strength club and tournament players in Britain (an English grading of 150 is roughly...
equivalent to 1800 Elo) and because its ideas were simple enough that it was a very dangerous weapon even in the hands of mid-ranking players. The basic idea was to exchange the dark-squared bishops and play for a mating attack on the black king. Since then, it has become much more refined, but we still have the unusual case of the world’s grandmasters and super-grandmasters borrowing the ideas of lesser players!

5...\textit{c6}

5...0-0 is an important possibility, which we shall consider in Game 16.

6 \textit{\textgchd}2 b5

Even positional players like to use the 150 Attack, although in their case it is sometimes a bluff. White sets up an attacking formation pointing towards Black’s kingside. The automatic response for Black is this counter-stroke on the queenside. However, then White can suddenly change tack, castle on the kingside, and set about exploiting the queenside weaknesses left by Black’s pawn advances. This time it is Black who is left bewildered and confused!

The reason for this is that while White’s moves are direct and aggressive, they are useful moves that fit in well in a wide variety of plans: he may be \textit{intending} to attack the black king, but he has not burned any boats by committing himself to doing so.

7 \textit{\textgchd}3 \textit{\textgchg}4 8 e5! (D)

8 \textit{\textgchh}4 is also possible (and it is examined in Game 18, together with many other options on the preceding moves), but the text-move is obviously more potent. The advance e5 often plays a key role in White’s victories in the 150 Attack.

\begin{center}
\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{game16.png}
\caption{Game 16}
\end{figure}
\end{center}

8...\textit{\textgcbf}4 9 exd6 \textit{\textgchf}3 (9...exd6 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 \textit{\textgchh}6 gives White the initiative) 10 gxf3 exd6 11 h4 \textit{\textgcb}6 12 0-0-0 \textit{\textgchd}7 13 \textit{\textgchg}5 f6 14 \textit{\textgcf}4 \pm Kharchenko-Borzov, Kiev 2006.

9 \textit{\textgce}4 \textit{\textgce}4

After 9...\textit{\textgcd}5?! 10 \textit{\textgchh}6 0-0 11 h4 \textit{\textgchf}3?! (11...f5 should be tried) 12 gxf3 dxe5 (12...f6 13 \textit{\textgchg}7 \textit{\textgchg}7 14 0-0-0 gives White the initiative) 13 h5 \textit{\textgcf}6 14 \textit{\textgchf}6+ exf6 15 hgx6 fxg6 16 \textit{\textgchf}8 \textit{\textgchf}8 17 dxe5 White has a large advantage. Short-Irzhano\v{v}, Elista Olympiad 1998 concluded 17...\textit{\textgchd}7 18 \textit{\textgce}4 \textit{\textgchb}6 19 exf6 \textit{\textgchf}6 20 \textit{\textgwh}6 \textit{\textgchf}7 21 0-0-0 \textit{\textgcf}6 22 \textit{\textgchg}6 1-0.

10 \textit{\textgce}4 d5

10...a5 11 exd6 exd6 12 h3 \textit{\textgchf}3 13 \textit{\textgchf}3 d5 \pm.

11 \textit{\textgchd}3 \textit{\textgchf}3

11...\textit{\textgchb}6 led to a quick win for White in E. Hossain-M. Mohammed Abdul, Dhaka 2008: 12 \textit{\textgchh}4 0-0 13 f4 f6 14 h3 \textit{\textgce}6 15 f5! fxe5 16 dxe5 d4
17 \textit{h}6 \textit{gxf5} 18 \textit{xg7} \textit{g7} 19 \textit{g5+ \textit{f7} 20 \textit{xf5} \textit{xf5} 21 \textit{xf5} \textit{c5} 22 0-0 1-0.

\textbf{12 gxf3}

White's pawn-structure has been compromised, but he has definite attacking chances on the kingside.

\textbf{12...a5}

12...\textit{wb6} 13 \textit{h4} (\textit{D}) is similar:

\begin{center}
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a) 13...\textit{h5} is met by 14 \textit{e6}.

b) 13...\textit{e6} 14 \textit{h5} \textit{d7} 15 0-0-0 \textit{c5} and now 16 \textit{dxc5} \textit{xc5} 17 hxg6 hxg6 18 \textit{xc8}+ \textit{h8} 19 f4 \textit{a5} was unclear in Kosteniuk-Cekro, Escaldes Zonal 1998. Instead White should try 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 \textit{xc8}+ \textit{h8} 18 \textit{h1} 0-0-0 19 \textit{dxc5} \textit{xc5} 20 \textit{d4}, when his play on the h-file and Black's weak f-pawn give White a large advantage.

c) 13...\textit{d7} 14 \textit{h5} c5 and now:

c1) 15 h6 \textit{f8} 16 \textit{dxc5} ±.

c2) 15 \textit{dxc5} \textit{xc5} 16 \textit{e2} 0-0 17 \textit{xd5} \textit{ac8} 18 hxg6 hxg6 19 \textit{d4} ± \textit{Deep Junior-Khalifman, Dortmund 2000}.

c3) 15 \textit{c3} \textit{bxc3} 16 \textit{bxc3} \textit{a5} 17 \textit{b1} \textit{b8} 18 \textit{xb8}+ \textit{xb8} 19 \textit{h6} is much better for White, Vyskočil-Skaček, Brno 2001.

\textbf{13 \textit{h4} \textit{d7}}

13...\textit{h5} is well met by the disruptive 14 \textit{e6}, and 13...\textit{e6} didn't look good in Kosteniuk-Flückiger, Biel 2004: 14 \textit{h5} \textit{d7} 15 \textit{c4} \textit{dxc4} 16 \textit{xc4} \textit{b6} 17 \textit{d3} \textit{f5} 18 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 19 hxg6 hxg6 20 \textit{g1} \textit{xf3} 21 \textit{c2} \textit{h1} 22 \textit{d2} \textit{h6} 23 \textit{e2} \textit{xf2} 24 \textit{xc6+} \textit{e7} 25 \textit{c5+} \textit{d7} 26 \textit{h6} \textit{h6} 27 \textit{af1} 1-0.

\textbf{14 \textit{h5} \textit{wb6} 15 \textit{c4}}

White opens up a second front for the attack.

\textbf{15...\textit{bxc3} 16 \textit{bxc3} \textit{e6} 17 \textit{b1} \textit{c7} 18 \textit{a6} \textit{f8}}

Obviously now was not the right time for Black to castle!

\textbf{19 \textit{g5} \textit{g8} 20 hxg6 hxg6 21 \textit{xe2} \textit{e7} 22 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 23 \textit{g5+} \textit{e8} 24 \textit{f4} (\textit{D})}
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White has a truly dominant position and only needs to find the final breakthrough. The text-move threatens exactly this through f5.

\textbf{24...\textit{d8} 25 \textit{g3} \textit{f8} 26 \textit{bg1} \textit{b8} 27 \textit{f5} \textit{b2}+}
Black lands a check, but one piece does not constitute an attack.
28 \(\text{\texttt{g}e3} \text{\texttt{exf5}} 29 \text{\texttt{xf5}} \text{\texttt{b6}} 30 \text{\texttt{d3}} \text{\texttt{c4+}} 31 \text{\texttt{xe4}} \text{\texttt{dxe4}} 32 \text{\texttt{f4}} \text{\texttt{e7}} 33 \text{\texttt{b1}} \text{\texttt{a3}} 34 \text{\texttt{f3}} \text{\texttt{g5}}\)
34...\text{\texttt{wxc3+}} 35 \text{\texttt{g2}} \text{\texttt{g5}} 36 \text{\texttt{wxf5}} \text{\texttt{xd4}} 37 \text{\texttt{e6}} is winning for White.
35 \text{\texttt{wcl1!}} 1-0

5...0-0

Game 16
Khalifman – Adams
World Team Ch, Lucerne 1997

1 d4 d6 2 e4 \text{\texttt{f6}} 3 \text{\texttt{c3}} g6 4 \text{\texttt{f3}} \text{\texttt{g7}} 5 \text{\texttt{e3}} 0-0 (D)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& \text{\texttt{w}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{w}} \\
\hline
\text{\texttt{w}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{w}} \\
\hline
\text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{w}} \\
\hline
\text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{w}} \\
\hline
\text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{w}} \\
\hline
\text{\texttt{w}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{b}} & \text{\texttt{w}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In the 1990s the majority of Pirc players reached this position as a matter of course. Today mainly the highly incautious and the extremely well prepared enter this dangerous line.

a) For 6...c6, the main line, see Game 18.

b) 6...\text{\texttt{bd7}} 7 \text{\texttt{h6}} e5 8 0-0-0 \text{\texttt{we7}} 9 \text{\texttt{xg7}} \text{\texttt{xg7}} 10 \text{\texttt{h4}} h5 11 \text{\texttt{e5}} ±.

c) 6...\text{\texttt{ac6}} is a major alternative. The previous edition suggested 7 d5 as deserving consideration (as an alternative to 7 0-0-0 and 7 \text{\texttt{b5}}). Matters are still not entirely resolved but it now looks like this is White’s most promising path:

c1) 7...\text{\texttt{b8}} 8 \text{\texttt{e2}} c6 9 0-0 \text{\texttt{cx5}} 10 \text{\texttt{exd5}} \text{\texttt{g4}} 11 \text{\texttt{fe1}} \text{\texttt{bd7}} 12 \text{\texttt{h3}} \text{\texttt{xf3}} 13 \text{\texttt{xf3}} ± Kleinegger-Radecke, Bad Wiessee 1999.

c2) 7...\text{\texttt{e5}} 8 \text{\texttt{xe5}} \text{\texttt{dxe5}} 9 \text{\texttt{h6}} e6 10 \text{\texttt{h7}} \text{\texttt{g7}} 11 0-0-0 \text{\texttt{exd5}} 12 \text{\texttt{exd5}} a5 (12...\text{\texttt{a6}} 13 \text{\texttt{h4}} \text{\texttt{h6}} 14 \text{\texttt{e2}} \text{\texttt{e8}} 15 \text{\texttt{we3}} \text{\texttt{wxf6}} 16 \text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{d6}} 17 \text{\texttt{g5}} \text{\texttt{hxg5}} 18 \text{\texttt{hxg5}} \text{\texttt{wxf4}} 19 \text{\texttt{wxf4}} \text{\texttt{exf4}} 20 \text{\texttt{ed4}} ± Kogan-Durão, Dos Hermanas 2000) 13 \text{\texttt{h4}} \text{\texttt{h5}} 14 \text{\texttt{e2}} \text{\texttt{g4}} 15 \text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{xg4}} 16 \text{\texttt{f3}} \text{\texttt{d7}} 17 \text{\texttt{wxe2}} 18 \text{\texttt{e4}} \text{\texttt{f4+}} 19 \text{\texttt{b1}} \text{\texttt{f5}} 20 \text{\texttt{g3}} \text{\texttt{h6}} 21 \text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{xe4}} 22 \text{\texttt{fxe4}} \text{\texttt{hxg4}} 23 \text{\texttt{wxf4}} 24 \text{\texttt{f5}} 25 \text{\texttt{exf5}} 26 \text{\texttt{d6}} 27 \text{\texttt{d7}} \text{\texttt{d8}} 28 \text{\texttt{dd1}} \text{\texttt{f6}} 29 \text{\texttt{gxg6}} 1-0 L.Adam-Feng, corr. 2001.

c3) 7...\text{\texttt{b4}} 8 \text{\texttt{a3}} \text{\texttt{a6}} 9 \text{\texttt{xa6}} \text{\texttt{bxa6}} 10 \text{\texttt{h6}} \text{\texttt{b8}} (10...\text{\texttt{e5}} 11 \text{\texttt{dxe6}} \text{\texttt{f6x6}} 12 \text{\texttt{e7}} \text{\texttt{e7}} 13 \text{\texttt{e5}} \text{\texttt{dxe5}} 14 \text{\texttt{d8}} 15 \text{\texttt{dxe5}} \text{\texttt{b7}} 16 \text{\texttt{f3}} \text{\texttt{d5}} = Zapata-Pfleger, Cienfuegos 1983) 11 \text{\texttt{dxe7}} \text{\texttt{dxe7}} 12 \text{\texttt{d4}} \text{\texttt{d4}} 13 \text{\texttt{d4}} 0-0-0 \text{\texttt{e5}} 14 \text{\texttt{dxe6}} \text{\texttt{f6x6}} 15 \text{\texttt{e5}} \text{\texttt{dxe5}} 16 \text{\texttt{b3}} (16 \text{\texttt{f3}}) 16...\text{\texttt{b7}} 17 \text{\texttt{f3}} = Emmens-Speelman, London 1990.

d) After 6...\text{\texttt{a6}} 7 0-0-0 \text{\texttt{b5}} 8 \text{\texttt{e5?!}} \text{\texttt{dxe5}} 9 \text{\texttt{e5}} \text{\texttt{e7}} 10 \text{\texttt{c6}}, we have:

d1) 10...\text{\texttt{xh6}}?! 11 \text{\texttt{wh6}} \text{\texttt{c6}} 12 \text{\texttt{h4}} \text{\texttt{xd4}} 13 \text{\texttt{d3}} b4? (13...\text{\texttt{d6}} is
necessary) 14 h5 +- g5 (Richardson-Beaumont, British League (4NCL) 2008/9) and now 15 Qg4 is the neatest win.

d2) 10...Qc6 was recommended by Vigus. After 11 Qxg7 Qxg7 12 We3 he offers two lines:

  d21) 12...Qb4 13 h4 h6 (13...Qbd5 14 Qxd5 Qxd5 15 h5 also gives Black problems) 14 h5 g5, when it seems White is clearly better after 15 f4 Qbd5 16 Qxd5 Qxd5 17 Wf3 e6 18 fxg5 Qxg5+ 19 Qd2 Qab8 20 Wf2 Qf6 21 Qd3 ±.

  d22) 12...e6 13 h4 Qe7 (13...h5 14 Qe2 b4 15 Qa4) 14 h5 Qf5 15 Wd2 Qxh5 and Vigus assesses the position as unclear. However, after 16 Qg1 it seems Black has a difficult task: 16...f6 (16...Qd6 17 g4 Qf6 18 f3 Qd7 19 Qh1 h5 20 Qd3 b4 21 Qe2 ±) 17 Qd3! Qxd4 (17...Qxd4 18 Qc5 +-) 18 g4 Qhg3 (18...Qh4 19 Qe2 Qf3 20 Qxf3 Qxf3 21 Qde1 ±) 19 gxf5 Qxf5 (19...Qxf1 20 Qgxf1 exf5 21 Qe2 Qd6 22 Qdf4 Qxd2+ 23 Qxd2 Qae8 24 Qd4 ±) 20 Qh3 Qae8 21 Qe2 Qd6 22 Qef4 ±.

e) 6...e5 7 0-0-0 and now:

  e1) 7...Qe7 8 Qg5 c6 9 Qb1 Qg4 10 h3 Qxf3 11 gxf3 Qbd7 12 h4 Qfd8 13 d5 (13 h5) 13...c5 14 h5 h6 15 Qxh6 Qxh5 16 Qe2 Qf6 17 Qg5 Qxf3 18 Qh3 Qxe4 19 Qxd8 Qb6 + Duppel-Lederle, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1999.

  e2) 7...Qf7 8 Qh6 Qe6 9 h4 exd4 10 Qxg7 Qxg7 11 Qxd4 h5 12 f4 Qxd4 13 Qxd4+ Qf6 14 Qb5 ± Hebden-Bokan, Kallithea 2000.

  e3) 7...Qc6 8 h3 a6 9 g4 b5 10 g5 b4 (10...Qh5 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 Qd5 ± Naiditsch-T.Reich, German Ch, Hückendorf 2004) 11 gxh6 Qxf6 (11...bxc3 12 Qxc3 Qxf6 13 Qg5 exd4 14 Qxd4 Qxg5+ 15 Qxg5 Qxd4 16 Qe3 ±) 12 Qe2 Qxc3 13 Qg5 Qxd4 14 Qxd4 Qh6 (14...Qe6!? 15 Qxh6 exb2+ 16 Qb1 exd4 17 Qxf8 Qxf8 18 Qg2 ±. 7 Qg5! (D))

B

It was the discovery of this move that enhanced the popularity of the 150 Attack. White side-steps the bishop’s attack and prepares his own on the kingside.

7...Qc6

Black has tried almost everything here:

a) 7...e5? 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 Qxd8 Qxd8 10 Qc4 Qf8 11 Qc5 ±

b) 7...h6 8 h3 Qh5 (8...Qd7 9 Qf3 Qh7 10 g4 with the initiative) 9 g4 (9 Qxf7 Qxf7 10 g4 may be even stronger) 9...hxg5 10 Qe2 (a clever move, designed to put maximum pressure on h5, before taking there) 10...c5 (Black in turn tries to find counterplay on the queenside, but is simply too far behind in the race) 11 gxh5 cxd4 12 Qxd4
13 \texttt{ae}3 \texttt{eh}7 14 h4 (White’s strategy is simple: open as many lines as possible) 14...g4 15 hxg6 fxg6 16 h5 \texttt{gxh}5 17 \texttt{exh}5 \texttt{f}e5 18 0-0-0 \texttt{df}6 19 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{ec}8 20 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{f}f7 (20...\texttt{wa}5 21 \texttt{exe}5 dxe5 22 \texttt{exg}4 \texttt{f}f5 22 \texttt{exg}7+ 1-0 Kosten-Seret, French Team Ch, Auxerre 1991. Black loses his queen after 22...\texttt{exg}7 23 \texttt{wg}5+.

c) 7...\texttt{dxa}6 8 \texttt{f}f3 \texttt{d}d7 9 h4 h6 10 g4 c5 11 0-0-0 and now 11...\texttt{exg}4? 12 \texttt{fxg}4 \texttt{exg}4 13 \texttt{f}f3 really isn’t adequate for Black, Siebrecht-Jansa, Differdange 2007.

d) 7...c6 8 f3 \texttt{c}c8 9 h4 h5 10 0-0-0 b5 11 g4 \texttt{hxg}4 12 h5 \texttt{exh}5 13 \texttt{fxg}4 \texttt{exg}4 14 \texttt{e}e2 \texttt{d}d7? 15 \texttt{exh}5 \texttt{gxh}5 16 \texttt{exh}5 f6 17 \texttt{g}g1 ++ Belikov-Semiev, Alushta 2005.

e) 7...c5 8 dxc5 h6 9 \texttt{f}f3 (9 h3 may be stronger) 9...dxc5 10 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{xf}3 11 \texttt{gxf}3 \texttt{d}c6 12 \texttt{exh}6 \texttt{d}d4 13 0-0-0 \texttt{d}xf3 14 \texttt{we}3 \texttt{wd}4 15 \texttt{e}e2 \texttt{we}3+ 16 \texttt{xe}3 \texttt{dd}4 17 \texttt{exd}4 cxd4 18 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{f}f6 19 \texttt{exf}3 \texttt{xf}3 20 \texttt{exf}3 \texttt{exe}5 21 \texttt{exe}5 dxe5 22 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{c}c6 23 \texttt{f}f3 \pm Hebden-S.Petrosian, Marseille 2003.

f) 7...\texttt{d}d7 8 h3 e6 9 0-0-0 \texttt{c}c6 10 \texttt{f}f3 e5 11 dxe5 \texttt{exe}5 12 \texttt{exe}5 dxe5 13 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{c}c6 14 \texttt{f}f3 \pm Khenkin-Golubev, Bad Wiessee 1999.

8 d5 \texttt{h}b8

8...\texttt{e}e5 9 f4 \texttt{ed}7 10 h3 \pm.

9 f3 (D)

This is the point: White can use Black’s bishop as a target, in order to gain time for his attack.

9...\texttt{d}d7 10 h4 h5 11 g4!

With Black’s queenside pieces so poorly placed, White thinks nothing of offering a pawn to open lines against Black’s king.

11...c6

Or 11...hxg4 12 \texttt{e}e2.

12 \texttt{gxh}5 \texttt{hxh}5 13 0-0-0 \texttt{wa}5

Black is trying hard to generate some counterplay before White’s kingside attack becomes too dangerous.

14 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{xd}4 15 \texttt{wd}4 b5 16 \texttt{wb}1 b4 17 \texttt{e}e2

But now the counterattack seems to have reached a dead end.

17...\texttt{c}c8 18 \texttt{wd}2 cxd5 19 \texttt{f}f4 (D)

B

Black’s position is critical, since he is faced with the inevitable collapse of his kingside defences while most of
his queenside pieces are still undeveloped.

19...h3!?

Adams decides to go down fighting. Unfortunately for him, he never even gets close to reasonable compensation for his queen.

20 $\text{W}xa5$ bxc2+ 21 $\text{Q}c1$ cxd1$\text{W}++$
22 $\text{Q}xd1$ \text{Qxf4} 23 exd5 $\text{Q}f5$ 24 $\text{W}d2$
$\text{h}5$ 25 $\text{W}e3$ $\text{h}c7$ 26 $\text{b}5$!

White goes back on the offensive, the clearest way to realize his advantage before Black can get organized. White ties Black up on the queenside and introduces the threat of $\text{h}e8$.

26...$\text{Q}f8$ 27 $\text{W}d4$

Black is given no rest, as White creates a threat with each move.

27...$\text{Q}f6$ 28 $\text{h}7+$ $\text{g}7$ 29 $\text{Q}xf6$
$\text{exf}6$ 30 $\text{h}5$ g$\text{xh}5$ 31 $\text{Q}xh5$ 1-0

Leaving Black defenceless against an invasion on the h-file.

150 Attack vs the Pirc Defence: Black Delays ...0-0

A decade ago, delaying castling against the 150 Attack was a refinement mainly used by grandmasters. But the idea has steadily crept down the rating ladder and today it’s standard procedure even at club level.

Game 17

Hebden – Felecan

Cappelle la Grande 1993

1 $\text{d}4$ $\text{Q}f6$ 2 $\text{Q}f3$ g6

For King’s Indian players (in contrast to Grünfeld players), 2...d6 is an alternative move-order. This gives the extra option of 3 $\text{Q}c3$ $\text{h}5$!?. However, after 4 $\text{Q}g5$ White is able to keep his initiative:

a) 4...$\text{Q}bd7$ 5 $\text{Q}h4$ $\text{g}6$ 6 $\text{Q}xg6$
$\text{hxg6}$ 7 d5?! $\text{Q}c5$ (7...c6 8 e4 $\text{W}a5$ 9 $\text{W}d2$ $\text{h}c8$ 10 0-0-0 $\pm$ Miles-Robović, Münster 1993) 8 e4! e5! 9 dxe6 $\text{Q}xe6$
10 $\text{Q}e3$ c6 11 $\text{W}f3$ $\pm$ Palliser.

b) 4...$\text{Q}e4$ 5 $\text{Q}xe4$ $\text{Q}xe4$ 6 $\text{Q}d2$
$\text{g}6$ 7 e4 d5 8 c3 c6 (8...dxe4 9 $\text{W}b3$
$c8$?! 10 0-0-0 $\text{Q}d7$ 11 $\text{Q}e1$ $\pm$) 9 $\text{Q}d3$
dxe4 10 $\text{Q}xe4$ $\text{Q}d7$ 11 $\text{W}f3$ $\text{W}a5$ 12 h4
$\pm$ Hebden-Collinson, British League (4NCL) 2007/8.

3 $\text{Q}c3$ $\text{g}7$ 4 e4 d6

4...d5?! should not be underestimated. In the critical line 5 e5 $\text{Q}e4$ 6 $\text{Q}xe4$ dxe4 7 $\text{Q}g5$ c5 no clear path to an advantage for White has been established. 8 $\text{h}c4$, 8 e6, 8 c3 and 8 d5 all deserve further investigation but 8 dxc5 seems a safe path to a small plus: 8...$\text{W}xd1$+ 9 $\text{W}xd1$ $\text{Q}xe5$ 10 $\text{Q}xe4$ 0-0 11 $\text{Q}d3$ $\pm$ or 8...$\text{W}a5$+ 9 c3 $\text{Q}c6$
(9...$\text{W}xc5$ 10 e6 fxe6 11 $\text{Q}e3$ $\text{W}e5$ 12 $\text{W}c2$ $\pm$) 10 $\text{Q}e3$ 0-0 11 $\text{Q}e2$ $\text{Q}xe5$ 12 $\text{Q}xe5$ $\pm$.

5 $\text{Q}e3$ ($D$)
5..\(\texttt{Qg4}\)

This attempt to harass the white bishop backfires badly. Black should stick to 5..\(\texttt{c6}\), which is considered in Game 18.

Other attempts to delay castling include:

a) 5..\(\texttt{Qg4}\) 6 \(\texttt{h3}\) (6 \(\texttt{Qe2} 0-0\) takes us outside our repertoire) 6..\(\texttt{xf3}\) 7 \(\texttt{xf3}\) \(\texttt{xc6}\) 8 0-0-0 0-0 (8..\(\texttt{d7}\) 9 \(\texttt{g4}\) e5 10 dxe5 \(\pm\) 9 \(\texttt{b5}\) (9 e5?!?) 9..\(\texttt{d7}\) 10 e5! \(\pm\) Khenkin-Agnos, Greek Team Ch, Athens 2000.

b) 5..\(\texttt{bd7}\) 6 \(\texttt{w2}\) \(\texttt{g4}\) 7 \(\texttt{g5}\) h6 8 \(\texttt{h4}\) and now:

b1) 8..\(\texttt{b6}\) 9 \(\texttt{h3}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 10 \(\texttt{d3}\) 0-0 11 0-0 \(\texttt{d7}\) 12 e5 \(\texttt{e8}\) 13 \(\texttt{fe1}\) dxe5 14 \(\texttt{xe5}\) \(\pm\) \(\texttt{c8}?!\) 15 \(\texttt{xg6}\) (15 \(\texttt{g4}?!\) \(\pm\)) 15..\(\texttt{fxg6}\) 16 \(\texttt{e7}\) \(\texttt{xd4}\) 17 \(\texttt{xf8}\) \(\texttt{fxe8}\) 18 \(\texttt{b5}\) \(\pm\) Hebden-Moser, Neuchâtel 2003.

b2) 8..\(\texttt{c6}\) 9 \(\texttt{d3}\) \(\texttt{wc7}\) 10 0-0-0 \(\texttt{b6}\) 11 \(\texttt{h3}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 12 e5 \(\texttt{fd5}\) 13 \(\texttt{xd5}\) \(\texttt{xd5}\) 14 c4 \(\texttt{b6}\) 15 exd6 exd6 16 \(\texttt{de1+}\) \(\texttt{e6}\) 17 \(\texttt{xg6}\) \(\pm\) Palliser-J.Gilbert, London 2000.

b3) 8..\(\texttt{c5}\) 9 \(\texttt{h3}\) cxd4 10 \(\texttt{xd4}\) \(\texttt{ge5}?!\) (10..\(\texttt{gf6}\) gives Black a more standard-looking Sicilian position) 11 0-0-0?! (11 \(\texttt{d5}\) g5 12 \(\texttt{df5} \pm\) 11..\(\texttt{a6}\)?) 12 \(\texttt{g4}?!\) (12 \(\texttt{d5}\) 12..\(\texttt{c5}\) 13 \(\texttt{f4}\) \(\texttt{c6}\) 14 \(\texttt{xc6}\) bxc6 15 \(\texttt{e5} \pm\) Drabke-Bie-lawski, NATO Ch, Kolobrzeg 2005.

c) 5..\(\texttt{a6}\) 6 \(\texttt{wd2}\) \(\texttt{b5}\) 7 \(\texttt{d3}\) \(\texttt{b7}\) 8 \(\texttt{h6}\) \(\texttt{xh6}\) (8..\(\texttt{0-0}?!\) 9 \(\texttt{h4}\) b4 10 \(\texttt{d5}\) \(\texttt{xd5}\) 11 exd5 \(\texttt{bd7}?!\) 12 h5 gave White a decisive attack in Fressinet-Smirin, Bastia rapid 2006: 12..\(\texttt{g4}\) 13 \(\texttt{hxg7}\) \(\texttt{xg7}\) 14 \(\texttt{g5}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 15 \(\texttt{f3}\) h6 16 \(\texttt{xf7}\) \(\texttt{xf7}\) 17 \(\texttt{hxg6}\) \(\texttt{fxg6}\) 18 0-0-0 \(\texttt{xd5}\) 19 \(\texttt{fxg4}\) \(\texttt{f4}\) 20 \(\texttt{f5}\) 1-0) 9 \(\texttt{xh6}\) \(\texttt{bd7}\) (9..\(\texttt{b4}\) 10 \(\texttt{e2}\) \(\texttt{xe4}\) 11 \(\texttt{xe4}\) \(\texttt{xe4}\) 12 \(\texttt{g7}\) \(\texttt{f8}\) 13 \(\texttt{hxh6}\) e6 14 \(\texttt{wh6}\) d7 15 0-0 d5 16 \(\texttt{e3}\) \(\texttt{h8}\) 17 c4 \(\pm\) Bricard-Agrést, Reykjavik 2000) 10 0-0 \(\texttt{e5}\) 11 \(\texttt{fe1}\) \(\texttt{g4}\) 12 \(\texttt{d2}\) 0-0 13 a4 exd4 14 \(\texttt{xd4}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 15 \(\texttt{f1}\) c5 16 \(\texttt{f3}\) b4 17 \(\texttt{d1}\) \(\texttt{de5} =\) Henao-A.Ivanov, Bled Olympiad 2002.

6 \(\texttt{g5}\) \(\texttt{h6}\)

Or 6..\(\texttt{c5}\) 7 \(\texttt{dxc5}\) \(\texttt{wa5}\) 8 \(\texttt{cxd6}\) \(\texttt{xc3+}\) 9 bxc3 \(\texttt{wc3+}\) 10 \(\texttt{d2}\) \(\texttt{c5}\) 11 \(\texttt{e2}\) \(\texttt{exd6}\) 12 \(\texttt{h3}\) \(\texttt{e5}\) 13 \(\texttt{b5+}\) \(\texttt{bc6}\) 14 \(\texttt{xc5}\) \(\texttt{xf3+}\) 15 \(\texttt{gxf3}\) dxc5 16 \(\texttt{h6} \pm\) Kolev-Huerga Tirados, Seville 1999.

7 \(\texttt{h4}\)

7 \(\texttt{f4}\) may also be promising; e.g., 7..\(\texttt{e5}\) 8 \(\texttt{dxe5}\) \(\texttt{xe5}\) 9 \(\texttt{xe5}\) dxe5 10 \(\texttt{xd8+}\) \(\texttt{xd8}\) 11 0-0-0+ \(\texttt{d7}\) 12 \(\texttt{e3}\) c6 13 \(\texttt{c4} \pm\) Galinsky-Chizhevsky, Kiev 2004.

7..\(\texttt{c6}\) 8 \(\texttt{wd2}\) \(\texttt{g5}\) (\(\texttt{D}\))

This is consistent with Black’s previous moves, but frankly does not impress. All Black has achieved is to weaken his kingside.

8..\(\texttt{b5}\) 9 \(\texttt{d3}\) a6 10 \(\texttt{h3}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) led to a nice attacking victory for White in Leitão-An.Rodriguez, Santos 2004: 11 \(\texttt{e5}!\) \(\texttt{h5}?!\) 12 g4 g5 13 \(\texttt{gxh5}\) \(\texttt{gxh5}\) 14 \(\texttt{g1} \pm\) \(\texttt{f8}?!\) 15 \(\texttt{wd4}\) dxe5 16 dxe5 \(\texttt{wc7}\) 17 0-0-0+ \(\texttt{d7}\) 18 \(\texttt{f5}\) \(\texttt{c5}\) 19 \(\texttt{xe7}\) \(\texttt{xe7}\) 20 \(\texttt{g1}\) \(\texttt{f8}\) 21 \(\texttt{dg4}\) \(\texttt{fxe5}\) 22 \(\texttt{g7+}\) \(\texttt{e8}\) 23 \(\texttt{wh8+}\) \(\texttt{d7}\) 24 \(\texttt{xa8}\) 1-0.

9 \(\texttt{g3}\) \(\texttt{d7}\) 10 0-0-0 \(\texttt{b5}\) 11 \(\texttt{e5}\)

The usual remedy to a flank attack.

11..\(\texttt{b4}\) 12 \(\texttt{b1}\)

Not 12 \(\texttt{e4}?!\) due to 12..\(\texttt{d5}\).

12..\(\texttt{dxe5}\) 13 \(\texttt{dxe5}\) \(\texttt{wa5}\) 14 \(\texttt{h4}\)

Seeking to make Black pay for his previous aggression.
g8+ #f8 is the only other defensive try, desperate-looking though it is.
19 #h1 #f6 20 #xe5 #d8??
Black had to try 20...#xe5 21 #xg5 (21 #xc6+? #f8 22 #xa8?? #f4)
21...#xb5, when 22 #xg4 #f8 is unclear and 22 #g8+?! #d7 23 #xa8 gives Black the option of an immediate draw by 23...#f4+ 24 #d2 #xd2+ 25 #xd2 #g5+ etc.
21 #xc6+ 1-0
White wins material after 21...#f8 22 #xf6.

Game 18
Izeta – Striković
Elgoibar 1994

1 d4 #f6 2 #f3 g6 3 #c3 #g7 4 e4
d6 5 #e3 c6
Black seeks queenside counterplay before developing his kingside.
6 #d2 (D)

A thunderbolt.
18...#g4!
18...#xb5? 19 #d8#; 18...xb5 19
#xg5 #d7 (19...#g6? 20 #d5 +++) 20

6...b5
Black has also tried:
a) 6...#bd7 is highly transpositional. A high-level encounter continued 7
\( \text{h6} \text{xh6} 8 \text{wxh6 e5 9 0-0-0!? we7} \) (White’s score from this position is formidable) 10 h3! a6 11 dxe5 dxe5 12 \( \text{c4!} \) b5 13 \( \text{b3 a5} \) 14 a4?! b4 15 \( \text{b1 a6?!} \) (Black should try 15...\( \text{xe4} \) 16 \( \text{he1} \) \( \text{ec5} \) as 16...f5? 17 \( \text{bd2} \) \( \text{xf2} \) loses to 18 \( \text{xc4} \), as pointed out by Lane) 16 \( \text{bd2} \) 0-0-0 17 \( \text{e3!} \) and White had a clear advantage in Kasparov-Radjabov, Moscow rapid 2002. The game concluded 17...\( \text{b7} \) 18 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c5?!} \) 19 \( \text{xaxa6+} \) \( \text{xa6} \) 20 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{fxe4} \) 21 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{xd5?} \) 22 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{g5} \) 23 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 24 \( \text{xe4a5} \) \( \text{xb6} \) 25 \( \text{xb4} \) 1-0.

b) 6...\( \text{g4} \) 7 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{hxh6} \) (this is always an option for Black, but it makes the position of his king more precarious; 7...0-0 8 \( \text{sg7} \) \( \text{sg7} \) 9 \( \text{g5} \) h6 10 h3 \( \text{c8} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 12 e5 \( \text{dxe5} \) 13 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 14 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{xg4} \) 15 hxg4 \( \text{h8} \) 16 f3 \( \text{f6} \) 17 \( \text{c4} \) b5 18 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 19 0-0-0 was very sharp but probably better for White in Degraeve-Ponomariov, Belfort 1998) 8 \( \text{wxh6} \) and now:

b1) 8...\( \text{xf3} \) 9 gxf3 \( \text{bd7} \) 10 0-0-0 \( \text{a5} \) 11 \( \text{c4} \) d5 12 \( \text{d3} \) 0-0-0 13 e5± de la Riva-Krasenkow, Olite 2006.

b2) 8...\( \text{a5} \) 9 \( \text{e3} \) (a very solid move, centralizing the white queen and hinting at a central breakthrough) 9...\( \text{xf3} \) 10 gxf3 b5 11 a4 (it looks strange to advance on the queenside when that seems a likely resting place for White’s king, but White has a devilishly clever idea!) 11...\( \text{bd7?!} \) (despite leaving light-square weaknesses, 11...b4 had to be tried) 12 b4! \( \text{xb4} \) (12...\( \text{a6} \) 13 \( \text{b1} \)±) 13 axb5 \( \text{c8?!} \) 14 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{b2} \) 15 \( \text{a2} \) \( \text{b4} \) 16 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{b2} \) 17 \( \text{d2} \)± Kinsman-W. Watson, European Clubs Cup, London 1996. White threatens simply to bring the h-rook to b1.

b3) 8...\( \text{bd7} \) 9 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a5} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{b4} \) 11 \( \text{e3} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{ab1} \) e5 13 \( \text{fdl} \) \( \text{fe8} \) 14 h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 15 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 16 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{ad8} \) 1/2-1/2 Anand-Ivanchuk, Amber Blindfold, Nice 2008.

c) 6...\( \text{a5} \) (in my opinion, this is the most flexible move for Black, as he holds back from giving White a target with ...b5) 7 h3 (the most accurate response; since Black is keeping his options open, it would seem best to play quietly and look for an opportunity to exploit the sometimes shaky position of the black queen) and now Black has tried:

c1) 7...0-0 8 \( \text{d3} \) e5 9 0-0 \( \text{bd7} \) 10 a4 \( \text{e8} \) 11 \( \text{fd1} \) (White is well placed for the inevitable opening of the centre, after which he will be better, thanks to his slight space advantage) 11...\( \text{c7} \) (11...\( \text{xd4} \) 12 \( \text{xd4} \) it is usually more accurate to recapture with the bishop for tactical reasons) 12...\( \text{c5?!} \) 13 b4 \( \text{xb4} \) 14 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 15 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{b2} \) 16 c3 -- was given by S.Pedersen) 12 a5 (a useful move, gaining space) 12...\( \text{xd4} \) 13 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 14 e5 (this is another reason for recapturing with the bishop on d4) 14...\( \text{fd7} \) 15 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 16 \( \text{fl} \)± Nunn-Azmai-parashvili, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

c2) 7...\( \text{bd7} \) 8 \( \text{d3} \) 0-0 9 0-0 and then:

c21) 9...\( \text{c7} \) 10 \( \text{e2} \) e5 11 \( \text{g3} \) d5 12 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 13 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{exd4} \) 14 \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{h8} \) 16 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 17 \( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{f6} \)± 18 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e6} \) 19 \( \text{xf6} \)
\(\mathcal{D}xf6\) 20 \(\mathcal{D}xe6\) fxe6 21 \(\mathcal{R}xe6\) ± Barua-McNab, Catalan Bay 2004.

\(c22\) 9...e5 10 a4 and now:

\(c221\) The line 10...\(\mathcal{R}e8\) 11 \(\mathcal{D}fe1\) \(\mathcal{D}f8\) 12 b4! \(\mathcal{W}xb4?\) 13 a5 exd4 14 \(\mathcal{R}xd4\) d5 15 \(\mathcal{D}a4\) \(\mathcal{W}e7\) 16 exd5 ± Naiditsch-Claesen, Belgian Team Ch 2002/3 is a reminder that the queen can be exposed on a5.

\(c222\) 10...exd4 11 \(\mathcal{D}xd4\) \(\mathcal{R}e8\) (or 11...\(\mathcal{D}e5\) 12 \(\mathcal{D}e2\) \(\mathcal{R}e8\) 13 \(\mathcal{D}fd1\) \(\mathcal{W}b4\) 14 a5 \(\mathcal{D}fd7??\) and in Hebden-Sandu, Montpellier 2006 White could have won by trapping the queen with 15 \(\mathcal{D}a4\) \(\mathcal{W}xb2\) 16 \(\mathcal{D}b1\) 12 \(\mathcal{D}b3\) \(\mathcal{W}c7\) 13 \(\mathcal{R}d1\) a6 14 \(\mathcal{D}h6\) \(\mathcal{D}xh6\) 15 \(\mathcal{W}xh6\) b5 16 axb5 axb5 17 \(\mathcal{D}d2\) b4 18 \(\mathcal{R}e2\) \(\mathcal{D}e5\) = Leko-Kamsky, Moscow 2007.

We now return to the position after 6...b5 (D):

\[\text{Diagram:} W\]

7 \(\mathcal{D}d3\)

The actual move-order of the game was 1 d4 d6 2 e4 g6 3 \(\mathcal{C}c3\) \(\mathcal{G}g7\) 4 \(\mathcal{D}e3\) c6 5 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) b5 6 \(\mathcal{D}d3\) \(\mathcal{D}f6\) 7 \(\mathcal{D}f3\).

7...\(\mathcal{G}g4\)

Aiming to disrupt White’s normal plan by threatening to double his pawns. Black also has the following options, none of which are attractive:

a) After 7...\(\mathcal{D}b7??\) Black has been going down in flames: 8 \(\mathcal{D}h6\) \(\mathcal{D}xh6\) 9 \(\mathcal{W}xh6\) b4 (9...\(\mathcal{D}bd7\) is pulverized by 10 e5 dxe5 11 dxe5 b4 12 \(\mathcal{D}e2\) \(\mathcal{D}d5\) 13 e6 \(\mathcal{D}f6\) 14 \(\mathcal{D}e5\) \(\mathcal{D}f8\) 15 \(\mathcal{D}xf7\) + \(\mathcal{D}xf7\) 16 \(\mathcal{D}xg6\) 1-0 Gallagher-De Reymaeker, Lausanne 2004) 10 \(\mathcal{D}e2\) \(\mathcal{W}b6\) 11 0-0 c5 12 e5 dxe5 13 dxe5 \(\mathcal{D}xf3\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}g7\) \(\mathcal{D}f8\) 15 \(\mathcal{D}xf6\) \(\mathcal{D}xe2\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xe7\) \(\mathcal{D}xe7\) 17 \(\mathcal{D}xe2\) \(\mathcal{D}d7\) 18 \(\mathcal{D}g4\) 1-0 Yagupov-Zakharevich, St Petersburg 1998.

b) 7...a6, bolstering Black’s queenside, is not the most active of ideas, and 8 \(\mathcal{D}h6\) seems sufficient for a substantial advantage:

b1) 8...\(\mathcal{D}xh6\) 9 \(\mathcal{W}xh6\) \(\mathcal{W}a5\) 10 e5 dxe5 11 dxe5 \(\mathcal{D}d5\) 12 0-0 \(\mathcal{D}xc3\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}g7\) \(\mathcal{F}f8\) 14 \(\mathcal{D}g5\) \(\mathcal{F}f5\) 15 bxc3 \(\mathcal{W}xc3\) 16 \(\mathcal{D}xf5\) \(\mathcal{G}xf5\) 17 \(\mathcal{D}ad1\) b4 18 \(\mathcal{D}xh7\) 1-0 Ganguly-Chiraranjan, New Delhi 2008.

b2) 8...0-0 9 e5 (as a general rule, a flank attack is often most successfully parried by a counter in the centre) 9...dxe5 10 dxe5 \(\mathcal{D}xh6\) 11 \(\mathcal{W}xh6\) \(\mathcal{D}g4\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}f4\) f6 (this is forced, due to the threat of h3) 13 h3 \(\mathcal{D}xe5\) (13...fxe5 14 \(\mathcal{W}g5\) ±) 14 \(\mathcal{D}xe5\) fxe5 15 \(\mathcal{W}xe5\) \(\mathcal{D}d6\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{D}d7\) 17 0-0-0 ± Gallagher-Todorčević, Biel 1991. White is better structurally, and has a lead in development.

c) 7...0-0 (Black puts king safety as his highest priority, although, as we shall see, often his majesty wishes he had remained in the centre) 8 \(\mathcal{D}h6\) (D) and now:

c1) 8...b4 (again with hindsight this looks like a mistake, as White is often
prepared to expend a tempo with a4 to provoke this) 9 ∆e2 ∆a6 10 ∆g3 (the pleasant thing about this manoeuvre after Black has played ...b4 is it probably appears non-threatening; Black may even feel he has driven the knight to a worse square and cost White two tempi, while furthering his queenside options, but nothing could be further from the truth!) 10...c5 11 e5 (this central breakthrough is the prelude to a kingside attack) 11...∆g4? (11...∆xh6 12 ∆hx6 ∆g4 13 ∆f4 is Black’s only chance, when he must avoid 13...dxe5? 14 dxe5 f6? 15 ∆xa6 with a simple overload, but 13...cxd4, based on 14 ∆xa6?! dxe5, gives him some practical chances at least) 12 ∆xg7 ∆xg7 13 h3 ∆h6 14 ∆h5+ gxh5 15 ∆g5+ ∆h8 16 ∆hx6 1-0 Hebden-P.Littlewood, Walsall 1992. A total rout!

c2) 8...∆g4 (at least with this move Black keeps a firm hand on the h5-square) 9 a4 (White could consider 9 ∆h4 here) and now:

c21) 9...∆xh6 10 ∆xh6 ∆xf3 11 gxf3 ∆a5 12 h4 ∆bd7 13 h5 e5 14 d5 b4 15 ∆d1 cxd5 16 ∆e3 ∆h8?! 17 hxg6 fxg6 18 exd5 e4 19 ∆xe4 ∆e5 20 f4 ∆c7 21 ∆xg6 ∆f3+ 22 ∆d1 ∆d4 23 ∆d3 ∆ae8 24 ∆h3 ∆e7 25 ∆d2 ∆g8? (a blunder in a lost position) 26 ∆xf6+! 1-0 Khalifman-Kupreichik, Aaland/Stockholm 1997.

c22) 9...b4 10 ∆e2 a5 11 ∆g3 ∆bd7 12 h4 e5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 h5 gives White an exciting attacking position. Zapata-Schüssler, Santa Clara 1996 concluded 14...∆xh5 15 0-0-0 ∆c5? (Zapata gave 15...∆xh6 16 ∆xh6 ∆g4 17 ∆d2 ∆df6 18 ∆h4 intending ∆xh5 as very good for White, but this may not be so clear after 18...∆h8) 16 ∆xg7 ∆xg7 17 ∆g5 ∆e6 18 ∆xe5 ∆xf3 19 gxf3 ∆d4 20 ∆f5+ gx5 21 ∆dg1+ 1-0. After the forced 21...∆h8, White has the amusing 22 ∆xh7+! ∆xh7 23 ∆h2+.

8 ∆h4

White could consider 8 0-0-0 or 8 e5!, which we examined in Game 15.

8...e5

Or 8...b4 9 ∆e2 ∆xe2 10 ∆xe2 ∆bd7 11 0-0 0-0 12 ∆f3 ∆c7 13 c3 bxc3 14 bxc3 c5 15 a4 ± Pavasović-Hendriks, Salzburg 2004.

9 dxe5 dxe5 10 h3

White’s point is that ∆h4 is not really a waste of time, as the bishop lacks a good retreat-square, since on e6 it could be harassed by a later ∆g5, and after 10...∆d7 11 a4! it seems to hamper the progress of Black’s development.

10...∆c8

After 10...∆e6 11 ∆f3 ∆bd7 12 a4 b4 13 ∆e2 ∆e7 14 ∆g5 (14 0-0 must be at least a little better for White) 14...a5 15 ∆g3 0-0 16 0-0 ∆fd8 17
\[ \text{\textit{150 ATTACK}} \]

\[ \text{\textit{B}} \]

\[ \text{\textit{We2 \text{\textit{d}f8 Black was very close to equality in Landa-Hickl, Bundesliga 2003/4.}} \]

11 \text{\textit{\text{\textit{d}f3 (D)}}}

\[ \text{\textit{B}} \]

11...\text{\textit{\text{\textit{c}d7 12 a4 b4 13 \text{\textit{e}2 a5}}}}

Zakić-Popchev, Belgrade 1991 continued 13...\textit{\textit{We7 14 0-0 a5 15 c3 \textit{\text{\textit{b}b8}}}}

16 \text{\textit{cxb4 \textit{\text{\textit{w}xb4 17 \textit{\text{\textit{w}xb4 \textit{\text{\textit{c}xc4} 18 \text{\textit{d}d2}}}}}}}}

0-0 19 \text{\textit{\text{\textit{f}c1 \text{\textit{d}d8 20 \text{\textit{a}c6 \text{\textit{b}b7 21 \text{\textit{c}c7 \text{\textit{e}e8 22 \text{\textit{a}c3}}} and White had the advantage.}}}}}}

14 \text{\textit{c3}}

This is a common idea, to open lines on the queenside in order to exploit the holes left by Black’s pawn moves.

14...\text{\textit{c5}}

Other options include:

a) 14...\textit{\textit{We7 15 cxb4 axb4 16 \text{\textit{c}c2 \text{\textit{c}b7 17 0-0 0-0 18 \text{\textit{f}d1 \text{\textit{a}a5 19 \text{\textit{c}c1 \text{\textit{c}c5 20 \text{\textit{b}b3 \text{\textit{c}xb3 21 \text{\textit{w}xb3 \text{\textit{d}h5?!}}}}}}}}}}}}

22 \text{\textit{b6 ± Gallacher-Fioramonti, Zug 1991.}}

b) 14...\textit{\textit{b8 15 cxb4 (15 0-0 0-0 16 \text{\textit{g3 \textit{f}c7 17 \textit{f}d1 \text{\textit{e}e8 18 \textit{a}c1 \text{\textit{f}f3}}}}}}}

19 \text{\textit{c4 \text{\textit{b}b6 20 \text{\textit{b}b3 \text{\textit{e}e6 21 \text{\textit{xe6 \textit{\text{\textit{a}xe6 22 b3 ± Scavo-Papa, Budapest 2000}}}}}}}}}}

15...\textit{\textit{cxb4 16 \text{\textit{c}c2 0-0 17 0-0 \text{\textit{d}e8 (17...\textit{\text{\textit{c}c7 18 \text{\textit{f}c1 \text{\textit{b}b8 19 \text{\textit{a}b1 \text{\textit{a}a8 20 \text{\textit{d}d2 \text{\textit{b}b8 21 \text{\textit{g}g3 c5 22 \text{\textit{c}c3 ± Gdanski-Van Wely, Iraklion 1993))}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}

18 \text{\textit{f}d1 \text{\textit{d}d7 19 \text{\textit{a}b1 \text{\textit{f}f8 20 \text{\textit{b}b3 \text{\textit{c}c8 21 \text{\textit{d}d1 h6 22 \text{\textit{a}a2 \text{\textit{c}d8 23 \text{\textit{c}c3 (23 \text{\textit{d}d4 ± 23...\text{\textit{a}a6 ± Kolev-Chakov, Varna 1995.}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}

15 \text{\textit{cxb4}}

15 \text{\textit{g3 0-0 16 0-0 \text{\textit{b}b7 17 \textit{f}d1 \text{\textit{w}e7 18 \textit{h}h6 \textit{f}e8 19 \textit{\text{\textit{g}xg7 \text{\textit{g}xg7 20 \text{\textit{a}b5 \text{\textit{d}ed8 21 \text{\textit{w}g5 \text{\textit{w}e6?!}}}}}}}}}}}

22 \text{\textit{a}d6 h6 23 \text{\textit{w}d2 ± Movsziszian-Oliva del Amo, Seville 2007.}}

15...\text{\textit{cxb4 16 0-0 0-0 17 \text{\textit{f}d1}}}

The knight on d7 is a serious cause of concern for Black. White was also somewhat better after 17 \text{\textit{a}c1 \text{\textit{c}a6 18 \text{\textit{f}d1 \text{\textit{b}b8 19 \text{\textit{g}g3 \text{\textit{b}b7 20 \text{\textit{a}xa6 \text{\textit{a}xa6 21 \text{\textit{b}d3 in Stefansson-Luckans, Liepaja 2004.}}}}}}}}}}}

17...\text{\textit{a}b7 18 \text{\textit{c}b5 (D)}}

\[ \text{\textit{B}} \]

18...\textit{\textit{We7}}

18...\textit{\textit{gb8}} is a better try, exploiting the tactical trick that 19 \text{\textit{a}xg8 can be met by 19...\textit{\text{\textit{c}c7. Nevertheless, a high-level example suggests that this is still}}}}
very far from easy for Black: 19 \( \text{g}3 \text{c}8 \) (19...\text{d}8 20 \text{c}4 \text{w}7 21 \text{c}2 \text{a}c8 22 \text{a}c1 \text{f}8 23 \text{g}5 \text{a}6 24 \text{xf}7 \text{xc}4 25 \text{d}6 +– is given by Nunn) 20 \text{ac}1 \text{xc}1 21 \text{xc}1 \text{f}8 22 \text{c}4 (just as Black solves one problem, a new one arises) 22...\text{e}6 (this amounts to positional suicide, but in any case Black lacks a satisfactory way to stop \( \text{g}5 \)) 23 \text{xe}6 \text{xe}6 24 \text{g}5 \text{a}6 25 \text{d}1 \text{h}6 26 \text{wd}8+ \text{xd}8 27 \text{xd}8+ \text{f}8 28 \text{b}8! +– hxg5 29 \text{xb}7 (Black’s pawn-structure is horrific!) 29...\text{d}6 30 \text{b}5 \text{d}1+ 31 \text{h}2 \text{b}1 32 \text{xe}5 \text{d}6 33 \text{xe}x6 \text{xg}3+ 34 \text{xg}3 \text{f}7 35 \text{a}6 \text{xe}4+ 36 \text{f}3 \text{f}6 37 \text{d}4 1-0 Nunn-Gelfand, Munich 1991. This game actually arose via a wholly different move-order, with the result that the move-numbers in the game were actually two less than those given. See note ‘c’ to Black’s 5th move in Game 19.

19 \text{xd}7!?

Imaginative; perhaps Black was only expecting 19 \text{xd}7? \text{fd}8. But the simple 19 \text{ac}1 is also strong.

19...\text{xd}7 20 \text{xd}7 \text{f}6 21 \text{xb}7

White has a clear advantage, with three well-coordinated pieces for the queen.

21...\text{wb}3 22 \text{d}2 \text{xb}2 23 \text{b}1 \text{a}2 24 \text{c}1 \text{e}6 25 \text{cb}3 \text{w}8 26 \text{b}6 \text{d}8 27 \text{c}6

The black queen is kept under lock and key.

27...f5 28 \text{c}5

This forces Black to part with material, without any compensation.

28...\text{h}6

28...\text{e}8 29 \text{d}6; 28...\text{f}7 29 \text{c}4.

29 \text{xf}8 \text{xf}8 30 \text{ex}f5 \text{xd}2 31 \text{xd}2 \text{gx}f5 32 \text{c}4 \text{e}4 33 \text{d}6 \text{e}8 34 \text{d}1 \text{h}6 35 \text{d}5 \text{f}6 36 \text{xf}5 \text{a}1+ 37 \text{h}2 \text{d}4 38 \text{c}4+ \text{g}7 39 \text{d}5 \text{xd}6

39...\text{xf}2 40 \text{f}5+.

40 \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 41 \text{c}5 1-0

Game 19

Dgebuadze – Cekro
Belgian Ch, Aalst 2005

1 e4 d6 2 d4 \text{f}6 3 \text{c}3 g6 4 \text{e}3

Black delays not only castling but also ...\text{g}7. This way Black discourages \text{h}6, which after ...\text{h}xh6 will now leave White a tempo down on lines we have already examined. Objectively this may be one of Black’s best options against the 150 Attack. However, it’s also an approach which takes considerable skill and courage as Black is two moves away from castling and must constantly watch out for central breaks that may embarrass his king at the cost of a pawn or two.

4...a6!? is a related idea, delaying castling and preparing ...b5. However, Black is somewhat more vulnerable than in the similar positions after 1 d4 g6 2 e4 \text{g}7 3 \text{c}3 d6 4 \text{e}3 a6 as the knight on f6 may be kicked with a well-timed e5. After 5 \text{d}2 b5 6 f3 \text{bd}7 7 a4 b4 8 \text{d}1 Black has tried:

a) 8...\text{b}8 9 \text{d}3 c5 10 c3 bxc3 11 bxc3 \text{g}7 12 \text{e}2 0-0 13 0-0 \text{a}5 14 \text{f}2 e5 15 d5 \text{h}5 16 \text{c}2 \text{c}7 17 \text{c}4 \text{f}4 18 \text{ab}1 \text{xe}2+ 19 \text{xe}2 \text{xb}1 20 \text{xb}1= K.Lutz-Margolin, Germany tt 1999/00.
b) 8...a5 9 c3 bxc3 10 bxc3 g7 11 d3 0-0 12 e2 a6 13 f2 xd3 14 wxd3 b6 15 0-0 wd7 16 c4 xa4 17 wc2 (17 e5?) 17...b6 18 c5 gave White more than enough compensation for his pawn in R.Pert-Bitansky, Witley 2000.

c) After 8...e6 9 h3 c5 10 a5 cxd4 11 xd4 e5 12 f2 White was clearly better in Chandler-Atzmon Simon, Sydney 2007 as Black was unable to free his position with ...d5 (although that was exactly what he tried to do!).

5 wd2

This fits best into our repertoire. But if you consider expanding your repertoire, you could investigate 5 h3!? followed by 6 f4, which is a kind of Austrian Attack in which Black really needs to play ...c5 in order to gain counterplay. This is probably the line that has done most to put players off 4...c6.

5...bd7

This appears the most solid. Black plays for ...e5 without weakening himself. Yet there is something to be said for the space-gaining 5...b5 too. After 6 d3 bd7 7 f3 Black has tried:

a) 7...g7 is no problem for White as he has made no concessions and is ready to play along known lines with 8 h6.

b) 7...e7 8 0-0 e5 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 h3 c5 11 b4 e6 12 a4 ± Tkachev-Galdunts, French Team Ch, Gonfreville l’Orcher 2007.

c) 7...e5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 h3 b7!? (9...g7 transposes to the position after Black’s 11th move in Game 18) 10 0-0 g7 11 a4 a6 12 e2 e7 13 g3 0-0 14 c4 fd8 (14...b4 15 c5 a5 16 wc2 fd8 17 fd1 f8 18 ac1 e8 19 c4 ± Nguyen Anh Dung-Villamayor, Bangkok 2004) 15 axb5 cxb5 16 cxb5 axb5 17 xa8 xa8 18 wa5 ± Adams-M.Gurevich, Wijk aan Zee 2002.

We now return to 5...bd7 (D):

6 f3 e5

Or 6...wc7 7 d3 e5 8 0-0, with these options:

a) After 8...g4 9 c4 g7?!, as in the game Kasparov-Azmaiparashvili, Rethymnon blitz 2003, it seems White could have gained a clear advantage by 10 g5! with the tactical point 10...0-0 11 e6!.

b) 8...g7 9 dxe5 xe5 10 xe5 dxe5 11 a4 e6 and now 12 a5 0-0 13 a4 d7 14 b4 b5 15 c5 xc5 16 xc5 fd8 was fairly equal in Waitzkin-McNab, London 1998. Possibly White should try 12 c5?!.

7 h3

This sensible, non-committal move, which stops ...g4 ideas and can be useful support for a later g4 attack, is
White’s most popular choice. Yet the critical test may be 7  \( \mathcal{c} \) c4\!, attempting to take advantage of Black’s uncastled king:

a) Somewhat surprisingly, 7...\( \mathcal{g} \) g7, which sensibly prepares to castle, allows White a very promising attack: 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 \( \mathcal{xf} \) f7++? (calmer approaches are also possible, of course) 9...\( \mathcal{xf} \) f7 10 \( \mathcal{g} \) g5+ gives Black an unpleasant choice:

a1) According to Vigus, 10...\( \mathcal{e} \) e7 11 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{w} \) e7 (Kupreichik-Slobodjan, Meisdorf 1996) 12 f4 gives White very reasonable compensation.

a2) 10...\( \mathcal{w} \) g8 11 \( \mathcal{w} \) d3 b5 12 \( \mathcal{xa} \) b5! \( \mathcal{w} \) a5+ 13 \( \mathcal{c} \) c3 \( \mathcal{a} \) a6 14 \( \mathcal{w} \) d6 \( \mathcal{e} \) e8 15 0-0-0 also seems to give White at least enough compensation.

b) 7...b5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 \( \mathcal{b} \) b3! (not 9 \( \mathcal{xf} \) f7++? \( \mathcal{xf} \) f7 10 \( \mathcal{xe} \) e5+ \( \mathcal{g} \) g8 11 \( \mathcal{x} \) x e6 \( \mathcal{w} \) e8 f) is extremely good for White: 9...\( \mathcal{b} \) b4 (9...a5? 10 \( \mathcal{g} \) g5 ++; 9...\( \mathcal{g} \) g7 10 \( \mathcal{w} \) d6 ±) 10 \( \mathcal{h} \) h6 \( \mathcal{xe} \) e4 11 \( \mathcal{w} \) e3 f5 12 \( \mathcal{g} \) g7 \( \mathcal{c} \) c5 13 \( \mathcal{w} \) h6 \( \mathcal{xf} \) f2+ 14 \( \mathcal{w} \) f1 \( \mathcal{w} \) b6 15 \( \mathcal{c} \) x e4 \( \mathcal{f} \) xe4 16 \( \mathcal{w} \) x h8 \( \mathcal{a} \) a6 17 \( \mathcal{f} \) f7+ \( \mathcal{w} \) x f7 18 \( \mathcal{x} \) x e5+ \( \mathcal{h} \) h8 19 b4 \( \mathcal{g} \) xe5 20 \( \mathcal{g} \) xe5 and White is much better.

7...\( \mathcal{w} \) e7

Or:

a) 7...b5 transposes to note ‘c’ to Black’s 5th move above.

b) 7...\( \mathcal{g} \) g7 8 \( \mathcal{h} \) h6 0-0 9 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g7 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g7 10 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{e} \) e8 11 g4 b5 12 g5 \( \mathcal{h} \) h5 13 \( \mathcal{c} \) c2 \( \mathcal{b} \) b6 14 \( \mathcal{c} \) c3 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g5 15 \( \mathcal{f} \) x g3 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d4 16 \( \mathcal{c} \) x d4 \( \mathcal{c} \) c5 17 \( \mathcal{g} \) g2 ± Landa-Rudolf, European Clubs Cup, Rethymnon 2003.

8 0-0-0 (D)

8...\( \mathcal{g} \) g7

Now there is a lot of risk and little to achieve by delaying kingside castling. It’s worth noting that 8...b5 can be met with 9 \( \mathcal{x} \) x b5 c x b5 10 \( \mathcal{x} \) x b5; e.g., 10...\( \mathcal{b} \) b8 11 \( \mathcal{c} \) c7+ \( \mathcal{d} \) d8 12 \( \mathcal{w} \) a5 \( \mathcal{b} \) b6 13 \( \mathcal{c} \) c5 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d4 14 \( \mathcal{c} \) x d6 and White wins.

9 \( \mathcal{h} \) h6 0-0 10 \( \mathcal{d} \) d3 \( \mathcal{e} \) e8

Or 10...b5 11 g4 (11 \( \mathcal{b} \) b1) 11...\( \mathcal{b} \) b7 12 \( \mathcal{h} \) h1 \( \mathcal{f} \) d8 13 \( \mathcal{c} \) c1 c5 14 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g7 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g7 15 g5 \( \mathcal{h} \) h5 16 d x e 5 \( \mathcal{x} \) x e 5 17 \( \mathcal{c} \) c2 \( \mathcal{c} \) c4 18 \( \mathcal{x} \) c4 b x c4 19 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d 5 \( \mathcal{b} \) b5 20 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d 5 ± Gommer-Cekro, Belgian Team Ch 2003/4.

11 \( \mathcal{h} \) h1 b5 12 \( \mathcal{e} \) e2

This direct plan is probably better than 12 \( \mathcal{b} \) b1 \( \mathcal{b} \) b7 13 \( \mathcal{c} \) c2 a6 14 \( \mathcal{g} \) g3, as in Szalanczy-C Horvath, Hungarian Ch, Budapest 1989. The knight has a job to do on the kingside.

12...a6 13 g4 c5 14 c3 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d4 15 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g7 \( \mathcal{x} \) x g7 16 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d4 \( \mathcal{x} \) x d4 17 \( \mathcal{c} \) c5 18 \( \mathcal{g} \) g3 \( \mathcal{g} \) g8

Although it doesn’t play a major role in the conclusion of the game, it seems more prudent to eliminate the dangerous light-squared bishop when given the chance.
19 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{b7?} \) (D)

20 f3?!
The simple tactical trick 20 \( \text{d}f5! \) is pretty much decisive.

20...\( \text{h8} \) 21 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{ad8} \) 22 g5 \( \text{g}8?! \)
After 22...\( \text{fd7} \) nothing would have been clear.

23 h4 f6 24 h5
Now White’s forces are crashing through in typical fashion.

24...fxg5 25 hxg6 \( \text{e}5 \) 26 \( \text{gf5} \)
\( \text{d}7 \) 27 \( \text{wxg5} \) \( \text{ee7} \) 28 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 29 \( \text{xf6} \)
1-0

150 Attack vs the Modern Defence (Black delays or omits ...\( \text{f6} \))

Game 20
Krasenkov – Vokač
Pardubice 1994

1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 2 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{g6} \) 3 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g7} \) 4 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{a6} \) (D)

This continuation has been growing in popularity lately – probably due to its recommendation by Tiger Hillarp

Persson. Black keeps his kingside options open while preparing queenside counterplay. White’s standard \( \text{h}6 \) idea will not be possible before Black moves his knight from g8.

5 \( \text{f3} \)

It’s worth noting that although there is no strong incentive in the Modern move-order 1 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 2 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) for White to play an early \( \text{f}3 \) (putting the \( f \)-pawn on f3 or f4 may be quite attractive), we shall concentrate on this set-up here too, as otherwise an early \( \text{f}6 \) from Black might lead us into unknown territory.

Let’s note that the move-order of the actual game was 1 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 2 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 3 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 4 \( \text{c}3 \) a6 5 \( \text{e}3 \).

5...\( \text{b5} \)

This is the logical follow-up to Black’s previous move. Other options:

a) 5...\( \text{f6} \) leads back to Pirc positions.

b) 5...\( \text{g}4 \) is an attempt to take the game back to the realms of the Classical Variation, but the loss of tempo should give White at least a small advantage; for example, 6 \( \text{e}2 \)
\[ \text{c6 7 d5 } \text{xf3 8 xf3 } \text{e5 9 e2} \]
\[ \text{f6 10 0-0 } \text{0-0 11 a4 and Black has difficulty creating counterplay without} \]
\[ \text{moving his c-pawn, which enables White to prepare to fix a weakness on } \]
\[ \text{b6, and simultaneously gain space on the queenside. Dunnington-Carlier,} \]
\[ \text{Hafnarfjördur 1996 continued } 11...c5 \]
\[ 12 a5 b5 13 axb6 } \text{xb6 14 c1 fb8} \]
\[ 15 h1 ed7 16 f4 and White was} \]
\[ \text{slightly better due to his bishop-pair, Black’s structural weakness on a6} \]
\[ \text{and the possibility of a central breakthrough, involving some combination} \]
\[ \text{of e5 and/or f5.} \]
\[ \text{c) } 5...e6 signals that Black is heading for the ‘Hippopotamus’, in which he} \]
\[ \text{places many of his pawns on his third rank and his minor pieces on his} \]
\[ \text{second rank. Black doesn’t really try} \]
\[ \text{to equalize, but he keeps the pieces on} \]
\[ \text{the board and delays the real fight to the middlegame. After } 6 \text{d2 b6 7} \]
\[ \text{e2 b7 8 0-0 d7 9 e1 h6 (Black often plays this move in order to stop} \]
\[ \text{h6 but now have problems castling kingside; } 9...e7 is a sensible alternative) } \]
\[ 10 \text{h3 e7 11 f1 g5 12 a4} \]
\[ g6 13 d5 e5 14 e2 f6 15 g3 \]
\[ \text{White had clearly the better prospects in Vink-Radjabov, Wijk aan Zee 2001} \]
\[ \text{(but Black won the game!).} \]
\[ \text{d) } 5...d7 is a flexible move which may transpose to the main game after} \]
\[ \text{a later } ...b5. \text{In Benjamin-D’Costa,} \]
\[ \text{Bunratty 2005, after } 6 \text{d3 Black went for another version of the Hippo} \]
\[ \text{with } 6...e6: 7 \text{d2 h6 8 h3 e7 9 0-0} \]
\[ b6 10 ad1 b7 11 e2 c5 12 g3} \]
\[ wc7 13 c3 b5 14 e1 e5 15 b3 \pm.} \]
\[ \text{6 d2 b7 7 d3 d7 8 a4 (D)} \]
\[ \text{This is an extremely important pawn-lever in the 150 Attack. Black is} \]
\[ \text{faced with the unpleasant choice of capturing on a4, or protecting his b-} \]
\[ \text{pawn with } ...c6, \text{or else advancing to b4.} \]
\[ \text{8 b4} \]
\[ \text{This is the most popular, driving the knight away from c3, but it still} \]
\[ \text{leaves Black with queenside weaknesses, which White can seek to} \]
\[ \text{exploit.} \]
\[ \text{a) } 8...bxa4 just leaves Black saddled with a permanently weak a-pawn.} \]
\[ \text{b) } 8...c6 makes more sense, but blocks in the light-squared bishop and} \]
\[ \text{leaves Black potentially vulnerable to a capture on b5, followed by d5.} \]
\[ \text{9 e2 gf6} \]
\[ \text{Black eventually has to complete kingside development and it’s natural} \]
\[ \text{to do so with an attack on e4, but actually protecting the b-pawn – directly} \]
\[ \text{or indirectly – has been more popular:} \]
\[ \text{a) After } 9...b8 \text{ White has made no headway with } 10 \text{g3}?! \text{ so probably} \]
\[ 10 0-0 should be explored further:
a1) 10...e6 11 \textit{Ad}d1 \textit{De}e7 12 \textit{D}g3 must be at least a little better for White.

a2) 10...\textit{D}gf6?! 11 e5 \textit{D}g4 (White is much better after 11...dxe5 12 dxe5 \textit{D}g4 13 e6 fxe6 14 \textit{D}g5 12 Df8 14 \textit{D}f4 also looks promising for White.

b) 9...c5 10 c3 and now:

b1) 10...\textit{D}gf6 11 \textit{D}g3 bxc3 12 bxc3 \textit{D}g4 (12...cxd4 13 cxd4 d5 14 e5 \textit{D}e4 15 \textit{X}xe4 dxe4 16 \textit{D}g5 0-0 17 e6 \textit{D}c5?! 17...f6) 18 exf7+ \textit{Xh}8 19 0-0 h6 20 \textit{W}c2 ± Moiseenko-Zozulia, Warsaw rapid 2006) 13 \textit{X}f4 e5 14 \textit{D}g5 f6 and now rather than 15 h3?! \textit{D}xf2, which was better for Black in Y.Geller-

b2) After 10...bxc3 11 bxc3 \textit{W}c7 (11...cxd4 12 cxd4 \textit{D}c5 13 \textit{D}g3 \textit{D}xd3+ 14 \textit{W}xd3 a5 15 \textit{W}b5+ \textit{D}d7 16 0-0 \textit{D}f6 17 \textit{W}xd7+ \textit{D}xd7 = Neelotpal-Koneru, Visakhapatnam 2004) 12 0-0 \textit{D}gf6 White can safely play 13 \textit{Ah}6 as 13...\textit{D}xe4?! (13...0-0 14 \textit{X}g7 \textit{X}g7 15 \textit{D}g3) 14 \textit{X}xe4 \textit{Ah}6 15 \textit{W}h6 \textit{X}xe4 16 \textit{D}g5 gives White ample compensation; e.g., 16...\textit{D}d5 17 \textit{D}f4 \textit{D}c4 18 \textit{D}fe1 e5 19 dxe5 \textit{D}xe5 20 \textit{X}g6 fxg6 21 f4 0-0 0 22 fxe5 dxe5 23 \textit{W}h4 \textit{D}d5 24 c4 \textit{D}b7 25 \textit{W}h3+ \textit{D}d7? (25...\textit{D}b8 26 \textit{D}e6 isn’t much better) 26 \textit{D}ad1 \textit{D}e8 (26...\textit{D}hd8 loses to 27 \textit{D}f7) 27 \textit{D}f7 1-0 P.Littlewood-

b3) After 9...a5 10 \textit{D}g3 Black has a somewhat unprepossessing choice:

c) 10...\textit{D}c5 Black looks less logical than the immediate 9...c5.

c1) 10...c5 11 c3 looks less logical than the immediate 9...c5.

c2) 10...e6 11 0-0 \textit{D}gf6 12 \textit{Ah}6 0-0 13 \textit{X}g7 \textit{X}g7 14 c3 \textit{B}xc3 15 \textit{B}xc3 e5 16 \textit{D}fe1 \textit{D}c6 17 \textit{W}g5 ± Ma.Tseitlin-Kantsler, Givataim 2000.

c3) 10...h6 11 0-0 e6 12 c3 \textit{B}xc3 13 \textit{B}xc3 \textit{D}gf6 14 h3 d5 15 \textit{W}c2 dxe4 16 \textit{D}xe4 0-0 17 \textit{B}ab1 \textit{B}b8 18 c4 \textit{D}c6 19 \textit{X}xb8 \textit{X}xb8 20 \textit{D}xf6+ \textit{D}xf6 21 \textit{D}e5 is much better for White, Kleiman-

10 \textit{D}g3

Although the knight may not seem particularly well placed here, it is actually a key piece in many kingside attacks. Black can now choose to defend his b-pawn in two ways.

10...c5

The alternative is 10...a5 11 \textit{Ah}6 0-0 (11...\textit{B}xh6 12 \textit{W}xh6 is the lesser evil, but makes life hard for the black king, who will not feel comfortable on the queenside) 12 h4 with a looming kingside attack.

11 dxc5

11 c3 would lead to play along the lines of 9...c5 10 c3.

11...\textit{D}xc5?

This is far too ambitious. Probably 11...\textit{D}g4! is best; e.g., 12 \textit{D}d4 \textit{D}xd4 13 \textit{D}xd4 dxc5 and in Borgo-Spassky, Italy 1995 White should have gone for
equality with 14 \( \text{\texttt{f}}3 \text{\texttt{d}}e5 15 \text{\texttt{x}}e5 \text{\texttt{x}}e5 16 \text{\texttt{d}}d1 \).

12 \( \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{b}}4 \text{\texttt{h}}b8 13 \text{\texttt{a}}x\text{\texttt{c}}5 \text{\texttt{d}}xc5 14 \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{c}}5 \text{\texttt{d}}d7 15 \text{\texttt{w}}a3 \text{\texttt{c}}6 16 \text{\texttt{c}}3 \)

Black has clearly insufficient compensation for the two-pawn deficit.

16...\( h5 \) 17 0-0 \( h4 \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{e}}2 \text{\texttt{e}}5 19 \text{\texttt{a}}x\text{\texttt{a}}6 \text{\texttt{a}}a8 20 \text{\texttt{c}}4 \text{\texttt{a}}a4 21 \text{\texttt{a}}x\text{\texttt{f}}7+ \\
Black's pawns just seem to fall off the board.

21...\( \text{\texttt{a}}x\text{\texttt{f}}7 \) 22 \( \text{\texttt{b}}3+ \text{\texttt{f}}6 23 \text{\texttt{a}}a4 \text{\texttt{c}}5 24 \text{\texttt{w}}c4 \text{\texttt{a}}a4 25 \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{c}}5 \text{\texttt{e}}8 26 \text{\texttt{a}}x\text{\texttt{h}}4 \text{\texttt{f}}8 27 \text{\texttt{e}}3 \text{\texttt{b}}5 28 \text{\texttt{a}}f3 \text{\texttt{g}}7 29 \text{\texttt{a}}a1 \text{\texttt{e}}6 30 \text{\texttt{h}}4 \text{\texttt{e}}7 31 \text{\texttt{h}}5 \text{\texttt{w}}f8 32 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{a}}c5 33 \text{\texttt{g}}5 \text{\texttt{h}}7 34 \text{\texttt{hxg}}6+ \text{\texttt{x}}x\text{\texttt{g}}6 35 \text{\texttt{w}}h5+ \text{\texttt{g}}7 36 \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{e}}5+ \text{\texttt{g}}8 \\
Black must either have been very short of time, or an amazing believer in the power of the two bishops to keep going now, five pawns down!

37 \( b4 \) 1-0

4...\( c6 \)

This is Black's main alternative to 4...\( a6 \).

5 \( \text{\texttt{w}}d2 \text{\texttt{d}}d7 \)

5...\( b5 \) is covered in Game 22. Black can also try 5...\( \text{\texttt{a}}5 \) or 5...\( \text{\texttt{w}}c7 \), when after 6 \( \text{\texttt{f}}3 \) transpositions to the next note are highly likely.

6 \( \text{\texttt{f}}3 \) \( b5 \)

Or:

a) 6...\( \text{\texttt{a}}5 \) 7 \( \text{\texttt{d}}3 \text{\texttt{g}}f6 8 \text{\texttt{h}}6 \text{\texttt{xh}}6 (8...0-0 9 \text{\texttt{xg}}7 \text{\texttt{g}}x7 10 0-0 \text{\texttt{e}}5 11 \text{\texttt{fe}}1 \text{\texttt{c}}7 12 \text{\texttt{e}}2 \text{\texttt{e}}8 13 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{g}}8 14 \text{\texttt{c}}3 \pm \text{\texttt{Goloshchapov-Botschek}} \text{\texttt{(Bad Wiessee 2002)}}) 9 \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{h}}6 \text{\texttt{h}}5 10 \text{\texttt{w}}d2 and then:

a1) 10...\( \text{\texttt{b}}6 11 \text{\texttt{e}}2 \text{\texttt{g}}4 12 \text{\texttt{h}}3 \text{\texttt{w}}h6 13 \text{\texttt{w}}a5 0-0 14 0-0 \text{\texttt{f}}6 15 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{e}}6 16 \text{\texttt{b}}3 \text{\texttt{d}}5 17 \text{\texttt{e}}5 \text{\texttt{h}}5 18 \text{\texttt{xh}}5 \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{h}}5 19 \text{\texttt{h}}2 \text{\texttt{f}}6 20 \text{\texttt{ae}}1 \pm \text{\texttt{Chernyshov-Goreskul, Cappelle la Grande 2005}}.

a2) 10...\( c5 11 \text{\texttt{e}}2 \text{\texttt{cxd}}4 12 \text{\texttt{xd}}4 \text{\texttt{w}}c5 13 \text{\texttt{f}}4 \text{\texttt{b}}6 14 0-0-0 \text{\texttt{h}}d7 15 \text{\texttt{b}}3 \text{\texttt{f}}2 16 \text{\texttt{e}}5 \text{\texttt{dxe}}5 17 \text{\texttt{fxe}}5 \text{\texttt{h}}5 18 \text{\texttt{hf}}1 \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{g}}2 19 \text{\texttt{xf}}7 \pm \text{\texttt{Arzumanian-Zakharevich, Tula 2002}}.

a3) 10...\( \text{\texttt{a}}5 11 \text{\texttt{h}}3 0-0 12 0-0 \text{\texttt{e}}5 13 \text{\texttt{dxe}}5 \text{\texttt{dxe}}5 14 \text{\texttt{wh}}6 \text{\texttt{c}}5 15 \text{\texttt{ad}}1 \text{\texttt{ae}}8 16 \text{\texttt{a}}3 \text{\texttt{w}}f8 17 \text{\texttt{w}}c1 \text{\texttt{b}}5 18 \text{\texttt{e}}2 \text{\texttt{b}}6 19 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \pm \text{\texttt{Golubovic-Biti, Kastav 2001}}.

a4) 10...0-0 11 \text{\texttt{e}}2 (11 0-0-0?? \text{\texttt{b}}5 12 \text{\texttt{g}}2 \pm \text{\texttt{g}}4? 13 \text{\texttt{h}}3 -- \text{\texttt{Santoro-Roman--Stigar, World Junior Ch, Dortmund 1980}}) 11...\( \text{\texttt{g}}7 12 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{wh}}6 13 \text{\texttt{g}}5 \text{\texttt{b}}6 14 \text{\texttt{f}}4 \text{\texttt{h}}5 15 0-0-0 \text{\texttt{f}}6 16 \text{\texttt{xh}}5+ \text{\texttt{w}}x\text{\texttt{h}}5 17 \text{\texttt{e}}2 \text{\texttt{wh}}6 18 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{g}}8 19 \text{\texttt{h}}4 \pm \text{\texttt{P.Cramling-Glinert, Toronto 2003}}.

b) 6...\( \text{\texttt{c}}7 7 \text{\texttt{d}}3 (7 \text{\texttt{a}}4 \text{\texttt{g}}f6 8 \text{\texttt{h}}3 0-0 9 \text{\texttt{d}}3 \text{\texttt{e}}5 10 0-0 \text{\texttt{b}}6 11 \text{\texttt{fe}}1 \text{\texttt{a}}6 12} \)
dxe5 dxe5 13 2e2 2e8 14 2g3 2f8 15 2c3 2d6 17 2c4 ± Hebden-Badea, Marseilles 2003) and Black has these options:

b1) 7...2gf6 8 2h6 2xh6 9 2xh6 b5 10 0-0 2b7 11 2fe1 e5 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 a4 b4 14 2b1 2d6 15 2bd2 ± Hodgson-Schekachev, Linares 1996.

b2) 7...e5 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 0-0 2gf6 10 h3 0-0 11 2fd1 2h5 12 a4 2h8 13 a5 is much better for White, E.Hosssain-M.Abdul, Dhaka 2004.

b3) 7...b5 8 0-0 2gf6 9 2h6 0-0 10 2e2 and now:

b31) 10...a5 11 2g3 e5 12 c3 a4 13 2h4 2xh6 14 2xh6 2h8 15 2f3 2g8 16 2d2 ± Van den Doel-Gagnashvili, Bled Olympiad 2002.

b32) 10...c5 11 c3 a6 (11...2b7 12 2g3 c4 13 2c2 e5 14 2fe1 2e8 15 2xg7 2xg7 16 2ad1 2ad8 17 2g5 ± De Vreught-Milov, Santo Domingo 2003) 12 2g3 2e8 13 2xg7 2xg7 14 2h4 ± Fressinet-Tkachev, Bordeaux rapid 2000.

7 2d3 (D)

Apart from this, Black has two other options:

a) 7...2b6 (this early attempt at queenside counterplay seems set to rebound on Black if White castles kingside) 8 h3 2f6 (8...a5 9 e5 d5 10 b3 a4 11 0-0 h5 12 2e2 2h6 13 2f4 e6 14 2xg6 fxg6 15 2g5 2c7 16 2xg6+ 2d7 17 2f6 2xf6 18 exf6 2d6 19 2fe1 2c7 20 2g5 2b7 21 2e5 ± Adams-Akopian, FIDE Knockout, Las Vegas 1999) 9 2h6 0-0 10 0-0 a5 11 2fe1 b4 12 2e2 2a6 13 2g3 c5 14 2xa6 2xa6 15 2xg7 2xg7 16 c3 2xd4 17 2xd4 2wb8 18 2ac1 ± Kasparov-Bonnafous, Besançon simul 1999.

b) 7...2b7 8 0-0 (D) with another division:

b1) 8...a6 9 a4 and now:

b11) 9...2b6 10 2fe1 2f6 11 a5 2c8 (11...2c4 is well answered by 12 2xc4 bxc4 13 e5 ±) 12 e5 dxe5 13 2d5 14 2h6 2xh6 (Black had to try 14...0-0 although after 15 2e4 White has a clear advantage) 15 2xh6 2xc3 16 bxc3 2d7 17 2g5 2f8 18 2xf8 2xf8 19 2xf7 2xf7 20 e6+
\(\text{\#e8 21 exf7+ gave White a decisive material advantage in Miles-Wohl, Linares 1998.}\)

(b2) 9...\(\text{\#c7 10 axb5 cxb5 (White is slightly better after 10...axb5 11 \#xa8+ \#xa8 12 d5 b4 13 dxc6) 11 \#xd5 \#wd8 12 \#wa5 (White’s clear strategic plan is to gang up on the a6-pawn, a plan which Black is hard-pressed to meet) 12...\#c8 13 \#xd8+ \#xd8 14 \#b4 \#gf6 15 e5 dxe5 16 \#xe5 \#xe5 17 dxe5 \#d7 18 f4 g5 (Black desperately tries to find counterplay, but it is too late) 19 \#fd1 gx4 20 \#xf4 \#xc5 21 \#xa6 \#d5 22 \#b4 \#d4 23 c3 \#xf4 24 \#xb5 \#xe5 25 \#xd7+ \#c8 26 \#a7 1-0 Adams-Dunnington, Hastings Masters 1995.}\)

(b3) 9...b4 10 \#e2 a5 (10...c5 11 \#g3 h5 12 h4 \#h6 13 c3 bxc3 14 bxc3 \#g4 15 \#g5 \#e4 15 \#g5 \#d4 16 \#xb5 \#xe5 17 bxc3 \#xf4 18 \#xc4 (although Black has an equal share of space, White’s actively placed pieces now give him a definite advantage; the sneaky 15 \#a2! looks even better, as it makes it very hard for Black to complete his kingside development without something dropping off) 15...\#a6 16 \#xa6 \#xa6 17 \#b2 \#gf6 18 \#fb1 0-0 19 \#b7 (White now has complete control of the position) 19...\#d8 20 \#d3 (or 20 \#d1 \#e4 21 \#c6 h6 23 h3 \#h7 24 \#c1 c5 25 \#b5 \#xb7 26 \#xb7 \#ab8 27 \#a3 \#xb7 28 \#xb7 (despite the exchange of two sets of major pieces, White’s advantage has not diminished) 28...\#a8 29 \#d2 \#f8 30 \#c4 \#a6 31 \#f1 \#g7 32 \#f3 \#a8 33 f3 \#e7 34 \#d5 (White converts his positional advantage into a material one) 34...\#f8 35 \#xf6 \#xf6 36 \#xe5 \#d6 37 \#xf7 \#g3 38 \#xc5 g5 39 \#d6 1-0 Norri-Salmensuu, Tampero 1996.}

b2) 8...\#c7 9 a4 (immediately challenging the b5-pawn is a logical approach; 9 \#fe1 in effect came to the same thing after 9...a6 10 a4 b4 11 \#e2 c5 12 \#g3 \#c8 13 c3 bxc3 14 bxc3 \#gf6 15 \#h6 0-0 16 \#xg7 \#xg7 17 \#g5 e6 18 e5 with a clear advantage to White in Emms-Mestel, British League (4NCL) 1998/9) 9...b4 10 \#e2 a5 11 \#f6 12 \#h6 0-0 13 \#g3 c5 14 c3 (as usual, White simply strengthens his centre, leaving Black biting on granite) 14...\#e6 15 \#g5 (with control of the centre, White can switch his attention to the kingside) 15...bxc3 16 bxc3 cxd4 17 cxd4 \#c8 18 b4 (business as usual; I think the fact that White can castle kingside and continue his attack attracts many players to the 150 Attack) 18...\#d8 19 \#xg7 \#xg7 20 h5 (White is simply piling on the pressure, waiting until Black reaches breaking point; meanwhile, because of White’s rock-solid centre, Black lacks meaningful counterplay) 20...\#g8 21 \#g4 \#a6 22 \#b1 \#ab8 23 hxg6 hxg6 24 \#h5+ \#f8 25 \#f4 (White feints at a sacrifice on e6 or g6, after perhaps playing e5; Black avoids the issue, but gives White a nice outpost on d5 as a result) 25...e5 26 \#d5 \#d6 27 \#g3 \#xd5 (Black had to try 27...exd4) 28 exd5
cxed4 29 \( \text{xg6! fxg6 } \) 30 \( \text{g5 } \) \( \text{+-- wd7 } \)
31 \( \text{e6+ f7 } \) 32 \( \text{f4+ } \) 1-0 Hodgson-Webster, Dublin Zonal 1993.

We now return to 7...a6 \( (D) \):

8 h3

Although very sensible and safe, this isn’t really necessary yet and I would recommend an immediate strike against the black queenside. The move that really fits the bill is 8 a4. This is the classic response to Black’s queenside pawn advance. White seeks to gain ground on the queenside to increase his manoeuvring space and has done rather well in practice following 8...\( \text{b7 } \) 9 0-0, which leads to a position we have already considered under the move-order 7...\( \text{b7 } \) 8 0-0 a6 9 a4 (note ‘b1’ to Black’s 7th move).

8...\( \text{wc7 } \)

Alternatively:

a) 8...e5 9 0-0 \( \text{g6 } \) 10 dxе5 dxе5 11 a4 \( \text{b7 } \) 12 \( \text{e20-0 } \) 13 \( \text{g3 e8 } \) 14 c4 bxа4 15 c5 f8 16 аa4 \( \pm \) Novgorodsky-Mikhailovsky, Kazan 2007.

b) 8...\( \text{b7 } \) 9 0-0 c5 10 a4 b4 11 \( \text{e2 w7 } \) 12 c4 (12 b3 and 12 \( \text{g3 are alternatives) } \) 12...cxе4 13 \( \text{xd4 e5 } \) 14 \( \text{e3 c5 } \) 15 \( \text{ad1 a5 } \) = Baron Rodriguez-Vassallo Barroche, Spanish Team Ch, Mondariz 2002.

9 0-0 \( \text{g6 } \) 10 \( \text{h6 } \) 0-0 11 \( \text{e2 } \)

Interestingly, White re-routes his knight without being asked.

11...\( \text{e8 } \)

Or 11...e5 12 \( \text{g3 e8 } \) 13 \( \text{fe1 h8 } \) 14 a4 \( \text{b7 } \) 15 dxе5 dxе5 16 \( \text{w3d6 } \) 17 \( \text{e3 g7 } \) 18 \( \text{ed1 } \) \( \pm \) Wippmann-Sailer, Bad Wiessee 2006.

12 \( \text{xg7 xg7 } \) 13 \( \text{g3 f8 } \?)

13...e5 prevents White’s next move, although even then 14 \( \text{w5 } \) is a little better for White. 13...c5 is another natural idea.

14 e5

If allowed, this is a key part of White’s armoury in the 150 Attack.

14...dxе5 15 dxе5 \( \text{g8 } \) 16 \( \text{fe1 c5 } \) 17 h4

White sounds the charge.

17...\( \text{e6 } \) 18 \( \text{g5 w6 } \) 19 h5 c4 20 hxg6 fxg6 21 \( \text{e4 a7 } \) \( (D) \)

22 \( \text{h5}+! \text{gxh5 } \)

22...\( \text{h8 } \) 23 \( \text{f7#}. \)
23 \( \text{Nxe6+} \) \( \text{Bxe6} \) 24 \( \text{Bxa6} \) 25 \( \text{Bc5+} \) \( \text{dxf8} \)

After 24...\( \text{Bh8} \) 25 \( \text{Bxh5} \) \( \text{Bxf6} \) 26 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{exf6} \) 27 \( \text{Be3} \) White has a huge attack.

25 \( \text{Be3} \) \( \text{Bg4} \) 26 \( \text{Bf3+} \) \( \text{Bxf6} \) 27 \( \text{Bh6+} \)

The immediate 27 \( \text{Be3} \) is a little more clinical.

27...\( \text{Bg7} \) 28 \( \text{Be3} \) \( \text{Bg4} \)

Black decides to keep his knight for defence.

29 \( \text{Bxa7} \) \( \text{Bxf3} \) 30 \( \text{Bxf3} \) \( \text{Bg4} \) 31 \( \text{Be1} \) \( \text{Bxe5} \) 32 \( \text{Bxh5} \) \( \text{Bg6} \) 33 \( \text{Bxa6} \)

Black has had to pay a high price for the safety of his king, with all the black pieces huddled on the kingside. Now White threatens simply to Hoover the queenside pawns.

33...\( \text{Bd4} \) 34 \( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{Bg5} \) 35 \( \text{Bb6} \) \( \text{Bg7} \) 36 \( \text{Bxe3} \) e5 37 g3 1-0

Game 22
Kupreichik – Lutikov
Sochi 1970

1 e4 g6 2 d4 \( \text{Ng7} \) 3 \( \text{c3} \) d6 4 \( \text{Be3} \) c6 5 \( \text{Bd2} \) b5

This is a popular move, seeking to initiate immediate counterplay on the queenside. 5...\( \text{Bc7} \) and 5...\( \text{Ba5} \) are both very likely to transpose to positions we discussed after the move 5...\( \text{Bd7} \) in Game 21.

6 \( \text{Bd3} \) \( \text{(D)} \)

6...a6

Here Black has a wide choice:

a) 6...\( \text{Bd7} \) 7 \( \text{Bf3} \) would lead right back to Game 21.

b) 6...\( \text{Bf6} \) 7 \( \text{Bf3} \) leads to typical Pirc positions.

c) 6...b4 must be considered inaccurate, given that White often expends a tempo with a4 in order to get Black to do just this. After 7 \( \text{Bce2} \) there is:

c1) 7...a5 8 h3 \( \text{Ba6} \) 9 \( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{Bxd3} \) 10 cxd3 \( \text{Bd7} \) 11 0-0 e5 12 dxe5 \( \text{Bxe5} \) 13 \( \text{Bxe5} \) dxe5 14 a3 b3 15 \( \text{Bc3} \) ± B.Ivanović-Joksimović, Bar 2005.

c2) 7...\( \text{Bb6} \) 8 \( \text{Bf3} \) d5 (Black is mixing up systems in order to confuse White, but he is lagging behind with development) 9 e5 \( \text{Bb7} \) 10 c4 (the better developed side should normally try to open the position) 10...dxc4 11 \( \text{Bxc4} \) e6 12 \( \text{Bg5} \) \( \text{Be7} \) 13 \( \text{Bxe4} \) (Black’s odd opening play has left him with critically weak dark squares) 13...0-0 14 \( \text{Bh6} \) (when playing against a weak colour complex, it usually makes sense to exchange any pieces that can guard the crucial squares) 14...\( \text{Bd7} \) 15 \( \text{Bxg7} \) \( \text{Bxg7} \) 16 h4 c5 (faced with a massive kingside attack, Black is compelled to strike back) 17 \( \text{Bf4} \) f6 18 exf6+ \( \text{Bxf6} \) 19 \( \text{Bxc5} \) \( \text{Bxg2} \) 20 \( \text{Bg1} \) \( \text{Bc6} \) 21 \( \text{Bxe5} \) \( \text{Bxe5} \) 22 \( \text{Bd5} \) 23 \( \text{Bg3} \) \( \text{Bf7} \) 23 \( \text{Bh5+} \) (placing Black on the critical list) 23...\( \text{Bg8} \) 24 \( \text{Bxf6}+ \) \( \text{Bxf6} \) 25 \( \text{Bxd5} \) and Black could easily have resigned in J.Schneider-Stassen, Wallertheim 1994.
d) 6...b7 7 a4 a6 8 f3 d7 9
0-0 g6 10 h3 0-0 11 e5 d8 12 h6
fxe5 13 dxe5 c5 14 xg7 xg7 15
e3 e6 16 fd1 w8 17 e4 ±
Thinius-Sobolevsky, Gotha 2006.
e) 6...e5 7 dxe5 dxe5 8 f3 w7 9
a4 b4 10 a2 a5 11 c3 a6 12 cb4
xd3 13 w43 axb4 14 c2 f6 15
c1 e6 16 0-0 0-0 17 c5 ±
f) 6...w7 h3 d7 8 f3 h7 9
0-0 a6 10 e2 c5 11 c3 b6 12 g3
e6 13 fe1 e5 14 dxe5 dxe5 15 ad1
h5 16 h4 ± Kotan-Hickl, Bad Ragaz 1993.

7 f3

This move, completing development,
would be my choice.
a) Cautious players might consider
7 h3, preventing ...g4.
b) 7 a4 is interesting, immediately
putting the question to the black queenside. After 7...b4 8 c3 9 c3
(White is very consistent in his attempts to clarify the structure on the
queenside) 9...a6 10 cb4 xd3 11
wd3 axb4 12 f3 f6 13 0-0 0-0 14
w c2 White has a small advantage,
Sion-Garcia Blazquez, Spanish Ch,
Linares 1993. The c6-pawn is weak
and under surveillance and the a-pawn
will be an asset in the endgame.

7 g4

7...d7 again transposes to Game
21.

8 h4 h5

I don’t feel this move is very consis-
tent; although the white attack is
certainly dangerous, Black should try
8...xf3 here.

9 g5

Now White builds up a powerful at-
tack without making any positional
concessions.

9...h6 10 f3 c8 11 0-0-0 d7
12 g4! (D)

Continuing the theme, White opens
the kingside.

12 c5

12...hxg4 is met by 13 h5. But after
the text-move, White is just better.

13 dxe5 dxe5 14 gxh5 gxh5 15

h1

White has a large lead in develop-
ment and can attack on any sector of
the board.

15 d4 16 d5 xe3 17 xe3
b7 18 c3 e5 19 xb5!

It is not surprising that White has a
combinative finish, with so many at-
tacking pieces.

19...xb5 20 xd7 xd7
20...xd7 21 xe5+ is also win-
ning for White.

21 d1+ c6 22 xd8 xd8 23
b4 f6 24 xc5+ d7 25 d5 xd5
25...fxg5 26 c7+ c6 27 c7#

26 xd5+ 1-0
3 Colle-Zukertort System

Introduction

The Colle-Zukertort System is a flexible alternative to offering the Queen’s Gambit. Through our recommended method of development, we take away many of Black’s exciting options, such as the Botvinnik Variation of the Semi-Slav. Hopefully, we again lure Black onto unfamiliar ground. When I used to play a lot of amateur league chess, the majority of club players who defended the Queen’s Gambit were fairly solid characters. They were happy to play slightly inferior positions for hours on end, waiting patiently for a mistake from their opponent (often caused by outright boredom). If this is true about your opponents, then they are in for a surprise!

On the surface, White’s opening appears quite unassuming. However, with just a couple of inaccuracies, Black is often left facing a frontal attack against his king. For a normally stodgy opponent, the message will be clear: kill or be killed! The question is, will Black find things too hot to handle? To begin, let’s take a look at a game where Zukertort, who generally played his opening in more positional fashion than I shall be advocating, unleashed his opening on an unsuspecting Englishman.

Game 23
Zukertort – Blackburne
London 1883

1 d4 d5 2 c4 f3 c6 3 e3 e6 4 d3 c5 5 b3

Please note that I have adjusted the move-order for the purpose of our discussion (the actual sequence was 1 d4 e6 2 c4 f3 c6 3 e3 d5 4 d3 e7 5 0-0 0-0 6 b3 c5).

Johannes Zukertort was the inventor of this system for White. The idea is to make the dark-squared bishop a more dangerous piece than in the sister variation (the Colle) where White plays c3. The beauty of the Colle-Zukertort is that the theory is easy to remember. White can set up the same attacking formation against whatever defensive regime Black chooses.

5...c7

This passive development of the bishop may seem unduly cautious, but as we shall see, with the bishop on d6 White sometimes gets to release his dark-squared bishop with tempo, with devastating effect.

6 0-0 0-0 7 b2 (D)

7...c6 8 b2 cxd4 9 exd4 b6 10 c4

With this move, White begins an unusual plan of playing almost solely on the queenside and in the centre.
The resulting positions can also arise from move-orders with an earlier c4. More typical for the Zukertort is 10 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \mathcal{B}b7 \) 11 f4 followed by swinging a major piece over to h3 and bringing it into the kingside attack. This idea will be discussed to a much fuller extent later on.

10...\( \mathcal{A}a6 \)

Black has also tried:

a) 10...dxc4 11 bxc4 \( \mathcal{A}a6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) \( \mathcal{E}c8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) \( \mathcal{B}b4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{B}b1 \) \( \mathcal{B}bd5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) ± Malaniuk-Gyimesi, Warsaw rapid 2005.

b) 10...\( \mathcal{B}b4 \) is another theme to which we shall return. Typically the losses of tempo cancel each other out: 11 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \mathcal{B}b7 \) 12 a3 \( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) dxc4 14 bxc4 \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) \( \mathcal{W}f4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) \( \mathcal{A}ad8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}e3 \) \( \mathcal{X}e3 \) 18 \( \mathcal{F}xe3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}c3 \) ½-½ Seirawan-Xu Jun, Seattle 2001.

c) 10...\( \mathcal{B}b7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \mathcal{E}e8 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) \( \mathcal{S}f8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{F}d1 \) dxc4 14 bxc4 g6 15 \( \mathcal{Q}f1 \) \( \mathcal{G}7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \) \( \mathcal{E}c8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}c2 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) = Kar-pov-Morović, Match (game 3), Las Palmas 1994.

11 \( \mathcal{E}e1 \) \( \mathcal{E}c8 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) \( \mathcal{A}a5 \)

Other options include:

a) 12...\( \mathcal{B}b4 \) 13 \( \mathcal{B}b1 \) dxc4 14 bxc4 b5 15 a3 \( \mathcal{C}c6 \) 16 c5 \( \mathcal{B}b7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{F}f1 \) a6 18 \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) \( \mathcal{A}a5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) \( \mathcal{E}c4 \) 20 \( \mathcal{X}e4 \) \( \mathcal{X}e4 \) 21 \( \mathcal{A}c2 \) \( \mathcal{F}f6 \) 22 \( \mathcal{B}b4 \) ± Benares-Jatoba, Rio de Janeiro, 2004.

b) 12...\( \mathcal{A}b7 \) 13 a3 dxc4 14 bxc4 \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) (14...\( \mathcal{A}a5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 16 f4 \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) ± Saacke-Behrhorst, Bundesliga 1981/2) 15 \( \mathcal{F}f1 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 16 d5 \( \mathcal{D}d7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) \( \mathcal{X}f6 \) \( \mathcal{G}xf6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}f5 \) \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{W}h4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 21 \( \mathcal{W}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}g6 \) 22 \( \mathcal{X}g6 \) \( \mathcal{X}g6 \) 23 \( \mathcal{A}xg6 \) \( \mathcal{F}xg6 \) 24 \( \mathcal{W}xg6 \) 25 \( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 26 \( \mathcal{W}h7+ \) \( \mathcal{F}f8 \) 27 \( \mathcal{F}c3 \) f5 28 \( \mathcal{A}g3 \) \( \mathcal{A}g5 \) 29 \( \mathcal{X}g5 \) 1-0 Kastani-edza-Zaw Win Lay, Istanbul Olympiad 2000.

13 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \)

White is getting ready for the c5 push.

In an earlier round in the same tournament, Zukertort tried 13 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \). After 13...\( \mathcal{A}b4 \) (13...\( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 15 c5 \( \mathcal{A}xd3 \) 16 \( \mathcal{X}d3 \) \( \mathcal{E}e7 \) 17 b4 \( \mathcal{B}b7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) a5 19 a3 gave White a clear advantage in Stumpf-J.Fischer, Germany tt 2000/1) 14 a3 \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 15 c5 \( \mathcal{A}xd3 \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}xd3 \) \( \mathcal{A}f4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}c2 \) \( \mathcal{D}c6 \) 18 b4 \( \mathcal{B}b8 \) 19 b5 \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 20 a4 he had an excellent position and went on to win in Zukertort-Englisch, London 1883.

13...\( \mathcal{A}b4 \)

13...dxc4 is another idea, giving White the dynamic 'hanging pawns' centre after 14 bxc4.

14 c5 (D)

With this advance, White creates a powerful queenside passed pawn. In the meantime, White's pieces are ideally placed to stop Black making anything of his central pawn-majority.
Main Line: Black plays ...
\[ \text{\ldots} \text{\texttt{c6}} \text{ and } \cdots \text{\texttt{d6}} \]

Game 24
Summerscale – Sadler
Crewe 1991

1 \text{\texttt{f3}} d5 2 d4 e6 3 e3 \text{\texttt{f6}} 4 \text{\texttt{d3}} c5 5 b3 (D)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
14...\text{\texttt{x}}d3 15 \text{\texttt{xd3}} \text{\texttt{xd2}} 16 \text{\texttt{xd2}} \\
\text{\texttt{e4}} 17 \text{\texttt{e3}} \text{\texttt{e8}} 18 f3 \text{\texttt{f6}} 19 \text{\texttt{c2}} \\
\text{White builds up slowly, which is very important even in the more attacking lines. Black's choice of active counterplay is limited, so White can afford to improve his position gradually.} \\
19...\text{\texttt{d7}} 20 \text{\texttt{ec1}} bxc5 21 dxc5 \\
\text{The c-pawn is a monster -- White already has a clear advantage.} \\
22...\text{\texttt{e5}} f6 23 c6 \\
\text{23...\texttt{ec7}} \\
23...\text{\texttt{xe5}} 24 \text{\texttt{xe5}} \text{\texttt{d7}} 25 cxb8\text{\texttt{d}} 26 \text{\texttt{d7}}++--. 23...d4 is relatively the best try. \\
24 \text{\texttt{d5}} \text{\texttt{xe5}} 25 \text{\texttt{a5}} \text{\texttt{c8}} 26 \\
\text{26...\texttt{xc6} 27 \text{\texttt{xa7}} ++.} \\
27 \text{\texttt{xb8}} \text{\texttt{xb8}} 28 \text{\texttt{c7}} \text{\texttt{c8}} 29 \text{\texttt{xa7}} \\
\text{e5 30 \texttt{e5} 31 \texttt{b5}} \\
\text{To convert his advantage into victory, White needs to exchange major pieces.} \\
31...\text{\texttt{ef8}} 32 \text{\texttt{b8}} \text{\texttt{d7}} 33 \text{\texttt{xf8+}} \\
\text{34 \texttt{a4} \texttt{xa4} 35 \texttt{bxa4} \texttt{e8} 36} \\
\text{fxe4 dxe4 37 \texttt{f2} \texttt{f7} 38 \texttt{e3} \texttt{e6} \\
39 \texttt{xe4} g6 40 \texttt{c6+} \texttt{d7} 41 \texttt{d5} 1-0 \\
\text{This is the basic starting position for the Colle-Zukertort System. It would be reached through our repertoire move-order of 1 d4 d5 2 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f6} 3 e3 \texttt{e6} 4 \texttt{d3} c5 5 b3. It is less frequently played than the Colle proper and this makes it less likely that your opponent will be ready for it. White aims to combine speedy development with kingside attacking chances.} \\
5...\text{\texttt{d6}} \\
\text{The systems where Black plays \texttt{d7} or \texttt{bd7} are covered later, so here I am only concerned with alternatives which do not easily transpose. The attempt to simplify by 5...cxd4 is possibly a mistake. By clarifying the central tension, Black makes it easier} \]
for White to access the key e5-square. 6 exd4 Qc6 7 0-0 Qd6 8 a3 (White often decides it is worth a tempo to avoid an annoying ...Qb4 at some stage) 8...0-0 9 Qe1 h6?! (this move is clearly not necessary yet; Black should be completing his development with ...b6 and ...Qb7) 10 Qb2 a5? (a misguided attempt at queenside counterplay; in reality, Black is simply wasting precious time) 11 c4 (this is a major option in the Colle-Zukertort; White allows Black to ‘inflict’ hanging pawns in exchange for dynamic counterchances) 11...Qe8 12 Qbd2 Qf8 13 Qc1 Qd7 14 Qb1 Qb8 (it must be said that Black’s play leaves a lot to be desired – he seems content to shuffle his pieces around and await developments, but this type of planless play is usually severely punished) 15 Qe5 Qd8 16 Qc2 Qe8 17 Qg4 1-0 J.Bellin-S.Moen, Gausdal 1992.

6 0-0 (D)

6...Qd6

Alternatively Black has tried 6...a6?! , hinting at queenside expansion, but by 7 Qb2! White sees that this will be to his advantage. Now:

a) 7...b5 is met by 8 a4 c4 (8...Qb8 9 axb5 axb5 10 dxc5 ±) 9 axb5 exd3 10 bxc6 dxc2 11 Qxc2 ±.

b) 7...cxd4 8 exd4 (the net effect of White calling Black’s bluff is that he has gained a tempo on normal lines; as you would expect, this grants White the advantage with accurate play) 8...Qd6 9 Qbd2 0-0 10 Qe1 Qd7 11 Qe5 Qc8 12 a3 (as this is a move White often has to play, it may be useful to introduce it much earlier in order not to worry about ...Qb4 at any stage; as the position is relatively closed, a3 is not a significant loss of tempo) 12...Qe7 13 Qdf3 Qg6 14 g3 Qe8 15 Qg5 (White has built up a dream attacking position in the Colle-Zukertort) 15...Qe7 16 h4 (16 Qxg6 hxg6 17 Qxg6 fxg6 18 Qxe6 is possible but passes the initiative to Black, which in the current position would be a crime) 16...Qh8 17 a4 (White takes away any possibility of ...Qb5, which hitherto would have been met by c4) 17...h6 18 Qh3 Qd7 19 Qf4 Qb4 20 c3 Qd6 (20...Qxc3 loses to 21 Qc2) 21 Qc2 g6 22 Qd2 (this game is impressive, as White is remarkably restrained about his various sacrificial possibilities and instead systematically increases the pressure with each move) 22...g5 (Black can stand the tension no longer and lashes out; this move serves only to weaken further his already loose kingside) 23 Qh3 Qxe5 24 dxe5 Qe7 25 Qxg5 hxg5 26 Qe2 Qg6 27 Qg4 (the upshot of Black’s 22nd move is that the g5-pawn is irrevocably weak and ultimately lost)
7...\textit{\textbf{a}} b2 (D)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

7...\textit{\textbf{0-0}}

Black has plenty of other options here:

a) 7...\textit{\textbf{w}} e7 8 c4 (White goes his own way, but 8 \textit{\textbf{c}} e5, with a likely transposition to the main line, is also possible) 8...\textit{\textbf{c}} x d4 9 \textit{\textbf{c}} x d4 \textit{\textbf{c}} x c4 10 bxc4 (Black has inflicted hanging pawns on White, but as this game shows, the pawns have a great deal of dynamic strength; the d5 advance, in particular, is likely to worry Black) 10...\textit{\textbf{c}} b4 11 \textit{\textbf{c}} e2 \textit{\textbf{d}} d7 12 \textit{\textbf{c}} x e1 \textit{\textbf{c}} e8 13 a3 \textit{\textbf{c}} c6 14 \textit{\textbf{d}} d3 0-0 15 \textit{\textbf{w}} d2 (this is an interesting attempt by White to stop \textit{\textbf{c}} f4 at some point, which might interfere with his attack) 15...\textit{\textbf{w}} d8 16 \textit{\textbf{c}} e5 \textit{\textbf{a}} a5 17 \textit{\textbf{w}} e3 a6 18 \textit{\textbf{d}} d2 b5 (Black’s approach has been quite positional; here he seeks to exchange the c4-pawn, in order to leave White with a more static IQP) 19 \textit{\textbf{c}} x d7 \textit{\textbf{w}} x d7 (19...\textit{\textbf{c}} x d7 20 cxb5 axb5 21 \textit{\textbf{c}} e4 \textit{\textbf{z}} is a more sensible approach by Black) 20 d5 \textit{\textbf{z}} (just look at those two raking bishops!) 20...\textit{\textbf{c}} x c4 21 \textit{\textbf{c}} x c4 bxc4 22 \textit{\textbf{c}} x f6 gxf6 23 \textit{\textbf{c}} x h7+ \textit{\textbf{w}} x h7 24 \textit{\textbf{w}} h3+ \textit{\textbf{c}} g7 25 \textit{\textbf{g}} g4+ \textit{\textbf{w}} h2 26 \textit{\textbf{c}} e3 \textit{\textbf{c}} f4 27 \textit{\textbf{c}} h3+ 1-0 Sieg-Beckhuis, 2nd Bundesliga 1989/90.

b) 7...\textit{\textbf{w}} c7 8 c4 (with the black queen committed to c7, this advance is even more attractive) and now:

b1) 8...\textit{\textbf{d}} x c4 9 bxc4 \textit{\textbf{w}} b6 (this is the idea behind ...\textit{\textbf{d}} x c4, but two early queen moves just to harass a bishop can’t be right) 10 \textit{\textbf{w}} c1 \textit{\textbf{b}} b4 11 \textit{\textbf{c}} e2 \textit{\textbf{d}} d7 12 \textit{\textbf{d}} bd2 \textit{\textbf{w}} c7 13 dxc5 \textit{\textbf{c}} e7 (13...\textit{\textbf{d}} x c5 14 \textit{\textbf{d}} x f6 gxf6 15 \textit{\textbf{c}} e4 \textit{\textbf{c}} e7 16 \textit{\textbf{w}} b2 \textit{\textbf{z}} 14 \textit{\textbf{d}} b3 \textit{\textbf{c}} c6 15 \textit{\textbf{c}} c3 0-0 16 \textit{\textbf{w}} b2 \textit{\textbf{f}} fd8 17 \textit{\textbf{c}} ab1 \textit{\textbf{d}} e8 18 \textit{\textbf{c}} fd4 a5 19 \textit{\textbf{d}} b5 \textit{\textbf{b}} b8 20 a4 \textit{\textbf{z}} Dizdar-Sax, Vinkovci 1993.

b2) The other capture is also interesting: 8...\textit{\textbf{d}} x d4 9 \textit{\textbf{d}} x d4 0-0 (Black tries a less ambitious approach, restricting himself to one pawn exchange, so as to reduce White’s dynamic potential) 10 \textit{\textbf{d}} bd2 b6 11 \textit{\textbf{a}} c1 \textit{\textbf{b}} b7 12 \textit{\textbf{c}} e2 \textit{\textbf{f}} fd8 13 \textit{\textbf{c}} e5 \textit{\textbf{d}} x e5 (if Black wants to take on e5, this would normally be a good time to do it, as White would otherwise play f4 and be able to recapture with the f-pawn; however, now the slightly awkward placing of the black queen becomes a factor) 14 dxe5 \textit{\textbf{d}} d7 15 cxd5 exd5 16 b4 a6 17 e6 fx6 18 \textit{\textbf{w}} x e6+ \textit{\textbf{d}} h8 19 \textit{\textbf{f}} f7 (Black is bound
hand and foot) 19...d4 20 ¤xd4 ¤ce5 21 ¥f5 1-0 Fuhrmann-D.Pedersen, German Open Junior Ch, Hamburg 1993.

c) 7...cxd4 8 exd4 0-0 9 a3 (for 9 ¤bd2, see the main game) 9...¥c7 10 ¤bd2 (White builds up slowly, as usual preparing ¥e2 and ¤e5) 10...¥g4 (Black tries to interfere with White’s plan, but this early attack is bound to fail against such a solid position – one of the advantages of the Colle-Zukertort is that White is well-placed to withstand any early aggression by Black; 10...e5 frees Black’s game but after 11 dxé5 ¥xe5 12 ¥xe5 ¥xe5 13 ¥xe5 ¥xe5 14 ¥e1 his isolated queen’s pawn causes him some worries in Zichichi-Sax, Rome 1984: 14...¥f4 15 ¥c1 ¥g4 16 ¥e4 ¥e5 17 ¥xf6+ ¥xf6 18 ¥g3 ¥± 11 h3 (the sacrifice 11 ¥xh7+ ¥xh7 12 ¥g5+ ¥xg6 13 ¥xg4 ¥xh2+ 14 ¥h1 ¥f4 is unclear) 11...¥h2 12 ¥e1 ¥xf3+ 13 ¥xf3 ¥a5 14 ¥e2 b6 15 ¥g5 (White does well not to be tempted by the unsound Greek Gift sacrifice 15 ¥xh7+? ¥xh7 16 ¥g5+ ¥g8 17 ¥h5 ¥xc2 ¥±) 15...h6 16 ¥f3 ¥b7 17 ¥e5 ¥c6 18 f4 ¥ac8 19 ¥f1 (despite Black’s best efforts, White has built up the ideal attacking position) 19...¥fd8?! (19...¥e7 is more resilient) 20 ¥ae1 ¥e7 21 ¥xc6 ¥xc6 22 f5 (White has prepared this breakthrough carefully) 22...¥g3 23 f6 ¥f8 24 ¥d1 ¥c7?! 25 ¥g4 ¥d6 26 ¥c1 g6 27 ¥xg6 fxg6 28 ¥xg6+ ¥h8 29 ¥xh6 ¥g8 30 ¥h5 1-0 Hawkins-MacLaughlin, British corr. Ch 1993.

We now return to 7...0-0 (D):

8 ¥bd2

The traditional main line. Alternatives are discussed in the next game.

8...cxd4

8...¥e7 is featured in Game 25 but Black has a number of other moves:

a) 8...¥b4 (this is intended to harass White’s important bishop on d3, but as we shall see, Black gains no time by doing so) 9 ¥e2 b6 10 a3 ¥c6 11 ¥e5 ¥e7 12 ¥d3 ¥b7 13 ¥f3 ¥g6 14 ¥h3 (I must admit to being a fan of this queen manoeuvre, which puts pressure on h7 and e6 simultaneously) 14...cxd4?! 15 ¥xg6! hxg6 16 exd4 ¥c8 17 ¥f1 ¥c7 18 ¥f3 ¥e4 (this is one of Black’s most solid defensive tryies, aiming to blunt the power of White’s light-squared bishop; the game now becomes more positional, as outright attacking lines for White don’t seem to work) 19 ¥e5 (19 ¥c1?! ¥e7) 19...¥xe5 20 dxe5 ¥c5 21 ¥d4 (a clever idea as after 21...¥xd3 22 ¥xd3 ¥c8 23 c3 it would be difficult for Black to get any serious counterplay without sacrificing material) 21...¥d7 22 b4 ¥e4?!
(22...\textit{\textdelta}xd3 could be a better try now that Black can make some inroads on the light squares) 23 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e8} 24 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}ae1} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c6} 25 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}g4} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b5} 26 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xe4} dxe4 27 c3 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c6} 28 h4 (with the c-file firmly covered, White has a free hand to attack) 28...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e8} 29 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f4} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d5} 30 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}g3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h7} 31 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}ee3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}a4} (Black makes a break for freedom with his queen, but his king begins to feel the heat) 32 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}g4} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h8} 33 h5 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}g8} 34 hxg6 fxg6 35 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xh3} 36 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xh3} e3 (36...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f7} 37 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h8}) 37 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xg6} exf2+ (37...e2 38 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h7}+ \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f7} 39 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h5}+ \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e7} 40 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xe2} \texttt{±}) 38 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xf2} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d1}+ 39 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h2} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e7} 40 c4 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c6} 41 h5 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e2} 42 bxc6 1-0 Rubinstein-Bogoljubow, Stockholm/Gothenburg 1920.

b) 8...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e8} (like 8...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e7}, this is an attempt to achieve the freeing...e5 advance, but it is easy for White to thwart this) 9 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e5} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c7} 10 f4 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xd4} 11 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xd4} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b4} (White needs to be wary of the combination of...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c7} and...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b4} and I would advise the reader to prepare to meet...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c7} with either c4 or a3; in this particular position White is OK because he can attack the rook on e8 – but be careful!) 12 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b5} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e7}?! (12...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} keeps Black’s position more harmonious) 13 c3 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c6} 14 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} 15 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e8} 16 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h3} g6 17 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h4} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} (Black seems to have defended himself with great care, but in reality his pieces are in a bit of a tangle, mostly due to the rook on e7; White is quick to exploit this) 18 c4 (White opens up a second front on the queenside) 18...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f8}? (Black collapses under the increasing pressure; 18...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}dxe5} 19 fxe5 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b4} 20 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f3} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} saves the piece but is highly unpleasant for Black) 19 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xc6} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xc6} 20 c5 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xc5} 21 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}ac1} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} 22 dxc5 1-0 Euwe-Kroone, Amsterdam 1921.

9 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}xd4} (D)

\textbf{B}

9...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b6}

Black has also tried:

a) After 9...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c7}, 10 a3 transposes to note ‘c’ to Black’s 7th move, while 10 c4 is line ‘b2’ of that same note.

b) 9...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}b4} tends to cost both sides the same amount of tempo: 10 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e2} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} (10...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e4}!? is an interesting try, since 11 a3 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c6} 12 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d3} 12 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}dxe4} dxe4 13 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d2} f5 14 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e1} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c7} 15 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f1} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}g5} \texttt{±} Tarley-Grekh, Lvov 2004) 12...f5 13 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e2} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f6} 14 b4 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}h6} 15 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}fd1} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d7} 16 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f1} g5 17 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e5} gave White little in A.Hoffman-L.Bronstein, Buenos Aires 1990) 11 a3 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c6} 12 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}d3} (back to square one!) 12...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}c7} 13 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e2} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e7} 14 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e5} \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}f5} 15 g4 (this is a key idea for White in the Colle-Zukertort – the g-pawn advances to drive back Black’s kingside defenders; this leaves some weaknesses on the white kingside but White counts on his initiative to see him through) 15...\textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e7} 16 g5 \textit{\texttt{\textalpha}e8} (the g4-g5 pawn-thrust is
especially effective if Black's bishop is on d7 rather than b7; on d7 the bishop takes away a retreat-square from the f6-knight and there is less danger of an accident on the h1-a8 diagonal) 17 f4 \( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{Q}dxf3 \) f6 19 gxf6 \( \mathcal{Q}xf6?! \) (Black should try 19...gxf6, since after the text-move, 20 \( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd7 \) 21 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \) gives Black a major problem on e6) 20 \( \mathcal{Q}g5?! \) \( \mathcal{A}c8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{A}ae1 \) h6 22 \( \mathcal{Q}h3 \) (the knight finds a route to g4) 22...a6 23 \( \mathcal{A}h1 \) b6 24 \( \mathcal{G}g1 \) \( \mathcal{A}b7 \) 25 \( \mathcal{G}g2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}h4 \) 26 \( \mathcal{A}gg1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xf5 \) 27 \( \mathcal{Q}f2 \) \( \mathcal{A}ae8 \) 28 \( \mathcal{Q}fg4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xg4 \) 29 \( \mathcal{W}xg4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe5 \) 30 \( \mathcal{F}xe5 \) \( \mathcal{A}h8 \) 31 \( \mathcal{E}f1 \) \( \mathcal{W}d7 \) (Black is defending himself quite well, but as usual finds it hard to develop counterplay) 32 \( \mathcal{E}f3 \) \( \mathcal{E}f7 \) 33 \( \mathcal{W}g6 \) \( \mathcal{E}fe8 \)? 34 \( \mathcal{A}c1! \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 35 \( \mathcal{H}h3 \) (White has completed the mobilization of his forces and Black is helpless against the various breakthrough ideas) 35...a5 (Walmisley-Samworth, Connecticut 1994) and now the clearest win is 36 \( \mathcal{A}xf5 \) exf5 (36...\( \mathcal{E}xf5 \) 37 \( \mathcal{Q}xh6! \)) 37 \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) ! and 38 \( \mathcal{G}h6+ \).

10 a3 \( \mathcal{A}b7 \) (D)

Two other games are worth mentioning as they illustrate some very useful and characteristic Colle-Zukertort ideas.

First a golden oldie: 11 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) (if you like the idea of putting your rook on h3 then this is the move for you) 11...\( \mathcal{A}c8 \) 12 \( \mathcal{E}e5 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 13 f4 \( \mathcal{E}e8 \) 14 \( \mathcal{E}f3 \) \( \mathcal{W}f8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{H}h3 \) g6 16 g4 \( \mathcal{G}g7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{F}f1 \) \( \mathcal{E}e7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{F}f2 \) (the main thing is for White not to rush the attack but to build up slowly; it is often harder to defend against vague threats than concrete ones you can calculate) 18...\( \mathcal{H}h8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{G}g2 \) \( \mathcal{H}c7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{D}df3 \) \( \mathcal{D}eg8 \)? 21 \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) \( \mathcal{H}h6 \) (21...\( \mathcal{E}ec8 \) 22 \( \mathcal{D}gxh7 \) + \( \mathcal{H}f7 \) 23 \( \mathcal{H}xg6+ \) -+) 22 \( \mathcal{D}gxh7+ \) \( \mathcal{H}f7 \) 23 \( \mathcal{D}xg6+ \) \( \mathcal{H}h7 \) 24 \( \mathcal{D}f8+ \) \( \mathcal{H}h8 \) 25 \( \mathcal{G}g6+ \) \( \mathcal{H}h7 \) 26 \( \mathcal{E}e5+ \) \( \mathcal{H}h8 \) 27 g5 (after toying with his opponent, White goes for the jugular) 27...\( \mathcal{X}xe5 \) 28 gxf6 \( \mathcal{F}xf6 \) 29 \( \mathcal{E}xg7 \) \( \mathcal{E}xg7+ \) 30 \( \mathcal{G}g3 \) \( \mathcal{A}c8 \) 31 c4 \( \mathcal{E}e7 \) 32 \( \mathcal{W}h5 \) \( \mathcal{A}d7 \) 33 \( \mathcal{W}xh6+ \) 1-0 Maroczy-Blake, Hastings 1923.

And next, the greatest Colle-Zukertort triumph in recent times (admittedly it's only a rapid game, but when the opponent is Anand it hardly detracts from the feat): 11 \( \mathcal{E}e5 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 12 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) \( \mathcal{E}e7 \) 13 f4 b5?! (an energetic attempt to create queenside play) 14 \( \mathcal{F}f3 \) \( \mathcal{A}ac8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) (Palliser suggests the direct 15 c3?! a6 16 \( \mathcal{H}h3!! \)?) 15...b4 16 a4?! (16 axb4 \( \mathcal{A}xb4 \) 17 c3 \( \mathcal{A}a5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{H}h3 \) gives White a kingside attack without allowing genuine counterplay) 16...\( \mathcal{G}g6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{F}cf1 \) \( \mathcal{E}e4! \) 18 \( \mathcal{H}h3 \) (after 18 \( \mathcal{D}xe4? \) dxe4 19 \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) 20 \( \mathcal{W}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{W}xc2 \) Black has all the chances) 18...f5 19 \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) dxe4? (19...\( \mathcal{A}xe5 \) is necessary, though 20 dxe5 fxe4 21
\( \textit{A Killer Chess Opening Repertoire} \)

[Chess diagram]

\( \text{Wh5} \text{ Qf7} 22 \text{f5} \text{exf5} 23 \text{\textnoteto{d4}} \text{poses awkward problems for Black) 20 Wh5} \text{xe5} 21 \text{fxe5} \text{Wxc2} 22 \text{Wh7+} \text{Qf7} 23 \text{Qg3} \text{Wxd2?! (a mistake in a hopeless position) 24 Qxg6 Qg8 25 Qxe6!}\)

\( \text{Qxe6} 26 \text{Wxf5+} \text{Qe7} 27 \text{Wf7+} \text{Qd8} 28 \text{e6} \text{e3} 1-0 \text{Bruzon-Anand, Leon rapid 2006.} \)

11...\text{e4}

As we saw in the previous note, if White can establish knights on g5 and e5 then Black is in serious trouble. The text-move is an attempt to hinder this, but it is ultimately unsuccessful. Other examples of play are:

a) 11...\text{Qe7} 12 \text{Qe5} \text{Qg6} 13 \text{g3}\n\text{Qxe5} 14 \text{dxe5} \text{Qd7} 15 \text{b4} a5 16 \text{b5}\n\text{Qc5} 17 \text{\textnoteto{d4}} \text{Qe7} 18 \text{f3}\n\text{Qxd3} 19\n\text{Qf5} 20 \text{Qa4} \text{Qc8} 21 \text{Qec1} \text{Wd7} 22 \text{Qxb6} d4 23 \text{Qxd4} \text{Wd5?} 24 \text{Qc6} f6 25 \text{Qc4} \text{Qxc6} 26 \text{bxc6} fxe5 27 \text{Wxd5} \text{exd5} 28 \text{c7} \text{Qf6} 29 \text{Qxa5} \text{Qd4} 30 \text{Qc1}\n\text{Qc6} 31 \text{Qb6} 1-0 \text{Rubinstein-Metger, Ostend 1907.}

b) 11...\text{Qc8} 12 \text{Qe5} \text{Qc7} 13 \text{Qe3}\n\text{Qe7} 14 \text{Qh3} \text{Qg6} 15 \text{Qf3} \text{Qe7} 16 \text{Qf1}\n\text{Qfc8} 17 \text{Qe3} \text{Qe4} 18 \text{Qxe4} \text{dxe4} 19 \text{Wh5} \text{is slightly better for White, Nav-}
\text{insek-Mazi, Bled 1998.}

12 \text{Qe5} \text{Qc8} 13 \text{Qdf3} \text{Qe7} 14 \text{Wf2}\n\text{Qc7} 15 \text{g3} \text{Qh6} 16 \text{h4} g6 17 \text{Qg5} \text{Qc8} 18 \text{a4}

I wanted to show that Black has problems on both wings.

18...\text{f5} 19 \text{f3} \text{Qe4}

Black falls into a devious trap.

20 \text{Qxe4} dxe4 21 \text{Qxe4} \text{Qxe4} 22 \text{Wxe4} \text{Qxc2} 23 \text{Qc4} (D)

Trapping Black's rook! It has to be said that despite this, Sadler outplays me over the next few moves.

23...\text{Qxb2} 24 \text{Qxb2} \text{Qc3} 25 \text{Qd3}\n\text{Qxb3} 26 \text{Qe5} \text{Qd2} 27 \text{Qeb1} \text{Qc3} 28 \text{Qd1}

28 \text{Qc6} keeps an edge.

28...\text{Qxd4} 29 \text{Qa2} f5 30 \text{Qd3} \text{Qw3} 31 \text{Qxd3} \text{Qh6} 32 \text{Qe5} \text{Qd8} 33 \text{Qg2}\n
33...\text{Qg7} gives Black good drawing chances.

34 \text{Qf3} e5 35 \text{Qxe5} fxe5 36 \text{Qf3}\n\text{Qc6} 37 \text{Qxd8+} \text{Qxd8} 38 \text{Qxg3} \text{Qh7} 39\n\text{Qd4} \text{Qf8} 40 \text{Qc6} a5 41 \text{Qe5}

Although White has an advantage, the win is technically quite difficult, but was made much easier by the mutual time-shortage common to weekend tournaments.

41...\text{Qd6} 42 \text{Qc2} b5 43 axb5 \text{Qxb5} 44 \text{Qc8} \text{Qg7} 45 \text{Qa8} \text{Qd6} 46 \text{Qc4}\n\text{Qd4} 47 \text{Qxa5} \text{Qc3} 48 \text{Qc4} \text{Qf6} 49\n\text{Qb8} \text{Qd4} 50 \text{Qb7+} \text{Qg8} 51 \text{Qd6}

I now saw the potential to weave a mating-net.

51...\text{Qe5} 52 \text{Qf7} \text{Qf6} 53 \text{Qh6+}\n\text{Qh8} 54 \text{Qg4} \text{Qd8} 55 \text{Qd7} \text{Qb6} 56\n\text{Qf6} 1-0

A very satisfying win against one of Britain's best players.
Colle-Zukertort System

Game 25
Hoffmeyer – U. Krause
2nd Bundesliga 1992/3

1 d4 e6 2 c3 f6 3 e3 d5 4 c3
b3 0 c6 6 0-0 d6 7 b2 0-0 8
bd2

White continues to develop naturally. However, as a response to White’s difficulties demonstrating an advantage in the main line, there has been quite a lot of experimentation from this position. These variations contain plenty of useful motifs of the Colle-Zukertort, so we should examine them carefully:

a) 8 dxc5 bxc5 9 a3?!, planning b4 and c4, was suggested by David Rudel as a way to play a kind of reversed Meran Semi-Slav. This leads to unbalanced positions where White may fight for an advantage – in particular if he has a good understanding of Meran positions. Yet it seems overly optimistic to claim that the extra tempo is sufficient for an objective advantage.

b) 8 a3 cxd4 (8...e8 9 e5 c7
f4 w6 11 c3 cxd4 12 a4 w8
10 exd4 e4 14 e2 f5 15 h1 cxe5
16 dxex c8 was equal in Yusupov-
Hubner, Frankfurt rapid 1998) 9 exd4
f4 10 c4 f5 11 c3 d7 ½-½ Kura-

c) 8 c4 (this makes slightly less sense when the black queen isn’t on the c-file, but White has an original plan in mind) 8...b6 9 c3 (this development of the queen’s knight is more familiar to the Classical Queen’s Indian) 9...cxd4 10 exd4 dcc4 11 bxc4

e5 (Black shows he is equal to the task and reduces White’s dynamic potential at the expense of allowing a protected passed pawn) 12 d5 c5 13 e1 g4
14 h3 xf3 15 wxf3 c8 16 db5 (this is one possibility normally denied to White, and indeed the knight proves to be a real workhorse) 16...db8 17 d6 a6
18 c7 e4 19 xe4 wxd6 (19...xe4
20 xe4 ±) 20 e5 wc6 21 xf6
wxf6 22 wxf6 gxf6 23 cd5 (from meagre beginnings, the knight is now master of all he surveys) 23...f5 24
h4 e5 25 b1 c8 26 xb6 and White realized his material advantage in Ryan-Engqvist, Isle of Man 1995.

d) 8 e5 (this early deployment of the knight is unusual, but involves a particularly nasty trap) 8...c7 9 f4
and now:

d1) 9...b6?? 10 a6 wc6 11
dxe5 a5 (11...wc5 12 d4 ++) 12
xf6 gxf6 13 xh7+ xh7 14 w5+
h7 15 g4+ sh7 16 f3 xe3+ 17
h1 1-0 Krabbé-Dappert, The Hague

d2) 9...cxd4 10 exd4 b4 11 c3
d3 12 wxd3 a7 (12...b4 13
ac1 axc3 14 a3 a5 15 b2 b6
and now 16 a3 a6 17 c4 keeps pressure on Black, while direct attacking play was, somewhat unjustly, rewarded in Bhakti-Forgues, World
Under-16 Girls Ch, Kemer 2007: 16
h3 b5 17 g4 d4 18 g5 a4 19 f3
d6? (19...f6) 20 a3 a7! 21 c3
wb6 22 c5 is much better for White)
13 d7! (the thematic 13 f3? could be better) 13...xd7 14 f5 ac8
15 fxe6 fxe6 16 a3 c4 and Black was at least equal in Rabinovich-Bog-
ljubow, USSR Ch, Moscow 1924.
8...\textsc{we7} (D)

Black has also tried:

a) 8...\textsc{b6} 9 a3 \textsc{b7} 10 \textsc{e5} \textsc{e7} 11 \textsc{f4} \textsc{e4} 12 \textsc{w2} f6 13 \textsc{d3} e8 14 \textsc{c4} dxc6 15 \textsc{xe2} dxe8 16 \textsc{d1} \textsc{c7} 17 dxc5 bxc5 and in Bruzon-Timman, Curacao rapid 2005 White could have achieved a clear advantage with 18 \textsc{wh5}.

b) 8...\textsc{wc7} prevents White's \textsc{d3} idea, but invites 9 dxc5 \textsc{xc5} 10 c4 with play on the c-file and along the diagonals leading to the black king. 10...\textsc{d7} (after 10...\textsc{we7}, as played by Lasker, White can grab a pawn by 11 \textsc{xf6} \textsc{xf6} 12 \textsc{xh7+}, based on 12...\textsc{xh7} 13 cxd5 and \textsc{wc2+}) 11 \textsc{c2} d7 12 b1 (12 \textsc{g5}?!?) 12...\textsc{g6} 13 \textsc{w2} \textsc{c8} 14 cxd5 \textsc{dxd5} 15 e4 \textsc{d4} 16 \textsc{e3} f6 17 e5 \textsc{d5} 18 \textsc{wh6} \textsc{d7}?! 19 \textsc{xf6} \textsc{xf6} 20 \textsc{xf6} \textsc{xf6} 21 \textsc{hxg6} hxg6 22 \textsc{wxe6+} \textsc{f8} 23 \textsc{g5} 1-0 Hamrakuova-I. Poulsen, Marianske Lazne 2006.

White cannot allow ...e5. The only sensible alternative is 9 dxc5 \textsc{xc5} 10 c4 with equal chances; for example, 10...\textsc{a3} 11 \textsc{wc1} \textsc{xb2} 12 \textsc{wb2} dxc4 13 \textsc{xc4} b6 14 \textsc{d1} 1/2-1/2 Sulava-Zelčič, Lugano 2007.

9...\textsc{cxd4}

This is the traditional main line and quite a challenge for anyone trying to prove an advantage for White. However, an even tougher nut is 9...\textsc{wc7}!, which has recently been recommended by several authorities. Having lured the knight to e5, Black attacks it, winning time for the threat ...\textsc{b4}. 10 \textsc{d3} (Rudel has demonstrated that White has practical attacking chances after 10 f4 \textsc{cxd4} 11 \textsc{d4} \textsc{b4} 12 \textsc{f3} but there is the risk that Black's bishop-pair will prove more important in the long term) 10...\textsc{cxd4} 11 \textsc{xc6} (11 \textsc{d4} \textsc{d}?!?) 11...bxc6 12 \textsc{exd4} and now:

a) 12...\textsc{a5} 13 c4 \textsc{a6} (13...\textsc{a4} 14 \textsc{w} c2 h6 15 \textsc{fc1} \textsc{a6} 16 \textsc{d5} dxc4 17 \textsc{xc4} a3 18 \textsc{c3} \textsc{xc4} 19 bxc4 c5 is equal, Ingbrandt-E. Berg, Swedish Team Ch 2000) 14 \textsc{e1} \textsc{e7} (14...\textsc{b4} 15 \textsc{e2} a4 16 \textsc{c1} axb3 17 axb3 \textsc{ew7} 18 \textsc{e5} 1/2-1/2 Breivik-Martyn, Amsterdam 2005) 15 \textsc{a4} a4 16 \textsc{e5} \textsc{b7} 17 \textsc{a1} axb3 18 axb3 \textsc{d7} 19 \textsc{h5} g6 20 \textsc{wh6} \textsc{f6} = Conquest-Luther, European Clubs Cup, Clichy 1995.

b) 12...\textsc{c5} 13 dxc5 \textsc{xc5} 14 \textsc{e5} (14 \textsc{wc1} \textsc{d} 15 \textsc{xe4} dxe4 dxe4 16 \textsc{a7} leads to perpetual check) 14...\textsc{d6} 15 \textsc{xf6} \textsc{gx} f6 16 c4 (16 \textsc{d4} \textsc{xh} 2+ 17 \textsc{h1} is also an option if the perpetual after 17...\textsc{e5} 18 \textsc{xh} 7+ is acceptable) 16...\textsc{dc} 4 and in Čabrilov-A. Kovačević, Zlatibor 2006 White should
have gone for 17 \( \text{Ec}1 \text{c}3 \text{18 We}1 \text{\text{xb}7} \) (18...\( \text{\text{xb}4} \text{??} \text{19 We}4 \) –) 19 \( \text{\text{xc}3} \text{\text{wa}5} \) 20 \( \text{We}3 \). However, Black can more or less force a draw with 20...\( \text{f}4 \text{21 Wxf4 Wxc3} \text{22 \text{\text{hx}7}+} \).

10 \( \text{exd4 \text{a}3} \)

This was the idea behind Black’s central exchange.

11 \( \text{\text{xa}3} \text{\text{xa}3} \) 12 \( \text{c}3 \) (D)

![Diagram](image)

This variation used to be considered the critical line of the Colle-Zukertort. However, White has been scoring well from this position.

12...\( \text{wa}5 \)

Black has tried a number of alternatives:

a) 12...\( \text{a}5 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \text{a}4 \text{14 \text{Ec}1 \text{axb}3} \text{15 \text{axb}3 \text{We}7 \text{16 \text{fa}3 \text{d}7 \text{17 \text{h}3 \text{g}6} \text{18 We1} \text{h}5 = \text{Abergel-Lutz, Belfort 2004.}} \)

b) 12...\( \text{b}2 \) 13 \( \text{Ec1 \text{xa}2} \text{14 \text{Ee}1 \text{wa}5 \text{15 \text{Ec3 \text{c7} \text{16 \text{h}3 \text{xe}5} \text{17 \text{xh7+ \text{xh7} \text{18 \text{h}5 \text{f6} \text{19 \text{wh}7+ \text{f7} \text{20 dxe5 \text{xe}5 \text{21 \text{g}3 \text{g}8 \text{22 \text{g}6+} \text{22 \text{\text{f}3 \pm} \text{22 \text{f}8 \text{23 \text{d}3 \text{d}7 \text{1/2-1/2 Tibensky-Veselovsky, Brno 2005.}} \)} \}

\)

c) 12...\( \text{exe}5 \) 13 dxe5 \( \text{\text{d}7 \text{14 \text{Ee}1} \text{and now:}} \)

\( \text{c1) 14...\text{Ec5} \text{15 \text{c2 \text{d}7 \text{16 \text{h}3 \text{c}6?} \text{17 b4 \text{e}4 \text{18 \text{xe}4 dxe4 \text{b5 \text{xe}5 \text{20 c4 \pm Abergel-Vallin, French Team Ch, Evry 2004.}} \)} \}

\( \text{c2) 14...\text{wh}5 \text{15 \text{Ec1 f}6 \text{16 \text{wh}5 \text{h}6 \text{17 exf6 \text{xf6 \text{18 \text{g}6?! \text{d}7 \text{19 \text{f}3 \text{Ec8 20 b4 \text{b}6 \text{21 \text{b}1 \text{c}7 22 \text{d}4 \text{e}5 = Abergel-Olivier, Nice 2003.}} \)} \}

\( \text{c3) 14...\text{b6 \text{15 \text{c}2 \text{g}6 \text{16 \text{b}4 \text{a}6 \text{17 \text{h}xg6 \text{hxg6 18 \text{b}1 \text{d}3 \text{19 \text{xa}3 \text{xc}2 20 \text{xc}2 \text{g}8 \text{= Abergel-Karpman, Israeli Team Ch 2008.}} \)} \}

\( \text{d) 12...\text{wd}6 \text{13 f4 (this is the basic idea: White sets up a Stonewall formation without the drawback of a dark-squared bishop) 13...\text{d}7 \text{14 \text{f}3 \text{e}7 \text{15 \text{h}3 (as I have mentioned, this is one of my favourite manoeuvres) 15...\text{g}6 \text{16 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 \text{17 \text{e}1 \text{fe}8 18 g4 (I decided this pawn-push was worth the risk, since I could remove Black’s light-squared bishop at will) 18...\text{ac}8 \text{19 g5 \text{e}4 (19...\text{d}7 \text{20 \text{h}5 leaves White with a massive attack, so Black is more or less forced to part with a pawn in order to relieve the tension) 20 \text{h}4 \text{dxe4 21 \text{xe}4 \text{d}4 22 \text{xe}4 \text{wa}3 \text{23 \text{g}6 \text{xg6 24 \text{e}2 \text{ed}8 25 \text{f}1 \pm Summerscale-I.Thompson, Hastings 1994/5.}} \)} \}

\( \text{e) 12...\text{d}7 \text{13 f4 and now:}} \)

\( \text{e1) 13...\text{f}8 \text{does not make a great deal of difference, viz. 14 g4 (again White chooses this attacking lunge to gain space on the kingside and drive back the f6-knight) 14...\text{e}8 \text{15 g5 \text{d}7 \text{16 \text{f}3 (Black now has to contend with possible bishop sacrifices on h7) 16...\text{cxe}5 \text{17 fxe}5 \text{g6 18 \text{c}1 (in} \)
this variation White is much more concerned with keeping his central supporting c-pawn than his a-pawn) 18...\textit{We}a5 19 \textit{Ke}b1 b5 20 \textit{Kf}f1 (the knight is \textit{en route} to g4, enticing Black to strike back on the queenside) 20...b4 21 c4 dxc4 22 bxc4 (White now enjoys a clear advantage, with a mobile central pawn-majority, and clear weaknesses to exploit, in the form of Black's weak dark squares on the kingside and a target on f7) 22...\textit{Kd}8 23 \textit{Kw}e1 \textit{Ke}f8 24 \textit{Kw}f2 (with his centre stable, White can start to think about establishing a knight on f6 or h6, trebling on the f-file and loosening Black further with h4-h5) 24...\textit{Kc}6 (faced with an extremely difficult defence, Black self-destructs) 25 \textit{Kx}f7 \textit{Kxd}4 26 \textit{Kw}f6 \textit{Kg}4+ 27 \textit{Kg}3 1-0 Danner-Beim, Vienna 1996.

\textit{e}2) 13...\textit{Ac}8 14 \textit{Kf}3 g6 15 \textit{We}1 \textit{Kg}7 16 \textit{K}h3 \textit{Ke}8 17 \textit{Kd}f3 \textit{K}h8 18 \textit{Kd}2 \textit{Ke}7 19 g4 (after a slower build-up, White again pushes his g-pawn towards the goal) 19...\textit{Wa}5 20 \textit{Kc}1 \textit{Kb}5 21 \textit{K}b1 h5 (having defended well so far, Black falters and weakens his kingside) 22 \textit{Kg}5 \textit{Kcf}8 23 f5 (the upshot is that g6 is now critically weak) 23...\textit{W}a6 24 \textit{K}e1 \textit{Kxf}5 25 \textit{x}f5 \textit{Kd}6 26 \textit{Kee}3 (26 \textit{Kx}g6 wins most cleanly) 26...\textit{Kf}g8 27 \textit{Kx}g6 \textit{W}f6 1-0 Hoë-Danielsen, Danish Ch, Ringsted 1995. It may seem odd to resign when you are threatening mate in one but after 28 \textit{Kef}3 Black is totally lost.

13 \textit{Kc}1

This would also be the response to 12...\textit{W}b2.

13...\textit{Kd}7 (\textit{D})

We have already seen that White can quietly build up a huge attack through natural moves and that the a-pawn is fairly irrelevant in the general scheme of things.

14 f4 \textit{Ac}8 15 \textit{Kf}3 \textit{W}c7

Black sets up the threat of ...\textit{Kxd}4, but it is easily dealt with.

16 \textit{Kc}2 \textit{Ke}7 17 \textit{K}h3 g6 18 g4 (\textit{D})

There is no reason for White to fear a counterattack on the kingside.

18...\textit{Kg}7 19 g5 \textit{Kf}g8

19...\textit{K}h5 is met with 20 \textit{K}xh5.

20 \textit{W}e1
Black’s position is marked by an obvious lack of counterplay.  
20...\( \text{c}f5 \) 21 \( \text{x}f5 \) efxf5 22 \( \text{wh}4 \) h5  
23 gxh6+ \( \text{wh}7 \) 24 \( \text{df}3 \)  
White has excellent ‘compensation’ for his extra pawn!  
24...\( \text{e}e8 \) 25 \( \text{g}g5+ \) \( \text{h}h8 \) 26 h7 \( \text{f}f6 \)  
27 \( \text{g}xf7+ \) 1-0

Black Plays ...\( \text{bd}7 \) or  
...\( \text{e}7 \)

Game 26  
Summerscale – Gimenez  
Andorra 1991

1 \( \text{f}f3 \) c5 2 e3 e6 3 d4 \( \text{f}6 \) 4 \( \text{d}3 \)  
d5 5 b3 (D)

5...\( \text{e}e7 \)

Black can choose between various placements of his f8-bishop and b8-knight. Obviously there are a lot of transpositional possibilities. White’s basic attacking idea remains the same: slowly building up with natural moves and punishing any overoptimistic aggression.

6 \( \text{b}2 \) 0-0  
Black can also consider delaying castling, waiting for c4 or other signs that there will be queenside play: 6...\( \text{bd}7 \) 7 0-0 b6 8 \( \text{bd}2 \) b7 9 \( \text{e}e5 \)  
(9 c4 0-0 10 cxd5 \( \text{xd}5 \) 11 \( \text{c}c1 \) cxd4 12 \( \text{c}xd4 \) \( \text{d}7f6 \) (12...\( \text{e}c5!?) \) 13 \( \text{w}e2 \) \( \text{c}c8 \) 14 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 15 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{d}5 \) leads to equality, Shankar-Mohota, Dindigul 2007) 9...\( \text{e}xe5 \) 10 dxe5 \( \text{d}7d7 \) 11 f4  
\( \text{w}c7 \) 12 \( \text{we}2 \) 0-0-0!? (a debatable but consistent decision) 13 a4 g5 14 a5  
bxa5 15 \( \text{a}6 \) gxf4 16 \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{h}f8 \) 17  
\( \text{f}a4 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 18 \( \text{x}b7+ \) \( \text{xb}7 \) 19 \( \text{xa}5 \) ±  
 Yusupov-Savchenko, Moscow 2007.  
7 0-0 (D)

B

7...\( \text{bd}7 \)  
After this move, White’s f-pawn plays a pivotal role in the attack.  
8 \( \text{bd}2 \) b6 9 \( \text{e}e5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \)  
Black takes on e5 before White has a chance to recapture with the f-pawn.  
9...\( \text{b}7 \) transposes to Game 27.  
10 dxe5 \( \text{d}7 \)  
After 10...\( \text{e}8 \) 11 f4 f5 12 exf6  
\( \text{xf6} \) 13 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) (13...\( \text{xf6} \) 14  
\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 15 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \) h6 17
\( \text{\&e5 \&fd8 18 \&g6 \pm Puskas-Balazs, Hungarian Team Ch 1993/4) 14 \text{\&f3} \text{\&d6 15 \&e5 \&f5 16 \&\textbf{f3} \&b8 17 g4 \text{\&f6}! (D) White was clearly better in Wilhelm-Beyer, Pardubice 1993, which concluded 17...\text{\&h4}! 18 \&h3 g5 19 fxg5 \&xe5 20 \&xh4 \&xe3+ 21 \&h1 \&xf1+ 22 \&xf1 \&b7 23 g6 1-0.} \\

11 f4 \&b7

Or 11...f5 12 c4 \&b7 13 cxd5 \&xd5 14 c4 fxe4 15 \&xe4 \&c8 16 \&\textbf{h5} g6 17 \&\textbf{h3} \&e8 18 \&\textbf{c3} c4 19 bxc4 \&c5+ 20 \&h1 \&b7 21 \&\textbf{e4} \pm Adly-Magnusson, Reykjavik 2006.

12 \&\textbf{h5}

Provoking a weakness.

12...g6

12...h6 just encourages g4-g5.

13 \&\textbf{h3}

My plan was to break through on the kingside with the pawn-lever f5.

13...b5

Black offers a pawn, which White is more or less obliged to accept, in the hope that the white bishop will become misplaced, thus blunting White’s attack.

14 \&\textbf{xh5} \&\textbf{a5} 15 \&\textbf{xh7} \&\textbf{xd2} 16 \&\textbf{f2} \&\textbf{b4} 17 a3 \&\textbf{b6} 18 f5!

The thematic breakthrough.

18...gx\textbf{f5} 19 \&\textbf{xf5}?!

Due to the threat of \&h5, it might seem that Black has to accept the rook sacrifice. However, 19...d4 is a better defensive try (as Black can meet 20 \&h5 with 20...\&e4). In that case, White retains a powerful attack, but there is nothing instantly decisive.

20 \&\textbf{xf5} h6 21 e6!

This great move brings the b2-bishop into the attack and breaks the lines of communication between the black queen and the kingside.

21...\&g5 22 \&f6! (D)

22...fxe6

22...\&xf6 23 \&\textbf{xh6} \&\textbf{fd8} 24 \&\textbf{h7}+ \&\textbf{h8} 25 \&\textbf{g6}+ \&\textbf{g8} 26 \&\textbf{h7}+ \&\textbf{f8} 27 \&\textbf{xh7}#.

23 \&\textbf{xe6}+ \&\textbf{f7} 24 \&\textbf{xg5} h\textbf{xg5} 25 \&\textbf{f1} \&\textbf{af8} 26 \&\textbf{f6}! 1-0

Game 27

Hartston – T. Upton

London 1984

1 d4 d5 2 \&\textbf{f3} \&\textbf{f6} 3 e3 e6 4 \&\textbf{d3} c5 5 b3 \&\textbf{e7} 6 \&\textbf{b2} 0-0 7 0-0 b6

Black develops without committing his queen’s knight and transpositions to other lines are common once the knight goes to either d7 or c6.

8 \&\textbf{e5} \&\textbf{b7} 9 \&\textbf{d2} \&\textbf{bd7} (D)

This knight development doesn’t block the long diagonal and fits well with Black’s set-up. 9...\&e4 is a logical alternative. White must do something about the knight if he does not want to allow Black to support it with
...f5. After 10 \textit{\texttt{\textsf{f}}\texttt{x}e4 \texttt{d}e4 11 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}4 \texttt{f}6?! (11...\texttt{c}xd4 looks better but both the simple recapture 12 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{x}d4 and the more complicated lines after 12 \texttt{\textsf{g}}\texttt{g}4 seem to favour White) 12 dxc5 bxc5 13 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{x}d8 (13 \texttt{\textsf{g}}\texttt{g}4 could be even better) 13...\texttt{\textsf{x}}\texttt{xd8 14 \texttt{\textsf{a}}d1 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}6 15 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{x}c6 \texttt{\textsf{x}}\texttt{xc6 16 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{x}f6 \texttt{gxf6 17 \texttt{\textsf{f}}f8 \texttt{\textsf{f}}f1} is slightly better for White, Markowski-Luch, Ustron 2008.  

10 \texttt{\textsf{f}}3 

This isn't White's most popular move but it seems logical to prevent ...\texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xe}4 for the time being.

10...\texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}8 

Lately Black has preferred other moves:

a) 10...\texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}7 11 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{h}3 \texttt{\textsf{b}}\texttt{b}8 12 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{x}d7 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{x}d7 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{x}f6 \texttt{\textsf{x}}\texttt{xf6 15 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{x}h7+ \texttt{\textsf{f}}f8 16 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{d}1 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{e}7 is unclear, Argandona-Cabanna, French Team Ch 2004/5.

b) 10...a6 11 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{d}1 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}7 12 \texttt{\textsf{h}}\texttt{h}3 \texttt{g}6 13 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{f}3 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xe}5 14 dxe5 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{d}7 15 c4 b5 16 cxd5 \texttt{\textsf{x}}\texttt{xd5 17 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{e}4 \texttt{\textsf{b}}\texttt{b}7} is again unclear, Palliser-M.Houska, British League (4NCL) 2001/2.

c) 10...\texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{d}4 11 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xe}5 12 dx\texttt{e}5 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{d}7 13 \texttt{\textsf{h}}\texttt{h}3 \texttt{h}6 14 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{d}1 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}5 15 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{e}2 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}7 16 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{d}4 \texttt{\textsf{f}}\texttt{d}8 17 c3 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{e}4 1/2-1/2 Yusupov-Kempinski, Bundesliga 2007/8.

11 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{h}3 

White has also been successful with the related 11 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{d}1 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}7 12 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{h}3 \texttt{h}6 (this is a different way of defending against the kingside threats, but it has fared no better in practice) 13 f4 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{e}4 (Black feels she can get away with this, now that White no longer has f3 at her disposal, but walks straight into a tactic) 14 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xd}7 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{x}d7 15 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{x}e4 dx\texttt{e}4 16 dxc5 \texttt{\textsf{b}}\texttt{b}5 (16...\texttt{\textsf{x}}\texttt{xc}5 17 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xe}4 ++) 17 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}4 \texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}5 18 \texttt{\textsf{g}}\texttt{g}4 \texttt{f}6 19 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xe}6+ \texttt{\textsf{h}}\texttt{h}8 20 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{d}7 (through natural moves White has built up an overwhelming position) 20...\texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}6? 21 \texttt{\textsf{g}}\texttt{g}4 1-0 Zsu.Polgar-Mai Thi, Novi Sad Women's Olympiad 1990.

11...\texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xe}5 

Seeking relief through exchanges. Alternatives include:

a) After 11...\texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}7?, 12 \texttt{\textsf{a}}\texttt{d}1?! transposes to the note to White's 11th move above, but there is also the little trick 12 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{x}d5 13 dxc5, winning a pawn due to the threat of \texttt{\textsf{x}}\texttt{xf6}.

b) 11...\texttt{\textsf{c}}\texttt{c}4 12 \texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{c}7 13 a3 followed by \texttt{\textsf{b}}\texttt{b}1 and \texttt{f}4 gives White the usual attack.

c) 11...\texttt{\textsf{e}}\texttt{e}4 (trying to blunt the attack by blocking lines, but this knight sally is easily repulsed) 12 f3 \texttt{\textsf{g}}\texttt{g}5 13 \texttt{\textsf{g}}\texttt{g}3 and now:

1) 13...f5?, as played in the game Van der Werf-Tondivar, Leeuwarden 2001, should be met by 14 \texttt{\textsf{d}}\texttt{d}7! \texttt{\textsf{w}}\texttt{x}d7 15 dxc5, winning a pawn as 15...bxc5 loses to 16 h4.
c2) 13...f6 (Black takes measures to close the a1-h8 diagonal) 14 \textit{Qxd7 Wxd7 15 Rad1} (again White mobilizes his last piece before proceeding with the attack) 15...b5 16 dxc5 \textit{Rxc5 17 f4} (now Black’s knight can’t go to e4) 17...\textit{d6 18 Qg4 Qe4?} (the knight had to retreat with 18...f7 but then 19 e4 is slightly better for White) 19 \textit{Qxe4 dxe4 20 \textit{Qxb5 Wxb5 21 Qxe6+ Qh8 22 Wxd6 We2 23 f2 1-0 V.Kova-}
\textit{\v{c}evi{\v{c}}-Nickoloff, Mississauga 1990.} Black will lose yet more material after 23...\textit{Qxe3 24 Qd4.}

12 dxe5 Qe4 13 Rad1 Qg5 14 \textit{Wh5 g6 15 We2 (D)}

Having created a weakness, White’s queen returns to a more central position.

15...\textit{Qc7 16 c4}

White chips away at the black centre.

16...f5 17 f4 Qe4

This natural-looking move leaves Black in great peril; however miserable it may be, the knight should have considered retreating.

18 cxd5 exd5?!

18...Qxd5 is ugly, but doesn’t lose on the spot.

19 \textit{Qxe4 fxe4 20 \textit{Qxe4! Qfd8}

20...dxe4 loses due to the opening of two diagonals leading to the black king: 21 \textit{We4+ Qh8} (or 21...f7 22 e6 \textit{Qf6 23 Qd7} 22 Qd7.

21 f5!

Rather than taking his pawn and running, White insists on crashing through on the kingside – Black is left to regret his pawn advances there.

21...dxe4 22 \textit{Qc4+ Qg7 23 f6+ Qxf6

23...Qh6 24 Qf7 Qd6 25 Qe6! leads to an easy win for White after 25...Qd7 26 Qxd7 Qxd7 27 Qxd6 Qxd6 28 exd6.

24 exf6+ Qf8 25 Qxd8+ Qxd8 26 f7

White prepares a dark-squared invasion; the pawn on f7 is a monster.

26...Qd2 27 Qe6 Qxe3+ 28 Qh1 Qd3 29 Qxc8+ Qxc8 30 Qg7+ 1-0

Game 28

Donnelly – Gray

British corr. Ch 1993

1 \textit{Qf3 d5 2 d4 Qf6 3 e3 e6 4 Qd3 c5 5 b3 Qc6}

The most natural development of the knight. 5...Qa5+ and some other rare moves will be discussed in Games 29 and 30.

6 Qb2 Qe7 7 0-0 0-0

Or 7...cxd4 8 exd4 0-0 9 Qbd2, and now:

a) 9...b6 10 Qe1 Qb7 11 a3 Qc8 12 Qe3 Qg4 13 Qe2 Qc7 14 Qf1 Qb8 15
g3 \(\triangle f6\) 16 \(\text{Cc1}\) \(\text{Bd7}\) 17 \(\text{Wh3}\) h6 18 \(\text{Rh4}\) \(\text{h7}\) 19 f4 \(\text{hxh4}\) 20 \(\text{Wxh4}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 21 \(\text{Wh3}\) \(\text{Wd6}\) 22 \(\text{Gg2}\) \(\text{Cc7}\) 23 \(\text{Wf3}\) \(\text{Af8}\) 24 g4 ± V.Kovačević-Farago, Hastings 1982/3.

b) 9...\(\text{Bb4}\) 10 \(\text{Be2}\) \(\text{Cc6}\) 11 a3 \(\text{Be4}\) 12 b4 \(\text{Aa}d7\) 13 \(\text{Aa}d3\) \(\text{Aa}d6\) 14 \(\text{We2}\) \(\text{Cc8}\) 15 \(\text{De5}\) \(\text{Ee8}\) 16 f4 \(\text{Wb6}\) 17 c3 \(\text{Cd8}\) ?!
18 c4 dxc4 19 \(\text{Dxc4}\) \(\text{Dxc4}\) 20 \(\text{Dxc4}\) is much better for White, Balasheov-Miezis, Tallinn 2007.

8 \(\text{Bd2}\) (D)

[Diagram]

\text{B}

8...\(\text{b6}\) 9 \(\text{De5}\)

White could of course consider 9 a3 first, as in V.Kovačević-Pavasović, Solin/Split 2002, which went 9...\(\text{Bb7}\) 10 \(\text{Ee1}\) \(\text{Cc7}\) 11 \(\text{Cc1}\) \(\text{Ad8}\) 12 \(\text{We2}\) \(\text{Efe8}\) 13 \(\text{De5}\) \(\text{Dxe5}\) 14 dxe5 \(\text{Dd7}\) 15 f4 \(\text{Df8}\) 16 c4 dxc4 17 \(\text{Axc4}\) \(\text{Dd7}\) 18 e4 \(\text{Cc6}\) 19 a4 \(\text{Dg6}\) 20 g3 \(\text{Af6}\) 21 \(\text{Df3}\) ±.

However, there is nothing wrong with the text-move.

9...\(\text{Bb4}\)

After 9...\(\text{Dxe5}\) 10 dxe5 \(\text{Dd7}\) 11 \(\text{Wh5}\) g6 12 \(\text{Wh6}\) it looks like White has made rapid progress with his attack, but 12...f5 13 f4 \(\text{Df7}\) 14 c4 \(\text{Df8}\) 15 \(\text{Dad1}\) \(\text{Db7}\) 16 \(\text{Df3}\) \(\text{Cc7}\) 17 h3 \(\text{Dd8}\) proved far from clear in Siebrecht-Bagaturov, Bratto 2007.

10 \(\text{De2}\) \(\text{Bb7}\)

10...\(\text{Dxa6}\) isn’t an option because of 11 c3 trapping the knight.

Now White can choose between kicking back the black knight with normal play, or ignoring it, arguing that the knight has no real future on b4. The first choice is the usual answer but as Yusupov shows in the next note, creative play has its own rewards.

11 a3

11 f4 \(\text{De4}\) (Black tries to take advantage of White’s omission of a3 and the game takes an original course) 12 \(\text{Dxe4}\) dxe4 13 a3 (13 \(\text{Dd2}\) f6 14 \(\text{Dg4}\) \(\text{Wc8}\) 15 a3 \(\text{Cc6}\) 16 dxc5 \(\text{Axc5}\) 17 b4 \(\text{Ae7}\) 18 \(\text{Dad1}\) ± Yusupov-Dorfman, Bundesliga 2000/1) 13...\(\text{Dd5}\) (although the knight seems well placed here, it is not secure and can be kicked away easily) 14 \(\text{Dd2}\) \(\text{Cc8}\) 15 c4 \(\text{Df6}\) 16 \(\text{Dad1}\) \(\text{Dd6}\) 17 dxc5 \(\text{Axc5}\) 18 \(\text{Dc3}\) \(\text{Dc7}\) 19 f5 (a key pawn-lever to open lines against the black king) 19...\(\text{Exf5}\) 20 \(\text{Dxf5}\) \(\text{Dxa3}\) (greedy, but Black was in trouble in any case) 21 \(\text{Dxa3}\) \(\text{Dxa3}\) 22 \(\text{Dxf6!}\) gx6f6 23 \(\text{Dg4}\) \(\text{Cc6}\) 24 \(\text{Dxf6}\) 25 \(\text{Dxf6}\) \(\text{Dxb3}\) 26 \(\text{Df2}\) (calmly protecting everything before closing in for the kill) 26...\(\text{Dxa4}\) 27 \(\text{Dg5+}\) \(\text{Dh8}\) 28 \(\text{Dc7}\) 1-0 Yusupov-Spiridonov, European Team Ch, Plovdiv 1983. A powerful double attack as 28...\(\text{Dxb8}\) is met by 29 \(\text{Dxe5}\) +, winning the house.
11...c6 12 f4 c8 13 d3 (D)

Again the two lost tempi, ...c6-b4-c6 by Black and d3-e2-d3 by White, cancel each other out.

13...w7

Black also has these options:

a) 13...cxd4 14 exd4 and now:
   a1) 14...xe5 15 fxe5 e4 16 w2 xd2 17 xd2 f5 18 exf6 xf6 19 xf6 xf6 20 w2 w2 ± Machulsky-Muse, Poznan 1986.

   a2) 14 d6 15 w6 is an improved version of Black’s play in the main game, but still better for White. K.Le-Ton Nu Hong, Phu Quoc 2007 continued 15...e7 16 f3 w7 17 h3 g6 18 f1 w7 19 g4 e4?! 20 xe4 dx e 21 xe4 xe4 22 xe4 f5 23 gxf5 xf5 24 xg6 hgx6 25 c1 ±.

b) 13...e4 14 dx e 15 xe4 dx e 16 e4 17 xe6 g6 18 g4 w7 19 f5 g5! was not as promising for White as it seemed in Danner-Baumeegger, Austrian Ch, Vienna 1999.

   c) 13...a6 seems slow but Black is planning to meet w3 with ...c4 so matters are not clear:

   c1) 14 w2 b5 15 dx c5 x c5 16 b4 e7 17 b3 x e5 18 x e5 g6 19 ad1 d7 20 d4 f6 = Danner-Izsaik, Budapest 2004.

   c2) 14 f3 g6 15 w2 b5 16 dx c5 x c5 17 h3 xe5 18 fxe5 e4 = Efimov-C.Bauer, Escaldes Zonal 1998.

14 w2 (D)

14...d6?

Black should preface this move with 14...cxd4, which should be compared with line ‘a2’ in the previous note.

Ristoja-Manninen, Finnish Team Ch 2001/2 was agreed drawn immediately after 14...cd8 15 f3. However, this line is a bit difficult for Black and it’s worth noting that 15...e4?! (15...xe5 should be inserted first) 16 dx c5 x e 17 x e5 xc5 18 h3 f6 19 d4 c8 20 h5 h6 21 g6 leaves White with a big advantage.

15 xe6! xc6 16 dx c5

This device should be becoming familiar by now.
16...\textit{xe7}  
16...\textit{xc5} 17 \textit{xf6} \textit{gf6} 18 \textit{f7}+ \textit{h7} 19 \textit{wh5}+ \textit{g7} 20 \textit{g4}+ \textit{h7} 21 \textit{f3} +--.

17 \textit{xb6} \textit{xb6} 18 \textit{f3}  
White is winning, as he is a clear pawn up, but impressively continues to build up his attack rather than rest on his laurels.

18...\textit{e4} 19 \textit{d4} \textit{c5} 20 \textit{f3} \textit{f6} 21 \textit{d1} \textit{fd8} (D)

22 \textit{g4}  
As long as White can keep the light squares under control, he can get away with this move.

22...\textit{c3} 23 \textit{xc3} \textit{xc3} 24 \textit{f2} \textit{g6} 25 \textit{g5} \textit{e7}  
The bishop would be better placed defensively on \textit{g7}.

26 \textit{a4} \textit{b2} 27 \textit{b4}  
White starts the second wave of the assault.

27...\textit{c5} 28 \textit{h5} \textit{e8} 29 \textit{hxg6} \textit{hxg6} 30 \textit{h3} \textit{g7}?! 31 \textit{f5}! \textit{exf5} 32 \textit{xf5} 1-0  
Black is defenceless against the threat of \textit{d7} with the idea of \textit{f6}+.

\textbf{5...\textit{wa5}+ and Rare 5th Moves}  

\textit{Game 29  
Yusupov – Short  
Dortmund 1997}

1 \textit{d4} \textit{f6} 2 \textit{f3} \textit{e6} 3 \textit{e3} \textit{c5} 4 \textit{d3} \textit{d5} 5 \textit{b3} \textit{wa5}+ (D)

A related idea is 5...\textit{cxd4} 6 \textit{exd4} \textit{b4}+ 7 \textit{c3} \textit{d6}, when Palliser suggests 8 0-0 0-0 9 \textit{we2} \textit{wc7} 10 \textit{c4}!?. Other rare 5th moves are examined in our next game.

\textit{W}

\textbf{The attempt to disrupt White’s development with this queen check is a double-edged plan. White is more or less forced to play \textit{c3}, which will restrict the mobility of his dark-squared bishop. On the other hand, the black queen is misplaced on \textit{a5} and if she returns to a more natural square, such as \textit{c7}, then \textit{c4} will, as usual, become a major option for White.  
6 \textit{c3}  
This is the only try for an advantage. 6 \textit{bd2} \textit{cxd4} 7 \textit{exd4} \textit{b4} 8 0-0}
\[ \text{c3 b4 \textit{Wc7 10 \textit{b1 \textit{c6 11 \textit{b5 a5}}}} 12 \textit{bxa5 0-0 13 \textit{a3 \textit{d8 14 \textit{c5}}}} \textit{was unclear in Yusupov-Miles, USSR-Rest of World, London 1984.}} \\
6...\textit{cx}d4?! \\
\text{If Black is playing to restrict White's dark-squared bishop then this move must be all wrong. It is surely better to maintain the central tension; e.g.,} 6...\textit{c6 7 0-0 (D)} \text{and now:}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\textit{b)} \textit{a7} (continuing development) 8 \textit{b2 0-0 9 \textit{bd2 \textit{Wc7 10 c4 \textit{d8 11 \textit{c1 cxd4 12 \textit{xd4?!}}}} (unwisely giving up the centre; 12 \textit{exd4}} \text{would bring us to a familiar position with the usual attacking chances for White) 12...\textit{xd4 13 \textit{cxd4 e5 14 \textit{cxd5 \textit{b8 15 \textit{a1 \textit{xd5 16 \textit{e2 \textit{g4 17 f3 \textit{d8 \textit{= McDonald-Piket, European Junior Ch, Groningen 1986/7.}}}}}}}}}

\textit{b2}} \text{is a slower approach than 'b2', but White can still count on an edge with a timely c4: 8...\textit{exd4 9 \textit{cxd4 \textit{e7 10 \textit{bd2 0-0 11 \textit{e2 b6 12 \textit{e5 \textit{xe5}}}}}} (again Black makes this exchange before White can play f4) 13 \textit{dx}e5 \textit{d7 14 \textit{c4 \textit{c5 15 \textit{xd5 \textit{d8 17 \textit{f3}}}} leaves White slightly better due to Black's IQP, Hoi-Inkiov, Gausdal International 1990.}}

\textit{b2) 8 c4 \textit{dxc4 9 bxc4 \textit{a7 10 \textit{b2 \textit{cxd4 11 \textit{exd4}}}} (White will accept hanging pawns, as is usual in the Colle-Zukertort after he has played c4; the only difference from the examples we have seen before is that the black bishop is on e7, which lends extra support to the knight on f6 but on the other hand the bishop could become a target on the e-file) 11...0-0 12 \textit{bd2 b6 13 \textit{c1 \textit{b7 14 \textit{e1}}}} (again White improves his position as much as possible before doing anything active; 14 \textit{d5?! \textit{b4 15 \textit{b1 \textit{d5 16 a3 \textit{a6 17 \textit{xd5 \textit{d8 18 \textit{e1}}}}}} is unclear – Kovacevic) 14...\textit{ad8 15 \textit{b1 \textit{f4}} (this is a useful defensive move as the queen removes itself from the c-file and heads toward the vulnerable kingside) 16 \textit{d5}} (even though this doesn't lead by force to a win, this game is a good example of the long-term pressure White enjoys for the price of a pawn) 16...\textit{exd5 17 \textit{cxd5 \textit{xd5 18 \textit{c4 \textit{d6 19 \textit{e4 \textit{h6 20 \textit{c1 \textit{g6 21 \textit{d2}}}}}}}}}}

\textit{b1) 8 \textit{b2}}
(24...\(\text{a}5\) at least removes one of White’s dangerous bishops) 25 \(\text{\textipa{a}}f5\) (this combination regains the sacrificed pawn and leaves White with a clear plus) 25...\(\text{\textipa{x}}f5\) 26 \(\text{\textipa{x}}c5\) \(\text{bxc5}\) 27 \(\text{\textipa{h}}4\) \(\text{\textipa{w}}f6\) 28 \(\text{\textipa{x}}f5\) \(\text{\textipa{d}}d4\) 29 \(\text{\textipa{x}}d4\) \(\text{cxd}4\) 30 \(\text{\textipa{w}}d3\) (the two bishops are more than a match for Black’s passed d-pawn) 30...g6 31 \(\text{\textipa{g}}3\) (White prepares an attack on the dark squares weakened by Black’s last move) 31...\(\text{\textipa{g}}7\) 32 \(\text{\textipa{h}}4\) \(\text{\textipa{c}}8\) 33 \(\text{\textipa{d}}d3\) h5 (this is a panic reaction to the threat of \(\text{\textipa{h}}6\) but Black was in trouble anyway) 34 \(\text{\textipa{e}}6\) \(\text{\textipa{b}}7\) 1-0 V. Kovačević-P. Popović, Zagreb 1985.

\(7\text{\textipa{exd}}4\)

White now has an edge.

\(7...\text{\textipa{e}}6\) 8 0-0 \(\text{\textipa{e}}7\)

Perhaps Black should try to transpose back with 8...\(\text{\textipa{w}}c7\).

\(9\text{\textipa{e}}5\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}e5\) 10 \(\text{\textipa{dxe}}5\) \(\text{\textipa{d}}d7\) 11 \(\text{\textipa{g}}4\)

\((D)\)

\(11...\text{\textipa{g}}6\) 12 \(\text{\textipa{e}}1\) h5

12...0-0 13 \(\text{\textipa{g}}5\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}g5\) 14 \(\text{\textipa{x}}g5\) gives White a clear plan of attack on the h-file.

\(13\text{\textipa{w}}e2\) \(\text{\textipa{f}}8\) 14 \(\text{\textipa{e}}3\)?

In his notes Yusupov claims a clear plus for White after 14 \(\text{\textipa{b}}2\) \(\text{\textipa{w}}c7\) 15 \(\text{\textipa{d}}d2\) (15 c4!?) 15...b6 16 c4 dxc4 17 \(\text{\textipa{x}}c4\). I see no reason to disagree with Yusupov’s assessment, with the idea of \(\text{\textipa{d}}6\) looming.

\(14...\text{\textipa{x}}e5\) 15 \(\text{\textipa{d}}4\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}d3\) 16 \(\text{\textipa{x}}d3\)

Now, however, White has enough compensation for the pawn but no more than that.

\(16...\text{\textipa{g}}8\) 17 \(\text{\textipa{d}}2\) \(\text{\textipa{d}}d7\) (\(D\))

After 17...f6!?, Yusupov gave 18 c4 as unclear, but perhaps White should stop ...e5 by 18 f4.

\(18\text{\textipa{w}}e3\)

White prepares an invasion on the dark squares but Short defends himself well.

\(18...\text{\textipa{f}}6!\) 19 \(\text{\textipa{h}}6+\) \(\text{\textipa{g}}7\)

After 19...\(\text{\textipa{w}}f7\)? Yusupov gives 20 \(\text{\textipa{f}}3\) with the point that 20...\(\text{\textipa{h}}8\)? loses to 21 \(\text{\textipa{g}}5+\) ! --.

\(20\text{\textipa{h}}8+\)

Yusupov shows why more ambitious alternatives don’t bring home the bacon: 20 \(\text{\textipa{x}}f6?! \text{xf6\!} 21 \text{\textipa{h}}8+\).
\( \text{e7 22 } \text{wa8 xc3 23 } \text{f3 f7 } \text{or 20 f3?! g8 21 g5?! (21 h4 is unclear at best) 21...wa6 } \text{but not 21...e5? 22 xe5 fxe5 23 xe5 f8 24 xg7 xg7 25 wh7+ f8 26 wxg6, when White wins.)} \\
20...g8 21 h6+ g7 22 wh8+ 1/2-1/2 \\
White has nothing better than to take the draw.

Game 30
Minarelli – Pastorini
Forli 1989

1 d4 \text{f6 2 f3 e6 3 e3 d5 4 d3 c5 5 b3 d6}
This attacks the e5-square but makes the bishop vulnerable to dxc5 in certain lines.
Other rare moves include:
a) 5...b6 to some extent threatens ...a6, exchanging light-squared bishops. In Mah–Speelman, British League (4NCL) 2007/8 White prevented this with 6 we2 e7 0-0 0-0 8 \text{bd2 c6 9 a3 b7 10 b2 w7 11 ac1 fd8 12 e5 xe5 13 dx5 e4 =. }

b) 5...\text{bd7} bolsters the f6-knight but is a little passive. After 6 b2 b6 7 0-0 b7 8 e5 a well-known game went: 8...a6 (Black is hoping for ...b5 and ...c4 to lock out White's bishops, but this plan is easily countered and wastes too much time) 9 d2 b5 10 xd7 xd7 11 dxc5 xc5 12 f3 (Black has developed successfully but has unleashed the full fury of the two raking bishops on d3 and b2) 12...e7 13 g3 0-0 14 f3 ac8 (Black is developing normally but without any real purpose, and White's next move puts him on the critical list) 15 g5 g6 (forced due to the threat of xh7) 16 h4 h5 17 ad1 (calmly bringing up the reserves and introducing ideas of e4 or e4) 17...h7? (Black cracks under the pressure, allowing a beautiful idea based on a well-known mating pattern) 18 wh5! xg5 (18 gxh5 19 xh7#) 19 xg6 (White rips away the black king's pawn-cover and forces the return of the piece) 19...f6 20 f4 g7 21 fxg5 xg5 22 h4 e4 (if 22...h7 then 23 d4 is very persuasive - the idea is xg4) 23 xe4 dx4 24 f4 1-0 Yusupov-Scheeren, European Team Ch, Plovdiv 1983.

6 \text{bd2 bd7 7 b2 (D)
13 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 15 0-0 ± Beckmann-Wagner, Recklinghausen 1999.

b) 7...\( \text{Wc7} \) 8 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 9 exd4 \( \text{Qa3} \) 10 \( \text{Qxa3} \) \( \text{Wxa3} \) 11 c3 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 12 dxe5 \( \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qf3} \) h6 14 0-0 \( \text{Wxa5} \) 15 \( \text{Wd2} \) ± J.Johansson-Rantanen, Helsinki 2002.

8 0-0 \( \text{Wc7} \)

I feel the knight is misplaced on d7; if Black continues normally with 8...b6 or 8...\( \text{Wc7} \) then he will undoubtedly get an inferior version of the main line after 9 \( \text{Qe5} \), as taking on e5 becomes less attractive since the f6-knight lacks a decent retreat-square. These disadvantages outweigh the fact that the knight on f6 is given some extra support in some lines. Therefore Black covers e5 directly with his queen, but this leaves it vulnerable on the c-file.

9 c4 (D)

With \( \text{Qe5} \) now prevented, he could consider 9...b6, but the c-file will surely become a problem. More immediate tactics on this file occur after 9...\( \text{cdx4} \) 10 exd4 dxc4 (10...b6 11 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Wb8} \) 12 \( \text{Qe2} \) b7 13 \( \text{Qe5} \) g6 14 f4 \( \text{Qe8} \) 15 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{wd8} \) 16 \( \text{Qf1} \) ± Szmacinska-Sofieva, Warsaw 1988) 11 \( \text{Qxc4} \) ! \( \text{Qe7} \) 12 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Wd8} \) 13 \( \text{Wc2} \) and White is much better, V.Kovačević-Zelčič, Croatian Ch, Slavonski Brod 1995.

10 exd5 \( \text{Qxd5} \)?

Black falls into the trap: 10...\( \text{cdx4} \) 11 exd4 exd4 12 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Wb8} \) 13 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 14 \( \text{Wc2} \) is only slightly better for White, who enjoys a lead in development and the better-placed pieces.

11 dxe5 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 12 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 13 \( \text{Qh7} \+)

This simple combination nets White a clear pawn and effectively wins the game.

13...\( \text{Qh7} \) 14 \( \text{Wc5} \) g8 15 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Wc6} \) 16 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 17 \( \text{Qac1} \)

It seems as though White is just building up pressure on the c5-pawn, but in reality he is preparing a thunderbolt.

17...b6? 18 \( \text{Qg7} \! \)

A brave decision, since White is completely winning without any need for fireworks, but this sacrifice is highly thematic and a classic example of the dangers Black must always watch out for.

18...\( \text{Qxg7} \) 19 \( \text{Wg5}+ \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 20 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 21 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 22 \( \text{Qh4}+ \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 23 \( \text{Qh6} \) 1-0

23...\( \text{Qf5} \) would be met by 24 e4, winning the queen.
4 1 d4 d5 2 .OPENING: Beating the Anti-Colle Systems

1 d4 d5 2 .OPENING

Miscellaneous

Game 31
Steinitz – Chigorin
World Ch match (game 2), Havana 1889

1 d4 d5 2 .OPENING (D)

I like this move, which shows good imagination. The obvious threat is 5.b5+, winning a pawn. What is not so obvious is the positional threat of 5.<br>h3, when after 5...<br>g6 6  xg6 Black would be forced to capture anti-positionally with the f-pawn.

4...c8
The only way to meet both threats.
5 c4
This is nearly always the way to take advantage of the early development of Black’s queen’s bishop.

5...f6 6  xf3

2...g4
This reversed Trompowsky failed to impress even back in 1889!
3  f5  h5?!
3...f5 may be preferable, and has been used most notably by Nigel Short. After 4 c4 f6 5  xf3, both 5...e6 and 5...c6 give Black a solid but uninspiring game, and White keeps the initiative with natural moves, as in the main game.

4  x3 (D)
4 g4 is also very strong.
In Solozhenkin-Rodkin, St Petersburg 2004, White preferred the sharper 6 g4!? fx e5 7 gxh5 e4?! (7...dx e4 is a better try) 8 b3 c6 9 d3h5 9 c7 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 c3 +-.  
6...e6 7 d3 g6 8 d1 c6 9 e3  
A peculiar kind of Semi-Slav structure has arisen, However, it is significantly worse for Black than usual: Black’s queen is misplaced on c8 and his pawn-structure has been weakened by ...f6, which hinders the natural development of the g8-knight.  
9...d6 10 d2 e7 11 c1  
Creating a concealed attack against the black queen and highlighting her awkward position.  
11...d7 12 h4 (D)  
Allowing his centre to collapse. Black had to play 15...0-0, when White is only slightly better.  
16 xg6 xg6 17 xe4 dxe4 18 xe4 e7 19 hxg4  
White has a large advantage.  
19...e5 20 d5 d7 21 c3 d8 22 h5 cxd5 23 cx d5 0-0 24 d6 e6  
24...xd6 25 xd6 xd6 26 xd6 27 xd6 28 b4 b6 29 xf8 xf8  
Here Black could have already resigned.  
30 c8+ f7 31 c7+ f6 32 f5+ e6 33 ff7 b4 34 xb7 xg4 35 xg7 h5 36 x a7 f5 37 f3 g2 38 a6 1-0  

Game 32  
Krallmann – Drill  
Kassel 1994  

1 d4 d5 2 f3 f5  
Black develops the bishop outside his intended pawn-chain, but to a square where it is less exposed than it is on g4. In a sense, this is a logical attempt to take advantage of the slowness of 2 f3, since White has fewer active options than he does in the case of 1 d4 d5 2 c4 f5.  
3 c4 e6 4 b3 (D)  
This is the most natural way to take advantage of Black’s early bishop sortie. The b7-square is no longer defended, so White immediately goes about attacking it and the queenside light squares in general.  
4...c6
This is the most active move, by which White is prevented from taking on b7 due to ...\(\text{\&}b4\). The main alternative here is 4...\(\text{\&}c8\) but after 5 \(\text{\&}c3\) White has the idea of quick development and attack on the queenside, i.e. \(\text{\&}f4\), \(\text{\&}c1\), cxd5 and an eventual b4-b5, while 4...b6 is exactly the sort of light-squared weakness White is trying to provoke.

5 \(\text{c}5\)

This excellent response renews the threat of taking on b7 and shuts out Black's king's bishop.

5...\(\text{\&}b8\)

5...a5?! has received surprisingly little attention. After 6 \(\text{\&}f4\) (6 \(\text{\&}xb7\)?! \(\text{\&}b4\) 7 \(\text{\&}a3\) \(\text{\&}b8\) 8 \(\text{\&}a7\) \(\text{\&}a8\) is a draw by repetition) 6...\(\text{\&}b4\) 7 \(\text{\&}a3\), 7...\(\text{\&}e7\)!, as played in Conquest-B.Jönsson, Hafnarfjörður 1992, allows 8 \(\text{\&}b5\)! \(\text{\&}c2+\) 9 \(\text{\&}xc2\)! \(\text{\&}xc2\) 10 \(\text{\&}xc7\)! \(\text{\&}d7\) 11 \(\text{\&}d6+\), when White wins a pawn.

6 \(\text{\&}f4\)

Another good move. White has a long-term plan of advancing on the queenside, which will give him a clear plus. Meanwhile he completes his development, while restricting Black's possibilities. Black has two ways to break against White's pawns. The first, ...b6, is ill-advised since it critically weakens the black knight on c6 after \(\text{\&}a4\). The second, more realistic, option is to play for ...e5. Thus White intensifies his grip on this square.

6...\(\text{\&}f6\)!!

This normal-looking move probably doesn't meet the requirements of the position. Several of the world's most creative players have worked on the task but have not succeeded in fully rehabilitating Black's system. Some important tries:

a) 6...\(\text{\&}g7\) 7 e3 a6 8 a3 \(\text{\&}g6\) 9 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 10 \(\text{\&}e2\) 0-0 11 0-0 e5?! 12 dxe5 \(\text{\&}xc5\) 13 \(\text{\&}c3\) \(\text{\&}e6\) 14 \(\text{\&}ad1\) \(\text{\&}ce7\) 15 \(\text{\&}e2\) ± Polugaevsky-Vaganian, Moscow tt 1981.

b) 6...f6 7 e3 g5 (7...\(\text{\&}g7\) 8 \(\text{\&}c3\) \(\text{\&}f7\) 9 \(\text{\&}a4\) b6 10 \(\text{\&}b5\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 11 cxb6 axb6 12 \(\text{\&}c1\) e5 13 dxe5 \(\text{\&}d7\) 14 exf6 gxf6 15 \(\text{\&}b3\) ± Edvardsson-Western, Hafnarfjörður 1999) 8 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 9 \(\text{\&}a4\) \(\text{\&}g6\) 10 b4 a6 11 \(\text{\&}c3\) 0-0 12 \(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\&}g6\) and in Bareev-Speelman, Hastings 1992/3 White's queenside initiative proved easier to pursue than Black's kingside counterplay.

c) In Portisch-Larsen, Montreal 1979 Black actually made 6...h6 look quite viable: 7 e3 g5 8 \(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 9 \(\text{\&}c3\) a6 10 h4 g4 11 \(\text{\&}e5\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 12 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\) 13 \(\text{\&}e2\) 0-0 14 \(\text{\&}d1\) e5 and Black was probably OK. However, there are not many players around able to handle this kind of position (actually, not even Larsen was!).

We now return to 6...\(\text{\&}f6\)!! (D):
7 筍c3 a6
Black takes away the b5-square from White’s knight.
8 e3 筣e7
In Scalcione-Chatalbashev, Reggio Emilia 2002 Black still managed to generate kingside counterplay with the inventive 8...筣d7! 9筣c1 筣e7 10筣a4 g5 11筣g3 h5 12 h3 筣f8 13 b4 筣g7 14筣b3 g4.
9筣e2 筣e4
9...筣d7, preparing to launch a kingside pawn-storm, might still be a better way to continue.
10筣xe4 筥xe4 11筣a4 0-0 12 0-0 筥f6 13筣fd1
Played to put pressure on d5 in the event that Black manages to play ...e5.
13...筥a8 14 b4
White has a space advantage on the queenside and clearly should attack there.
14...筥e7 15筥ac1 筥fd8
15...e5 16 dx5 筥xe5 17 筥xe5 筥xe5 18 筥xe5 筥xe5 19 c6 b5 20筣b3 gives White the long-term plan of attacking the weak pawn on d5.
16筣b3 筥a7 17 a4 (D)
17...筥da8
Black is being very prophylactic in his aim to discourage White’s natural plan of b5. However, if White delays this, the two rooks look strange doubled up on a file that can only open if White chooses to play b5.
18筥d2
The game now enters a phase of positional manoeuvring, where both sides try to achieve their strategic goals without allowing the opponent to achieve his; it’s a clear case of cat and mouse.
18...筥h6 19 h3 筥h8 20筥a2 筥d8 21筥ca1
White plays the same game and, because he has more space, can even think about trebling on the a-file.
21...筥xf3 22筥xf3 c6 23筥c3
The queen keeps a firm eye on the critical e5-square.
23...筥d7 24筥e2 筥e7 25筥a3 f6
Black again hints at playing ...e5 one day but critically weakens the light squares on his kingside.
26筥h5 筥f8 27筥g6 (D)
With the bishop on g6, the b5 thrust becomes a more realistic possibility as
the opening of lines will highlight the weakness of Black's back rank.

27...a5
Therefore Black strikes out.
28 b5 cxb5 29 axb5 \text{W}xb5 30 \text{d}d3
Now the bishop is forced to retreat but Black has a clear weakness on b7.
30...\text{w}e8 31 \text{e}xa5 \text{e}xa5 32 \text{e}xa5 \text{e}xa5 33 \text{w}xa5 e5
At last!
34 dxe5 fxe5
Black sets the trap 35 \text{xe}5? \text{c}6, winning a piece.
35 \text{g}3 \text{e}6
Through the thematic ...e5, Black has created a weakness on c5 at the cost of opening the position advantageously for the white bishops.
36 \text{b}5 \text{w}c8 37 \text{xe}5 \text{w}xe5 38 \text{w}a4
White has a clear advantage as in this type of position, bishops rule!
38...\text{c}7 39 \text{d}3 \text{d}6 40 \text{b}2 \text{w}b4 41 \text{d}7
Black's back-rank problems come back to haunt him.
41...\text{f}8 42 \text{e}5 \text{w}a3 43 \text{f}5 \text{d}a6 44 \text{w}e6 1-0

There's not much to be done about the threat of \text{w}xh6+.

Game 33
Birmakin – Meszaros
Szeged 1993

1 d4 d5 2 \text{f}3 c5
Black immediately strikes at the white centre; this is a very challenging move since Black attempts to play a Queen's Gambit with colours reversed.
3 dxc5 (D)

Taking up the challenge.
3...e6
3...\text{w}a5+ and 3...\text{f}6 are likely to transpose to Game 36, though in the latter case, White could consider 4 a3 – compare Queen's Gambit Accepted (QGA) lines.
4 c4 \text{xe}5
Having allowed Black's bishop to reach c5 in one move, White must be careful to avoid simply ending up in a theoretical line where Black is a useful tempo up.
4...dxc4 5 \( \text{W} \)xd8+ \( \text{Q} \)xd8 6 e4 leads to a small endgame advantage for White.

5 \text{cxd5}  

Playing by strict analogy with the QGA might suggest 5 e3 and a3, but in this reversed form, Black can be happier with simplifying lines than White is with the dxc5 lines in the regular QGA.

5...\text{exd5}  

5...\text{Qf6} is playable as 6 dxe6?? loses to 6...\text{Qxf2+}. As 6 \text{Qc3} exd5 7 e3 would lead to a continuation that White avoids in the game, we suggest 6 \text{Wc2}!?, with these options:

a) 6...\text{Wc7} 7 \text{Qc3} \text{Qxd5} 8 \text{Qd2} \text{Qxc3} 9 \text{Qxc3} 0-0 10 e3 \text{Qb4} 11 \text{Qc1} \text{Qxc3}+ 12 \text{Wxc3} \text{Wxc3}+ 13 \text{Qxc3} \text{Qc6} 14 \text{Qb5} \text{Qd7} 15 0-0 ± Summermatter-Flear, San Bernardino 1990.

b) 6...\text{Wb6} 7 e3 exd5 (7...\text{Qxd5} 8 a3 a5 9 e4 \text{Qf6} 10 \text{Qc3} \text{Qd7} 11 e5 ± Borges Mateos-Gonzalez Aguirre, Mislata 2001) 8 a3 0-0 9 b4 \text{Qe7} 10 \text{Qb2} \text{Qg4} 11 \text{Qbd2} \text{Qbd7} 12 \text{Qd4} \text{Wd6} 13 \text{Qd3} = Kurajica-Brkić, Solin 2007.

6 e3 \text{Qf6} 7 a3!?

This interesting attempt to get away from the trodden path is still lightly tested. The position after the more common 7 \text{Qc3} 0-0 8 \text{Qe2} \text{Qc6} 9 0-0 a6 has proven satisfactory for Black, although strong players still take the white pieces hoping to reach an advantageous endgame.

7...0-0  

7...a5 8 b3 leads to similar play but with White having control of b5. After 8...0-0 9 \text{Qb2} \text{Qc6} 10 \text{Qe2} \text{Wc7} 11 \text{Qc3} \text{Qg4} 12 \text{Qb5} \text{Qe4} 13 \text{Qfd4} \text{Qxd4} 14 \text{Qxd4} chances were roughly equal in Duriga-Harasta, Slovakian Team Ch 2000/1 but with Black’s isolated queen’s pawn (IQP) safely blockaded, White had every possibility to play for a win in the endgame.

8 b4 \text{Qd6} 9 \text{Qb2} \text{Qe8}  

9...a6 10 \text{Qe2} \text{Qc6} 11 0-0 \text{Qc7} 12 \text{Qbd2} essentially leads to the same kind of position: Black has the more active pieces but White can play for an endgame advantage. In Ezsol-Peter, Hungarian Team Ch 1996/7 White had somewhat the better chances after 12...\text{Wf7} 13 \text{Wb3} \text{Qd8} 14 \text{Qf1} \text{Qg4} 15 \text{Qad1} \text{Qb6} 16 \text{Qf1} \text{Qac8} 17 \text{Wd6} \text{Qa2} 18 \text{Wd6} 18 \text{We8} 19 \text{Qg3} \text{Qdd8} 20 \text{h3}.

10 \text{Qe2} a6 11 0-0 \text{Qc6} 12 \text{Qbd2} (D)

White has a firm grip on the blockading square d4 in this IQP position.

12...\text{Qc7} 13 \text{Wb3} \text{Wd6} 14 \text{Qfd1} \text{Qg4} 15 \text{Qf1}  

An unusual square for the knight in such positions. Normally you would want it on d4, but on f1 it is useful defensively as it guards both h2 and e3.
15...\texttt{ad}8 16 \texttt{ac}1 \texttt{de}4 17 a4 \texttt{b}6 17...\texttt{xb}4 18 \texttt{xc}7 \texttt{xc}7 19 \texttt{xb}4 ±

18 b5
Driving away the well-placed knight on c6.
18...\texttt{a}5 19 \texttt{a}2 \texttt{axb}5 20 \texttt{axb}5 (D)

With White’s kingside squares well defended and a clear plan of action – to blockade d4 and exchange pieces – White is slightly better.

20...\texttt{g}6?!  
This tactical oversight comes close to losing the game on the spot.
21 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{xe}5 22 \texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xf}2 23 \texttt{xg}4

Perhaps this is what Black missed: White keeps a material advantage and Black’s attack soon runs out of steam.
23...\texttt{xd}1 24 \texttt{xd}1 \texttt{g}5 25 \texttt{a}1 \texttt{xe}3+ 26 \texttt{xe}3 \texttt{xe}3+ 27 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{c}4 28 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{f}4+ 29 \texttt{f}3?!?
29...\texttt{g}1 looks preferable.
29...\texttt{xh}2?!
29...d4 is a better try.
30 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{h}6 31 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{g}6 32 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{f}6 33 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{h}6 34 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{f}5 35 \texttt{xd}5

\texttt{xd}5 36 \texttt{xc}4 \texttt{c}2+ 37 \texttt{g}1 \texttt{c}1+ 38 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{h}8 39 \texttt{xd}5 1-0

Game 34
Jobava – Zaragatski
Bad Zwesten 2005

1 d4 d5 2 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{c}6
Black indicates his willingness to play a Chigorin Defence.
3 \texttt{f}4 (D)

This move certainly has its logic. In the Chigorin Queen’s Gambit (1 d4 d5 2 c4 \texttt{c}6), Black seeks counterplay against the d4-pawn and often has the ...e5 thrust in mind. By avoiding the move c4 for the time being (though probably not for long!), White avoids any rapid counterplay against d4, and nailing down control of the e5-square also challenges Black to justify the move ...\texttt{c}6. If nothing special happens, the knight could end up demonstrating the classic reason why this move tended to be frowned upon: the c-pawn cannot be used in the fight for the centre.
3...\textit{g4}

This seems logical. That is not to say that it will be easy to get a large advantage against other sensible moves:

a) 3...\textit{f6} 4 e3 \textit{g4} 5 c4 e6 6 \textit{c3} \textit{b4} transposes to the main game after Black’s 6th move.

b) 3...\textit{f5} 4 e3 and now:

b1) 4...a6 5 c4 e6 6 \textit{c3} \textit{f6} 7 \textit{e5} \textit{xe5} 8 a4 \textit{e5} 9 \textit{c1} \textit{d7} 10 \textit{g3} b5 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 \textit{e2} \textit{e7} 13 0-0 0-0 14 a4 b4 15 \textit{b1} \textit{a7} 16 \textit{d2} \textit{b6} 17 \textit{c6} ± Sergeev-Potapov, Salekhard 2007.

b2) 4...e6 5 c4 \textit{f6} 6 \textit{c3} \textit{d6} 7 \textit{g5} \textit{e7} 8 \textit{c1} 0-0 0-0 9 a3 \textit{e4} 10 \textit{f4} a6 11 cxd5 exd5 12 \textit{e2} \textit{e6} 13 0-0 \textit{d6} 14 \textit{xd6} \textit{xd6} 15 \textit{xe4} dxe4 16 \textit{d2} f5 17 \textit{c2} \textit{ac8} 18 \textit{b3} \textit{e7} 19 \textit{c5} \textit{d5} 20 \textit{c4} is slightly better for White, Malakhatko-Meyssonnier, Bastia/Ajaccio rapid 2008.

4 e3 e6 5 c4 (D)
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5...\textit{b4}+

Or:

a) 5...\textit{f6} 6 \textit{c3} \textit{b4} (Black has achieved a strange type of Queen’s Gambit Declined with his normally passive queen’s bishop active but his queen’s knight misplaced in front of his c-pawn) 7 \textit{g5} (played to avoid any problems after ...\textit{dxc4} and ...\textit{d5})

7...\textit{dxc4} 8 \textit{xc4} h6 9 \textit{h4} 0-0 10 \textit{e2} (again White shows caution and guards against the possibility of ...\textit{e5})

10...\textit{e7} 11 0-0 \textit{d5} 12 \textit{g3} \textit{d6} 13 \textit{c1} (having completed his development, White begins to probe the drawbacks to Black’s game and targets the c-pawn) 13...\textit{xc3} (Black, for his part, seeks relief through exchanges) 14 \textit{hxg3} \textit{xc3} 15 \textit{xc3} \textit{e7} 16 \textit{wb3} \textit{wb8} 17 \textit{c4} (planning \textit{e5}) 17...\textit{xf3} 18 \textit{gxf3} c6 19 \textit{g2} \textit{d5} 20 \textit{c1} \textit{d8} 21 \textit{f4} and White, with bishop against knight and kingside attacking chances (with suitable preparation, White can pursue ideas of f5, \textit{h1} and g4-g5), was better in Garcia Ilundain-Narciso Dublan, Saragossa 1995.

b) 5...\textit{d6} 6 \textit{g3} with these options:

b1) 6...h5 7 \textit{c3} h4 8 \textit{xd6} \textit{xd6} 9 h3 \textit{xf3} 10 \textit{xf3} \textit{ge7} 11 0-0 0-0 15 \textit{b1} ± Shariyazdanov-B.Kovače-

b2) 6...\textit{g7} 7 \textit{c3} 0-0 8 \textit{c1} \textit{xc4} 9 \textit{xc4} e5 10 dxe5 \textit{xf3} 11 \textit{xf3} \textit{xe5} 12 0-0 \textit{xe3} 13 \textit{g3} \textit{wxg3} \textit{wd6} 14 \textit{xd6} cxd6 15 \textit{d1} ± Halkias-Kristjansson, Reykjavik 2008.

b3) 6...\textit{f6} 7 \textit{c3} 0-0 8 \textit{cxd5} \textit{cxd5} 8...\textit{xd5} 9 \textit{e2} \textit{xc3} 10 \textit{bxc3} 11 \textit{b6} 12 \textit{d2} \textit{xe2} 13 \textit{xe2} \textit{a5} 14 0-0 \textit{g3} 15 \textit{hxg3} \textit{e7} = S.Martinović-Degraeve, Sremic Krsko

10...\textit{e8} 10 0-0 0-0 11 \textit{h4} 12 \textit{b3} \textit{d6} 13 \textit{c1}
\[ \text{b6 14 \text{xb6 axb6 15 \text{cxb5 ± Martinović-D. Trifunović, Estensi 2001}}}
\text{10 \text{h4 e7 11 xe7 xe7 12 \text{c2 d6 13 d3 g6 14 e5 f5 15 xf5 dxf5 16 0-0-0 ± Polaninov-Sepman,}
St Petersburg 2002.}}
\]

6 c3 c6

6...\text{ge7} 7 c1 0-0 8 d3 dxc4 9
\text{hx7+ h8} 10 \text{b1 d5 11 g3 ce7 12 0-0 c6 13 wc2 f5 14 e4
g6 15 e5 h7 16 ecx4 df6 17 w3 was a lot better for White in Top-
alov-Rabiega, Frankfurt rapid 2000.}
The game ended 17...a5 18 a3 xxc3 19 bxc3 ce4 20 xe4 xxe4 21 d6 g6 22 \text{xb7 bb8 23 xf7+ 1-0.}

7 \text{c1}

7 h3 xf3 8 \text{xf3 also seems promising; e.g., 8...e4 9 cc1 ce7 10 cxd5
exd5 11 wc1 0-0 12 ce2 d8 13 0-0 xxc3 14 bxc3 de6 15 h2 with an advantage to White.}
Ki.Georgiev-Pirrot, Bad Wörishofen 2002 concluded 15...\text{fd8 16 c4 c6 17 wc2 df8 18
d3 ef6 19 fe1 gg6 20 a4 xc4 21
xc4 dc5 22 a5 a6 23 bb1 1-0.}

7...0-0 8 \text{g5 (D)}

It’s possible that 8 h3 xf3 9 \text{xf3 ce7 10 g5 is more precise, if for
no other reason than it was played in the high-powered encounter Kram-
nik-Ivanchuk, Linares 1998, which
continued 10...xxc3+ 11 xxc3 xb4 12 xf6 wb2 13 bb3 ce1+ 14 xd1
xd1+ 15 xd1 dc4 16 xb7 dx6 17 d2 with White having the more
comfortable position.

8...dxc4

Alternatives include:

a) 8...e5 9 a3 ce7 (9...exd4 10
axb4 dxc3 sets Black’s development
advantage against White’s bishop-pair) 10 xf6 xf6 11 dxe5 xe5 12
cxd5 c6 13 xxe2 cxd5 14 0-0 xf3 15
xf3 d4 16 exd4 xf3+ 17 xf3
xd4 18 fd1 ± E.Agdestein-Bae, Oslo 2007.

b) 8...h6 9 xf6 xf6 10 cxd5
exd5 11 xxe2 we6 12 0-0 fd8 13
b3 ff8 14 aa4 da5 15 wc3 b6 and
in P.Cramling-Yeo, Campillos 2004
chances were equal as 16 wc7 d6
17 wc3 ac8 would have given Black
dangerous piece activity.

9 \text{xc4 c5?}

Black probably should have inserted
9...h6 10 h4, eliminating some of the
tactical possibilities we shall see
later in this game.

10 d5 da5

The knight will prove very exposed here.

11 dd3 c6?

Despite appearances, 11...xd5 is possible, since 12 xf6 is met by
d7...e4!. The position is messy, but
White can keep an edge by 13 wa4
xc3+ 14 wc3.

12 wa4
White takes advantage of Black’s loose pieces.

12...c5

This loses more or less by force but there is no really acceptable solution:

a) 12...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{xf3}}}\) 13 \(\text{\texttt{xb4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) 14 \(\text{\texttt{wh4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) 15 \(\text{\texttt{xg6}}\) fxg6 16 b4 should be winning for White.

b) 12...\(\text{\texttt{xc3}}\) + 13 \(\text{\texttt{xc3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h5}}\) 14 \(\text{\texttt{xf6}}\) gxf6 15 d6 is extremely difficult for Black. A couple of sample variations illustrate his difficulties: 15...b6 16 \(\text{\texttt{xe7}}}+\) \(\text{\texttt{eh7}}\) 17 \(\text{\texttt{wh4}}\) ±; 15...\(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) 16 \(\text{\texttt{h4}}\) b5 17 \(\text{\texttt{b4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b6}}\) 18 \(\text{\texttt{g4}}\) c5 19 \(\text{\texttt{xe6}}\) fxg6 20 \(\text{\texttt{xg6}}\) hxg6 21 \(\text{\texttt{wh6+c8}}\) 22 e4 with mate to follow.

13 0-0

A more forcing path to victory is 13 \(\text{\texttt{xe5!}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xd5}}\) 14 \(\text{\texttt{xb4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe5}}\) (or 14...\(\text{\texttt{g2}}\) 15 \(\text{\texttt{f4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{wh1+}}\) 16 \(\text{\texttt{d2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{g2}}\) 17 \(\text{\texttt{xf6}}\) gxf6 18 \(\text{\texttt{xe4}}\) +–) 15 \(\text{\texttt{xf6}}\) cxb4 16 \(\text{\texttt{xe5}}\) bxc3 17 \(\text{\texttt{xc3}}\) and White’s healthy extra pawn proves decisive.

13...\(\text{\texttt{xf3}}\) 14 gxf3 a6 15 \(\text{\texttt{b1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xc3}}\)

An oversight, but Black’s position was beyond repair. A typical line is 16...b6 17 \(\text{\texttt{wh4}}\) h6? 18 \(\text{\texttt{xe6}}\) gxh6 19 \(\text{\texttt{wh6+}}\).

17 \(\text{\texttt{xf6}}\) gxf6 18 \(\text{\texttt{c2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 19 \(\text{\texttt{wh7+}}\)

The rest is simple.

19...\(\text{\texttt{f8}}\) 20 \(\text{\texttt{d1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) 21 b4 \(\text{\texttt{c6}}\) 22 \(\text{\texttt{xc4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e7}}\) 23 \(\text{\texttt{f1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\) 24 \(\text{\texttt{c2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xb4}}\) 25 \(\text{\texttt{b3}}\) a5 26 a3 b5 27 \(\text{\texttt{cc1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{a6}}\) 28 \(\text{\texttt{c6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d7}}\) 29 \(\text{\texttt{xb5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b8}}\) 31 \(\text{\texttt{c5+}}\) 1-0

Black’s Alternatives on Moves 3 and 4

Game 35
Vitor – Fancsy
Matinhos 1994

1 d4 d5 2 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{f3}}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f6}}\) 3 e3 c5 4 dxc5 e6
Black tries to be solid.

Black has two alternatives, against which White has interesting ways to pose unusual problems:

a) 4...\(\text{\texttt{a5+}}\) – Game 36.

b) 4...\(\text{\texttt{c6}}\) (more aggressive – Black prepares ...e5; however, this move allows White to borrow ideas from another unusual defence) 5 c3 e6 (5...a5 6 \(\text{\texttt{b5}}\) e6 7 b4 transposes; or 5...e5 leads to similar positions to that of 5...e6 but with the e-pawn more vulnerable) 6 b4 a5 7 \(\text{\texttt{b5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d7}}\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{b2}}\) axb4 9 \(\text{\texttt{xc6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xc6}}\) 10 cxb4 b6 11 a4 bxc5 12 b5 (\(\text{\texttt{D}}\)).

This position is a reversed Noteboom/Abrahams. White’s extra tempo again means he has a good chance of an advantage. The strategic factors are very similar to those discussed in our
previous variation, i.e. play for piece exchanges, look for opportunities to advance the queenside pawns and, perhaps most importantly, meet ...e5 by e4. Play could continue 12...♗b7 13 ♗bd2 ♗d6 14 0-0 0-0 15 ♗c2 ♗e8 16 ♗fe1 (16 ♗e5 ♗d7 17 ♗xd7 ♗xd7 18 ♗fb1 ♗c7 was unclear in Drogou-Geffroy, Issy les Moulineaux 2003) 16...e5 17 e4 dxe4 (17...d4 18 ♗c4) 18 ♗g5 with a good position for White.

5 b4 (D)

This is White’s key idea: he hopes to create two queenside passed pawns.

5...a5 6 c3

The idea for this variation came from one of Black’s more ambitious defences to the Queen’s Gambit: after 1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 ♗f3 dxc4 4 e3 b5 5 a4 e6 we get a similar position with colours reversed. I believe the extra tempo gives White good chances for the advantage and certainly will throw Black upon his own resources.

6...axb4

6...b6 may be a more challenging test:

a) 7 a4 bxc5 8 b5 ♗d6 9 c4 0-0 10 ♗b2 ♗bd7 11 ♗bd2 ♗b7 12 ♗d3 ♗e7 13 ♗c2 ♗fe8 14 e4 d4 = Summerscale-Plaskett, Edinburgh 1999.

b) 7 ♗b5+ ♗d7 8 ♗xd7+ ♗xd7 9 e4?! dxe4 10 ♗g5 (White’s approach here is certainly bold, but also a little reckless; now 10...axb4 would have left White material down for compensation that is none too clear) 10...bxc5? and in An.Rodriguez-Panno, Villa Martelli 2008, rather than 11 0-0?!, White should have tried 11 b5; e.g., 11...♗e7 (11...c4 12 ♗d4) 12 ♗xe4 with an unbalanced position where White probably is a bit better.

7 cxb4 b6 8 ♗b5+ ♗d7

Obviously not 8...♗bd7? 9 c6 and White is winning.

9 ♗xd7+ ♗xd7 10 a4 bxc5 11 b5 (D)

This is what White is aiming for out of the opening: a completely unbalanced pawn-structure where the player who understands the position better will triumph. The key points to remember are that ...e5 must be met by e4 and piece exchanges will generally
favour White, as his outside passed pawns gain the power the closer an endgame approaches. Of course, if Black is generous enough to allow the pawns to advance free of charge, then you should be his guest.

After 15...d4, Black’s pawns are more easily blockaded and therefore much less of a menace.

16 $\text{c4xe4}$ $\text{dxe4}$ 17 $\text{c2d2}$ $\text{e3}$
17...f5 18 $\text{c4}$ is no improvement.

18 $\text{f3xe3}$ $\text{h4}$ 19 $\text{e4}$ $\text{f6}$ 20 $\text{e2}$ $\text{fd8}$ 21 $\text{c3}$ $\text{(D)}$

White prepares the advance of his a-pawn.

21 $\text{g4}$ 22 $\text{f3}$ $\text{h5}$ 23 $\text{h3}$ $\text{f6}$
Black has been unable to create any real problems on the kingside and White is now ready to press through his queenside pawns.

24 $\text{a5}$ $\text{g6}$ 25 $\text{b6}$ $\text{b8}$ 26 $\text{f1}$ $\text{h5}$ 27 $\text{xe5}$ $\text{g5}$ 28 $\text{g4}$ 1-0

With his kingside initiative totally neutralized, Black called it a day.

Game 36
Behrmann – Anhalt
Germany tt 1989/90

1 $\text{d4}$ $\text{d5}$ 2 $\text{f3}$ $\text{f6}$ 3 $\text{e3}$ $\text{c5}$ 4 $\text{dxc5}$ $\text{a5+}$ $\text{(D)}$
Black’s alternatives were discussed in the previous game.
5 \( \text{Qd2} \text{ Wxc5} \)

Or:

a) 5...e6 6 a3 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 7 \( \text{Qe2} \) 0-0 8 0-0 \( \text{Wc7} \) 9 c4 a5 10 b3 e5 11 \( \text{Qb2} \) c4 12 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{We5} \) 13 cxd5 \( \text{Wg5} \) 14 \( \text{Qh1} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 15 \( \text{Qc1} \) ± P.Nikolić-Sermek, Pertools 1993.

b) The main alternative is 5...\( \text{Qc6} \) 6 a3 \( \text{Qg4} \) (Black decides upon classical development; 6...e6 7 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Wxc5} \) 8 b4 \( \text{Wb6} \) 9 c4 \( \text{Qe7} \) 10 \( \text{Qb2} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{Qc2} \) a6 12 0-0 \( \text{Qd8} \) 13 \( \text{Qb3} \) was also better for White in Chepuakaitis-Bukal, Bad Zwischenahn 2003) 7 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qxc5} \) 8 b4 \( \text{Wb6} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{Qd8} \) 10 \( \text{Qb2} \) (White's play is very unpretentious – he simply completes development before undertaking active operations) 10...e6 11 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qxe2} \) 12 \( \text{Wxe2} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 13 \( \text{Qc4} \) (this is a key part of White’s armoury and already creates problems for Black due to the threat of \( \text{Qc5} \)?) (Black has to be careful; he is also losing after 13...0-0? 14 c5 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxe6} \) bx6 c6 16 \( \text{Qxf6} \) gxf6 17 hx5 –, but a better option is 13...dxc4 14 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 15 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Wxd6} \), even though White is better, as the opening of the position favours his bishop and better-developed pieces) 14 cxd5? (14 c5 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 15 \( \text{Wb5} \) \( \text{Wxb5} \) 16 \( \text{Qxb5} \) wins a piece) 14...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 15 f4 \( \text{Qg6} \) 16 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Wc6} \) 17 f5 (Black is being driven back on both sides of the board) 17...\( \text{Qe5} \) 18 b5 \( \text{Wa5} \) 19 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) 20 \( \text{Qxe6}! \) (decisive) 20...\( \text{Qc4} \) 20...\( \text{Qxe6} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe6} \) ++) 21 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 22 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 23 f6 \( \text{Qxe3} \) 24 \( \text{Qxe3} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 25 \( \text{Qae1} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 26 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{Qxg7} \) 27 \( \text{Qxd6} \) 1-0 Guimard-Wade, Barcelona 1946.

6 a3 \( \text{g6} \) 7 b4 \( \text{Qc3} \)

Black has also tried:

a) 7...\( \text{Wc7} \) 8 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 9 c4 \( \text{dxc4} \) 10 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 11 \( \text{Qc1} \) a6 12 \( \text{Qb3} \) 0-0 13 0-0 ± Djagnidze-Gallanova, European Clubs Cup (women), Rethymnon 2003.

b) 7...\( \text{Wd6} \) 8 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 9 \( \text{Qb5} \) 10 \( \text{Qd3} \) a4 11 \( \text{Wc2} \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \text{Qbd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qac8} \) 14 \( \text{Qac1} \) ± Harmatosi-Kolbus, Budapest 2005.

8 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{g7} \)

8...\( \text{Qf5} \) is best met with 9 \( \text{Qb2}! \).

9 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 10 c4 \( \text{dxc4} \)

Or 10...0-0 11 \( \text{Qc1} \) a5 12 cxd5 \( \text{Wd8} \) 13 \( \text{Wb3} \) axb4 14 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Wxd5} \) 15 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Wd8} \) 16 0-0 \( \text{Qbd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qg5} \) ± V.Kovačević-Abramović, Zenica 1986.

11 \( \text{Qxc4} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{Qc1} \)

White has a very active position and Black has had to lose a lot of time with his queen.

12...\( \text{Qd8} \)

After 12...\( \text{Wb6} \) 13 \( \text{Wb3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 14 0-0 \( \text{Qe8} \) 15 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qxg7} \), as in Breivik-En.Rodriguez, Linares 2005, White could have ensured a very clear advantage with 16 \( \text{Qg5} \).

13 \( \text{Wb3} \) e6
13...a6 14 ¤e5 e6 15 0-0 b5 16 
æd3 øb7 17 ¤d7 øbd7 and now 18 
êtfd1 was a bit better for White in 
Kononov-Bochko, Kostroma 2008 but 18 
êtc6 appears even stronger. 
14 0-0 øbd7 15 øfd1 (D) 

White has a large lead in develop-
ment and the main problem is break-
through the black defences. 
15...êe7 16 êc2 øb6 17 øb3 
ød7 18 ød4 õfe8 19 õb2 øc6 20 
êtc2 

White prepares to take control of the 
c-file. 
20...ød5 21 êd1 øxc2 22 êxc2 
øxb3 23 øxb3 øbd5 24 øa5 h6 25 
êtc1 b6 26 øc6 õe8 

Now Black is relying on a tactical se-
quence for his survival. After 26...êd6 
his position may still be tenable by 
normal means. 
27 øxa7 õa4 28 êc8+ õxc8 29 
õxc8 b5?

Black is seeking to make it as hard 
as possible for White to realize his ex-
tra pawn, but this move is inadequate. 
He had to try 29...êe4! 30 øxb6 
øxb6 31 øxb6 øb2, exploiting White’s 
back rank to target the a- and b-pawns. 
30 øb6 

White seeks piece exchanges to 
clarify the position. 
30...ñxb6 31 ñxb6 ñd5 32 ñd4 
ñb3 33 ñg7 ñg7 34 ñd4 ñd3 35 
h3 ñc3?

The final mistake. 35...e5 would 
still keep Black in the game, at least 
temporarily. 
36 õf1 õd2 

The pure knight endgame is lost, so 
Black has to lose a second pawn. 
37 ñxb5 õe2+ 38 õh2 õc1 39 
ñd4 õd3 40 õg1 e5 41 õf3 õc3 42 
ñb1 e4 43 õd4 õxa3 44 b5 

This extra pawn decides the game 
in short order. 
44...ña5 45 b6 õd2 46 b7 õxf2+ 
47 õh2 õe1 48 õxe4 1-0 

Game 37
Kosashvili – Peker
Kfar Saba 1993

1 1 d4 d5 2 õf3 õf6 3 e3 g6 
3...êbd7 4 õd3 c5 5 b3 õf7 6 õb2 
puts paid to any ideas of an early ...e5. 
4 b3 

The 3...g6 system is a tough nut to 
crack and I feel the best approach is to 
carry on playing in the Colle-Zukertort 
style. 

However, 4 c4!?, seeking a Grün-
feld where White benefits from not yet 
having played õc3, leads to relatively 
unexplored positions where White can 
realistically fight for an advantage. 
However, after 4...ãg7 (4...c6 is also 
possible, with the solid but passive
Schlechter Slav) 5 cxd5, Black does not have to go in for 5...\(\text{\&}xd5\) 6 e4 \(\text{\&}b6\) 7 h3!?, but can try to extract a slow move from White by playing 5...0-0! Then 6 \(\text{\&}e2\) (probably the most useful move which makes sure that Black's knight will have no target when it captures on d5) 6...\(\text{\&}xd5\) 7 e4 \(\text{\&}b6\) 8 \(\text{\&}c3\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 9 \(\text{\&}e3\) leads to a position that is quite well known from the 4 cxd5 \(\text{\&}xd5\) 5 \(\text{\&}d2\) line of the Grünfeld, and generally considered playable for both sides, but not easy to handle if you arrive in it by surprise. Also, let's not forget that even 6 \(\text{\&}c3\) \(\text{\&}xd5\) is a slow form of Exchange Grünfeld that certainly has its drop of poison, and is not overlaid with sharp theory. Anyway, this is a way to force Black to rely on his own resources from an early stage of the game.

6 \(\text{\&}e2\)

White's main decision is where to post his light-squared bishop. The other possibility is to put it on d3 via 6 \(\text{\&}bd2\) b6 7 \(\text{\&}d3\). However, this has two drawbacks. Firstly, the bishop bites on granite as Black's kingside fianchetto blunts its power; secondly, in some lines when Black plays ...c5 it may be useful to defend d4 with the queen or rook – then the bishop on d3 will get in the way. On the plus side, White's set-up makes it harder for Black to move his knight to e4. 7...\(\text{\&}a6\) 8 c4 (White is keen to keep his light-squared bishop; this move is also part of White's plan to attack Black's centre) 8...e6 9 0-0 \(\text{\&}bd7\) 10 \(\text{\&}e2\) (White is ready to break in the centre with e4, so Black counterattacks) 10...c5 11 \(\text{\&}e5\) (if you have studied carefully the chapter on the Colle-Zukertort, then you will be familiar with this move) 11...\(\text{\&}xe5\) 12 dxe5 \(\text{\&}d7\) 13 f4 (White's attack is not as powerful as usual because Black already has a good defensive position on the kingside; on the other hand the g7-bishop is obstructed by White's pawn-chain and Black even suffers from some dark-square weaknesses) 13...\(\text{\&}b7\) 14 cxd5 exd5 15 e4 \(\text{\&}e7\) (Black could pass with 15...d4 but after 16 \(\text{\&}c4\) the d6-square beckons) 16 exd5 \(\text{\&}xd5\) 17 \(\text{\&}ae1\) \(\text{\&}fe8\) 18 \(\text{\&}e4\) (with an eye on d6 and f6) 18...\(\text{\&}xe4\) (Black decides he cannot tolerate the knight, but giving up the bishop-pair is never an easy option) 19 \(\text{\&}xe4\) a6 20 a4 \(\text{\&}h8\) 21 \(\text{\&}c4\) and White was better in Remling-Wapner, Budapest 1994.

(Please note that for the sake of convenience I have adjusted the move-order of the opening of this game, which actually went 1 d4 \(\text{\&}f6\) 2 \(\text{\&}f3\) g6 3 b3 \(\text{\&}g7\) 4 \(\text{\&}b2\) 0-0 5 e3 d5.)
defending his e-pawn) 12...\texttt{\textit{e}e8} 13 \texttt{\textit{d}e5} (White immediately takes advantage of the pin) 13...\texttt{\textit{d}d7} 14 \texttt{\textit{f}d3} \texttt{\textit{d}xe5} 15 \texttt{\textit{x}e5} \texttt{\textit{d}d6} 16 a4 White enjoyed a definite initiative in Van Riemsdijk-Kawano, São Paulo 1995.

8 c4 dxc4

Or:

a) 8...\texttt{\textit{c}c6} 9 \texttt{\textit{c}c3} \texttt{\textit{x}c3} 10 \texttt{\textit{x}c3} dxc4 11 bxc4 \texttt{\textit{g}g4} 12 \texttt{\textit{b}b1} \texttt{\textit{c}c7} 13 \texttt{\textit{c}c1} \texttt{\textit{xf}3} 14 \texttt{\textit{xf}3} cxd4 15 exd4 \texttt{\textit{f}d8} 16 d5 = Limp-Leitão, São Paulo 1998.

b) After 8...\texttt{\textit{g}g4} 9 \texttt{\textit{bd}2} e6 10 h3 \texttt{\textit{x}f3} 11 \texttt{\textit{x}f3} f5, as in Iliushkin-Purygin, Samara 2007, 12 cxd5 exd5 13 \texttt{\textit{a}a3}! looks critical.

9 bxc4 \texttt{\textit{c}c6} 10 \texttt{\textit{a}a3}

An unusual development of White's knight, but, with hanging pawns likely, White tries to avoid piece exchanges. A more recent try is 10 \texttt{\textit{d}d3} \texttt{\textit{f}5} 11 g4?! \texttt{\textit{b}b6} (11...cxd4 12 gxf5 dxe3 13 \texttt{\textit{x}g7} \texttt{\textit{x}f3} 14 \texttt{\textit{xf}2} exf2+ 15 \texttt{\textit{x}f2} \texttt{\textit{x}g7} is unclear) 12 \texttt{\textit{c}c1} cxd4?! 13 gxf5 dxe3?! 14 \texttt{\textit{x}e3} \texttt{\textit{d}d8} 15 \texttt{\textit{x}e4} \texttt{\textit{x}al} 16 \texttt{\textit{bd}2} \texttt{\textit{g}7} 17 fxg6 hxg6 18 \texttt{\textit{g}5} \texttt{\textit{f}6} 19 \texttt{\textit{g}4} = Deriabin-Kurinoi, Alushta 2002.

10...b6 11 h3 cxd4 12 exd4 \texttt{\textit{b}b7} 13 \texttt{\textit{c}c2} \texttt{\textit{c}c8} 14 \texttt{\textit{e}e3}

The white knight is very well placed here as it exerts influence over both the centre and kingside as well as defending c4.

14...\texttt{\textit{a}a5} 15 \texttt{\textit{c}c1} \texttt{\textit{c}c7} 16 \texttt{\textit{a}a4} \texttt{\textit{a}a8} 17 \texttt{\textit{a}a3} \texttt{\textit{f}c8} 18 d5

The aim of this thematic thrust is to remove a key defender of the black king and blunt the power of the queen and remaining bishop.
18...\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Xxb2}} 19 \textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Wxb2 \texttt{\textbackslash Dd6}}} }}
Black increases the pressure on the critical c4-square.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Wd4 \texttt{\textbackslash Aa6}} 21 \texttt{\textbackslash Dd2}}} 
Fully securing the c4-point.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Ab7}}} 
Black threatens ...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Bb5}}.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Bb1 \texttt{\textbackslash Cc5}} 23 \texttt{\textbackslash Hh4}}} 
With the queenside covered for the moment, White logically takes action on the kingside.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Dd7}} 24 \texttt{\textbackslash Hh5 \texttt{\textbackslash F6}} 25 \texttt{\textbackslash F4}} 
Otherwise ...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Dd5}} will be annoying.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Ae5}} 26 \texttt{\textbackslash Hxg6 \texttt{\textbackslash Hxg6}} 27 \texttt{\textbackslash Dd3}} 
The black king begins to feel the heat.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Ff7}} 28 \texttt{\textbackslash Ff3 \texttt{\textbackslash Hh8}} 29 \texttt{\textbackslash Gg4 \texttt{\textbackslash Hh4}} 30 \texttt{\textbackslash Ee3 \texttt{\textbackslash Ff8}} 31 \texttt{\textbackslash Ee5+! (D)}}

This knight offer begins the final assault on the black monarch.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Gg7}}} 
The knight can’t be taken: 31...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Xxe5}} 32 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Xxe5+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df5}} 33 \texttt{\textbackslash Xxf5} \texttt{\textbackslash Gxf5}} 34 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Dxe5+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df6}} 35 \texttt{\textbackslash Dxe5+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df7}} 36 \texttt{\textbackslash Dxe5+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df6}} 37 \texttt{\textbackslash Dxe5+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df6}} 38 \texttt{\textbackslash Dxe5+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df6}}}
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Xg6 \texttt{\textbackslash Xg6}} 33 \texttt{\textbackslash Gg3 \texttt{\textbackslash Hh6}} 34 \texttt{\textbackslash Wxe7+ \texttt{\textbackslash Df7}} 35 \texttt{\textbackslash Ee4}}} 

The black position is in tatters as White’s pieces come crashing through.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Wd8}} 36 \texttt{\textbackslash Wxd8 \texttt{\textbackslash Xxd8}} 37 \texttt{\textbackslash Dxc5 \texttt{\textbackslash Bxc5}} 38 \texttt{\textbackslash F5 1-0}} 
White’s material advantage will soon be overwhelming.

\textbf{Game 38} 
\textbf{Summerscale – A. Marić} 
\textit{Oakham Junior 1990}

\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Df3}} d5 2 \texttt{\textbackslash Dd4 \texttt{\textbackslash Df6}} 3 \texttt{\textbackslash Dg4}} 
This is a more justified approach than 2...\texttt{\textbackslash Dg4}, as at least the white knight is pinned.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Cc4}}} 
As usual, White strikes back on the queenside.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash De6}}} 
4...\texttt{\textbackslash Dxc4} and other plausible moves are considered in our next game.
\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash Wb3 (D)}}}

5 \texttt{\textbackslash Wc8} 
Black could consider 5...\texttt{\textbackslash Dxf3} (we see more of this theme in the next game), but this allows White the additional possibility 6 \texttt{\textbackslash Wxb7+!} (White
could of course simply recapture on f3 – compare lines given in the next game – but the move played is far more ambitious) 6...\( \text{d}_b7 7 \text{gxf3} \text{h}_8 (7...c_5 8 \text{c}_c3 \text{cxd4} 9 \text{exd4} \text{dxc4} 10 \text{\textit{x}xc4} \text{e}_7 11 \text{g}_1 0-0 12 \text{h}_6 \text{e}_8 13 \text{w}_e4 \text{h}_8 14 \text{e}_3 \text{d}_f6 15 \text{d}_d3 \pm \text{Adly-Ashton, Port Erin 2005}) 8 \text{w}_a7 \text{b}_4+ 9 \text{c}_c3 0-0 10 \text{w}_a4 (the queen makes a dash for it with her booty) 10...c_5 11 \text{dxc5} \text{x}xc5 12 \text{w}_c2 (Black has a large lead in development but greedy players will like White’s position, and the onus is certainly on Black to prove he has compensation for the two-pawn deficit) 12...\text{dxc4} 13 \text{\textit{x}xc4} \text{d}_d5 14 \text{d}_d2 \text{w}_f6 15 \text{e}_2 \text{f}_d8 (Black is now fully mobilized but White’s position is quite resilient) 16 0-0 (bravely putting his head in the lion’s mouth; the question is, does Black have a big enough bite?) 16...\text{w}h4 17 \text{f}_d1 (good defence: White provides an escape-route for the king, should it become necessary) 17...\text{a}_5 (the problem for Black is he doesn’t have any support for his lone attacker on the kingside and this move aims to remedy that situation; however, there is a tactical problem) 18 \text{d}_d5! (this looks risky, as it allows the black rook to enter the fray, but White has it all worked out) 18...\text{d}_d5 19 \text{\textit{x}xa5} \text{g}_5+ 20 \text{h}_1 \text{h}_5 (20...\text{w}x_f2 21 \text{g}_1 defends) 21 \text{c}_7! (the key move to allow White to escape mate) 21...e_5 22 \text{x}_e5 (another one bites the dust!) 22...\text{\textit{x}xe5} 23 \text{f}_4 \text{e}_6 24 \text{d}_c4 \text{h}_6 25 \text{f}_3. The white queen is brought into the defence and with her introduction the black attack falters. White’s large material advantage was eventually too much for Black in Iglesias-Perez, Havana 1970.

6 \text{\textit{c}c3} (D)

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess-board.png}
\end{center}

6...c_6

Again the capture on f3 is a possibility but only has independent value if Black chooses to castle queenside, viz. 6...\text{xf3} 7 \text{gxf3} \text{dxc4} 8 \text{\textit{xc}c4} \text{d}_d7 9 \text{e}_4 (White pursues a policy of central expansion rather than weakening Black first with an early \text{f}_4-f_5) 9...\text{b}_6 10 \text{e}_2 \text{w}_d7 11 \text{e}_3 0-0-0. Although it may seem that the white king has nowhere safe to go, the same could be said of Black; if Black castles kingside his king will be subjected to an attack on the g-file with the white f- and h-pawns being used as batteringrams, while on the queenside the half-open c-file is a cause for concern. Meanwhile, White’s central space advantage goes some way towards protecting his own king and gives White the manoeuvrability to attack on either wing. 12 \text{b}_5 \text{b}_8 13 a_4 (the a-pawn is a useful part of the attacking process since if Black decides to kick White’s
knight with ...a6 at some stage, White can seriously consider just leaving his knight there in order to open the a-file against the black king) 13...\(\text{Qc8}\) 14 0-0 \(\text{Qe7}\) 15 \(\text{Qfc1}\) (more and more pressure is brought to bear against Black’s queenside; moreover, Black lacks space and as a result lacks a good way to prevent \(\text{Qxc7}\)) 15...c6 16 \(\text{Qf4+}\) (winning a piece) 16...\(\text{Qd6}\) 17 \(\text{Qxd6+}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\) 18 \(\text{Qxd6}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\) 19 e5 \(\text{Qxd4}\) (19...\(\text{Qd5}\) 20 \(\text{Qc4}\)) 20 exf6 \(\text{Qxf6}\) 21 \(\text{Qd1}\) with a decisive material advantage for White, Green-Rex, Man vs Machine 1991.

7 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qbd7}\) 8 \(\text{Qc1}\) \(\text{Qb8}\)

Or:

a) 8...\(\text{Qd6}\) hasn’t been tried since it was mishandled more than a century ago. 9 cxd5 exd5 10 \(\text{Qb5!}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 11 \(\text{Qb4}\) is probably a key line.

b) 8...\(\text{Qe7}\) 9 \(\text{Qd3}\) 0-0 seems very sensible. After 10 cxd5 exd5 11 0-0 \(\text{Qxf3}\) 12 \(\text{Qxh3}\) chances are roughly balanced in an interesting position.

9 \(\text{Qh3}\) \(\text{Qh5}\)

As we have seen, exchanging on f3 is no picnic for Black, so instead she retreats, hoping for a solid game.

10 \(\text{g4}\)

Not a chance! I played this game when I was still young and fearless.

10...\(\text{Qg6}\) 11 \(\text{Qh4}\) (D)

This move forms an important part of White’s strategy, as it bags the bishop-pair, thus compensating for his weakened kingside.

11...\(\text{Qe7}\) 12 \(\text{Qxg6}\) \(\text{hxg6}\) 13 \(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qb6}\) 14 cxd5 exd5 15 \(\text{Qa4}\) \(\text{Qxa4}\)

Or 15...\(\text{Qc4}\) 16 \(\text{Qb4}\).

16 \(\text{Qxa4}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{b4}\) a6 18 \(\text{Qc2}\)

18 \(\text{Qb3}\) is perhaps more accurate, but I wanted to keep an eye on the possibility of ...\(\text{Qe4}\).

18...\(\text{Qe8}\) 19 a4 \(\text{Qd6}\) 20 \(\text{Qb1}\)

A case of too many queen moves; it would be better to castle and prepare a b5 break.

20...\(\text{Qd8}\) 21 b5 cxb5 22 axb5 \(\text{Qe4}\)

23 \(\text{Qb4}\) \(\text{Qb6}\) 24 0-0

24 bxa6 \(\text{Qxa6}\) would have left my king in trouble, another reason why I should have castled earlier.

24...a5?!

24...\(\text{Qxb5}\) is the acid test. In the cold light of day I have to admit White has insufficient compensation for the pawn.

25 \(\text{Qa2}\) \(\text{Qe6}\) ?!

Black was clearly worried about the pressure on the a- and b-files following a capture on b5 and all I can say is it was a real stroke of luck! Bluff is an essential part of any killer’s repertoire.

26 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qb6}\) 27 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 28 \(\text{Qfc1}\)

f5 29 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Qh7}\)

It is clearly too risky to take on b5 now.
30 \( \text{wb3} \) \( \text{wf7} \) 31 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 32 \( \text{f2} \) \\
\( \text{ad8} \) 33 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f4!} \) \\
An excellent move, detonating my centre and offering Black attacking chances on the kingside. I must admit I began to feel I was being outplayed around here and decided to try to knuckle down to make things as difficult as possible for my higher-rated opponent.

34 \( \text{exf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 35 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 36 \( \text{e2} \) \\
\( \text{c7} \) 37 \( \text{h4} \) \\
Seeking to make the most of my chances on the kingside.

37...\( \text{e6} \) 38 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{de8} \) 39 \( \text{hxg6+} \) \\
\( \text{g8?} \) \( (D) \) \\
39...\( \text{xg6} \), in spite of the self-pin, leaves Black with a good grip on the position.

This is far too optimistic. Black would still be doing well after the prudent 41...\( \text{xf5} \) 42 \( \text{gxf5} \) \( \text{f6} \).

42 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 43 \( \text{f7+} \) \\
Probably the move Black missed.

43...\( \text{h8} \) 44 \( \text{exe6} \) \( (D) \)

This back-rank tactic must have been terribly embarrassing for my opponent, who had outplayed me for much of the game.

44...\( \text{d1+} \) 45 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{exe1+} \) 46 \( \text{exe1} \) \\
\( \text{exel+} \) 47 \( \text{exe1} \) \( \text{b4} \) 48 \( \text{d2} \) a4 49 \\
\( \text{c2} \) 1-0

Game 39

Hebden – Matulović

Vrnjačka Banja 1991

1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 2 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 3 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 4 \( \text{c4} \) \\
\( (D) \) \\
4...\( \text{dxc4} \) \\
This takes us into a line of the Queen’s Gambit Accepted that has recently returned to the limelight, with Tkachev as the top advocate. The game’s actual move-order was 1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 2 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g4} \).
Other moves:

a) 4...\(\text{Nxf3}\) (White should never fear this capture as the resulting positions are dynamically rich) 5 \(\text{gx}f3\)? (perhaps surprising, but White has plans for his queen on the queenside) 5...\(\text{c6}\) 6 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{e6}\) 7 \(\text{Wb}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\) (7...\(\text{Wc}8\) is similar, while 7...\(\text{Wb}6\) transposes to line 'b21') is line 'b1' below.

b) 4...\(\text{c6}\) is a solid option, and transposes to a line of the Slav (1 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{d5}\) 2 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{c6}\) 3 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 4 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{g4}\)). A thematic move is 5 \(\text{Wb}3\), when Black has tried:

b1) After 5...\(\text{Nxf3}\) 6 \(\text{gx}f3\) White's bishop-pair and big centre give him the better chances; e.g., 6...\(\text{Wc}7\) 7 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{e6}\) 8 \(\text{Qd}2\) and now:

b11) 8...\(\text{Qbd}7\) 9 \(\text{f4}\) (it is important for White to put the brakes on \(...\text{e5}\)) 9...\(\text{dxc4}\) 10 \(\text{Nxc4}\) \(\text{Qb}6\) (10...\(\text{c5}\) 11 \(\text{d5}\) favours White) 11 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\text{Qbd}5\) 12 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 13 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Wb}6\) 14 \(\text{Wc}2\) \(\text{Wd}8\) (this is a bit uninspired; Black should simply bite the bullet and castle) 15 \(\text{f5}\) (played to weaken Black's grip in the centre) 15...\(\text{exf}5\) 16 \(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{g6}\) 17 \(\text{Qh}3\) (the bishop finds a new active diagonal) 17...\(0-0\) 18 \(0-0\) \(\text{Qh}5\) 19 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{Qc}7\) 20 \(\text{f4}\) (White's central pawn-majority begins to make itself felt) 20...\(\text{Qf}6\) 21 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 22 \(\text{Qg}4\) \(\text{Qg}7\) 23 \(\text{Qf}2\) (the black knight isn't going anywhere, so White improves his kingside position) 23...\(\text{Wd}4\) 24 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qd}5\) 25 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{f5}\) 26 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 27 \(\text{Qxh}5\) \(\text{gxh}5\) 28 \(\text{Qg}3\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 29 \(\text{Qxf}5\) and White converted his material advantage in Lasker-Blackburne, Match game 4, London 1892.

b2) 5...\(\text{Wb}6\) 6 \(\text{Qc}3\) and now:

b21) 6...\(\text{Nxf3}\) 7 \(\text{gx}f3\) \(\text{e}6\) offers White some pleasant options, including 8 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{Wxb}3\) (8...\(\text{Wc}7\) 9 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{Qb}3\) 9 \(\text{axb}3\) \(\text{Qbd}7\) 10 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{a}6\) 11 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{Qa}6\) 8 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{Qbd}7\) 9 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 10 \(\text{Qg}1\) \(\text{g}6\) 11 \(\text{cxd}5\) \(\text{cxd}5\) 12 \(\text{Qb}5\) \(\text{Qd}8\) 13 \(\text{Qc}1\) \(\text{Qf}4\) 14 \(\text{Qe}5\) \(\text{Qc}5\) -- Bu Xiangzhi-Sean. Cap d'Agde 2008. The black queen has run out of safe squares, with \(\text{Qa}4\) coming.

b22) 6...\(\text{e}6\) 7 \(\text{Qe}5\) (Topalov has tried 7 \(\text{Qh}4\)?? 7...\(\text{f}5\) 8 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{Wc}7\) 9 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Qbd}7\) 10 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{Qxe}5\) (10...\(\text{Qe}4\) comes close to equality) 11 \(\text{fxe}5\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 12 \(0-0\) \(\text{b}6\) 13 \(\text{cxb}6\) \(\text{axb}6\) 14 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 15 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{dxe}4\) 16 \(\text{Qxe}4\) 0-0 17 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Qac}8\) 18 \(\text{Qac}1\) ± B.Socko-Kuzubov, Polanica Zdroj 2007.

5 \(\text{Qbd}2\)?

Played in order to recapture with the knight on \(\text{c}4\), giving it access to \(\text{e}5\). The theoretical main line is 5 \(\text{Qxc}4\).
5...e6 6 ∆xc4 (D)

6...∆b4+
Black banks on speedy development.

a) After 6...∆bd7 7 ∆e2 here are some examples of play:

a1) 7...∆b4+ 8 ∆d2 ∆xd2+ 9 ∆xd2 0-0 10 b4 ∆e4 11 ∆b2 ∆d6 12 ∆a5 c5? (12...∆b6 looks robust) 13 dxc5 ∆xc5 14 ∆d1 ∆b6 (Epishin-Sulava, Nice 2002) 15 ∆xd6! ∆xd6 16 bxc5 ∆xc5 17 ∆b3±.

a2) 7...∆e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 b3 ∆b6 (9...c5 10 ∆b2 ∆c8 11 ∆c1 h6 12 dxc5 ∆xc5 13 ∆d4 ∆xe2 14 ∆xe2 a6 15 ∆fd1 ∆cd7 16 ∆f3 b5 17 ∆ce5 ∆xc1 18 ∆xc1 ± Donner-Dückstein, Nice Olympiad 1974) 10 ∆b2 ∆xc4 11 bxc4 c5 12 ∆e5 (12 h3??) 12...∆xe2 13 ∆xe2 ∆c7 14 ∆fd1 ∆d6 15 h3 ∆fd8 = Brumen-Sulava, Croatian Team Ch, Medulin 2002.

b) 6...∆c6 7 ∆e2 and now:

b1) 7...∆b4+ 8 ∆d2 ∆xd2+ 9 ∆xd2 0-0 10 h3 ∆h5 11 0-0 ∆e4 12 ∆d1 ∆d5 13 ∆c1 ± Vasin-Zholtsova Lysenko, World Blind Ch, Goa 2006.

b2) 7...∆d5 8 ∆b3 ∆b4+ 9 ∆d2 ∆xd2+ 10 ∆cxd2 ∆xb3 (10...0-0 11 ∆c1 ∆ab8 12 h3 ∆f5 13 ∆xd5 exd5 14 g4 ∆d7 15 ∆b3 ∆e4 16 ∆c5 ∆xc5 17 ∆xc5 ± Degerman-Angqvist, Stockholm 1991) 11 ∆xb3 0-0 12 ∆c1 ∆fe8 13 h3 ∆h5 14 0-0 ∆e4 15 ∆c5 ± Spiridonov-Petitcunot, Le Touquet 2000.

7 ∆d2 ∆xd2+ 8 ∆xd2 ∆bd7
Alternatively, 8...∆xf3 9 gxf3 ∆e7 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 ∆c6 111 g6 12 f4 0-0-0 13 ∆b1 ∆b8 14 a3 ∆d5 15 ∆c2 ∆b6 16 ∆d2 ∆a8 17 ∆b3 f6 18 ∆c1 ∆c8 19 ∆g2 ∆b8 20 ∆c5 is much better for White, Hebden-Mulder, French Team Ch 1998/9.

9 ∆c1
The c-file is a key point of contention for both colours: White strives to prevent ...c5.

9...0-0 10 ∆fe5 ∆xe5 11 dxe5 (D)
Black’s bishop serves as a target to enhance White’s initiative.

13...c5 14 ♕f4 ♖g6 15 h4 h6 16 g5 h5 17 ♖g2

The bishop is particularly effective along this diagonal...

17...b5

...so much so that Black is prepared to part with an exchange; if instead 17...♖b8 then 18 0-0 with the idea of ♖fd1.

18 ♖d6 ♗a5+ (D)

19 b4! cxb4

19...♗xb4+ allows White to take the black rook in safety: 20 ♗xb4 cxb4 21 ♖xa8 ±.

20 0-0 ♖ab8 21 ♖fd1 ♗b6 22 ♖e4

White still has a powerful kingside attack, despite castling on that side. Now Black could try 22...♕c3!?.

22...♖d5?! 23 ♖xd5 ♖xe4?

23...exd5 24 ♖xd5 leaves Black the exchange ahead but totally tied up. But even this is preferable to what follows.

24 ♖xe4 exd5 25 ♖f6+! ♗h8

25...gxf6 26 gxf6 leads to a quick mate.

26 ♗f3 g6 27 ♗d7

Not just winning back the exchange but allowing White’s attack to continue unabated.

27...b3 28 ♗f6+ ♗g8 29 e6 (D)

White plays the attack with great energy. This is a standard pawn-break to lever open Black’s defences.

29...♗b4

29...♗d2 offers more resistance, but White is comfortably on top.

30 exf7+ ♗h7 31 ♖xf8+ ♖xf8 32 axb3 ♗g4+ 33 ♗f1 ♖h4 34 ♖c6 ♖e4 35 ♖e6 ♗f5 36 ♖xf5 gxf5 37 b4 ♗g7 38 g6 ♖b8

Hastening the end, but Black was helpless in any case.

39 ♖e8 1-0

Game 40

Hebden – Summerscale

Upminster 1993

1 d4 d5 2 ♗f3 ♗f6 3 e3 c6

If 3...♗f5 then 4 c4 c6 transposes to Game 41.

4 c4
We have now reached one of the most important sidelines of the Slav (indeed, 1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 d3 d6 4 e3 was the actual move-order of the main game, but I have adjusted it to show how it fits into our repertoire). Nevertheless, by carefully choosing our options, we can still steer the game onto our turf and keep the theoretical burden to a minimum.

4...e6

This attempt to get an exciting Semi-Slav variation is neatly parried by White’s clever move-order.

4...g4 transposes to note ‘b’ to Black’s 4th move in Game 39, while 4...f5 is the subject of the next game. That leaves two significant moves:

a) 4...g6 is the Schlechter Slav, a solid if uninspiring hybrid form of the Slav and Grünfeld. Given its quiet nature, it is quite possible simply to play natural moves against it and expect to reach a viable position. The main lines continue 5 c3 g7 and then 6 e2 or 6 d3, with Black having various ideas with ...g4 and the central break ...e5, often preceded by an exchange on c4. It is interesting to note, however, that the Colle-Zukertort lookalike approach, 5 b3 g7 6 b2 0-0 7 d3 g4 8 bd2, has scored quite well for White, albeit in a small sample of games. This will certainly take a lot of Schlechter players out of their comfort zone, as their normal ...e5 ideas have had a firm clamp put on them.

b) 4...a6 is one of several forms of the ...a6 Slav, a highly trendy opening whose popularity spread like wildfire in the late 1990s and has by now reached mature and respectable status. However, this form of it – with White not yet having played c3 – is relatively poorly explored, and there is good reason to think it is less satisfactory for Black than other forms of the ...a6 Slav. One possible reply is our familiar set-up 5 d3 g4 6 bd2 e6 7 c2 bd7 8 b3 d6 9 b2, when White may keep an edge after 9...b8 10 0-0 0-0 11 h3 h5 12 g5, while it is worth noting that Hebden’s preference has tended to be 5 d2.

5 bd2 (D)

5...bd7

5...c5 is a principled way to fight back immediately against the white centre, although I suspect the concept of moving the c-pawn twice in the first five moves will be alien to most players. 6 cxd5 exd5 (6...xd5 allows White a nice space advantage after 7 e4 f6 8 e5 d5 9 dxc5 xc5 10 e4 followed by d3 with attacking chances on the kingside, Staniszewski-Jagodzinski, Polish Team Ch, Lubniewice 1981) 7 b3 and now:
a) 7...\(\text{d}6\) 8 \(\text{b}2\) 0-0 9 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 10 0-0 \(\text{cx}d4\) 11 \(\text{dx}d4\) \(\text{e}5\) 12 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{cx}d3\) 13 \(\text{w}x\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}8\) 14 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{b}8\) 15 \(\text{ac}1\) ± Nenashev-Kramnik, Moscow 1992.

b) 7...\(\text{c}6\) 8 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{cx}d4\) 9 \(\text{cx}d4\) \(\text{b}4\) (9...\(\text{cx}d4\) 10 \(\text{ax}d4\) \(\text{e}7\) 11 \(\text{d}3\) 0-0 12 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 13 0-0 \(\text{e}8\) 14 \(\text{f}3\) a6 15 \(\text{fd}1\) h6 16 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 17 \(\text{g}3\) ± Volkov-Svetushkin, Korinthsos 2002) 10 a3 \(\text{a}5\) 11 b4 \(\text{b}6\) 12 \(\text{cx}c6\) bxc6 13 \(\text{w}c2\) \(\text{wd}6\) 14 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 15 \(\text{d}3\) a5 = Karpov-Shirov, Bastia rapid 2003.

c) 7...\(\text{cx}d4\) 8 \(\text{dx}d4\) \(\text{b}4\) 9 \(\text{wc}2\) \(\text{c}6\) 10 \(\text{ax}c6\) bxc6 11 \(\text{d}3\) (White very sensibly declines the pawn offer, knowing that Black’s structural weakness won’t go away; not 11 \(\text{w}x\text{c}6\)? \(\text{d}7\) 12 \(\text{w}c2\)? \(\text{c}8\) ‘+) 11...0-0 12 0-0 \(\text{d}6\) 13 \(\text{b}2\) (the 13 \(\text{w}x\text{c}6\) pawn-grab could be considered at this point though) 13...c5 (Black has the dynamic hanging pawns and White sets about breaking them up right away) 14 e4 \(\text{g}4\)?! (this early attack backfires on Black, who should have played either 14...\(\text{dx}e4\) 15 \(\text{exe}4\) ± or 14...\(\text{d}4\) 15 h3 \(\text{b}7\) 16 \(\text{c}4\) ± 15 h3 \(\text{h}2\) 16 \(\text{fd}1\) \(\text{g}5\) 17 e5! (taking the wind out of Black’s sails) 17...\(\text{h}3\) 18 g3 \(\text{g}4\) 19 \(\text{wh}2\) \(\text{xd}1\) 20 \(\text{xd}1\) f5 (Black pushes the self-destruct button but he was clearly worse in any case; for example, 20...\(\text{xe}5\) 21 \(\text{exe}5\)+ \(\text{h}8\) 22 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{wh}5\) 23 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{xb}2\) 24 \(\text{h}1\) ±) 21 \(\text{ex}d6\) f4 22 \(\text{f}1\) (three pieces for a rook is far too much) 22...\(\text{ad}8\) 23 \(\text{we}2\) \(\text{wh}6\) 24 \(\text{g}1\) f3 25 \(\text{we}5\) d4 26 b4 \(\text{xd}6\) 27 \(\text{dd}2\) \(\text{xb}4\) 28 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{dd}6\) 29 \(\text{e}4\) 1-0 Chernikov-Rapoport, Česke Budejovice 1996.

6 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 7 \(\text{b}2\) 0-0 8 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}7\)

This whole plan of preparing...e5 is flawed, so Black would do better to play for...b6 and...c5 despite being a tempo down on normal Colle-Zukertort lines; e.g., 8...b6 9 0-0 \(\text{b}7\) 10 \(\text{e}5\) (10 \(\text{we}2\) \(\text{we}7\) 11 \(\text{ad}1\) \(\text{ad}8\) 12 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{dx}e4\) 13 \(\text{exe}4\) \(\text{exe}4\) 14 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 15 \(\text{wh}4\) h6 16 \(\text{fe}1\) \(\text{a}3\) 17 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{fe}8\) 18 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{d}7\) 19 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 20 \(\text{de}1\) ± Karpov-Guliev, Bastia rapid 2007) 10...\(\text{e}7\) 11 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{fd}8\) 12 \(\text{wh}3\) \(\text{f}8\) 13 \(\text{ad}1\) c5 14 \(\text{cx}d5\) \(\text{f}5\) 15 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{cx}d4\) 16 \(\text{ex}d4\) \(\text{a}3\) 17 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{e}4\) 18 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{dx}e4\) 19 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 20 \(\text{f}5\) ± Riazantsev-Matsenko, Satka 2008.

9 \(\text{e}5\) (\(D\))

Black chooses to relieve some of the central tension, which is no better or worse than maintaining it; e.g.: a) 9...\(\text{a}3\) 10 \(\text{xa}3\) \(\text{xa}3\) 11 \(\text{f}4\) c5 12 0-0 \(\text{cx}d4\) 13 \(\text{ex}d4\) \(\text{xc}4\) 14 \(\text{dx}c4\) \(\text{e}7\) 15 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{b}6\) (after 15...\(\text{d}5\), the patient 16 \(\text{a}1\) is better than 16 \(\text{f}5\), as in Bolduc-Berube, Quebec 2005) 16 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{d}8\) 17 \(\text{f}2\) a5 18 a4 \(\text{xc}4\) 19
bxc4 b6 20 h3 \textit{d6} 21 c5 bxc5 22 dxc5 \textit{c7} 23 c6 \textit{a6} 24 \textit{b5} ± Volkov-Panarin, Internet blitz 2005.

b) 9...\textit{d8} 10 0-0 \textit{f8} 11 \textit{e2}
\textit{d6} 12 \textit{ad1} a5 13 f4 a4 14 e4
(White has been able to build up an imposing central space advantage and already stands clearly better) 14...axb3
15 axb3 \textit{a2} (the minor irritation of Black’s rook infiltration in no way makes up for White’s growing initiative and positional advantages) 16 \textit{df3} f6 17 \textit{exd7} \textit{xd7} 18 \textit{bl} \textit{aa8}
19 e5 (further increasing White’s command of space and opening the way for the b1-bishop to reach the kingside)
19...fxe5 20 fxe5 \textit{a3} 21 \textit{c3} \textit{b4}?
(moving a vital defender away from his kingside) 22 \textit{xb4} \textit{xb4} 23 \textit{g5} (D).

\textbf{B}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{B}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Black is now completely busted, as the following variations show:

b1) 23...h6 24 \textit{f7} \textit{e8} 25 \textit{xb6}+ gh6 26 \textit{g4}+ \textit{h8} 27 \textit{f7}+--.

b2) 23...\textit{xb3} 24 \textit{xf8}+ \textit{xf8} (or 24...\textit{xf8} 25 \textit{f2}+ \textit{g8} 26 \textit{h7}+ \textit{h8} 27 \textit{c2} \textit{xc4} 28 \textit{h4}+ \textit{g8} 29 \textit{h7}+ \textit{f8} 30 \textit{h8}+ \textit{e7} 31 \textit{g7}+
\textit{e8} 32 \textit{f7}#) 25 \textit{xh7}+ \textit{h8} 26 \textit{c2} \textit{xc4} 27 \textit{h5}+ \textit{g8} 28 \textit{h7}#.

b3) 23...g6 24 \textit{fd7} \textit{db8} 25 \textit{h6}+
\textit{g7} (25...\textit{h8} 26 \textit{f7} \textit{xb3} 27 \textit{df1}
[threatening \textit{f2-f6#}] 27...\textit{b6} 28 \textit{f2} \textit{d8} 29 \textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 30 \textit{f7}+
\textit{g8} 31 \textit{f6} also wins for White) 26
\textit{f7}+ \textit{h8} (26...\textit{hxh6} 27 \textit{g4}+--) 27 \textit{f3}+--.

b4) The game continuation was no better: 23...\textit{e8} 24 \textit{xf8}+! (removing the key defender of the kingside) 24...\textit{xf8} 25 \textit{e7}+ \textit{h8} 26
\textit{f1} \textit{e7} 27 \textit{g4} g6 28 \textit{h3}! (keeping an eye on e6) 28...\textit{xc4} 29 \textit{h6}
\textit{d7} 30 \textit{hxg6}+ 1-0 Summerscale-Salo, European Clubs Cup, Bratislava 1996. 30...\textit{g8} 31 \textit{f7}+ decides. I learnt the hard way the strengths of White’s position in the main game against Hebden; in this game, three years later, I was able to put the experience to good use.

10 \textit{exe4} \textit{c7} 11 0-0 b5
No better is the optimistic 11...e5
12 \textit{a3} c5 13 dxc5 \textit{xc5} 14 \textit{wc2} e4?!
15 \textit{xc5} \textit{xc5} 16 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 17
\textit{xe4} \textit{wh} 18 g3 \textit{b8} 19 \textit{ad1} ± Volkov-Andriasian, Moscow 2007.

12 \textit{e5} \textit{xe5} 13 dxe5 \textit{d5} 14
\textit{wh} 15 \textit{e4}
White’s kingside initiative far outweighs Black’s queenside pawn-majority.

15...\textit{d8} 16 \textit{ad1} \textit{b7} 17 \textit{g4}
\textit{f8} 18 \textit{h4} \textit{ab8} 19 \textit{d6} \textit{a8}

For some reason that I couldn’t fathom at the time, I never seemed able to take one of his pieces unless he wanted me to! It’s because Black just has a terrible position.
20 e4 b4 21 f4
The f-pawn decides the issue.
21...d7 22 f5 exf5 23 xf5 f6 (D)

24 exf6 xf6 25 fxg7++ g8
I had a faint glimmer of hope here, thinking he may have overreached himself, until he played...
26 f8+ 1-0
26...xf8 27 gxf8++ xf8 28 f1+ f7 29 g7+ is the end.

Game 41
Khenkin – L. Milov
Bad Homburg 2006

1 d4 d5 2 f3 f6 3 e3 c6 4 c4 f5 (D)
This is a very popular move. Black develops his light-squared bishop actively before supporting his centre with ...e6. This is one of the most important sidelines of the regular Slav (1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 f3 f6 4 e3 f5), so we shall be choosing our repertoire lines carefully to avoid having to keep up-to-date with ever-changing opening theory.

5 cxd5
5 c3 is more popular but we go for a slightly less well known system which contains quite a lot of venom if Black is ill-prepared.
5...cxd5 6 b3 c7
6...b6 7 xb6 axb6 8 c3 is a bit better for White due to Black’s weak doubled b-pawns.
7 d2
White’s plan is to develop quickly and put pressure on Black along the open c-file. An early example was 7 c3 e6 8 d2 c6 9 b5 e7 10 0-0 0-0 11 fc1 intending e5, Yusupov-P.Nikolić, Belgrade 1991. which was slightly better for White and certainly not very inspiring for Black. The text-move is an attempt to refine this basic strategy by keeping the knight out of the c-file.

7...e6
7...c6 is a somewhat less flexible move and after 8 b5 e6 9 0-0 Black must show great care if he is to equalize:

a) 9...d6 10 b4 0-0 11 xc6 and now:
a1) After 11...ऱxb4 12 ऱxb4 ऱxc6 13 रe5 रc7 (13...ऱb6 is solid; e.g., 14 ऱxb6 axb6 15 रc3 रfc8 16 रfc1 रe8 ± McNab-Wang Yue, Turin Olympiad 2006) 14 रc3 रfc8 15 रac1 a5 16 ऱb5 रg4 17 रxg4 रxg4, as in Rizzitano-Fang, Marlborough 2004, White should try 18 f3 रh5 (18...ऱf5 19 रxd5 ऱxc1 20 रe7+ रf8 21 रxc1 ऱxc1+ 22 रf2 is similar) 19 g4 रg6 20 रxd5! ऱxc1 21 रc7+ रf8 22 रxc1 ऱxc1+ 23 रf2, when according to Rizzitano White has a clear advantage as the queen is much stronger than the two rooks.

a2) 11...bxc6 12 रbd2 is also promising for White:

a21) 12...ऱfb8 13 रxd6 ऱxd6 14 रc3 रb4 15 ऱxb4 ऱxb4 16 b3 रd7 17 रfc1 रb6 18 रc3 a5 19 a3 ± Hebden-Arkell, London 1999.

a22) 12...ऱab8 13 रxd6 ऱxd6 14 रc3 रfc8 15 रfc1 रd7 16 रb3 is slightly better for White, Hebden-Dimitrov, Montpellier 2005.

a23) 12...रd7 13 रfc1 रfc8 14 रa3 ऱxb4 15 ऱxb4 c5 16 dxc5 रxc5 17 रc3 रb6 18 रa3 रd7 (after 18...ऱc7 19 रac1 रac8 20 रd4 रg6, as in Nemeth-Kreienbühl, Zurich 2005, 21 b4 रd3 22 रxc7 रxc7 23 रxc7 ऱxc7 24 b5 ऱb6 25 रb3 h6 26 रe7 keeps an advantage for White) 19 रac1 रxc3 20 ऱxc3 ± Nemeth-Burmakin, Berne 1999.

b) After 9...रd7! 10 रc1 it seems Black can equalize with careful play:

b1) Palliser gives 10...ऱe7 11 ऱb4 ऱxb4 12 ऱxb4 ऱb6, when 13 ऱb3 0-0 14 ऱxc6 रfc8!, with equality, is a useful tactical idea to be aware of.

Perhaps 13 ऱa4 ऱc8 14 ऱh4 is a better try for a small pull.

b2) After 10...ऱc8 11 ऱa4 ऱd6 12 ऱxc6 bxc6 13 ऱb4 Black must still be careful:

b21) 13...ऱxb4?! 14 ऱxb4 ऱb6 (14...c5? 15 dxc5 ऱxc5? 16 ऱa3! a5 17 रbd2 ++) 15 ऱa3 c5 16 रc3! ±.

b22) 13...0-0! 14 ऱxd6 ऱxd6 15 रbd2 (15 ऱxa7 ऱb8 also gives Black good counterplay) 15...c5 16 dxc5 ऱxc5 17 ऱxa7 रd3 18 ऱxc8 ऱxc8 led to an interesting position in Khengin-Hector, Malmö 2006. Black probably has enough activity for the pawn but no more than that.

We now return to 7...e6 (D):

![Diagram](image-url)

### 8 ऱb5+ रbd7!?

This is Black's independent idea. For 8...ऱc6 see the previous note.

(The actual move-order of the main game was 1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 e3 ऱf5 4 cxd5 cxd5 5 ऱb3 ऱc7 6 ऱb5+ रd7 7 रd2 e6 8 ऱf3 रf6.)

### 9 रc3

An alternative try for White is 9 0-0 a6 10 रc1!?; e.g., 10...ऱb6 11 ऱe2
\( \text{d6 12 c3 h6 13 a4 wb3 14 axb3 e4 15 a5 0-0 16 b4 ab8 17 c5 df6 18 b6 fc8 19 b5 axb5 20 xb5 and White had a tiny edge in Tkachev-Wang Hao, Dagomys 2008.} \)

9...a6 10 c1 wb6 11 a4 d8??

11...wd8! looks fully playable for Black.

12 e5! (D)

This tactical trick ensures White a useful initiative.

12...e7

After 12...axb5 13 xb5 White's threats are decisive.

13 xd7+ xd7 14 d1?!?

White threatens a5.

14...wb5 15 xb5 axb5

Now the b-pawns are vulnerable and Black must play accurately in order to fight for equality.

16 a3 xe5 17 dxe5 d7 18 e2 c8 19 c3 f6 20 h1!

White maintains his initiative by tactical means.

20...g6

20...fxe5 21 e4 g6 leads to the same position.

21 e4 xe5 22 edx5 edx5

It seems that 22...b4 23 axb4 xb4 is almost equal.

23 xd5 (D)

White has a pleasant advantage.

23...xc1 24 xc1 d6 25 b4 e4?!

25...xb4 26 xb4 f7 probably gives Black better chances to save the game.

26 c3 xb4 27 xe4 e7 28 c5+ xc5 29 xc5 b4 30 axb4

White's extra pawn may not count for much in itself, but he is more active and Black still has pawn weaknesses.

30 d6 31 b5 b8 32 e3 b6 33 e4 f8 34 d5+ c7 35 d2 f4+ 36 xe5 xb4

The extra pawn and better king position ensure an easy win.

37 f4 c6 38 g4 b5+ 39 e6 b4 40 c2+ b7 41 f2 c4 1-0
5 Classical Queen’s Indian

Introduction

Before we look at the variations relating to the Classical Queen’s Indian, I would like to show you a game which will help to explain some of the problems White can have if he continues with the standard Colle-Zukertort setup in cases where Black has opted for a queen’s fianchetto but avoided an early ...d5.

Game 42

Summerscale – Palkövi

Budapest 1990

1 폰f3 폰f6 2 d4 e6 3 e3 c5 4 폰d3 b6 5 0-0 폰b7 6 폰bd2 폰e7

One problem I found as a Colle-Zukertort player against Queen’s Indian exponents was that their positions had so much flexibility. This was mainly due to the fact that they could delay ...d5 for as long as they wanted, thus making it harder to carry out the standard plan of 폰e5, f4, etc. In fact, I used to heave a sigh of relief as soon as they did play ...d5 (which wasn’t very often). I think this game clearly illustrates the problems White can face because of Black’s flexibility.

7 b3 cxd4 8 exd4 폰c6 9 폰b2 폰b4 10 폰e2 폰bd5 (D)

Black is playing the opening quite creatively and is making full use of the d5-square from an early stage. I had severe reservations about my next move but was loathe to allow the black knight into f4.

11 g3

A more recent game confirmed that 11 a3 폰f4 is indeed uncomfortable for White: 12 폰c4 폰c7 13 폰e1 폰c8 14 c3 g5!? 15 폰f1 g4 16 폰e5 폰g8 17 폰d3? 폰h3+! 18 폰h1 g3!? (18...폰d5 19 폰c4 폰d4 is also very strong) 19 hxg3 폰xf2+! 20 폰xf2 폰xg3 0-1 Reifenschläger-Ákessson, Bad Wiessee 2005.

11...폰b4

The knight on d5 shows it also has eyes for my queenside and, not wanting to give up the bishop-pair, I was forced to make a grovelling retreat.

12 폰b1 폰e4
It felt as if the black knights were crawling all over my position.

13 \textit{wd3 f5 14 e5 g5}

Here Black sees a forcing continuation and goes for it, but with hindsight perhaps simply 14...0-0 would have kept the advantage.

15 \textit{d1}

Making an escape-square for my king, which lacks light-squared protection.

15...h3+ 16 fl df4 (D)

This is the idea Black was playing for, and to be honest I had completely missed it. Still, there was no use in worrying about it – I just had to knuckle down and take what was thrown at me. In retrospect, I now question Black’s decision to win my queen and a pawn for three pieces, as I believe the material imbalance favours White.

17 gxf4 g2+ 18 xg2 xf4+ 19 fl xd3 20 xd3 h4 21 g1 d6 22 f3 g4+ 23 fl h3+ 24 g1

I would have been very happy with a draw here as I was only an average international player while my opponent was a much higher rated international master. I knew the onus was on him to make something of the position.

24...g4+ 25 fl d5 26 e4 h3+ 27 g1 g4+ 28 fl 0-0 29 a3 h3+ 30 g1 g4+ 31 fl d6 32 c3 h3+ 33 g1 f6

Finally Black makes an aggressive move towards my king.

34 e5 g6+ 35 g3 xe5 36 dxe5 xg3+ 37 hxg3 f4! 38 fl g4 39 e2 fxg3 40 xg3 f8

We reached the time-control and over the next few moves my more experienced opponent outplayed me.

41 e2 f4 42 fl d4 43 g2 d3 44 d1 g6 45 c3 h5 46 f3 h4 47 e4 f5

Things have begun to look very grim for White.

48 g1 h3+ 49 h1 h2?

Too ambitious – he should have defended g6.

50 xg6+ h1 51 g2 f1?

This was his masterstroke, which seems to create some difficult problems for White, but...

52 xh2+ g7 53 g2+ (D)
The game was adjourned at this point and I was enormously grateful to another English junior at the time, Gary Quillan, who spotted the way to trap Black’s queen from this position.

53...\texttt{h}h8 54 \texttt{d}d2! \texttt{xf}3
54...\texttt{xa}3 55 \texttt{xd}3 is also fairly hopeless for Black.

55 \texttt{b}b2 \texttt{f}f1+ 56 \texttt{g}g2 \texttt{xd}2+ 57 \texttt{xd}2 \texttt{xd}1 58 \texttt{c}c3

The position is now technically winning and I am still impressed with my technique in the game all these years on.

58...\texttt{e}e1 59 \texttt{f}f3 \texttt{e}e2 60 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{g}g8
61 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{f}f7 62 a4 \texttt{e}e7 63 \texttt{f}e3 \texttt{d}d7
64 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{h}h2 65 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{h}h5 66 b4 \texttt{h}h1
67 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{b}b3 68 c5 \texttt{c}c7 69 exb6+ axb6 70 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{c}c6 71 b5+ \texttt{b}b7 72 \texttt{e}e3 \texttt{h}h2 73 \texttt{xd}3 \texttt{a}a2 74 \texttt{xb}6 1-0

So it all turned out right in the end (apart from missing the plane home, but that’s another story!). However, I don’t think many players would take the white position by choice after move 12. A more aggressive system for White that keeps a firm eye on the crucial d5-square is the Classical Queen’s Indian. By utilizing a Colle-Zukertort move-order, we avoid some of Black’s most significant options. Black can try to confuse the issue, as in the next game, but White keeps a clear head and rises to the occasion.

Game 43
Malaniuk – Merino Garcia
Linares 1996

1 d4 \texttt{f}f6 2 \texttt{f}f3 e6 3 c3 b6 4 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{b}7 5 0-0 c5 6 c4 (D)

It is via this move-order that the Classical Queen’s Indian plays a part in our recommended repertoire. Black has not played an early ...d5, so White abandons the Colle-Zukertort set-up, and instead transposes to a Queen’s Indian line (you’ll find it in the theory books under 1 d4 \texttt{f}f6 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{f}f3 b6 4 e3). Note that by using this move-order, White has cut out many possibilities that are available to Black in a standard Queen’s Indian, most notably all options of ...\texttt{b}b4+ (we have also totally circumvented the Bogo-Indian, 1 d4 \texttt{f}f6 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{f}f3 \texttt{b}b4+). Note that if Black had played ...d5 at any stage, White could have kept his c-pawn on c2, and transposed back to a Colle-Zukertort.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\end{center}

(The move-order in the actual game was 1 d4 \texttt{f}f6 2 \texttt{f}f3 e6 3 c3 b6 4 e3 \texttt{b}7 5 \texttt{d}3 c5 6 0-0.)

6...\texttt{g}6
6...\texttt{e}7 7 \texttt{c}c3 cxd4 8 exd4 d5 (or 8...d6 9 d5) 9 cxd5 \texttt{xd}5 10 \texttt{e}e5 is the main line we consider later. Here Black plays more ambitiously, trying
for a double fianchetto. In the main lines the most important decision for Black is whether he should allow the cramping d5 by White. If he doesn't want to, he must play ...d5 himself, after which White takes and we get an IQP position where White has attacking chances on the kingside.

7 c3 g7 8 e4

It makes sense to take the space in the centre that Black has so graciously offered. White risks being a tempo down compared to certain lines where e4 is achieved in one move but the position is not very tempo-sensitive as there usually is a lot of slow manoeuvring. 8 d5 is a somewhat more popular way of seizing space, though compared with the lines we examine in Game 45, Black is better organized for a transition to a Benoni structure.

8...xd4 9 xd4 d6

There are lots of transpositional possibilities for both sides. However, after 9...0-0, White can try to change the pawn-structure with 10 db5!? d6 11 f4 (or 11 c2!? de8 12 f4) 11...e5, although 12 g5 a6 13 a3 bd7 14 b4 c8 15 wd2 a5 left the position fairly equal in Djurhuus-T.R.Hansen, Norwegian Ch, Hamar 2007.

10 e3 0-0 11 f3 a6

We have now reached a Hedgehog position. White's plan is to put pressure on Black on the dark squares and keep a close eye on the black pawn-breaks, ...d5 and ...b5.

12 e1

12 wd2 e8 13 fd1 bd7 14 f1 d5 15 exd5 exd5 16 cxd5 xd5 17 xd5 xd5 18 f2 f6 19 ac1 b7 led to an equal position in Yusupov-Hrác, Bundesliga 1998/9.

12...bd7 13 f1 c7 14 c1 ac8 15 wd2 e5

After 15 fe8 16 b4 wb8 17 db3 f8 18 a3 a8 19 h1 e7 20 g1 de5 21 da4 d8 22 ed1 c7 23 f2 ed7 24 h4 d8, as in Lock-Plaskett, Hastings 1999/00, White had kept his space advantage but Black's well-coordinated forces secured him equal chances.

16 b3 fd8 17 ed1 a8 18 h1 wb7 (D)

19 g5

White starts his attack on the dark squares.

19...wb8 20 f4 ed7 21 h4 e8 22 c2

Stage two of White's plan is simple: attack the weak d6-pawn.

22 wa7

22...d5 immediately loses a pawn after 23 exd5 exd5 24 xd5 xd5 25 cxd5 xd5 26 xa6.

23 cd2 d5
If Black thought he had prepared this well, he was mistaken.

24 exd5 exd5 25 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{d}xd5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{x}xd5}} \) 26 cxd5 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xd5}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b5}} \)

This key move sows the seeds of defeat for Black.

27...axb5 28 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xd5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{c}c5}} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xb5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e6}} \) 30 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}d8+}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xd8}} \) 31 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xd8+}} \) 1-0

It’s forced mate as 21...\( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f8}} \) is met by 32 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xf8+}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}xf8}} \) 33 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}h6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{g}g8}} \) 34 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{w}d8+}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e8}} \) 35 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{w}xe8#}} \).

**Black Omits \ldots d5**

Game 44

Zsu. Polgar – Hraček

*Stara Zagora Zonal 1990*

1 d4 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f6}} \) 2 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f3}} \) e6 3 e3 b6 4 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d3}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b7}} \)

It’s also possible to delay this development, as this will make the d5 advance a little less attractive for White (in a Benoni structure, as we shall see in Game 45, the move ...\( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b7}} \) is often even **worse** than a clear loss of a tempo). A typical example was the game Inkov-Sofronie, Predeal 2006 where after 4...c5 5 0-0 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e7}} \) 6 c4 0-0 7 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{c}c3}} \) d6 8 b3 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}bd7}} \) 9 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b2}} \) a6 10 a4 Black had run out of useful waiting moves. After 10...\( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b7}} \) 11 d5 e5 12 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d2}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e8}} \) 13 f4 exf4 14 exf4 f5 15 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{w}c2}} \) g6 16 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}ae1}} \) White had kept his normal small advantage.

5 0-0 c5 6 c4 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e7}} \) 7 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{c}c3}} \) (**D**)

The main difference between the Classical Queen’s Indian and the Colle-Zukertort System we examined before is the positioning of White’s queen’s knight. This is more actively

posted on c3 than on d2; indeed White often counts on this greater central influence to give him the advantage against inaccurate black responses.

7...\( \text{\textit{\textsc{c}xd4}} \)

This exchange lessens the impact of White’s possible d5 advance, as Black will have extra freedom to manoeuvre. Other moves:

a) 7...0-0? is discussed in our next game.

b) 7...a6?! 8 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e1}} \) 0-0 9 d5 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e5}} \) 10 cxd5 b5 11 e4 d6 12 a4 b4 (12...\( \text{\textit{\textsc{x}xa4}} \) 13 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{w}xa4}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}bd7}} \) 14 h3 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b6}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{w}a5}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}fd7}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f4}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e8}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{a}ad1}} \) ± Gausel-Gild.Garcia, Hoogeveen 1998) 13 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}bd7}} \) 14 h3 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e8}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f4}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f8}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}bd2}} \) ± Malaniuk-Conquest, Oviedo rapid 1993.

8 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{c}xd4}} \) (**D**)

8...d6

8...d5 is dealt with in Game 46.

8...0-0 9 d5 is still promising for White, even if less depressing for Black than his lot in Game 45. Then:

a) 9...h6 10 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{c}c2}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b4}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e4}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{x}xd5}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{\textsc{xf6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textsc{w}xf6}} \) 13 cxd5 (White’s central space advantage gives him
greater mobility and hinders Black's development) 13...\(\text{\textae}6\) 14 \(\text{\textad}3\) \(\text{\textxd}3\) 15 \(\text{\textw}x\text{\textd}3\) a5 (Black finds a way to develop on the queenside but gives himself a weakness on b6) 16 a3 \(\text{\textad}6\) 17 \(\text{\textac}3\) \(\text{\textda}6\) 18 \(\text{\textad}4\) \(\text{\textdc}5\) 19 \(\text{\textw}b5\) \(\text{\textw}g6\) 20 \(\text{\textad}1\) a4 21 g3 \(\text{\textwc}2\) 22 \(\text{\textdd}2\) \(\text{\textfb}8\) 23 \(\text{\textdc}4\) \(\text{\textc}7\) 24 d6 \(\text{\textbd}8\) 25 \(\text{\textde}1\) and White has clearly the superior position, B.Lalić-Pliester, Isle of Man 1995.

b) 9...\(\text{\textda}6\) 10 \(\text{\textdf}4\) d6 11 dxe6 fxe6 12 \(\text{\textag}3\) \(\text{\textdc}5\) 13 \(\text{\textdd}4\) leaves White better as Black has three pawn-islands to White's two, with the e6/d6 duo being particularly weak, Malaniuk-Tiviakov, Moscow 1992.

c) 9...\(\text{\textex}d5\) 10 cxd5 and now:

\begin{itemize}
  \item c1) 10...\(\text{\textdf}6\)?! transposes to the note to Black's 9th move below.
  \item c2) 10...\(\text{\textee}8\) 11 \(\text{\textdd}4\) g6 12 \(\text{\textee}1\) \(\text{\textdf}8\) 13 \(\text{\textag}5\) \(\text{\textxe}1+\) 14 \(\text{\textw}x\text{\texte}1\) h6 15 \(\text{\textah}4\) \(\text{\textda}6\) 16 \(\text{\textdd}1\) \(\text{\textdc}7\) 17 \(\text{\textac}4\) \(\text{\textg}7\) 18 \(\text{\textac}6\) was clearly better for White in Dizdar-Giehring, Berlin 1991. The game concluded 18...\(\text{\textxc}6\) 19 dxc6 g5 20 \(\text{\textag}3\) d5 21 \(\text{\textxd}5\) \(\text{\textcx}d5\) 22 \(\text{\textdx}d5\) \(\text{\textcx}d5\) 23 \(\text{\textwe}4\) \(\text{\textdc}3\) 24 \(\text{\textxd}8+\) \(\text{\textxd}8\) 25 \(\text{\textwc}2\) 1-0.
\end{itemize}

c3) 10...\(\text{\textfb}4\) 11 \(\text{\textee}4\) \(\text{\textxe}4\) 12 \(\text{\textxe}4\) f5 13 \(\text{\textac}2\) \(\text{\texta}6\) 14 \(\text{\textag}5\) \(\text{\textwe}8\) 15 \(\text{\textad}3\) ± Siebrecht-Van Haastert, Dutch Team Ch 2007/8.

9 \(\text{\textdf}5\)

This is the most incisive; I give the alternatives only as food for thought:

a) 9 a3 0-0 10 b4 \(\text{\textbd}7\) 11 \(\text{\textee}1\) \(\text{\textec}8\) 12 h3 \(\text{\textee}8\) 13 \(\text{\textff}4\) ± Adler-Genov, Antwerp 1992.

b) 9 \(\text{\textee}1\) 0-0 and now:

\begin{itemize}
  \item b1) 10 \(\text{\textag}5\) \(\text{\textbd}7\) 11 \(\text{\textwe}2\) \(\text{\textee}8\) 12 \(\text{\textad}1\) \(\text{\textec}8\) 13 h3 \(\text{\textwc}7\) 14 \(\text{\textwe}3\) \(\text{\textwb}8\) 15 d5 ± Lechtynsky-Mokry, Trenčianske Teplice 1985.
  \item b2) 10 d5 e5 11 a3 a5 12 \(\text{\textbb}1\) (White's plan should be familiar by now: expand on the queenside with b4 in order to create weaknesses there) 12...\(\text{\textee}8\) 13 \(\text{\textwc}2\) g6 14 \(\text{\textah}6\) \(\text{\textgg}7\) 15 b4 \(\text{\textdd}7\) 16 \(\text{\textwe}2\) \(\text{\textda}6\) 17 \(\text{\textbc}1\) \(\text{\textec}8\) 18 \(\text{\textda}4\) \(\text{\textee}8\) 19 bxa5 bxa5 20 c5 ± Chekhov-Bareev, Kharkov 1985.
  \item b3) 10 a3 \(\text{\textbd}7\) 11 b4 \(\text{\textee}8\) 12 \(\text{\textbb}2\) \(\text{\textff}8\) 13 d5 e5 14 \(\text{\textdd}2\) g6 15 a4 ± Zsu.Polgar-Arnason, European Clubs Cup, Budapest 1989. White's plan is a5 followed by gradually increasing the pressure on the queenside, for example by doubling rooks on the a-file.
  \item c) 9 b3 0-0 10 \(\text{\textbb}2\) \(\text{\textbd}7\) 11 \(\text{\textee}1\) a6 12 h3 (White begins an original plan of trebling major pieces on the e-file, hoping to land a tactical blow) 12...\(\text{\textee}7\) (Black's play looks too slow here and he would do better to anticipate the danger on the kingside by 12...\(\text{\textee}8\) and...\(\text{\textff}8\) 13 \(\text{\textee}3\) \(\text{\textwa}8\) 14 \(\text{\textwe}2\) b5 15 \(\text{\textee}1\) (White is very sensibly ignoring Black's queenside play and now begins to introduce some very nasty
threats) 15...bxc4 16 bxc4 8e8 17
g5 e8 f7! (bang!) 18...dxf7
19 e6 b8? (after the more stub-
born 19...g6, 20 d5 with the idea of
e4 gives White an overwhelming at-
tack) 20 dxf6+! 1-0 Yusupov-Teske,

We return to 9 d5 (D):

9...e5

Black is well advised to keep the
centre closed.

9...exd5?! has turned out disastrously
in practice: 10 cxd5 0-0 (10...bd7 11
b5 a6 12 c6 xc6 13 dxc6 d5 14
d4 e8 15 c4 ± Dizdar-Radzie-
wick, Cappelle la Grande 1999) 11
d4 and now:

a) 11...a6 12 f5 e8 13 c3 f8
14 g5 e7 15 e4 h8 16 h3
c8 17 h4 ± Wells-Arkell, British Ch,
Eastbourne 1990.

b) 11...g6 12 h6 e8 13 b5
bd7 14 c6 xc6 (14 wc7 15
xe7+ e7 16 c1 e5 17 f4 e5
18 g3 e5 19 d3 h5 20 e2 e5
21 e4 ± J.Ryan-O’Shaughnessy,
Irish Ch, Dublin 1996) 15 dxc6 d8
(15...e5 16 g5 f8 17 xf6 xf6
18 f4 Darr-Höpf, Germany tt
2007/8) 16 c7 xc7 17 xe8 xc8 18
d5 xd5 19 xd5 e6 20 ad1 ±

c) 11...e8 12 f3 f6 13 c3
7d7 14 wh3 g6 15 f4 c5 16 c2 ±
Almström-P-Collett, Swedish Team Ch
2005/6.

d) 11...bd7 12 c6 (this is the
problem; Black is more or less forced
to give up his light-squared bishop
and will have to contend with his
light-square weaknesses for the rest
of the game) 12...xc6 13 dxc6 b8
(13...e5 14 a6 ±; 13...c5 14
f5 d5 15 b4 e6 16 b5 ±) 14 a4
(Black’s biggest problem is his knight
on b8: recently undeveloped, it has
trouble getting back into the game)
14...d5 15 f4 d6 16 g5 h6 17
xf6 xf6 18 ae1 c7 (Black jet-
tions his d-pawn, which is ultimately
lost anyway; his biggest problem, how-
ever, remains the still undeveloped
Knight on b8, which interferes with
the coordination of Black’s pieces) 19
xc5 d6 20 xc7 xc7 21 c1 a6
22 a4 (with an extra passed pawn
on the sixth rank and the initiative,
White’s position is overwhelming)
22...g6 23 c3 a7 24 fc1 c8 25
wc5 h5 26 e2 wd8 27 d1 wc7 28
xe7 xe7 29 c7 xe2 30 d8+ e8
31 f1 1-0 Yakovich-Arkell, Hastings
1993/4.

10 g5 (D)

This is one of the two most critical
lines; the other is 10 h4?.

10...e1 is a more sedate positional
approach, but after 10...bd7 11 b1
White prepares to take advantage of Black’s queenside weaknesses, and push his pawn-majority, viz. 11...0-0 12 b4 c8 13 d2 a6 14 a4 d8 15 b3 f5 16 f1 f7 17 d2 f6 18 a5 (White has prepared well for this pawn-lever, which gives him an outpost on a5 and isolates Black’s a-pawn) 18...bxa5 19 xa5 ± Malaniuk-Lysenko, Russia Cup, Ekaterinburg 1997.

![Diagram](image)

10...b6

Practice has also seen 10...0-0, which gets the king to relative safety, and 10...h6, putting the immediate question to White’s knight:

a) 10...0-0 11 f4 (this is an extremely desirable move, positionally speaking, as White introduces the ideas of either playing f5, making it harder for Black to push his kingside pawn-majority, or as in the game opening the f-file, in order to attack the black king) 11...exf4? 12 xf4 bd7 13 f3 e8 14 wh3 f8 15 ae1 (White enjoys a clear advantage due to the superior mobility of his forces; at the same time his space advantage restricts the maneuverability of the black bishops) 15...a6 16 c2 c8 17 wh4 h6 18 xf7! (with most of White’s pieces pointing towards the black king, this sacrifice highlights the weaknesses and lack of harmony in the black camp) 18...xf7 19 xh6! gxh6 20 xe7+! 1-0 Høi-U. Nielsen, Gausdal 1990.

b) 10...h6 11 ge4 xe4 12 xe4 and now:

b1) 12...g6 (this is an extremely ambitious approach, aiming to push the kingside pawns before completing development) 13 f4 f5 14 fxe5 dxe5 (14...fxe4 15 xe4 gives White a huge initiative for the piece) 15 g3 c8 16 xf5 xf5 17 xf5 gxf5 18 h5+ d7 19 xf5 c7 20 xe5 with three pawns and an attack for the piece, Danner-Siegel, Swiss Team Ch 1993.

b2) 12...0-0 13 h5 d7 14 xh6! (D).

![Diagram](image)

This intuitive piece sacrifice gives White a huge attack, with a perpetual check available as a ‘safety-net’. 14...gxh6 15 xh6 f5 16 g6+ h8 17 f4? (White boldly goes for it, but...
this attempt to open lines is not the most effective continuation; 17...g3! would be my suggested improvement as after 17...e4 18...xf5 xf5 19...xe4...f8 20...h6+...g8 21...xf5 White has four pawns, a rook and an overwhelming position for two pieces; 17...ae1! is also strong) 17...fxe4 18...xe4...f6 19...h6+...g8 20...g5+ (by this point, 20...h3 was White’s only way to seek more than a draw, but 20...xe4 21...h3...h4 22...xh4...xh4 23...xh4...xf4 24...e7...a6 is not risk-free for White) 20...h8 21...h6+...g8 22...g6 e4 23 f5? (23...f5 still achieves a draw) 23...f7 24...f4...d8 25...h4...g7 and Black has defended himself, K.Berg-Ward, London 1989.

11 f4 (D)

11...g6?

11...a6 is a more solid approach: 12 b3...c7 13 a4 (White uses this standard push to dissuade Black from any ideas of...b5 and to introduce the possibility of...a3) 13...c5+ (this is too optimistic, but a more cautious approach such

as 13...0-0 would allow White his normal plan of queenside expansion) 14...h1...d4 (this early queen sortie is easily repulsed and amounts to a loss of time) 15...c2...c5 16...e2 e4 17...d1...d3 18...xd3 exd3 19...xd3 gave White a clear material and positional advantage in the game Kharkova-Litinskaya, Polish Team Ch, Lubniewice 1994.

12 f5 (D)

12...h6?!

Black mistakenly kicks the white knight, assuming that it will retreat. 12...0-0 is a better option, although after 13 fxg6 hxg6 14...e1, with the idea of...h4, White’s attacking prospects give him the advantage.

13...e6! fx6?

Black’s best try is 13...c8! 14...a4 (with the idea of 15 fxg6 ++) 14...g5 and now Polgar gave 15...b5(!) fx6 16 fxe6, analysing 16...c5(?) 17...d6++ as very good for White. However, 16...0-0! 17 exd7...c5+ 18...h1...e4 is far from clear, so White should play 15...e3, completing development
before taking further action. Then Black has serious difficulties.

14 fxe6 \( \mathcal{Q}f8 \)
14...\( \mathcal{Q}c5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}xg6+ \mathcal{Q}f8 \) 16 b4
\( \mathcal{Q}a6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{Q}e4 +.-. \)
15 \( \mathcal{Q}a4+ \mathcal{Q}d6 \) 16 c5! (D)

The light squares around the black king are fatally weak.

16...\( \mathcal{Q}c8 \)
16...bxc5 17 exd7+ \( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) (after 17...\( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) Black is mated at once by 18 \( \mathcal{Q}xg6\# \)) 18 \( \mathcal{Q}b5 \).
17 exd7+ 1-0
White wins after 17...\( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) 18 c6
\( \mathcal{Q}f5 \) 19 c7+ \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 20 \( \mathcal{Q}b5 \).

Game 45

**Dizdar – Plachetka**

_Slovakia-Croatia match,
Piestany 1996_

1 d4 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 2 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) e6 3 e3 b6 4 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) 5 0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 6 c4 c5 7 \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) 0-0?

This is a clear positional mistake as it allows White either a solid space advantage that Black is ill-placed to contest, or a very strong attack against the black king, as demonstrated in this game.

8 d5! exd5
8...d6 9 e4 e5 looks like a Czech Benoni gone wrong for Black. The moves ...b6 and ...\( \mathcal{Q}b7 \) are worse than useless in this structure.
9 cxd5 (D)

Black is faced with a difficult decision as to whether he should take the d-pawn.

9...\( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \)

This capture is playing with fire, but the alternative is not much more palatable: 9...d6 (Black declines the proffered pawn but suffers from being stuck in a very bad Benoni: both black bishops are ineffectively placed) 10 e4. As in the Benoni, the main hope of counterplay for Black lies in pushing his queenside pawn-majority, but Black suffers here in that the bishop is getting in the way on b7; Black will have to lose at least two tempi if he is to achieve ...b5 and this alone is enough to ensure that Black will never achieve full equality. Now:
a) 10...\texttt{a}6 11 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{c}7 12 a4 a6
13 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{b}8 (after 13...\texttt{c}8 14 h3 \texttt{e}8
15 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{f}8 16 b4 \texttt{d}7 17 bxc5 bx\texttt{c}5
18 \texttt{d}2 White was close to winning in
Kosić-Stanojević, Vršac 2000) 14 b4
\texttt{xb}4 15 \texttt{x}b4 \texttt{d}7 16 \texttt{e}3 a5 17 \texttt{b}1
\texttt{d}6 18 \texttt{xa}6 \texttt{xa}6 19 \texttt{d}4 \pm Pallis-
er-Crouch, British League (4NCL)
2000/1.

b) 10...a6 11 a4 \texttt{bd}7 gives White
a pleasant choice:

b1) 12 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}8 13 \texttt{c}2 \texttt{f}6 14
\texttt{ab}1 \texttt{e}7 15 \texttt{fc}1 (again White
prepares the critical b4 break) 15...\texttt{c}7
16 b4 \texttt{ab}8 17 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{fc}8 18 \texttt{e}3 g6
19 bxc5 bxc5 20 \texttt{c}4 (with the arrival
of White’s knight on its ideal outpost,
White forces Black on the defensive
and claims a large advantage) 20...\texttt{e}8
21 \texttt{a}5 \texttt{c}7 22 \texttt{d}2 g5 (the dark-
squared bishop is usually Black’s pride
and joy in the Benoni but here it is
fairly ineffective as there are no tar-
gets left on the h8-a1 diagonal) 23
\texttt{xg}5 \texttt{xg}5 24 \texttt{dc}4 and White has
achieved a dream Benoni position,

b2) 12 h3 was Malaniuk’s prefer-
ence in a more recent game: 12...\texttt{c}7
(12...\texttt{e}8 13 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{e}5 14 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{g}6
15 f4 \texttt{d}7 16 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{f}8 17 \texttt{a}3 \texttt{b}8
18 \texttt{b}3 \pm Belikov-Rodin, Voronezh,
Voronezh 2007) 13 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{f}8 14 \texttt{c}1 \texttt{f}8 15
\texttt{d}2 \texttt{d}6 16 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{f}6 17 \texttt{c}1 \texttt{d}8
18 g3 g5 19 \texttt{h}5 \pm Malaniuk-Simat-
tsev, Minsk 1998.

c) 10...\texttt{bd}7 11 h3 \texttt{e}8 12 \texttt{e}1
\texttt{f}8 13 \texttt{f}4 a6 14 a4 \texttt{e}8 (14...\texttt{c}7
15 b3 g6 16 \texttt{c}1 \texttt{g}7 17 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{ad}8
18 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{e}7 19 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{e}8 20 \texttt{h}1
\texttt{d}4 21 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{g}7 22 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{e}5?! 23
\texttt{e}2 \texttt{xc}4 24 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{e}5 25 \texttt{h}4
Zsu.Polgar-Littke, North Bay 1995)
15 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{c}7 16 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{a}8 17 \texttt{ad}1
\texttt{h}5 18 \texttt{h}2 g6 19 e5! \texttt{xe}5 20
\texttt{xe}5 dxe5 21 d6 \texttt{d}7 22 \texttt{xe}5 \pm
Yusupov-Kaliszewski, Warsaw rapid
2007.

10 \texttt{xd}5 \texttt{d}5 11 \texttt{d}7+ \texttt{d}7 12
\texttt{xd}5

White is much better as Black suf-
fers from an exposed king and weak-
nesses on the d-file.

12...\texttt{c}6 13 \texttt{d}2

In later games 13 e4 and 13 \texttt{d}1
have also proved sufficient for a clear
advantage.

13...\texttt{f}6 14 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{g}8

White is winning after 14...\texttt{xc}3
15 \texttt{h}5+ \texttt{g}8 16 \texttt{g}5.

15 \texttt{h}5 \texttt{e}8 16 \texttt{ad}1

White now enjoys an overwhelming
initiative, being able to create threats
with almost every move.

16...\texttt{d}6 17 \texttt{d}5 (D)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{B} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Threatening \texttt{g}5.

17...\texttt{g}6 18 \texttt{h}6

Now the threat is \texttt{h}5!. 
b) 11...g6 12 \( \texttt{Wh}3 \) \( \texttt{Cc}6 \) (12...\( \texttt{Dc}3 \)) 13 \( \texttt{Bc}3 \) \( \texttt{Cd}7 \) 14 \( \texttt{Ah}6 \) \( \texttt{Ce}8 \) 15 \( \texttt{Dh}5 \) \( \texttt{Dxe}5 \) 16 \( \texttt{Dxe}5 \) \( \texttt{Wc}7 \) 17 \( \texttt{Dxe}8 \) \( \texttt{Hxe}8 \) 18 \( \texttt{Wg}3 \) was slightly better for White in Danielian-Brosdsky, Cappelle la Grande 2006) 13 \( \texttt{Ah}6 \) \( \texttt{Dxd}4 \) (13...\( \texttt{Be}8 \)!!) 14 \( \texttt{Dc}5 \) \( \texttt{Cc}8 \) 15 \( \texttt{Aa}d1 \) \( \texttt{Dxc}3 \) 16 \( \texttt{Bc}3 \) \( \texttt{Df}8 \) 17 \( \texttt{Dd}3 \) \( \texttt{We}7 \) 18 \( \texttt{Ag}3 \) \( \texttt{Ded}8 \) 19 \( \texttt{Dxf}8 \) \( \texttt{Wxf}8 \) 20 \( \texttt{Axc}6 \) \( \texttt{Ax}c6 \) 21 \( \texttt{Wh}4 \) \( \texttt{Ab}5 \) 22 \( \texttt{Ae}1 \) \( \texttt{Wa}3 \)?? 23 \( \texttt{Dxf}7 \) \( \texttt{Dd}7 \) 24 \( \texttt{Dh}6+ \) \( \texttt{Ag}7 \) 25 \( \texttt{Dg}4 \) \( \texttt{Af}7 \) 26 \( \texttt{Wh}6+ \) \( \texttt{Ag}8 \) 27 \( \texttt{Wg}5 \) 1-0 Kosić-B. Smith, Budapest 2006) 14 \( \texttt{Dxf}8 \) \( \texttt{Dxf}8 \) 15 \( \texttt{Dxd}5 \) \( \texttt{Wxd}5 \) 16 \( \texttt{Dfe}1 \) \( \texttt{Db}4 \) 17 \( \texttt{Dc}4 \) \( \texttt{Wxe}5 \) 18 \( \texttt{Dxb}7 \) \( \texttt{Dxe}1 \) 19 \( \texttt{Dxa}8 \) \( \texttt{Dc}2+ \) 20 \( \texttt{Dh}1 \) \( \texttt{Dxf}2 \) (Werle-Naiditsch, European Ch, Dresden 2007) and now 21 \( \texttt{Wf}3 \) leads to a very interesting game.

12 \( \texttt{Wh}4 \)

A decade ago 12 \( \texttt{Wh}3 \)?? (D) was an untried suggestion by Keith Arkell.

Now it has enjoyed a few outings but there are still more questions than answers:

a) 12...\( \texttt{Da}6 \)?? 13 \( \texttt{Dd}1 \) \( \texttt{Dxd}3 \) 14 \( \texttt{Dxd}3 \) \( \texttt{Da}6 \) 15 \( \texttt{Ah}6 \) \( \texttt{Ge}8 \) 16 \( \texttt{Gg}3 \) ± (16 \( \texttt{Aad}1 \) is also good) 16...\( \texttt{Wxd}4 \)?? 17 \( \texttt{Df}3 \) \( \texttt{Wd}8 \) 18 \( \texttt{Dd}1 \) \( \texttt{Wb}8 \) 19 \( \texttt{Ad}7 \)? (19 \( \texttt{Dc}4 \) +-) 19...\( \texttt{f6} \) 20 \( \texttt{Df}4 \)?? (20 \( \texttt{Dg}5 \) ±) 20...\( \texttt{Dxb}2 \) 21 \( \texttt{Df}5 \)?? (21 \( \texttt{Wh}5 \) may improve) 21...\( \texttt{f4} \) and chances were relatively balanced in M.Richter-B. Socko, Bundesliga 2005/6.

b) 12...\( \texttt{Wxd}4 \) 13 \( \texttt{Ec}1 \) (13 \( \texttt{Ag}5 \)??) and now:

b1) 13...\( \texttt{Cc}6 \) 14 \( \texttt{Dc}5 \)?? (14 \( \texttt{Ec}4 \) \( \texttt{Wd}8 \) 15 \( \texttt{Dxc}6 \) \( \texttt{Dxc}6 \) 16 \( \texttt{Wh}4 \) \( \texttt{h}5 \) 17 \( \texttt{g}4 \) \( \texttt{Wd}4 \) 18 \( \texttt{g}x\texttt{h}5 \) \( \texttt{Wd}6 \) 19 \( \texttt{h}6 \) \( \texttt{g}6 \) is unclear) 14...\( \texttt{Dd}8 \) 15 \( \texttt{Ce}4 \) (15 \( \texttt{Dg}4 \) \( \texttt{Df}4 \) 16 \( \texttt{Dc}4 \) \( \texttt{Dfd}5 \) 17 \( \texttt{Dd}2 \) \( \texttt{Dc}2 \) 18 \( \texttt{Dd}3 \) \( \texttt{Df}6 \) ?) 15...\( \texttt{g}6 \) 16 \( \texttt{Dh}6+ \) \( \texttt{Dg}7 \) 17 \( \texttt{Dd}2 \) \( \texttt{a}6 \) 18 \( \texttt{Dc}3 \) \( \texttt{Db}4 \) 19 \( \texttt{Dc}3 \) \( \texttt{Dc}2 \) 20 \( \texttt{Dxc}2 \) \( \texttt{Wxd}2 \) \( \texttt{T} \) McDonald Ross-Kwiatkowski, British League (4NCL) 2006/7.

b2) 13...\( \texttt{Db}7 \) 14 \( \texttt{Dxd}7 \) \( \texttt{Wxd}7 \) 15 \( \texttt{Dg}5 \) \( \texttt{h}6 \) 16 \( \texttt{Aad}1 \) \( \texttt{Cc}6 \) 17 \( \texttt{Dc}4 \) \( \texttt{Dd}5 \) and now 18 \( \texttt{Dc}1 \)?? \( \texttt{Dd}7 \) 19 \( \texttt{Axe}6 \) \( \texttt{g}x\texttt{h}6 \) 20 \( \texttt{Wxh}6 \) \( \texttt{f}5 \) 21 \( \texttt{Dh}5 \) \( \texttt{Wx}b5 \) 22 \( \texttt{Dc}3 \)? \( \texttt{Wc}8 \) 23 \( \texttt{Dxd}5 \) \( \texttt{Dxd}5 \) 24 \( \texttt{Dc}3 \) \( \texttt{Dg}5 \)? (24...\( \texttt{Dd}6 \) 25 \( \texttt{Dh}3 \) \( \texttt{Dd}7 \) ?) 25 \( \texttt{Wxg}5+ \) 1-0 was the entertaining if highly inaccurate finish of Brameyer-Merz, Berlin 2000. White should have played 18 \( \texttt{Dxe}6 \) \( \texttt{g}x\texttt{h}6 \)?? (18...\( \texttt{f}5 \) is necessary) 19 \( \texttt{Wxh}6 \) \( \texttt{f}5 \) (19...\( \texttt{Dfd}8 \) 20 \( \texttt{Dc}3 \) \( \texttt{Dxe}5 \) 21 \( \texttt{Df}6+ \) \( \texttt{Dxf}6 \) 22 \( \texttt{Dh}7+ \) \( \texttt{Dh}8 \) 23 \( \texttt{Dg}6+ \) \( \texttt{Dg}8 \) 24 \( \texttt{Dh}7+ \) \( \texttt{Df}8 \) 25 \( \texttt{Wxf}7 \#) 20 \( \texttt{Dg}5 \) \( \texttt{Dxg}5 \) 21 \( \texttt{Wxg}5+ \) \( \texttt{Df}7 \) 22 \( \texttt{Dxf}5 \) \( \texttt{exf}5 \) 23 \( \texttt{Dxd}5 \)+-.

We now return to 12 \( \texttt{Wh}4 \) (D):

12...\( \texttt{Dc}4 \)

This very direct approach has scored reasonably for Black but I believe there is a way for White to gain the advantage. Black’s main alternatives are:

a) 12...\( \texttt{Dc}6 \)? (over-aggressive; this is a very careless, yet seemingly natural move, that an unsuspecting opponent
might make without much thought) 13 \textit{g5} (it is still not obvious at a glance that Black is teetering on the brink of total collapse) 13...g6? (13...\textit{xd4?!} 14 \textit{xc6} +--; 13...h6? 14 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 15 \textit{e4} +--; 13...\textit{xe5} may be relatively best as after 14 \textit{xf6} \textit{fxd3} 15 \textit{xe7} Black can fight on an exchange down with 15...\textit{d7} 16 \textit{xf8} \textit{xf8} 17 \textit{ab1} \textit{c8} 14 \textit{a6!} h6 (14...\textit{xa6} 15 \textit{xc6} +--; 14...\textit{xe5} 15 dxe5 +--) 15 \textit{xe6} \textit{d5} 16 \textit{w3} (Black must lose at least the exchange) 16...\textit{xc3} 17 \textit{xb7} \textit{e2+} 18 \textit{w1} \textit{exd4} 19 \textit{xf8} \textit{xf8} 20 \textit{xa8} \textit{xa8} 21 \textit{e3} +-- Plaskett-Arkell, London 1991.

b) 12...\textit{bd7} (this is the most solid approach) 13 \textit{d1} \textit{e4}?? (13...\textit{e8} ± continues in a solid vein; then White will complete his development and play for a kingside attack) 14 \textit{wh3} \textit{df6} (if Black thought he had the position firmly under control, he was rudely awakened by White's next move, but it appears that all is not lost) 15 d5! (White's thematic central breakthrough) 15...\textit{xc3} 16 bxc3 \textit{xd5} (after 16...exd5? 17 \textit{d7}! Black had nothing better than 17...h6, allowing 18 \textit{xf8}, in Chatalbashev-Pogorelov, Benidorm 2007) 17 \textit{g5} and now:

b1) After 17...h6? 18 \textit{xh6} gxh6 19 \textit{wh6} the first edition of this book stated that "the concealed attack of White's rook on d1 against the black queen on d8 makes defence almost impossible for Black" and gave the lines 19...\textit{c8} (or 19...\textit{e8}; alternatively 19...\textit{d6} loses to 20 \textit{g4} ++) 20 \textit{g5+} \textit{h8} 21 \textit{g4} \textit{gxg4} 22 \textit{wh5+} \textit{g7} 23 \textit{xe4+} \textit{h8} 24 \textit{h5+} \textit{g7} 25 \textit{h7+} \textit{f6} 26 \textit{h6+} \textit{e5} 27 \textit{c4} ±. Remarkably, the game Yusupov-Beliavsky, Austrian Team Ch 1998/9 concluded 19...\textit{c7} 20 \textit{g5+} \textit{h8} 21 \textit{wh4} 1-0. Is it fair to assume that White had read the book and Black hadn't?

b2) 17...g6 18 \textit{wh4}! gives White powerful threats of c4 and \textit{g4}. However, this may not be the end of the story, since after 18...h6 19 \textit{gxg6}!! (as played in Zsu.Polgar-Christianensen, San Francisco 1991; neither 19 \textit{wh6} \textit{g4} nor 19 \textit{axh6} \textit{d7} is especially clear) 19...hxg5 20 \textit{wg5} fxg6 21 \textit{wxg6+} \textit{h8} 22 \textit{f3} (given by Rogers as winning for White, but 22 c4 looks a better try) 22...\textit{h7} 23 \textit{h3} \textit{e4}, White has nothing very convincing.

13 \textit{wh3} \textit{xd4} (D)

14 \textit{f4}

The first edition of this book suggested 14 \textit{xf7} \textit{xf7} 15 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 16 \textit{g4} as an improvement, reckoning that after regaining his piece White would have a distinct endgame advantage due to the weak isolated pawn on e6 and his strong square on e4. More
recent games have indicated that this is to a large extent compensated by Black's better development. Some examples:

a) 16...\(\text{\#d7}\) 17 \(\text{\#e3}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 18 \(\text{\#xd4}\) \(\text{\#xg4}\) 19 \(\text{\#xe4}\) \(\text{\#f4}\) (19...\(\text{\#d8}\) 20 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#f5}\) 21 \(\text{\#ae1}\) \(\text{\#f7}\) 22 \(\text{\#e2}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 23 \(\text{\#e1}\) \(\text{\#xe4}\) 24 \(\text{\#xe4}\) \(\text{\#c5}\) 25 \(\text{\#xe2}\) = Justopham Minh Hoang, French Team Ch 2005/6) 20 \(\text{\#fe1}\) e5 21 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 22 \(\text{\#g5}\) \(\text{\#c5}\) 23 \(\text{\#h3}\) \(\text{\#g4}\) 24 \(\text{\#xe5}\) \(\text{\#xf2}\) 25 \(\text{\#xf2}\) \(\text{\#xe5}\) 26 \(\text{\#xe5}\) \(\text{\#f5}\) 27 \(\text{\#c3}\) ± Claesen-Van de Berkemortel, Belgian Team Ch 2000/1.

b) 16...\(\text{\#c6}\) 17 \(\text{\#xe4}\) \(\text{\#xe4}\) 18 \(\text{\#xe4}\) and now:

b1) 18...\(\text{\#c8}\) 19 \(\text{\#e3}\) \(\text{\#b4}\) 20 \(\text{\#fc1}\) \(\text{\#ff8}\) 21 a4 \(\text{\#c2}\) ½-½ Gausel-Womacka, Gausdal 2003.

b2) 18...\(\text{\#d4}\) 19 \(\text{\#d1}\) \(\text{\#c2}\) 20 \(\text{\#b1}\) \(\text{\#b4}\) 21 a3 \(\text{\#d5}\) 22 \(\text{\#g5}\) ½-½ Bensdorf-Zdebskaya, World Girls Ch, Istanbul 2005.

b3) 18...\(\text{\#d8}\) 19 \(\text{\#e3}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 20 \(\text{\#ac1}\) \(\text{\#b4}\) 21 \(\text{\#e4}\) \(\text{\#d5}\) 22 b3 \(\text{\#xe3}\) 23 \(\text{\#xe3}\) \(\text{\#e5}\) 24 \(\text{\#fc1}\) (24 \(\text{\#xf7}\) \(\text{\#xf7}\) 25 \(\text{\#c1}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) 26 \(\text{\#f2}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 27 h3 \(\text{\#c7}\) is equal, Ozoren-Kwiatkowski, British League (4NCL) 2007/8) 24...h6 25 \(\text{\#c6}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) 26 \(\text{\#f2}\) \(\text{\#f7}\) 27 \(\text{\#e2}\) \(\text{\#ed7}\) = Izoria-Cordova, Chicago 2006.

b4) 18...\(\text{\#b4}\) 19 \(\text{\#d2}\) (19 \(\text{\#e3}\) \(\text{\#c2}\) 20 \(\text{\#ac1}\) \(\text{\#xe3}\) 21 \(\text{\#xe3}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 22 b3 \(\text{\#e5}\) 23 \(\text{\#xf7}\) \(\text{\#xf7}\) 24 \(\text{\#f2}\) = Yusupov-Macieja, Bundesliga 2006/7) 19...\(\text{\#d3}\) 20 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#c5}\) 21 \(\text{\#ae1}\) \(\text{\#xe4}\) 22 \(\text{\#xe4}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 23 \(\text{\#xf6}\) \(\text{\#xf6}\) 24 \(\text{\#c1}\) ± Prusikin-Sprenger, German Ch, Altenkirchen 2005.

14...\(\text{\#f6}\)

Not 14...\(\text{\#f5}\)? 15 \(\text{\#b5}\) (15 \(\text{\#c4}?!\))

15...\(\text{\#d8}\) 16 \(\text{\#fd1}\) \(\text{\#d5}\) 17 \(\text{\#xe4}\) \(\text{\#f4}\) 18 \(\text{\#xd5}\) \(\text{\#xd5}\) 19 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#b7}\) 20 \(\text{\#xe6}\) and White was clearly better in Danner-Thinuus, Austrian Team Ch 1998/9.

15 \(\text{\#e2}\) \(\text{\#wa4}\)

Recent experience includes:

a) 15...\(\text{\#wd8}\) 16 \(\text{\#fd1}\) \(\text{\#d5}\) 17 \(\text{\#g5}\) g6 18 \(\text{\#h6}\) (18 \(\text{\#h4}\) a6 19 \(\text{\#f4}\) \(\text{\#a7}\) 20 \(\text{\#c4}\) \(\text{\#e4}\)?! 21 \(\text{\#xe7}\)?! {21 \(\text{\#xd5}\)!?)

21...\(\text{\#xe7}\) 22 \(\text{\#xe7}\) \(\text{\#xe7}\) 23 \(\text{\#xd5}\) exd5 24 \(\text{\#g4}\) \(\text{\#g7}\) ½-½ Burlai-Golovanzh, Alushta 2005) 18...\(\text{\#bd7}\) 19 \(\text{\#xd7}\) \(\text{\#xd7}\) 20 \(\text{\#xf8}\) \(\text{\#xf8}\) 21 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) 22 \(\text{\#xd5}\) exd5 23 \(\text{\#ac1}\) is much better for White, Prusikin-Naumkin, 2nd Bundesliga 1999/00.

b) 15...\(\text{\#b4}\) 16 a3 \(\text{\#wa4}\) 17 \(\text{\#ac1}\) (17 \(\text{\#g5}\) will be very similar to the main game) 17...\(\text{\#a8}\) 18 \(\text{\#c2}\) \(\text{\#e8}\) 19 \(\text{\#g5}\) g6 20 \(\text{\#fe1}\) \(\text{\#d5}\) 21 \(\text{\#h6}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 22 \(\text{\#d4}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 23 \(\text{\#df3}\) \(\text{\#xe5}\) 24 \(\text{\#xe5}\) \(\text{\#ac8}\) 25 \(\text{\#xf8}\) \(\text{\#xf8}\) 26 \(\text{\#d7}\) = Vaganian-Lobron, Mainz rapid 2003.

16 \(\text{\#g5}\) (D)

For the moment this seems the most promising. The previous edition of this book gave 16 b3 \(\text{\#e8}\) 17 \(\text{\#g5}\)
16...g6

Alternatively:
a) 16...h6?! 17 hxh6 gxh6? (surprisingly, by playing 17...c6 Black avoids any immediate catastrophe) 18 wxb6 d4 19 f4! -+- 19 h5! +- 20 xe4 xe4 21 f4 f5 22 e3 1-0 Braun-Petri, Brno 2006.

b) 16...d8 17 c3! (17 xh7+?! xh7 18 xe7 e8 19 d6 c6 20 b3 1/2-1/2 Solana Suarez-G.Gonzalez, Las Palmas 1994) 17...e8 18 xf6 xf6? (18...xd3 gives Black better fighting chances) 19 wxh7+ e8 20 b5 d7 21 c7+ d7 22 h8+ e7 23 xe8+ xe8 24 xd7 xd7 25 c1 was much better for White in Solozhenkin-Sammalvuo, Helsinki 2002.

17 c1

This is more promising than 17 yf4? xd7, when 18 xg6? was totally misguided because of 18...xe5 in Payen-Dumitrache, Avoine 2004, and 18 xd7 xd7 19 ad1 wc6 seems better for Black.

17 wa5 18 f4 c5+ 19 h1 d5 20 a3 wa4 21 c3 xc3 22 xc3 f5 23 c4

White is winning thanks to Black’s lagging development and weakened king position.

23...d5 24 xd5 exd5 25 b4 d4 26 cc1 d6 27 f3

Even the unprotected rook plays a part in Black’s downfall.

27 h6 28 wd5+ g7 29 xd6 hxg5 30 c7+ 1-0
6 Anti-Benoni

Introduction and Unusual Systems

Game 47
Hodgson – Martin Gonzalez
Seville 1987

1 d4 d6 2 c3 c5

With this move Black is trying to steer the game into a Benoni type of position. The problem for White is that there is no really good way to avoid this. What White can do, though, is enter a Benoni structure on his own terms and take a lot of the fun away from Black.

3 d5 (D)

This forthright move, gaining space in the centre, is undoubtedly best. After 3 e3 g6 4 d3 g7 the benefits of Black’s flexible development become apparent, as he has not yet committed himself to ...d5. White will have to choose between c3 and b3 at some stage but both moves will take us outside the scope of the repertoire. After 3 d5 Black is faced with a choice between direct central conflict and quiet development.

3...e6

This is the most direct move: Black challenges White to enter a Benoni with 4 c4. The Benoni is an extremely dangerous opening and play often becomes quite sharp. This is exactly what Benoni players want and I recommend a way of keeping the tactics to a minimum.

3...d6 4 c3 will most likely transpose to other lines in this chapter: for 4...e6 5 e4 see Games 49-51, while 4...g6 5 e4 g7 is Game 53. Only 4...e5 remains, when 5 e4 is like a Czech Benoni where White has additional freedom to act thanks to the c4-square, while Black can’t quickly play ...g5. Compare the line 1 d4 c5 2 d5 e5, discussed in the notes to Game 68.

Another alternative, of a totally different nature, is 3...c4, the so-called Hawk Variation, which is a recommendation of Stefan Bűcker. If White reacts sensibly it fails to impress. 4 c3 a5 5 d2 (5 d2 is the other theoretically approved way of getting
the advantage, but the text-move is a lot less complex) 5...\text{cxd}5 (more or less forced, else White will achieve a turbo-charged Benoni after e4) 6 e4 \text{cxc}3 7 \text{xc3 c5} (after 7...\text{c7} 8 \text{d}2 \text{e}6 9 \text{xc}4 \text{c}6 10 0-0 Black has problems unravelling his kingside) 8 \text{wd}4 \text{xd}4 9 \text{xd}4 \text{a}6 10 \text{a}4 \text{b}6 11 \text{xc}4 (White has a large lead in development, which allows him to attack the black position) 11...\text{b}7 12 \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 13 exd5 e5 (Black drives away the strongly posted white knight; however, putting his pawns on dark squares only makes his bishop worse) 14 \text{f}5 d6 15 \text{e}2 \text{d}7 16 \text{e}3 \text{c}7 (played in order to develop the queenside) 17 a5 b5 18 \text{d}2 \text{d}7 19 c4 (with a lead in development it is logical to open lines for your pieces to exploit) 19...\text{xc}4 20 \text{hc}1 \text{b}7 21 \text{xc}4 (the black kingside pieces are sitting idly by, but development is not easy) 21...\text{c}8 (or 21...\text{e}7 22 \text{f}5) 22 \text{xc}8 \text{xc}8 23 \text{c}1+ \text{b}7 24 \text{c}6 (targeting the weak points on a6 and d6) 24...\text{f}6 25 \text{b}6+ \text{a}7 26 \text{b}4 \text{e}7 27 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 28 \text{xd}6 and White converted his material advantage in Hoi-Liardet, Geneva 1991.

4 \text{c}3 (D)

4...\text{wa}5?!

This attempt to hold up the e4 advance and prepare queenside counterplay falls short. Another possibility is 4...g6?! 5 e4 d6 (to prevent \text{e}5) 6 \text{b}5+ \text{d}7 7 dxe6 (highlighting the drawbacks in Black’s move-order; 7 \text{xd}7 is also not bad, because after 7...\text{xd}7 8 0-0 \text{g}7 9 dxe6 fxe6 10 \text{f}4 e5 11 \text{g}5 0-0 12 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 13 \text{d}5 \text{c}6 14 c3 White enjoyed a positional advantage in Vaisman-Nemirovski, French Ch, Epinal 1989) 7...\text{xe}6 8 \text{g}5 \text{xb}5 9 \text{xb}5 \text{wa}5+ 10 \text{wd}2 \text{xb}5 11 \text{xf}6 is good for White, as Black’s king is unsafe; e.g., 11...\text{g}8 12 \text{g}5 \text{d}7 13 0-0-0 ±.

4...b5!? can be met with a counter-gambit: 5 dxe6 fxe6 6 e4?! \text{b}4 7 \text{c}5 \text{xe}4 (7...\text{a}6 8 \text{d}6+ \text{xd}6 9 \text{xd}6 \text{xe}4 10 \text{e}5 \text{b}7 11 \text{wg}7 = Ortega-Piscopo, Arvier 2009) 8 \text{f}4 \text{d}6 (8...\text{a}6 9 \text{d}3 \text{f}6 10 \text{g}5 ±) 9 \text{d}2! \text{xd}2 (9...\text{w}f6 10 \text{w}f3! ±) 10 \text{xd}2 ±.

5 \text{d}2 b5

This is the only sensible continuation. 5...\text{wb}6 has been treated very roughly after 6 e4:

a) 6...\text{exd}5 7 e5 \text{we}6 8 \text{e}2 \text{e}4 9 0-0 \text{xc}3 10 \text{bxc}3 \text{e}7 11 \text{g}5 \text{c}xg5 (Black has grave difficulties after 11...\text{xe}5 12 \text{d}3) 12 \text{c}xg5 0-0 13 f4 gave White a comfortable advantage in Kosten-Kalwa, Naujac 2000.

b) 6...\text{g}6 7 \text{e}5 (with the idea of \text{c}4) 7...\text{c}7 8 \text{c}4 \text{a}6 9 \text{f}3 (thanks to Black’s time-wasting, White has
secured a large initiative by simple moves) 9...g7 10 f4 d8 11 d6+ f8 12 g5 exd5 13 xd5 1-0 Morant-Jarvela, Finnish Team Ch 1986.

6 e4 d8?! 6...b6 keeps the queen active but allows White to weaken the black kingside. 7 xf6+ xf6 8 e4 gives Black these options:

a) 8...g8 9 c4 bxc4 10 c3 b7 (10...a6 11 g3 f5?! 12 g2 fxe4 13 e5 d6? {13...g7 ±} 14 dxe6 dxe5 15 exf7+ xf7 16 xe4 1-0 S.Schneider-C.Olsson, Swedish Team Ch 2006/7) 11 xc4 (White sacrifices the g-pawn to accelerate his attack) 11...xg2 12 h4 g5 13 e2 e7 14 0-0-0 a6 15 xa6 xa6 16 f3 xa2 17 e5! with a big initiative and full compensation for the sacrificed material, Åkesson-Hector, Malmö 1986.

b) 8...b7 9 c4 g8 (9...b4?! 10 d3 f5?! 11 0-0 fxe4 12 xe4 f5 13 e5 fxe4 14 h5+ d8 15 f7+ -- Polovodin-Tetenkina, Tula 1999) 10 b3 a6 11 c3 c7 12 d2 0-0-0 13 a5 d6 14 0-0-0 bxc4 15 bxc4 g4 16 c2 is unclear, Todorov-Badev, Sunny Beach 2006.

7 xf6+ xf6 8 e4 (D)

The big problems for Black here are his severely misplaced queen and queenside pawn weaknesses.

8...g6 9 e2 c7 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 e5 f6 12 g4 g6

This is Black’s sixth queen move by move 12, a sure sign that the opening hasn’t gone according to plan.

13 b4

White already has a large advantage and, to add insult to injury, the queen is now used as a target to start White’s kingside attack.

13 exd5 14 exd5 d6 15 g3 c4?

Black is fiddling while his position burns. It is no surprise that this attempt at a ‘pawn-storm’ fails with all the queenside pieces undeveloped.

16 g2 b7? 17 f4

Winning material or forcing mate!

17 c5 18 d6 xg2 19 dxe7 e8 20 f6+! (D)

20...xf6 21 g4+ 1-0

21...h8 22 h6 would be the humiliating end.
4...exd5

Game 48
Karpov – Topalov
Dos Hermanas 1994

1 d4 ∆f6 2 ∆f3 c5 3 d5 e6 4 ∆c3 d5

4...exd5 5 cxd5 ∆xd5 6 ♗xd5 leads to the same position, of course. Either way, by making the exchange immediately, Black makes sure that a white pawn doesn’t remain on d5.

4...d6 is the subject of the next three games.

5 ∆xd5 exd5 6 ♗xd5 e7

After 6...d6 7 e4 c6, the move 8 ∆e2 is plausible, and transposes to the game continuation following 8...e6 9 0-0 0-0. However, Black also has 8...e6, when 9 w4 g6 10 c3 h6 11 w3 0-0 12 0-0 was far from clear in Hebden-Tebb, British League (4NCL) 1999/00. Therefore White probably should go for the critical 8 g5:

a) 8...e7 9 c4 d8?! (9...f6!?)

10 0-0 h6 11 f3 c6 12 w3 e6 13 d5 b4 14 w4 0-0-0 15 e1 d7 16 xe6 wxe6 17 c3 ± Doettiling-Schmidt, Germany tt 2003/4.

b) 8...c7 9 c4 e5 (9...d8 10 a5+ e7 12 w7+ w7 13 f3 w6 14 f4 xd5 15 exd5 w7 16 d2 ± Suba-D.Gurevich, Hastings 1983/4) 10 a5+ d7 11 xd7+ w7 12 f4 w6 (12...h6 13 xe5 hxg5 14 g3 e7 15 0-0 w8 16 e5 xe5 17 xe5 w6 18 xd8+ xd8 19 wxe5 ± Cebalo-Passoni, Mendrisio 1988; 12...g6 13 g3 h6 14 f3 0-0-0 15 0-0-0 w6 16 d3)

8...d6
8...c6 9 c3 d6 10 0-0 just transposes.

9 0-0 c6

9...d7 10 d1 f6 11 w3 is a little better for White, who can intensify his bind on d5 by c4.

10 c3

The key to this variation for White is to keep a careful eye on Black’s freeing ...d5 break, which, although difficult to prevent in the long run, must be discouraged at present. Here
White prevents 10...♘b4 followed by ...

10...♗e6 11 ♘h5 h6?!

Or:

a) The immediate 11...d5 can be met by 12 ♘d1 d4 (forced) 13 e5!? with a space advantage and attacking chances on the kingside.

b) 11...♗e8 12 ♘g5 ♘xg5 13 ♘xg5 ♗f5 14 ♘xf4 d5 15 exd5 ♘xd5 16 ♘f1 ♘f7 17 ♘d6 ± P.Schlosser-Wehmeier, Lippstadt 2000.

c) 11...f5 12 ♘g5 ♘xg5 13 ♘xg5 ♗d7 (13...♗b6 14 exf5 ♘xf5 15 ♘c4+ ♘h8 16 b3 ♘e5 17 ♘d5 ♘d3 18 ♘f1 c4 19 ♘h4 ♘c5? 20 ♘d4 ± Perić-Valverde, Merida 2002; 13...♗e8 14 ♘xe8 ♘xe8 15 ♘fd1 fxe4 16 ♘xd6 ♘e5 17 ♘e3 ♘c4 18 ♘xc4+ ♘xc4 19 ♘d7 ♘xe3 20 fxe3 ♘f7 21 ♘ad1 ± Hebden-Wise, British Ch, Great Yarmouth 2007) 14 exf5 ♘xf5 15 ♘ad1 ♘h8 16 ♘e3 b6 17 ♘h4 ± Damjano-vić-Arizmendi, Andorra 2005.

12 ♘d1 ♘e8

12...♗d7 13 ♘f4 ♘f5 14 ♘xd6 ♘xd6 15 e5 ♘f7 16 ♘h4 ♘e8 17 ♘xd6 ♘xe5 18 ♘f4 ♘g6 19 ♘d2 ♘d8 20 ♘f1 ♘e7 21 ♘d1 ♘xd6 22 ♘xd6 ♘xd6 23 ♘xd6 ♘e8 24 ♘b5 is slightly better for White, Cosma-Jaenig, Metz 2002.

13 ♘f4 ♘f8!

Black is defending accurately and threatens to harass the white queen with ...g6.

14 ♘d2 (D)

To make space for the queen.

14...g6 15 ♘f3 d5

The only problem Black has to watch now is tactics on the d-file.

16 ♘g3 ♘e7 17 exd5 ♘xd5 18 ♘f1 ♘f6 19 ♘b3

This position appears completely equal, which makes it even more impressive how Karpov gradually creeps up on his top-class opponent.

19...♗ad8 20 ♘d2

White’s main idea for the moment is to try to gain control of the d-file without allowing too many simplifying exchanges.

20...♗e6 21 ♘c7! (D)

This is a key component in wresting control of the d-file.
21...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xd2 22  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f5 23  \textit{\textbf{Q}}c4  \\
\textit{\textbf{Q}}e4 24  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e3  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e8 25  \textit{\textbf{Q}}d1  \\
Mission accomplished! The d-file now belongs to White – thus the first small advantage is accumulated. The knight on e3 is significant in reducing Black’s possibilities on the e-file.  \\
25...\textit{\textbf{Q}}e8 26 h3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g5 27  \textit{\textbf{Q}}f3  \\
Karpov sticks to his policy of keeping pieces on the board.  \\
27...\textit{\textbf{Q}}g7 28  \textit{\textbf{Q}}f4  \\
Suddenly the black queen is embarrassed for squares.  \\
28...\textit{\textbf{Q}}e7  \\
Other moves are no better: 28...\textit{\textbf{Q}}h4 29 g3 doesn’t help, while 28...\textit{\textbf{Q}}h5 29  \\
\textit{\textbf{Q}}xh5 gxh5 is not the sort of endgame to play against the master of exploiting small advantages, and 28...\textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 29  \\
\textit{\textbf{Q}}xh6+ costs Black his queen.  \\
29  \textit{\textbf{Q}}d5  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e4 30  \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6!! (D)  \\

\begin{center}
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This wonderful mini-combination forces a gain of material.  \\
30...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xf6  \\
30...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xf3 31  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe8+ ++.  \\
31  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e5++  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe5 32  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe4+  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe4  \\
33  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e1+  \\

This skewer followed by a fork of Black’s two bishops was the fiendish idea behind White’s 30th move.  \\
33...\textit{\textbf{Q}}f5 34  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe8  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e6 35  \textit{\textbf{Q}}xf8  \\
\textit{\textbf{Q}}xa2 36  \textit{\textbf{Q}}e8 1-0  \\
Black resigned, seeing no good answer to  \textit{\textbf{Q}}c7 and not wanting an endgame lesson.  \\

4...d6 5 e4: Alternatives to 5...exd5  \\

Game 49  \\
Speelman – Suba  \\
Seville 1981  \\

1  d4  \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 2  \textit{\textbf{Q}}f3  c5 3  d5  e6 4  \textit{\textbf{Q}}c3  \\
d6 5 e4 (D)  \\

\begin{center}
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Black now has an important choice between exchanging pawns on d5 (see Games 50 and 51) and trying to retain some flexibility by delaying that exchange – we focus on the latter approach here.  \\
5...\textit{\textbf{Q}}a6  \\
This is played to prevent the threat of  \textit{\textbf{Q}}b5+. If 5...\textit{\textbf{Q}}e7 then 6  \textit{\textbf{Q}}b5+
gives Black a choice of ways to reach an inferior position:

a) 6...\(\mathcal{D}d5\) (this is just plain bad) 7 dxe6 fxe6 8 \(\mathcal{G}g5\) (Black has no good way to prevent the knight’s arrival on e6) 8...\(\mathcal{W}a5\) 9 \(\mathcal{X}xe6\) ++ \(\mathcal{X}xe4\) (Black rests his meagre hopes on a counterattack but is helpless against the white onslaught) 10 \(\mathcal{X}xg7+\) \(\mathcal{F}f7\) 11 \(\mathcal{W}h5+\) \(\mathcal{X}xg7\) 12 \(\mathcal{H}h6+\) \(\mathcal{F}f6\) (12...\(\mathcal{G}g8\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}d5\#)) 13 \(\mathcal{W}f3+ 1-0\) Machulsky-Rios, Philadelphia 1992. Black decided he’d had enough because after 13...\(\mathcal{G}g6\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}xe4+\) \(\mathcal{X}xh6\) 15 \(\mathcal{W}xe7\) White will have recaptured the sacrificed material with interest and still have a powerful attack.

b) 6...\(\mathcal{A}d7\) leads to a small endgame advantage for White after 7 dxe6 fxe6 8 e5 \(\mathcal{X}xe5\) 9 \(\mathcal{X}xe5\) \(\mathcal{X}xb5\) 10 \(\mathcal{W}xd8+\) \(\mathcal{X}xd8\) 11 \(\mathcal{X}xb5\) 0-0 (or 11...\(\mathcal{D}bd7\) 12 \(\mathcal{D}c4\) 0-0 13 a4 \(\mathcal{D}e4\) 14 0-0 a6 15 \(\mathcal{D}bd6\) \(\mathcal{X}xd6\) 16 \(\mathcal{X}xd6\) \(\mathcal{A}c7\) 17 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) b6 18 a5 ± Polovodin-Akhmetov, St Petersburg 2000) 12 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) (White is better on account of the weak isolated e-pawn; Black has a long, arduous defence in front of him) 12...\(\mathcal{A}a6\) 13 c3 \(\mathcal{D}d5\) 14 \(\mathcal{A}d2\) \(\mathcal{F}f5\) 15 \(\mathcal{D}c4\) \(\mathcal{F}f7\) 16 0-0 \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 17 \(\mathcal{D}xa7\) \(\mathcal{D}ac7\) 18 a4 \(\mathcal{D}f4\) 19 \(\mathcal{D}b5\) \(\mathcal{D}cd5\) 20 \(\mathcal{A}ae1\) \(\mathcal{F}f6\) 21 g3 \(\mathcal{D}d3\) 22 \(\mathcal{X}xe6\) \(\mathcal{X}xb2\) 23 \(\mathcal{X}xb2\) \(\mathcal{X}xd2\) 24 \(\mathcal{A}c4\) \(\mathcal{A}d7\) 25 \(\mathcal{B}b6\) 1-0 Benjamin-Shaine, Boston 1988.

c) 6...\(\mathcal{F}f7\) 7 dxe6 fxe6 8 \(\mathcal{G}g5\) \(\mathcal{X}xg5\) 9 \(\mathcal{W}h5+\) g6 10 \(\mathcal{W}xg5\) \(\mathcal{X}xg5\) 11 \(\mathcal{A}xg5\) ± Sharif-Luco, Cap d’Agde 1994. White enjoys the advantage of the two bishops and can target the weak d-pawn.

6...\(f6\) 6...\(\mathcal{X}xe6\) 7 e5 leads to a structural advantage for White.

7 \(\mathcal{G}g5\) \(b5\)

7...\(\mathcal{C}c6\) 8 \(\mathcal{X}xe6\) fxe6 9 g3 \(\mathcal{W}e7\) 10 \(\mathcal{H}g2\) g6 11 \(\mathcal{F}f4\) \(\mathcal{D}e5\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{G}g7\) 13 0-0 0-0 14 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) was somewhat better for White in Damaso-Outerelo Ucha, Orense 2002.

8 \(\mathcal{X}xe6\) fxe6 9 g3 (D)

Tempting Black to win a pawn.

9...\(\mathcal{C}c6\)

9...b4 10 \(\mathcal{D}e2\) \(\mathcal{X}xe4?!\) (Black wins a central pawn but falls behind in development with his king stuck in the centre) 11 \(\mathcal{G}g2\) d5 12 \(\mathcal{F}f4\) \(\mathcal{W}f6\) 13 0-0 \(\mathcal{A}a7\) (anticipating White’s next move) 14 \(\mathcal{X}xd5!\) (but White sacrifices anyway – the black king’s cover is ripped to shreds) 14...\(\mathcal{X}xd5\) 15 \(\mathcal{W}xd5\) \(\mathcal{X}d6\) 16 \(\mathcal{G}g5\) + (Black is defenceless against the onslaught) 16...\(\mathcal{W}d4\) (16...\(\mathcal{F}f5\) 17 \(\mathcal{F}f1+\) \(\mathcal{D}d7\) 18 \(\mathcal{E}e5\) \(\mathcal{W}g4\) 19 \(\mathcal{B}d1\) \(\mathcal{C}c7\) 20 \(\mathcal{F}f7+\) \(\mathcal{C}c8\) 21 \(\mathcal{E}e8+\) \(\mathcal{X}xe8\) 22 \(\mathcal{W}xe8\#) 17 \(\mathcal{W}e6+\) \(\mathcal{F}f7\) 18 \(\mathcal{X}xe7\) \(\mathcal{X}xe7\) 19 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) \(\mathcal{W}f6\) 20 \(\mathcal{X}xd6\) 1-0 Correa-Madeira, São Paulo 1991.

10 \(\mathcal{G}g2\) \(\mathcal{W}c7\) 11 0-0
White is better due to his two bishops and his ability to target Black's vulnerable central pawns.

11...\he7 12 \he2 \he7 13 \he4 \he8 14 a4 b4 15 g4

White's central space advantage allows him to attack on any part of the board at will, as indeed he has on the last three moves.

15...h6 16 h4

Threatening g5, which makes Black choose a radical solution...

16...g5

...but this creates a new target.

17 \h3 \h7 18 f4 (D)

Blowing open the kingside. It may seem risky to play like this with White's king posted there but the g2-bishop defends White's monarch well - and creating chaos is a Speelman trademark.

18...\g7 19 hxg5 hxg5 20 fxg5 \e5 21 g6

White jettisons a pawn to give his pieces some breathing space and begin an attack on the dark squares.

21...\xg6 22 \d2 \hf8?!

22...\e5 might provide a little more hope for Black.

23 \f4 \xf4 24 \xf4 \d8 25 e5

Grabbing some more dark squares.

25...d5 26 \h6+ \g8 27 \xf8+

A mini-combination to force a winning endgame.

27...\xf8 28 \xe6+ \f7 29 \xf7+ \xf7 30 \xd5 \e8 31 \e3 \g7 32 \xf7 \xf7 33 \f1+

Black could already resign with a clear conscience.

33...\g7 34 \g2 \e7 35 e6 \g6 36 \f5 \c6 37 \e5 \f6 38 \e4 \d6 38...\xe6 39 \g5+ \f7 40 \xe6 \xe6 41 \xe7 \xe7 is a won king and pawn endgame.

39 \f3 \d1

Seeking piece activity is a golden rule of most endgames but here Black has left himself with too steep a hill to climb.

40 b3 \d5 41 \f2 \g6 42 \e2 \g7 43 \g3 \d8 44 \f3 \g6 45 \f4 \d6 46 \f5 \d2 47 \f7 \f6 48 \f8 \xc2 49 \e5 \e7 50 \g8+ \h6 51 \d8 c4 52 \xe7 1-0

4...d6 5 e4 exd5 6 exd5

Game 50

Short – Eley

Rochdale 1977

1 d4 \f6 2 \f3 c5 3 d5 e6 4 \c3 d6 5 e4 exd5 6 exd5 (D)

If given the chance by Black's move-order, I recommend that White recaptures on d5 with the e-pawn. (The actual move-order of our featured game was 1 d4 \f6 2 \c3 c5 3
d5 e6 4 e4 exd5 5 exd5 d6 6 \( \text{Qf}3 \), which is not only less relevant to our repertoire, but also somewhat inaccurate, since White passed over the powerful possibility of 5 e5!.)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

The black systems in this section are by and large unambitious. The basic plan for White is to develop sensibly and go for the b4 break on the queenside. I can’t see the attraction of these lines for Black as he often is left with a dull, inferior position with hopes for a draw at best.

6...a6

6...\( \text{g}4 \) and 6...\( \text{e}7 \) lead to similar stodgy positions and are considered in the next game.

6...g6 (D) seeks to fianchetto the dark-squared bishop, but this has its drawbacks, as Black doesn’t have time to fianchetto and get his king to safety.

7 \( \text{b}5 + \text{bd}7 \) 8 0-0 \( \text{g}7 \) 9 \( \text{e}1 + \text{f}8 \) 10 \( \text{f}4 \) (the misplaced black king already gives White a large advantage) 10...\( \text{c}7 \) (10...\( \text{b}6 \) 11 \( \text{e}4 \), as in Zhitnikov-Nozdrin, Ufa 2007, is just as hopeless since after 11...\( \text{xe}4 \)

12 \( \text{x}e4 \) Black cannot protect d6 and e8) 11 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 12 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 13 \( \text{g}e4 \) (Black is in no position to defend his weak d6-pawn with both rooks still out of play) 13...\( \text{xe}4 \) 14 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) (Black holds on to material equality for the moment, but the opening of another central file hugely favours White’s better developed forces; 14...\( \text{f}8 \) 15 \( \text{f}6 + \text{g}7 \) 16 \( \text{e}8 + \) 15...\( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 16 \( \text{e}d1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 17 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 18 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xc}4 \) 19 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 20 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 21 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 22 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{bxc}6 \) 23 \( \text{b}8 \) 1-0 Kharitonov-Gutierrez, Bayamo 1989. Black is helpless against a back-rank invasion.

7 a4 (D)

7...\( \text{g}4 \)

Even though after 7...g6, White no longer has the bishop check on b5 (note the need to insert ...a6 and a4 robs Black of ...\( \text{a}6-c7 \) ideas), 8 \( \text{f}4 ! \) again casts doubt on Black’s entire strategy of fianchettoing his dark-squared bishop:

a) 8...\( \text{e}7 + \) 9 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 10 \( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 11 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 12 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 13 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xg}2 \) 14 0-0-0 \( \text{d}7 \) 15 \( \text{xd}6 \)
\( \text{b) 8...g6 9 0-0 \text{g7 10 d2 f5}} \)
\( \text{11 c4 0-0 12 f4 e8 13 a5 c7 14 e1 h5 15 h3 c8 16 e4 e5 17 xe5 dxe5 18 h6 \text{ -- Zeidler-Sinnett, Fishguard, 2003}}. \)

\( \text{9 xf3 bd7 10 0-0 e7} \)

This more passive development of Black’s bishop makes his position a lot harder to crack.

\( \text{11 f4 0-0 12 d2 e8 13 f1 e8 14 e4 (D)} \)

Rather than going for the more ambitious plan of b4, White is content to exchange pieces and rely on the power of the two bishops.

\( \text{14...xe4 15 xe4 f6 16 c3 d7} \)
\( \text{17 d3 c7 18 f5 g6 19 h3 c7 20 e7 xe7 21 f1 e8 22 d2} \)

White prepares to trade pieces on the e-file and enter an advantageous endgame.

\( \text{22...e4} \)

Black plays for piece activity but perhaps underestimated the power of White’s passed d-pawn.

\( \text{23 xd6 c4+ 24 g1 e2 25 f4 xf4 26 xf4 zb2 27 d6 c6?} \)
Black should try 27...\(\text{\&}x\text{c}3\).
\[28 \text{\&}x\text{e}6 \text{fxe}6 29 \text{\&}d1\]
Despite material equality, White has a decisive advantage, as the d-pawn is a monster.
\[29...\text{\&}f7 30 \text{d}7 \text{\&}d8 31 \text{h}4\]
Black has to lose a piece.
\[31...\text{h}6 32 \text{\&}xh6 \text{b}5 33 \text{\&}g5 \text{\&}a5 34 \text{axb}5 \text{axb}5 35 \text{d}8\text{\&}d8 36 \text{\&}xd8 \text{b}4 37 \text{cxb}4 \text{cxb}4 38 \text{\&}b8 \text{e}5 39 \text{g}4 \text{b}3 40 \text{h}5 \text{gxh}5 41 \text{gxh}5 \text{e}4 42 \text{\&}b7+ 1-0\]

Game 51
Chandler – Mi. Tseitlin
Palma de Mallorca 1989

1 \text{d}4 \text{\&}f6 2 \text{\&}f3 \text{c}5 3 \text{d}5 \text{e}6 4 \text{\&}c3 \text{d}6 5 \text{e}4 \text{exd}5 6 \text{exd}5

The actual move-order this time was 1 \text{e}4 \text{e}6 2 \text{d}4 \text{c}5 3 \text{d}5 \text{exd}5 4 \text{exd}5 \text{d}6 5 \text{\&}f3 \text{\&}f6 6 \text{\&}c3, which just goes to show what a wide range of openings can lead to the same position.

6...\text{\&}e7

6...\text{\&}g4 is also rather prospectless for Black: 7 \text{\&}e2 \text{\&}e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 \text{\&}f4 \text{\&}a6 10 \text{\&}e1 \text{\&}c7 11 \text{h}3 \text{\&}xf3 12 \text{\&}xf3 \text{\&}e8 13 \text{a}3 (D).

White is now almost fully developed and can begin his queenside expansion: 13...\text{\&}d7 14 \text{b}4 \text{cxb}4 15 \text{axb}4 (if White can now achieve c4 he will have built up an impressive position; Black could seek to prevent this with ...\text{b}5 but then the a-pawn would be weak and White would try to exploit the hole on c6 – just imagine a white knight there) 15...\text{\&}b5 16 \text{\&}e2 (White plans simply \text{\&}d3 and c4) 16...\text{\&}f5 17 \text{g}4 (this is a very useful move, driving the black queen back and introducing the threat of g5) 17...\text{\&}e8 18 \text{\&}d3 \text{\&}c7 19 \text{c}4 ± (White has achieved all his goals and stands better) 19...\text{\&}a6 20 \text{\&}ab1 \text{\&}f8 21 \text{\&}ec1 (Black is suffering from a lack of space, so White refuses to give him the possibility of exchanging pieces at the moment) 21...\text{\&}d7 22 \text{\&}d4 \text{\&}d8 23 \text{\&}g2 \text{\&}f6 24 \text{\&}d2 (the only source of counterplay for Black involves the c5-square, so White prepares to take that away from Black before proceeding with the main plan of advancing on the queenside) 24...\text{h}6 25 \text{\&}g3 \text{\&}e5 26 \text{f}4 \text{\&}d7 27 \text{\&}f2 \text{\&}c7 28 \text{\&}b3 \text{\&}e7 29 \text{c}5 ± (with this next stage completed, White can claim a large advantage) 29...\text{\&}ae8 30 \text{\&}d4 \text{\&}e4 (this attempt to strike back inevitably fails, but Black was bound hand and foot in any case – it is not easy to sit back and wait for what slow torture your opponent has in mind for you next) 31 \text{\&}xe4 \text{\&}xe4 32 \text{\&}f5 dxc5 33 \text{bxc}5 \text{\&}a6 34 \text{\&}a1 \text{\&}b5 35 \text{\&}d4 (trapping the black queen!) 35...\text{\&}xd4 36 \text{\&}xd4 +– (White is two exchanges up – the rest only requires the barest technique) 36...\text{\&}b3 37 \text{c}3 \text{\&}b2 38 \text{\&}d3
\( \mathcal{W}c2 \, 39 \mathcal{W}c3 \, \mathcal{W}xc3 \, 40 \mathcal{A}xc3 \, \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) (a mini-victory for Black; finally one of his minor pieces achieves what the others have only dreamt about – activity! Alas, it is not enough to save the game) 41 \( \mathcal{M}c4 \, g5 \) 42 \( \mathcal{M}xa7 \, \mathcal{Q}xf4 \) 43 \( \mathcal{M}xb7 \, \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 44 \( \mathcal{M}xf4 \, gxf4 \) 45 \( \mathcal{Q}g2 \, h5 \) 46 \( \mathcal{G}xh5 \, f6 \) 47 \( \mathcal{M}c7 \, \mathcal{A}h6 \) 48 \( c6 \, f3+ \) 49 \( \mathcal{Q}f1 \) 1-0 Mohandesi-Pearson, Erevan Olympiad 1996.

7 \( \mathcal{Q}e2 \) 0-0 8 0-0 (D)

B

8...\( \mathcal{B}b6?! \)

This move just looks slow. Alternatives:

a) 8...\( \mathcal{M}e8 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \, \mathcal{B}a6 \) 10 h3 \( \mathcal{Q}f8 \) 11 \( \mathcal{M}e1 \, h6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \, \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 13 a3 ± Mikhalechishin-Miezis, Bled Olympiad 2002.

b) 8...\( a6 \) 9 a4 \( \mathcal{M}e8 \) (9...\( \mathcal{B}d7 \)) 10 h3 \( \mathcal{M}e8 \) 11 \( \mathcal{M}e1 \, \mathcal{Q}f8 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}f1 \, \mathcal{M}xe1 \) 13 \( \mathcal{W}xe1 \, b6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \, h6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}h4 \, \mathcal{A}b7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \, \mathcal{W}c7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{M}e1 \) ± Jianu-Bogdan, Baile Tusnad 2005) 10 \( \mathcal{B}d2 \, \mathcal{B}d7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}c4 \, \mathcal{Q}f8 \) 12 a5 b5 13 axb6 \( \mathcal{A}xb6 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}a5 \, \mathcal{Q}e4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{B}xe4 \, \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) 16 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \, \mathcal{M}e8 \) 17 c4 ± Postny-Quillan, Port Erin 2006.

c) 8...\( \mathcal{B}a6 \) should be met with similar treatment to that after 6...\( \mathcal{B}g4: \) 9 \( \mathcal{B}e1 \, \mathcal{Q}c7 \) (9...\( \mathcal{M}e8 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \, h6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}h4 \, g5 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}g3 \, \mathcal{Q}f5 \) 13 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) ± Szekeres-Szalanczy, Budapest 2008) 10 a4 a6 11 \( \mathcal{M}b1 \, \mathcal{Q}g4 \) 12 b4 (again this is the key move) 12...\( \mathcal{B}d7 \) 13 \( \mathcal{B}f4 \, \mathcal{B}xf3 \) 14 \( \mathcal{B}xf3 \, \mathcal{B}xb4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{B}e4 \) (this clever move is designed to prevent Black’s knight from reaching its ideal square on c5; the temporary loss of a pawn is of small importance) 15...\( \mathcal{B}f6 \) 16 \( \mathcal{Q}g3 \) a5 17 c3 \( \mathcal{M}e8 \) (17...\( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) 18 \( \mathcal{M}xb7 \) leaves Black with a cramped position and no way, in the long term, to hang on to his c-pawn; nevertheless, this must be superior to the text-move, which leaves him with an additional weakness on the queenside) 18 \( \mathcal{B}xb4 \, \mathcal{B}f8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{M}xe8 \, \mathcal{B}xe8 \) 20 \( \mathcal{B}d2 \, \mathcal{B}xb4 \) 21 \( \mathcal{B}xb4 \) ± (now to go with his space advantage and bishop-pair, White has a target on the b-file) 21...b6 22 \( \mathcal{B}e3 \, \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 23 \( \mathcal{B}e2 \, \mathcal{B}c5 \) 24 \( \mathcal{B}b5 \, \mathcal{B}f6 \) 25 \( \mathcal{B}c6 \) (the bishop is ideally placed here in the heart of Black’s position, combining attack with defence) 25...\( \mathcal{A}a7 \) 26 \( \mathcal{B}b1 \, \mathcal{B}d7 \) 27 \( \mathcal{B}f5 \, \mathcal{B}f6 \) 28 \( \mathcal{B}d4 \) (the white pieces coordinate extremely effectively) 28...\( \mathcal{B}g6 \) 29 \( \mathcal{B}e3 \, \mathcal{B}d3 \) 30 \( \mathcal{A}xb6 \) (White cashes in and picks up a material advantage in exchange for the bishop-pair) 30...\( \mathcal{B}xb6 \) 31 \( \mathcal{M}xb6 \, \mathcal{A}e5 \) 32 \( \mathcal{W}xg6 \, \mathcal{Q}xg6 \) 33 \( \mathcal{B}b4 \) ± \( \mathcal{B}f7 \) 34 \( \mathcal{B}c4 \, \mathcal{B}e7 \) 35 h4 \( \mathcal{B}d8 \) 36 \( \mathcal{B}b8+ \) \( \mathcal{B}e7 \) 37 a5 (to add to Black’s already significant problems, knights are especially ineffective when dealing with passed rook’s pawns) 37...\( \mathcal{B}f7 \) 38 \( \mathcal{B}e8+ \, \mathcal{B}e7 \) 39 \( \mathcal{B}b5 \, \mathcal{B}f7 \) 40 \( \mathcal{B}b6 \, \mathcal{B}e7 \) 41 a6 \( \mathcal{B}f6 \) 42 \( \mathcal{B}a5 \, \mathcal{B}d8 \) 43 \( \mathcal{A}xd6+ \) 1-0.
San Segundo-Cacho, Linares Zonal 1995.

9 \( \text{f}\text{e}1 \) \( \text{a}\text{a}6 \) 10 \( \text{h}\text{b}5 \) \((D)\)

White threatens \( \text{w}\text{e}2 \) forking bishop and knight and winning a piece. Already Black’s careless 8th move looks misjudged.

10...\( \text{c}\text{b}8 \)

A pathetic retreat, but 10...\( \text{c}\text{c}7 \) 11 \( \text{c}\text{c}6 \) \( \text{b}\text{b}8 \) 12 \( \text{w}\text{e}2 \) wins the bishop on \( \text{e}7 \).

11 \( \text{w}\text{e}2 \)

This leads into a forcing variation which leads to an endgame advantage for White. It is also possible to stay in the middlegame with the restraining 11 \( \text{a}4 \).

11...\( \text{a}\text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{w}\text{x}\text{e}7 \) \( \text{w}\text{x}\text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{w}\text{x}\text{e}7 \) \( \text{b}\text{x}\text{b}5 \) 14 \( \text{w}\text{g}5 \)

Threatening to take the knight followed by either \( \text{b}\text{e}4 \) or \( \text{b}\text{x}\text{b}5 \).

14...\( \text{b}\text{b}7 \)

The only move.

15 \( \text{b}\text{x}\text{b}5 \) \( \text{b}\text{x}\text{d}5 \) 16 \( \text{c}\text{x}\text{d}6 ! \) \( \text{f}\text{f}6 \)

16...\( \text{c}\text{x}\text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{c}\text{x}\text{e}7 \) ±.

17 \( \text{c}\text{x}\text{c}8 \) \( \text{c}\text{x}\text{e}7 \) 18 \( \text{c}\text{x}\text{e}7+ \) \( \text{f}\text{f}7 \) 19 \( \text{c}\text{d}5 \) \( \text{f}\text{f}5 \) 20 \( \text{c}\text{x}\text{g}5+ \) \( \text{g}\text{g}8 \) 21 \( \text{f}\text{f}3 \) \((D)\)

White has a large advantage, with two pawns for the exchange, and both his knights occupying dominant locations.

21...\( \text{h}\text{e}8 \) 22 \( \text{d}\text{d}1 \)

White creates a potential attack on the black knight and plans \( \text{e}\text{e}4 \).

22...\( \text{f}\text{f}6 ! ? \)

Black sacrifices another pawn in a bid to activate his rooks. 22...\( \text{e}\text{e}2 \) 23 \( \text{c}\text{c}3 \) reveals one of the points behind White’s last move, viz. 23...\( \text{e}\text{e}7 \) 24 \( \text{g}\text{g}4 \).

23 \( \text{b}\text{x}\text{b}6 \) \( \text{e}\text{e}2 \) 24 \( \text{c}\text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}\text{d}8 \) 25 \( \text{c}\text{c}4 \)

Chandler points out in Informator that 25...\( \text{d}\text{d}5 \) loses to 26 \( \text{f}\text{f}1 \) \( \text{f}\text{f}4 \) 27 \( \text{h}\text{h}3 \).

26 \( \text{f}\text{f}1 \) \( \text{e}\text{e}7 \) 27 \( \text{b}\text{b}3 \) \( \text{h}\text{h}6 \)

Or 27...\( \text{c}\text{c}5 \) 28 \( \text{e}\text{e}4 \).

28 \( \text{h}\text{h}3 \) \( \text{d}\text{d}5 \) 29 \( \text{f}\text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}\text{c}3 \)

Black is doing his utmost to keep the white knight out of \( \text{e}4 \).

30 \( \text{a}\text{a}4 \)

Trying to tempt Black into a faulty combination and releasing the passed a-pawn at the same time.

30...\( \text{h}\text{h}4 \)
Chandler gives 30...\(\texttt{\textit{Qxa4}}\) 31 c3 \(\texttt{\textit{Bxc4}}\) 32 bxc4 \(\texttt{\textit{Qb6}}\) 33 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe4}}\) with a winning endgame for White.

31 h3 \(\texttt{\textit{Qa2}}\) 32 \(\texttt{\textit{Bxh2}}\) 33 c3 \(\texttt{\textit{Qc2}}\) 34 \(\texttt{\textit{Bc1}}\) 35 \(\texttt{\textit{Qxe3}}\) 36 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe4}}\)

The knight finally arrives on its most desirable square and White has a decisive advantage.

36...c4 37 b4 \(\texttt{\textit{Qf4}}\) 38 \(\texttt{\textit{Qc5}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qf5}}\) 39 a5 \(\texttt{\textit{Qd5}}\) 40 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe4}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qed3}}\) 41 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe2}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qb5}}\) 42 \(\texttt{\textit{Bxa7}}\) 43 a6 \(\texttt{\textit{Bxa7}}\) 44 \(\texttt{\textit{Qc5}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qb6}}\) 45 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe3}}\) 1-0

**3...g6: Black delays both ...\(\texttt{\textit{e6}}\) and ...\(\texttt{\textit{d6}}\)**

We now move on to lines where Black fianchettos his king’s bishop before deciding what to do with his centre pawns.

**Game 52**

**Khuzman – Minasian**

*European Team Ch, Pula 1997*

1 \(\texttt{\textit{d4}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qf6}}\) 2 \(\texttt{\textit{Qf3}}\) c5 3 d5 g6 4 \(\texttt{\textit{Qc3}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qg7}}\) 5 e4 0-0?! (D)

This provocative move seeks to keep maximum flexibility in the black position. Black avoids 5...d6 6 \(\texttt{\textit{Qb5+}}\) (see Game 53) and may sometimes try to do without ...d6 altogether (e.g., 6 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe2}}\) b5?!). My recommendation is that you allow yourself to be provoked!

6 e5!

White goes for it! The way to refute Black’s ambitious opening is to attack full steam ahead.

6...\(\texttt{\textit{Qg4?!}}\)

It was originally thought that the white pawns were overextended and this, together with Black’s lead in development, would give Black at least equality. However, White’s next move, suggested by Yermolinsky, put that assessment into question.

6...\(\texttt{\textit{Qe8}}\) has proved tougher, even though it invites White to launch a powerful kingside attack by 7 h4! d6 8 e6?! (this sacrifice plays an essential part in weakening Black’s kingside pawn-structure) 8...fxe6 9 h5 (White goes all-out for the kill), and now (D):

\[\text{Diagram}\]

a) 9...\(\texttt{\textit{Qc7}}\) 10 \(\texttt{\textit{Qd3}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qe8}}\) 11 \(\texttt{\textit{Qg5}}\) \(\texttt{\textit{Qd4}}\) 12 \(\texttt{\textit{Qe3}}\) exd5 13 \(\texttt{\textit{Qxh7}}\) is winning

b) 9...exd5 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 wxd5+ e6 12 w3 (White targets the ‘weaker’ on g6 created by his 8th and 9th moves) 12...zf5 13 zh4 (forcing Black to give up material to relieve his beleaguered king) 13...czc6 (13...zh5? 14 w7+ leaves White with an investment-free attack) 14 zbxf5 gxf5 15 zh6 (it is normal practice to try to remove as many defenders from the enemy king as possible) 15...ze5 16 zd2 w3f6 17 zb5 zd7 18 zxd7 zbxd7 19 zbzd7 zbzd7 20 0-0-0 (White is now fully developed and ready to start the next wave of his attack) 20...ze5 21 zbzd7 zzb7 22 ze2 zf8 (22...ze5 {to stop zb4} would be met by 23 zb3, exploiting the newly-weakened d5-square) 23 zb4 zd8 24 ze1 zg7 25 zh7 (gradually White begins to pile on the pressure) 25...zb5 26 zbzd7 zzw7 27 ze6 with a massive plus for White due to Black’s weak king. Yermolinsky-Khmelnitsky, USA Ch, Modesto 1995 finished 27...zf7 28 zg6+ zg8 29 ze7+ zb8 30 zg6+ zg8 31 f4! w7h7 32 b3! d5 33 zb3 d4 34 zbxc5 wh1+ 35 zb2 d3 36 zb7 zb7 37 zbzf5+ zb7 38 zb7 zb7 39 zb6 zb6 40 zbxf7+ 1-0.

c) 9...gxd5!? 10 dxe6! zbxe6 (after 10...zbf6 11 zg5 White has a wonderful attacking position) 11 zb5 looks very promising for White but 11...wd7 (11...zb5? 12 zb4+ e6 13 zbxe6 zbxe6 14 zbxe6+ zb8 15 zbxe5 --> Sorokin-Evdokimov, Krasnoiarsk 2003) 12 zbxd5 zbxc3+ 13 bxc3 zb6 may be just sufficient for Black. After 14 zbxe2 zb5 15 f3 zb5 16 zb3 zb6 17 zb4 zb6 18 0-0-0, Black should try 18...zb4! with huge complications rather than 18...zb6? 19 zb6 d5 20 zb2 zb4?! 21 cxd4 cxd4 22 zbxd6 zbxd6 23 zb5, when White had a winning attack in Damljanović-Vučković, Serbian Ch, Pančevo 2006.

7 zb5 (D)

This highly striking idea presents severe difficulties for Black. The g4-knight turns out to be short of good squares.

7...zh6

The alternatives don’t seem tempting:

a) 7...zbxe5 leaves Black’s knight stranded and after 8 f4 f6 (forced; 8...zb6 9 zb3 wins a piece for White) 9 zbxd7 zb7 10 fxe5 fxe5?? 11 zb3 White threatens a very nasty check on h5.

b) 7...zh5 weakens the kingside. Then 8 f4 (intending h3 and g4) 8...zd6 9 e6 gives White an interesting attacking position.
c) 7...f6 8 ¤xh7 ¤xf2 9 ¤xf2
¤xh7 10 ♦d3 f5 11 ♦e2 e6?! 12 ♦h4
¤h8 13 ♦c4 exd5 14 ♦xd5 ♦c6 15 ♦g5 ♦f8 16 ♦f6+ ♦xf6 17 ♦xf6 d6
18 h5 +- Aronian-Guyot, Bastia rapid 2003.

d) 7...d6 8 e6 f5 (8...¤h6 9 h4 fxe6
10 h5 exd5 11 ♦xh7 ♦g4 12 ♦xd5+ e6 13 ♦xb7 +- De Vreugt-Al Sayed,
Erevan 2000) 9 ♦e2 ♦f6 10 h4 h5 11
a4 ♦a6 12 ♦f3 ♦c7 13 ♦e2 b6 14
¤f4 ± J.Horvath-Galić, Poreč 1998.

8 h4
Sounding the charge.

8...f6
8...¤xe5 (a very greedy move) 9 h5
gives White a murderous attack, as
Baburin analysed: 9...¤f5 (forced; 9...
¤g7 10 ♦xh7! ♦xh7 11 hxg6+ fxg6
12 ♦xh6 ♦xh6 13 ♦d2 g5 14
¤xg5 ♦f6 15 ♦d3+ ++) 10 ♦xh7!!
¤xh7 11 hxg6+ ♦g7 12 ♦h7+ ♦g8
13 ♦h5 fxg6 14 ♦xg6+ ♦g7 15 ♦h6
f7 16 ♦d3 ++. 8...¤c7 9 d6!? exd6
10 ♦d5 is no solution to Black’s prob-
lems either.

9 ♦ge4 ♦f7
After 9...fxe5 White just ploughs on
with 10 h5 ♦f5 11 hxg6 hxg6 12 d6!,
creating chaos in the black camp. 9...f5
10 ♦xc5 ♦g4 11 ♦e2 ♦xe5 12 h5 is
also good for White; e.g., 12...¤f7?!
13 hxg6 hxg6 14 ♦d3 e5?! 15 ♦h3
¤d6 16 ♦h7+ ♦f7 17 ♦h6 ♦f6 18
¤xg6 ♦xg6 19 ♦h5 ♦xh5 20 ♦xh5+
¤g8 21 ♦h6 1-0 Sturua-Krivolapov,

10 h5!
White, quite rightly, values his king-
side attack much more highly than his
e-pawn.

10...f5
After 10...¤xe5 11 hxg6 hxg6 12
f4 ♦f7 13 ♦g4 Black is in deep trouble,
while 10...fxe5 11 hxg6 hxg6 12
¤g4 leaves White with an imposing
position.

11 ♦g5 ♦xg5

As Baburin analysed, both captures
on e5 lead to mate:

a) 11...¤xe5 12 ♦xh7! ♦xh7 13
hxg6++ ♦g8 14 ♦h5 ♦e8 15 ♦h7+
¤f8 16 ♦h6 ++.

b) 11...¤xe5 12 ♦xh7! and now:

b1) 12...¤xh7 13 hxg6++ ♦xg6
14 ♦h5+ ♦f6 15 ♦h4+ ♦g6 16 ♦h7+
¤f6 17 ♦g5!! ♦xg5 18 ♦h5+ ♦f6 19
¤xf5#.

b2) 12...¤xc3+ 13 bxc3 ♦xh7 14
hxg6++ ♦xg6 (the complications are
in White’s favour – he enjoys a great
lead in development and his attack is
irresistible) 15 ♦h5+ ♦f6 16 ♦h4+
¤g7 (16...¤g6 17 ♦h3 ++) 16...¤e5
17 ♦f4+! ♦xh5 18 ♦b5! e5 19 0-0-0+
¤e6 20 ♦c4+ d5 21 ♦xd5+ ♦xh5 22
¤xd5 ♦xd5 23 ♦e7 ++) 17 ♦h6+
¤xh6 18 ♦xh6+ ♦f7 19 ♦h7+ ♦f6
20 f4! and White mates.

12 ♦xg5 ♦xe5
Black is in trouble:

a) 12...h6 was also analysed by
Baburin. White has a very attractive
way to continue: 13 hxg6! hxg6 14
¤h8++ ♦xh8 15 ♦h5 ♦f7 (forced) 16
gxf7+ ♦g7 17 ♦d3 e6 18 0-0-0 with
a winning attack due to the threat of ♦xh1.
White’s pieces coordinate amazingly
well, while Black’s queenside remains
asleep until the end of the game.

b) 12...¤e8 13 f4 h6 14 hxg6 ♦xg6
15 ♦h4 d6 16 e6 ♦f6 17 ♦f3 ♦a6 18
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\textit{xf6 xf6 19 Wh5 b6 20 0-0-0 c7 21 d3} with a winning position for White, Fressinet-Guidarelli, Aix-les-Bains 2007.

\textbf{13 hxg6 hxg6 14 d6!}
White introduces the idea of an attack on the a2-g8 diagonal.

\textbf{14...c6 15 c6 xf6 c6}
After 15...exf6 (Baburin) White would have continued by 16 d2 with a very strong attack.

\textbf{16 c4+ e6}
16...g7 is well met by 17 d2, transferring the attack to the dark squares.

\textbf{17 d2 f8 18 d5! (D)}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

White insists that his bishop is invited to the party.

\textbf{18 exd5}
18...xf7 gives White a choice of wins, including 19 h6 g7 20 g5 xd6 21 d8+ f7 22 h8.

\textbf{19 d5+ e6+}
19...f7 is well met by 20 g5 g7 21 xf7 xf7 22 h7+ e6 23 0-0-0!, mating.

\textbf{20 xe6+ dxe6 21 g5}
The powerful passed d-pawn and White’s monstrous initiative are too much for Black to cope with.

\textbf{21 d7 22 0-0-0 e8}
This allows White to tie Black up completely but even the more natural-looking 22...c6 doesn’t stave off defeat after 23 h6 e8 24 d7 f7 25 h4! g7 26 d8+ xd8 27 xd8+ xd8 28 xd8+ f8 29 h8+ xh8 30 xf8+.

\textbf{23 d8+ 1-0}
Black is helpless against the threat of d7.

\textbf{3...g6: Black Delays or Omits...e6}

\textit{Game 53}
\textit{Speelman – Djurhuus}
\textit{Copenhagen 1996}

\textbf{1 d4 f6 2 ff3 c5 3 d5 g6 4 c3 g7 5 e4 d6 6 b5+ (D)}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

The idea behind this check is to interfere with what has proved to be Black’s most popular plan, namely to
castle, play ...\textit{d}a6-c7 and perhaps ...\textit{g}g4. White hopes the check will disrupt this approach and force Black onto his own resources. Black has countered in three different ways in practice.

\textbf{6...\textit{d}d7}

This is the best way for Black to block the check, but the alternatives also deserve attention:

a) 6...\textit{f}d7 (perhaps the worst way of getting out of check with the exception of the ridiculous 6...\textit{f}f8; for no apparent reason, Black interferes with his own development) 7 a4! (again adopting a policy of making it difficult for Black to carry out his most likely plan; this move is directed against Black's expansion on the queenside by ...a6 and ...b5) 7...0-0 (7...\textit{a}a6 8 0-0 \textit{c}c7 9 \textit{e}e1 \textit{xb}5 10 \textit{ax}b5 0-0 11 \textit{f}f4 \textit{b}6 12 e5 \textit{f}5 13 h3 h6 14 \textit{e}e2 g5 15 \textit{g}g3 \textit{wd}7 16 h4 f6 17 e6 \pm I.Sokolov-Topalov, Hoogeveen 2006) 8 0-0 \textit{a}a6 9 \textit{e}e1 \textit{c}c7 10 \textit{c}c4 b6 11 \textit{f}f4 (White's play is of course not solely concerned with limiting his opponent's possibilities; here he prepares e5, a major idea in this variation – White must open some lines in order to attack successfully) 11...\textit{a}a6 12 \textit{xa}6 \textit{xa}6 13 \textit{we}2 \textit{c}c7 14 e5?! (this is the thematic pawn-break, but I would prefer the preparatory 14 \textit{ad}1! first) 14...dxe5 15 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 16 \textit{xe}5 (D) and now:

a1) 16...\textit{xe}5? 17 \textit{xe}5 \textit{e}e8 18 \textit{ad}1 (this is the position White would have aimed for with the more accurate move 14 \textit{ad}1) 18...\textit{wd}7 19 \textit{e}e4 \pm (Black has no good way to prevent the

\textbf{crushing d6}) 19...\textit{ad}8?! 20 d6 f5 21 dxc7 \textit{wd}1 22 \textit{we}6+ 1-0 Pira-San Marco, Paris 1993.

a2) 16...\textit{xd}5 is a good try for equality; for example, 17 \textit{ad}1 (17 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 18 \textit{we}5+ \textit{f}6 19 \textit{we}e7 \textit{e}e8) 17...\textit{xc}3 18 \textit{xc}3 \textit{wc}7 19 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 20 \textit{wc}7 \textit{xe}7 21 \textit{xe}7 \textit{fe}8 with fairly level chances.

b) 6...\textit{bd}7 (this is more logical, but Black has some difficulties unravelling his queenside) 7 a4 0-0 8 0-0 a6 (8...\textit{e}e8 9 \textit{e}e1 \textit{c}c7 10 \textit{f}f1 b6 11 \textit{f}f4 \textit{e}5 12 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 13 \textit{wd}2 \textit{xf}4 14 \textit{xf}4 e5 15 dxe6 \textit{fxe}6 16 \textit{g}g3 \textit{b}7 17 \textit{ad}1 \pm Gustafsson-Bezold, Bundesliga 2008/9) 9 \textit{e}e2 b6 (9...\textit{c}7 10 \textit{d}d2 e5 11 dxe6 \textit{fxe}6 12 \textit{c}c4 \textit{e}8 13 \textit{e}e3 \pm Miladinović-Sibilio, Rome 2005; 9...\textit{b}b8 10 a5 \textit{e}e8 11 \textit{d}d2 \textit{c}c7 12 \textit{c}c4 \textit{b}5 13 \textit{a}a4 \textit{wc}7 14 c3 \textit{f}6 15 \textit{f}3 e6 16 \textit{ab}6 \textit{exd}5 17 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 18 \textit{exd}5 h6 19 \textit{e}e1 \pm Melkumyan-Pantsulaia, Martuni 2008) 10 \textit{f}f4 \textit{e}8 11 \textit{wd}2 \textit{e}5 (Black tries to keep e5 under lock and key) 12 \textit{h}h6 \textit{xf}3+ (Black has to give ground in the centre, as
White is ready to exchange both the knight on e5 and the bishop on g7 followed by f4; e.g., 12...\(\text{d}7\) 13 \(\text{d}xe5\) dxe5 14 \(\text{x}g7\) \(\text{x}g7\) 15 f4 with a slight advantage for White) 13 \(\text{x}f3\) \(\text{x}h6\) 14 \(\text{w}xh6\) \(\text{d}7\) 15 \(\text{e}2\) (White nevertheless prepares f4 followed by a central breakthrough) 15...\(\text{f}6\) 16 f4 \(\text{c}7\) 17 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{g}7\) 18 e5 (at last!) 18...\(\text{g}8\) 19 exd6 exd6 20 f5 (the pawn exchanges have significantly weakened the squares around the black king – a fact that White is quick to exploit) 20...\(\text{f}6\) 21 \(\text{f}4\) h6 22 \(\text{w}g3\) \(\text{a}e8\) 23 \(\text{a}f1\) \(\text{c}8\) 24 h4 (White has built up his kingside attack patiently and now begins the second wave of attack) 24...\(\text{e}5\) 25 fxg6 fxg6 26 \(\text{d}3\) g5 (a painful move to have to make) 27 hxg5 hxg5 28 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{h}7\)?! 29 \(\text{x}h7\) \(\text{xf}4\) 30 \(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{x}h7\) 31 \(\text{xf}8\) (the decisive infiltration) 31...\(\text{f}5\) 32 \(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{wd}3\) 1-0 Züger-Bischoff, Altensteig 1993.

7 a4 (D)

\[
7...0-0
\]

Other moves are not better:

a) 7...\(\text{x}b5\) is an anti-positional move that just serves to give White extra pressure along the a-file. After the continuation 8 axb5 0-0 9 0-0 \(\text{bd}7\) 10 h3 \(\text{e}8\) 11 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{c}7\) 12 \(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{b}6\) 13 c4 e6 14 \(\text{d}d2\) a6 15 bxa6 \(\text{xa}6\) 16 \(\text{a}5\) exd5 17 exd5 \(\text{e}8\) 18 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{b}4\) 19 \(\text{xb}4\) cxb4 20 \(\text{wd}2\) White held a comfortable advantage in Abramović-Damljanović, Serbian Team Ch, Subotica 2008.

b) 7...\(\text{a}6\) 8 0-0 \(\text{c}7\) 9 \(\text{c}4\) 0-0 (9...\(\text{g}4\) 10 h3 \(\text{xf}3\) 11 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{d}7\) 12 \(\text{w}e2\) 0-0 13 f4 b6 14 h4 \(\text{w}c8\) 15 h5 \(\text{f}6\) 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 f5 ± Martens-Pieterse, Dutch Team Ch 2006/7) 10 h3 a6 11 e5 dxe5 12 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 13 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}6\) 14 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{c}8\) 15 g3 f6 16 \(\text{d}3\) c4 17 \(\text{f}4\) f5 18 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{b}8\) 19 h4 is much better for White, Ostoijić-Radosavljević, Belgrade 2007.

8 0-0 \(\text{a}6\)

8...\(\text{g}4\) is an unpretentious way to play the position, but the tempo lost (...\(\text{c}8\)-d7-g4) is enough to ensure White a small advantage: 9 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{bd}7\) 10 h3 \(\text{xf}3\) 11 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{e}8\) (11...a6 12 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}8\) 13 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{c}7\) 14 a5 \(\text{b}8\) 15 \(\text{ab}1\) b5 16 axb6 \(\text{xb}6\) 17 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{we}8\) 18 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{b}8\) 19 \(\text{e}3\) ± Portisch-K.Lie, Gausdal 2007) 12 \(\text{f}1\) (the bishop is safely tucked away) 12...e5 (Black resorts to drastic measures to counter White’s long-term plan of f4 and e5; 12...\(\text{c}7\) transposes to the note to Black’s 12th move below) 13 dxe6 fxe6 14 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{w}e7\) 15 \(\text{e}3\) a6 and Black’s central pawn weaknesses gave White the advantage in D.Gurevich-Mortazavi, London 1994.

9 \(\text{e}1\) (D)
9...\( \text{Qc7} \)

Black also has tried:

a) 9...\( \text{Qxb5} \) 10 axb5 \( \text{Qc7} \) 11 \( \text{Qd3} \) a6 12 b6 \( \text{Qb5} \) 13 \( \text{Qxb5} \) axb5 14 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qxa8} \) 15 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 16 \( \text{Qxa6} \) bxa6 17 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 18 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qxb6} \) 19 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 20 b3 \( \pm \) Piket-Ree, Dutch Ch, Eindhoven 1993.

b) 9...\( \text{Qg4} \) 10 h3 \( \text{Qxf3} \) 11 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) (11...\( \text{Qd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 13 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Mainka-Zsu.Polgar, Polanica Zdroj 1991) 12 \( \text{Qd3} \) a6 13 \( \text{Qc4} \) b6 14 \( \text{Qg5} \) h6 15 \( \text{Qh4} \) g5 16 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) 17 \( \text{Qh2} \) b5 18 axb5 axb5 19 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qxa8} \) 20 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \pm \) Kotanjian-Danilov, European Ch, Dresden 2007.

10 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 11 h3 \( \text{Qxf3} \) 12 \( \text{Qxf3} \) e6!?

Again we see Black deciding to take action in the centre before White can organize a breakthrough himself. M.Ivanov-Malakhatko, Oberwart 2006 continued 12...\( \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qg5} \)!? a6 14 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 15 \( \text{Qd2} \) b6 16 \( \text{Qh1} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 17 \( \text{Qa3} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 18 \( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 19 \( \text{Qg3} \) b5 20 axb5 axb5 21 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qxa3} \) 22 bxa3 \( \text{Qxb5} \) 23 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qa8} \) 24 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 25 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \pm \).

13 \( \text{Qg5} \) h6 14 \( \text{Qh4} \) e5

After 14...\( \text{exd5} \) 15 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe8+} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 17 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 18 \( \text{Qf1} \)

White has the advantage in view of his bishop-pair and Black's inability to contest the e-file.

15 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{Qce8} \)

If 15...a6, to prevent White's next move, then 16 \( \text{Qeb1} \) preparing b4 gives White the edge.

16 \( \text{a6} \) (D)

16...\( \text{Qb8} \)

Black decides he can't bear the pawn to remain on a6 and puts his hopes on counterplay along the b-file. 16...b6 17 \( \text{Qb5} \) gives White a nice bind on the queenside and the possibility of organizing a pawn-break with either b4 or f4 at his leisure.

17 axb7 \( \text{Qxb7} \) 18 \( \text{Qb5} \)

The black a-pawn is a serious weakness.

18...\( \text{Qb8} \) 19 c4 \( \text{Qh7} \) 20 \( \text{Qa3} \) f5

In view of his positional problems, Black has to go for counterplay on the kingside.

21 exf5 gxf5 22 \( \text{Qxa7} \) \( \text{Qg5} \)
After 22...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}xb2} the black queen becomes overloaded: 23 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}6} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}7} 24 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}7+ f7} (24...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h}8} 25 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}6+ --} 25 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}f5} +--.} 23 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}6} \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}7} 24 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}3 f4} 25 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}3} (D)\textit{}}}}

It's almost always a good idea to exchange pieces when material ahead.

\texttt{32...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xa7} 33 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}xa7 e4} 34 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}2 e8} 35 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}5 e5} 36 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}3 g7} 37 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xe4} +-- \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}4 f4} 38 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}2 e4} 39 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{xe4 e4} 40 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{xe4}?!} 1-0}}}}

Black resigned since, even with opposite-coloured bishops, his material deficit is just too large.

The aggressive 3...b5

Game 54

Stohl – Blodshtein

Pardubice 1992

1 d4 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}6} 2 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}3 e5} 3 d5 b5}

This is possibly the most ambitious try for Black, striking out and gaining space on the queenside.

4 \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}5} (D)\textit{}}

This Trompowsky-like response is the theoretically recommended continuation.

4...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}4}

Putting the question to the bishop on g5.
Black has quite a large choice of alternatives here:

a) 4...\textit{b}7 – Game 55.
b) 4...\textit{b}6 – Game 56.
c) 4...\textit{a}5+ (this looks almost like a beginner’s check but it is designed to disrupt White’s natural development; it was played by a future world champion so deserves some respect) 5 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}4 6 \textit{b}d2 (White could consider 6 \textit{h}4, but decided the lead in development outweighed giving up the bishop-pair) 6...\textit{x}g5 7 \textit{x}g5 \textit{h}6 8 \textit{g}f3 \textit{d}6 9 \textit{e}4 \textit{d}7 (9...\textit{e}5 10 \textit{a}4 \textit{b}xa4 11 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}7 12 \textit{w}xa4+ \textit{d}8 13 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}7 14 0-0 ± Ikonnikov-Fochtler, Schwäbisch Gmünd 1997) 10 \textit{a}4 (this is a typical pawn-lever in this variation, attempting to exploit the weaknesses left by Black’s third move) 10...\textit{b}xa4 (10...\textit{b}4 11 \textit{c}4 gives White’s knight a wonderful outpost, although it has to be said the text-move does the same thing) 11 \textit{w}xa4 \textit{c}7 12 \textit{w}a1 (the weakness of the black a-pawn clearly outweighs White’s slightly backward b-pawn) 12...\textit{g}b6 13 \textit{b}5+! (White aims to exchange off the light-squared bishops to strengthen his control of the queenside light squares) 13...\textit{d}7 14 \textit{x}d7+ \textit{w}xd7 15 \textit{a}6 \textit{c}8 16 0-0 (White enjoys a clear advantage, with a lead in development and targets on the queenside) 16...\textit{e}5 (to stop White playing \textit{e}5) 17 dxe6 fxe6 18 \textit{h}4 (White now skilfully opens up a second attacking front on the kingside; Black’s inactive pieces are poorly placed to counter this) 18...\textit{f}7 19 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}8 (the natural-looking 19...\textit{e}7 loses to 20 \textit{f}5! \textit{h}4 21 fxe6++ \textit{e}6 22 \textit{w}a2+ \textit{e}7 23 \textit{w}f7+) 20 \textit{h}f3 \textit{w}e8 21 f5 (the decisive breakthrough) 21...\textit{e}5 22 \textit{w}a2+ \textit{w}e6 23 \textit{e}5+! (White exploits all the pins masterfully) 23...\textit{w}e7 24 \textit{c}6+ \textit{d}7 25 \textit{w}a4 \textit{w}e8 26 \textit{e}xf5 \textit{w}e3+ 27 \textit{h}1 1-0 Ståhlberg-Petrosian, Budapest 1952. Black will shortly be mated after 27...\textit{w}xd2 28 \textit{e}5+.

d) 4...\textit{d}6 (challenging White to execute his positional threat of doubling Black’s pawns) 5 \textit{xf}6 (it is desirable to damage Black’s pawn-structure) 5...\textit{xf}6 (5...\textit{xf}6 6 \textit{e}4 \textit{w}b6 7 \textit{h}4 \textit{a}6 8 \textit{e}2 \textit{h}6 9 0-0 \textit{g}5 10 \textit{c}5 \textit{xf}5 11 \textit{xf}5 \textit{c}7 12 \textit{c}3 0-0 13 \textit{d}4 ± Sargsian-Bermejo, San Sebastián 2006) 6 \textit{e}4 \textit{a}6 7 \textit{a}4 (business as usual) and now (D):

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

d1) 7...\textit{b}xa4 8 \textit{xa}4 \textit{g}6 9 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}7 (9...\textit{h}6 10 0-0 0-0 11 \textit{fd}2 \textit{d}7 12 \textit{c}4 \textit{b}6 13 \textit{xb}6 \textit{w}xb6 14 \textit{a}2 \textit{b}7 15 \textit{wf}3 is slightly better for White, Zatonskikh-Malakhato, Port Erin 2006) 10 \textit{bd}2 \textit{d}7 11 \textit{c}4 0-0 12 \textit{fd}2 \textit{e}5 13 \textit{xe}5 \textit{fxe}5 14 \textit{w}e2 \textit{f}5 15 0-0 \textit{h}6 16 \textit{fa}1 \textit{xd}2 17 \textit{w}d2

d2) 7...b4 8 ♦d3 g6 9 ♦bd2 ♦g7 10 0-0 0-0 11 ♦c4 (White has the better game due to his space advantage and the difficulties Black has in achieving meaningful counterplay) 11...a5 12 ♦fd2 ♦c7 13 f4 ♦d7 14 ♦e1 ♦a6 15 ♦h4 ♦fe8 16 f5 (an excellent move, burying the dark-squared bishop and preparing a kingside attack) 16...♠ad8 17 ♦f3 ♦c8 18 ♦af1 ♦f8 (Black has been forced into utter passivity and must await his fate) 19 ♦e3 ♦d7 20 b3 h5 (played so the g7-bishop can find some activity, but unfortunately weakening the kingside at the same time) 21 ♦dc4 ♦c8 22 g4 (opening the kingside for the final assault) 22...h6 23 gxh5 ♦xe3+ 24 ♦xe3 g5 (this is only a temporary closing of the kingside) 25 ♦f2 ♦h8 26 ♦g4 ♦d7 27 ♦g3 ♦e7 28 h4 and White had a winning attack in Kasparov-Nenashev, Geneva rapid 1996.

5 ♦f4 (D)

Black has also tried:

a) 5...w5+ 6 c3 ♦b7 7 ♦d3 ♦f6 8 e4 e6 9 dxe6 fxe6 10 ♦bd2 c4 11 ♦c2 d6?! 12 ♦e2 e5 13 ♦g5 ♦bd7 14 0-0 ♦b6 15 a4 ± a6 16 axb5 axb5 17 ♦xa8+ ♦xa8 18 b3 ♦c6 19 bxc4 bxc4 20 ♦xf6 ♦xf6 21 ♦a1 ♦e7 22 ♦xc4 ♦d7 23 ♦a6 ♦c5 24 ♦a4+ ♦c7 25 ♦b3 1-0 Vaganian-Zaragatski, 2nd Bundesliga 2007/8.

b) 5...w6 6 a4 b4 7 a5 ♦g6 8 g3 d6 9 ♦g2 f5 10 ♦bd2 ♦xd2 11 ♦xd2 ♦a6 12 0-0 ♦c7 13 c3 bxc3 14 ♦xc3 ± ♦d7 15 ♦e1 ♦h5 16 ♦b3 ♦b5 17 e4 fxe4 18 ♦d2 a6 19 ♦xe4 0-0-0?! 20 ♦c4 (20 ♦xc5!) 20...b8 21 ♦xc5 1-0 Fressinet-Gunnarsson, Reykjavik 2006.

c) The other way to challenge d5 is 5...e6, when play may continue 6 e3 ♦b7 7 a4 ♦xd5 (7...b4 allows White to keep his grip on d5 with 9 ♦c4) 8 axb5 ♦c7 9 ♦d3 a6 (Black sacrifices a pawn to free his queenside) 10 ♦a4?! (10 c4) 10...f5?! (10...AXB5! 11 ♦xe4 c4!) 11 bxa6 ♦b6 12 ♦xb8! (White undogmatically gives up the bishop-pair to maintain his passed a-pawn) 12...wxb8 13 b3 ♦c6 14 ♦a2 0-0 15 0-0 d5 16 c4 ♦d6 17 ♦c2 and Black had insufficient compensation for his pawn deficit in the game Arkell-Collas, Cappelle la Grande 1991.

6 a4

White fights for control of c4.

6...w5+

Alternatively:

a) 6...w6 7 e4 ♦xe4 8 ♦xb5 e6 9 dxe6 fxe6 10 ♦c3 ♦e7 11 ♦xe4 ♦xe4 12 ♦xb8 ♦xb8 13 ♦e5 ♦b7?! 14 0-0 0-0 15 ♦xd7 (15 ♦xd7?!) 15...w8
(15...♗d5 16 c4 ♕xc4 17 ♕xc4 ♕xd7 18 ♕xd7 ♕xd7 19 ♖fe1 ± 16 ♖c6 ♕xc6 17 ♕xc6 ♕e8 18 ♕xe7 ♕xe7 19 ♖3 ± Tregubov-Kogan, Bastia rapid 2003.

b) 6...e6 7 dxe6 fxe6 8 axb5 and now:

b1) 8...♕e7 9 ♙bd2 0-0 10 e3 ♙xd2 11 ♕xd2 d6 12 ♙d1 e5 13 ♕xe5?! (13 ♕g3 ±) 13...dxe5 14 ♕c4+ ♕h8 15 ♕xd8 ♕xd8 16 ♕xe5 ♕f6 (16...♕a5+ 17 ♕f1 ♕a6 18 ♕b6 ♕c6 19 ♕f7+ ±) 17 ♕f7+ ♕xf7 18 ♕xf7 ± Komarov-Tirard, French Team Ch, Drancy 2003.

b2) 8...d6 9 ♙bd2 ♕f6 10 ♕xe4 ♕xf4 11 ♙c3 d5 12 ♕xe4 ♕f6 13 ♕g2 ♙d7 14 0-0 ± Mchedlishvili-Jones, European Ch, Dresden 2007.

7 ♙bd2! (D)

Quick development is more important than hanging on to the d5-pawn.

7...♕xd5
7...♕xd2 8 ♕xd2 ♕xd5 9 axb5 ♕d8 10 e4 ♕b7 11 ♕d3 g6 12 ♕b3 ♕b6 13 ♕a5 ♕g7 14 ♕xb7 ♕xb7 15 c3 d6 16 0-0 with a clearly better position for White, Fominykh-Medvegy, Cairo 2001.

8 axb5 ♕b6

Or:

a) 8...♕xb5 9 c4 +–.

b) 8...♕d8 9 ♕a4 ♕xd2 10 ♕xd2 d6 11 c4 ♕b7 12 ♕a1 e5 13 ♕g5 ♕e7 14 ♕xe7 ♕xe7 15 ♕d3 ♕d7 16 0-0 ± Hebden-Degraeve, Clichy 2001.

9 ♕xe4 ♕xe4 10 ♕d2 ♕b7 11 e4 (D)

The pawn on b5 is a major thorn in Black’s side, as it hinders the development of his queenside. The vulnerable position of Black’s queen will enable White to develop his initiative with tempo.

11...d6

Instead the pawn-grabbing mission 11...♕f6?! proves totally counterproductive. After 12 ♕c3 ♕xb2 13 ♕xc5 ♕c3 Black has been wasting time with queen moves – this is the fifth – and retribution is not long in coming: 14 ♕c4 ♕xe4?! 15 ♕a3 ♕e5 16 ♕e3 f5 (16...♕xc5 is no better: 17 ♕xe4 ♕b4+ {17...♕xc4 18 ♕d6+ ++) 18...
c3 \( \text{\#.a3} \) 19 \( \text{\#d6+ \#d8} \) 20 \( \text{\#xf7+} \) 17 \( \text{\#xe4} \) fxe4 and instead of 18 \( \text{\#d5} \), which led to an endgame that White won in Stohl-Votava, Prague 1992, White should insert the moves 18 \( \text{\#d4} \) \( \text{\#d6} \) 19 \( \text{\#h5+ \#d8} \) and only now play 20 \( \text{\#d5} \), with a decisive advantage.

12 \( \text{\#c4} \) \( \text{\#d8} \)

12...\( \text{\#c7} \) 13 \( \text{\#xa7 \#xa7} \) 14 \( \text{\#c8} \) \( \text{\#e5} \) 16 \( \text{\#a1} \) \( \text{\#a8} \) 17 \( \text{\#a5} \) \( \text{\#xa7} \) 18 \( \text{\#a4+} \) is also much better for White, Nosenko-Potebnya, Chernigov 2005.

13 \( \text{\#e5} \) \( \text{\#xe5} \)

After 13...\( \text{\#d5} \), both 14 \( \text{\#a5} \) and 14 \( \text{\#e} \) are very unappetizing for Black.

14 \( \text{\#xd8+} \) \( \text{\#xd8} \) 15 \( \text{\#xe5} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 16 \( \text{\#c4} \)

16 \( \text{\#b6} \), with the idea of \( \text{\#b5+} \), is interesting.

16...\( \text{\#e6} \) 17 0-0-0 \( \text{\#e7} \) 18 \( \text{\#h1} \)

White is preparing a surprising sacrificial attack; Black would love to castle, but of course can’t.

18...\( \text{\#g5} \) 19 \( \text{\#g3} \) \( \text{\#a6} \) 20 \( \text{\#b6} \) \( \text{\#h5} \) (\( \text{\#d} \))

20...\( \text{\#c6} \) walks into the same tactic: 21 \( \text{\#xf7} \) \( \text{\#xf7} \) 22 \( \text{\#xe6+} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 23 \( \text{\#d7} \) \( \text{\#c8} \) 24 \( \text{\#b7} \) \( \text{\#xb7} \) 25 \( \text{\#xb7} +-. \)

21 \( \text{\#xf7} \) \( \text{\#xf7} \) 22 \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( \text{\#d8} \) 23 \( \text{\#d1} \) 1-0

Black must lose one of his bishops in view of the threat of 24 \( \text{\#xe7} +. \)

Game 55

Khalifman – Fominykh

Russian Ch, Elista 1995

1 \( \text{\#d4} \) \( \text{\#f6} \) 2 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#c5} \) 3 \( \text{\#d5} \) \( \text{\#b5} \) 4 \( \text{\#g5} \) \( \text{\#b7} \)

This is Black’s most direct continuation, applying pressure on White’s d-pawn, forcing him to carry out his planned strategy.

5 \( \text{\#xf6} \) \( \text{\#xf6} \) 6 \( \text{\#e4} \) (\( \text{\#d} \))

6...\( \text{\#c4} \)

Black has several other options:

a) 6...\( \text{\#b6} \) (to avoid the loss of the b5-pawn) 7 \( \text{\#e2} \) \( \text{\#d6} \) 8 0-0 0-0 9 \( \text{\#a4} \)

bxa4 10 \( \text{\#bd2} \) \( \text{\#a6} \) 11 \( \text{\#xa6} \) \( \text{\#xa6} \) 12 \( \text{\#e8} \) 13 \( \text{\#xa4} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) 14 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#f8} \) 15 \( \text{\#c4} \) led to the usual advantage for White in Soln-Pinter, Ljubljana 1994.

b) 6...\( \text{\#a6} \) (likewise securing b5) 7 \( \text{\#a4} \) \( \text{\#b4} \) 8 \( \text{\#c4} \) d6 9 \( \text{\#a5} \) (to take the b6-square) 9...\( \text{\#d7} \) 10 \( \text{\#c3} \) bxc3 11 bxc3
\texttt{c7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}/text{d}3 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{w}}}/text{c}7 14 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{d}}}/text{bd}2 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{f}}}b8 15 g3 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c8 16 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a2 (White can afford to manoeuvre patiently since Black lacks counterplay) 16...\text{g}6 17 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{g}}}g2 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{f}}}f8 18 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e1 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d7 19 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{a}}}f1 \text{h}5 20 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e3 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{b}}}b7 21 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d2 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{b}}}b5 22 \text{f}4 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d7 23 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h1 \pm \text{Zsu.Polgar-Andruet, Val Maubuée 1988.} White is ready to expand on the kingside.

c) 6...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}e7 (trying for counterplay in the centre) 7 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{d}}}bd2 \text{b}4 (7...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{a}}}xd5 8 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}xb5 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}xe4 9 0-0 gives White the initiative) 8 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c4 \text{g}6 9 0-0 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{g}}}g7 10 \text{a}3 (Black's unusual move-order gives White this extra option of opening lines on the queenside) 10...0-0 11 \text{axb}4 \text{cxb}4 12 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{b}}}b3 (a pawn sacrifice to try to exploit White's lead in development) 12...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}xe4 13 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{d}}}a5 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a6 14 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e1 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{f}}}f4 15 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}d3 \text{\textbf{w}}d6 16 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}xa6 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{w}}}xa6 17 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{w}}}b7 18 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a4 \text{f}5 19 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{e}}}ea1 \text{a}6 20 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}e2 \text{a}5 21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}xa5 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}xa5 22 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}xa5 and White is much better, Khuzman-Rashkovsky, Kuibyshev 1986.

7 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e2

White concentrates on getting his king to safety before commencing active operations.

7...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c5

Black plays very dynamically but White can achieve an advantage by attacking the weak queenside pawns.

8 0-0 \text{a}6

It's worth noting 8...0-0 9 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d4?! \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}b6 10 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{f}}}f5 \text{g}6 11 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{g}}}g3 \text{d}6 12 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}d2 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d7 13 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c3 \text{a}6 14 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}ae1 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}ae8 15 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{g}}}g4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e5 16 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h3 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e7 17 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h1 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}d8 18 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h6 \pm \text{Hebden-Mannion, Edinburgh 1995.} The game concluded 18...\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c8 (18...\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e8 19 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{f}}}f5 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h8 20 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h5 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{g}}}g8 21 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{d}}}xf6 +-) 19 \text{f}4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d7? 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{f}}}f5 1-0.

9 a4 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{b}}}6 (D)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

10 \text{c}3?!

An unusual approach, but by no means bad. 10 \text{axb}5 is much more direct; after 10...\text{axb}5 11 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{a}}}xa8 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{a}}}xa8 12 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c3 0-0, 13 \text{b}3 is perhaps the most principled way to take advantage of Black's queenside pawn advances. After 13...\text{cxb}3 14 \text{cxb}3 Black has been unsuccessful in practice:

a) 14...\textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e8 15 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}d3! \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{b}}}b7 (15...\text{b}4 16 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a5 17 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}xc5 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{c}}}xc5 leaves Black with no compensation for his structural weaknesses) 16 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{w}}}xb5 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a6 17 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}a4 \text{\textbf{e}}e2 18 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{e}}}xe2 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a6 19 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}d7 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{e}}}xe4 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c3 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{b}}}b4 21 \text{d}6 1-0 Piket-Brenninkmeijer, European Junior Ch, Groningen 1986/7. Black is faced with back-rank mate, the threat of \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d5 and the continuation 21...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{w}}}b8 22 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textbf{e}}}e1!.

b) 14...f5 (a radical way to get rid of the weakness, but a pawn is a pawn!) 15 \text{exf}5 \text{b}4 16 \textcolor{green}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{a}}}a5 17 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}xc5 \textcolor{black}{\text{\textbf{c}}}xc5 18 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{c}}}c4 \text{d}6 19 \text{f}6! \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{d}}}d7 (19...\text{gxf}6 horribly weakens Black's kingside, and 20 \textcolor{blue}{\text{\textbf{h}}}h4 launches a decisive attack) 20...
fxg7 a8 21 g5 a6 22 a1 g4 23 b1 f6 24 a1 a5 25 a4 f6 26 h3 xd5 27 xd5 xd5 28 xb4 is much better for White, Browne-Quinteros, Buenos Aires 1979.

10...0-0 11 d4 e8
11...xd4 12 cxd4 ± leaves Black without compensation for his inferior pawn-structure.

12 f3 d6 13 axb5 axb5 14 xa8 a8 15 b4 cxb3 16 xb3 xd4?! Not 16...b4? 17 a4 forking a8 and e8, but 16...d7!? could be tried.

17 cxd4 (D)

The trio of white pawns control many important central squares.

17...a6
17...xd4 18 xb5 is not a favourable exchange for Black.

18 a3 b8 19 d1 g6 20 c2 b7 21 e2 e8

White’s advantage lies in his imposing centre, which severely limits Black’s counterplay.

22 h3 d7 23 a1 a8 24 b2 c7 25 xa8+ xa8 26 a1 c7 27 b4

Black is by and large reduced to moving to and fro.

27 h5 28 d3 f8 29 f1 c8 30 e2 b7 31 f3 g7 32 g4! h4 33 e3 a6

The exchange of knights is a minor success for Black but does not take away his fundamental problem – lack of space.

34 xa6 xa6 35 c3 b7 35 b4 36 c6.

36 b4 a6 37 f4 g5 38 f5! f8 39 c3 b7 40 b4 a6 41 d2 e8 42 c2 d7 43 b2 c8 44 e5!

(D)

This decisive breakthrough leaves Black defenceless.

44...fxe5 45 dxe5 d8
45...dxe5 46 f8+.

46 e6 f6 47 c3 e7 48 c6! b7 49 b3 c8 50 b4 a7 51 xc8 xc8 52 xb5 b7 53 c4 1-0

An excellent example of complete domination by a top-class grandmaster. The endgame is lost for Black, as either his bishop will be trapped or the e-pawn will promote.
Game 56
Razuvaev – Vaganian
Kislovodsk tt 1982

1 d4 ♜f6 2 ♜f3 c5 3 d5 b5 4 ♜g5 ♭b6 (D)

Black ensures he can avoid doubled pawns but he loses time in the process.

5 ♜xf6

White invests his bishop-pair in order to win time by harassing Black’s queen.

5...♛xf6

Recapturing with a pawn may be playable but appears inconsistent with Black’s previous move:

a) 5...exf6 6 e4 d6 7 ♜bd2 ♝d7 8 ♝d3 a6 9 c3 g6 10 a4 ♛a7 11 0-0 ♝g7 12 ♛e2 ♛b7 13 axb5 axb5 14 ♛a8 0-0 15 ♛f1 gave White the better chances in the game Bocharov-Nguyen, Moscow 2008.

b) 5...gxg6 doesn’t inspire confidence. Here are two examples of play after 6 e4:

b1) 6...♗g7 7 c3 d6 8 a4 bxax 9 ♛xa4+ ♝d7 10 ♛c2 0-0 11 ♜bd2 ♝h6 12 ♜c4 ♛c7 13 ♝d3 ± Doettling-Schramm, Bad Wörishofen 2001.

b2) 6...♗b7 7 ♝c3 c4 8 ♛d4 ♛a5 9 ♝e2 ♛a6 10 0-0 ♛b4 11 ♛d2 e6 12 ♝a6 13 a4 b4 14 ♝b5 ± Barnaure-Voiteanu, Predeal 2006.

6 c3 g6

This looks sensible but Black’s results have been disastrous. Alternatives:

a) 6...♛g5 7 e4 a6 8 ♝e2 d6 9 0-0 ♛d7 10 ♝bd2 g4 11 ♝e1 ♝e5 12 a4 b4 13 cxb4 cxb4 14 ♝c2 ♝h6 15 ♝xb4 ± Sakaev-Gubazhdullin, Zvenigorod 2008.

b) 6...♛a6 7 e4 ♛b8 8 a4 b4 9 ♛c4 g5 10 0-0 ♛c7 11 e5 ♛f4 12 ♝bd2 g4 13 g3 ♛f5 14 ♝h4 ♛xe5 15 ♝e1 ♛h5 16 ♝e4 ♛d8 17 ♛xc5 d6 18 ♛d4 ♛g8 19 ♛d3 ± Tukmakov-D.Paulsen, Zurich 1997.

c) Surprisingly, 6...♛f5 has been tested extensively. Black loses more time with his queen but prevents e4 and puts pressure on the d-pawn. 7 a4 b4 (7...♗b7 8 axb5 ♛xd5 9 ♝bd2 g6 10 ♛a4 ♛g7 11 e4 ♛e6 12 ♛c4 ♛b6 13 0-0 0-0 14 ♛b3 ± Doettling-Navrotescu, Budapest 2001) 8 cxb5 cxb5 9 ♛d4 ♛c2 10 ♛bd2 ♛f6 11 e4 e5 12 ♛xe6 ♛xe6 13 ♛b5+ ♛d7 14 e5 ♛e7?! (14...♛c5?!) 15 0-0 ♛c6 16 ♛e3 ♛xb2 17 ♛xf6 ♛xf6 18 ♛e1 e5 19 ♛e4 ♛g6 20 ♛xc6 1-0 Shalimov-Aveskulov, Alushta 2001.

7 e4 (D)

White threatens both ♛xb5 and e5, so the queen is forced to move yet again. Black has tried two possibilities:

7...♛b6
This is the sensible approach, getting the queen away from the danger zone, but it is difficult to imagine that Black could achieve equality after so many queen moves. After 7...b4 8 e5 the queen is in for a tough ride wherever it goes: 8...\textit{Wf}4 (better is 8...\textit{Wb}6
9 \textit{Qbd}2 \textit{Qb}7 10 \textit{Qc}4 with a small edge for White) 9 \textit{Qbd}2 \textit{Qg}7 10 g3
\textit{Wf}5 11 \textit{Qc}4 (White is ready to continue gaining time by \textit{Qd}3 so the black queen tries to fight its way out of trouble) 11...\textit{We}4+ 12 \textit{We}2 (12 \textit{Qe}3!?) 12...\textit{Wxd}5?! (Black should try 12...\textit{Wxe}2+ 13 \textit{Qxe}2 \textit{bxc}3 14 \textit{bxc}3 \textit{f}6) 13 \textit{Qd}1 \textit{We}6 (13...\textit{Wc}6 14 \textit{Qd}6+ \textit{exd}6?! 15 \textit{exd}6+ \textit{Qf}8 16 \textit{Qe}7+ \textit{Qg}8
17 \textit{Qg}5 \rightarrow) 14 \textit{Qg}5 \textit{Wf}5 (14...\textit{wa}6 15 \textit{Qd}6+!) 15 f4 (with the apocalyptic threat of \textit{Qh}3 winning the queen) 15...\textit{Qxe}5 (this saves the queen at the cost of a piece but, not surprisingly with no other pieces yet developed against White's well-mobilized force, Black is completely lost) 16 \textit{Qxe}5 0-0
17 \textit{Qh}3 \textit{Wf}6 18 \textit{Qg}4 \textit{Qg}7 19 \textit{Wxe}7
\textit{Qb}7 20 0-0 \textit{f}6 21 \textit{Wxg}7+ \textit{Qxg}7 22
\textit{Qf}3 \textit{We}8 23 \textit{Qd}6 \textit{Qe}6 24 \textit{Qxe}6 dxe6

25 \textit{Qg}2 \textit{Qa}6 26 \textit{Qd}1 \textit{Qd}5 27 c4 \textit{Qc}6
28 \textit{Qg}5 1-0 Engqvist-Kallgren, Stockholm 1996/7.

8 \textit{Qbd}2 (D)

8 a4 is also a good try for advantage; for example, 8...b4 9 a5 \textit{Wb}7 10
\textit{Qbd}2 \textit{Qa}6 11 \textit{Qc}4 \textit{Qg}7 12 0-0 0-0 13
d6 exd6 14 \textit{Qd}5 \textit{Wb}8 15 \textit{Qxa}8 \textit{Qxa}8
16 \textit{Qc}4 \textit{bxc}3 17 \textit{bxc}3 \textit{Qxc}3 18 \textit{Qc}1
\textit{Qg}7 19 \textit{Qxd}6 and White is much better, Miroshnichenko-Ooms, Antwerp 2007.

8...d6

White quickly achieved an advantage after 8...\textit{Qg}7 9 a4 b4 10 \textit{Qc}4
\textit{Wb}7 11 e5 d6 12 \textit{Qe}2 \textit{bxc}3 13 \textit{bxc}3
\textit{Qc}7 14 0-0 dxe5? (Black should try the sensible 14...0-0 or the combative 14...\textit{Qd}7) 15 d6 exd6 16 \textit{Qxd}6+ in
Kaidanov-Alburt, New York 1994. The game concluded 16...\textit{Qe}7 17 \textit{Qb}5
\textit{Wb}6 18 \textit{Qg}5 \textit{Qb}7 19 \textit{Wb}3 \textit{Wf}8 20 a5
\textit{Wa}6 21 \textit{Qd}4 cxd4 22 \textit{Qxa}6 \textit{Qxa}6 23
\textit{Wb}4+ \textit{Qd}7 24 \textit{Qe}4 1-0.

9 a4

Again Black has problems holding his queenside together.
9...bxa4 10 \( \mathcal{c} \)c4 \( \mathcal{w} \)c7 11 \( \mathcal{w} \)xa4+ \( \mathcal{d} \)d7 (D)

11...\( \mathcal{d} \)d7 avoids the problems of the game, but leaves White better after the simple 12 \( \mathcal{w} \)a5.

12 \( \mathcal{w} \)c6

Highlighting Black's light-squared weaknesses. 12 e5 is another way forward, based on the same tactical motifs; e.g., 12...e6 (for 12...dxe5 13 \( \mathcal{w} \)c6 \( \mathcal{w} \)b7, see the note to Black's 13th move below) 13 dxe6 fxe6 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)xd6+ \( \mathcal{c} \)c6 15 exd6 \( \mathcal{w} \)b7 16 \( \mathcal{d} \)b5 0-0 17 \( \mathcal{c} \)c6 \( \mathcal{w} \)xb2 18 0-0 \( \mathcal{d} \)d6 19 \( \mathcal{w} \)h4 1-0 Pozo-Saez, Collado Villalba 2008.

12...\( \mathcal{w} \)b7 (D)

Exchanging queens is tantamount to disaster for Black: 12...\( \mathcal{w} \)xc6 13 dxc6 \( \mathcal{d} \)f6 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)b6 \( \mathcal{b} \)b8 15 \( \mathcal{d} \)c8 \( \mathcal{w} \)xc8 16 \( \mathcal{w} \)xa7 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe4 17 \( \mathcal{a} \)a6+--.

13 e5!

White plays his thematic central breakthrough.

13...\( \mathcal{g} \)g7

The alternative 13...dxe5 14 \( \mathcal{d} \)fxe5 \( \mathcal{w} \)xe6 15 \( \mathcal{d} \)c6 is very pleasant for White. After 15...\( \mathcal{g} \)g7 16 \( \mathcal{e} \)e2 \( \mathcal{b} \)b7 17 0-0 \( \mathcal{f} \)f6 18 \( \mathcal{f} \)fe1 \( \mathcal{d} \)b6 (Gross-Protaziuk, Brno 2006) White can secure a large advantage by 19 \( \mathcal{d} \)d6+ exd6 20 \( \mathcal{a} \)a6+ \( \mathcal{d} \)d7 21 \( \mathcal{d} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{a} \)e8 22 \( \mathcal{d} \)xa7 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe1+ 23 \( \mathcal{d} \)xe1 \( \mathcal{c} \)c7 24 \( \mathcal{c} \)c6.

14 exd6 e6 15 \( \mathcal{w} \)xb7 \( \mathcal{a} \)xb7 16 dxe6 fxe6 17 \( \mathcal{g} \)g5

White has a decisive material advantage.

17...\( \mathcal{d} \)d5 18 \( \mathcal{e} \)e3 \( \mathcal{b} \)b8 19 \( \mathcal{c} \)c4 \( \mathcal{f} \)xb2 20 0-0 \( \mathcal{a} \)xc4 21 \( \mathcal{f} \)xc4 \( \mathcal{b} \)b7 22 \( \mathcal{a} \)ae1 \( \mathcal{f} \)f6 23 \( \mathcal{a} \)xe6+ \( \mathcal{f} \)f8 24 f4 \( \mathcal{h} \)h6 25 \( \mathcal{c} \)c5 hgx5 26 \( \mathcal{d} \)xd7+ \( \mathcal{d} \)xd7 27 fxg5 \( \mathcal{f} \)f7 28 gxf6 1-0.
7 Anti-Dutch 2 \( \text{g5} \)

**Introduction and Unusual Second Moves for Black**

Dutch specialists tend to be quite uncompromising, creative types. They often know their pet lines very well and make no secret of their aggressive intentions. I have used the 2 \( \text{g5} \) Anti-Dutch successfully for a number of years. Very few players I have encountered have felt comfortable on the black side. Even fewer have been able to find their way to a playable game. For this reason many Stonewall Dutch enthusiasts play 1...e6 followed by 2...f5 but as we shall see White can disrupt this plan with the unusual move 3 d5!?.

The main theme running through both these systems is that White is looking for an advantageous time to play the e4 pawn-break, which often ruins the black pawn-structure. In this introduction we shall concentrate on divergences from the main lines (2...g6 and 2...h6).

---

**Game 57**

**Rowson – Preuss**

*Copenhagen 1996*

1 d4 f5 2 \( \text{g5} \) (D)

In the Dutch Defence it is very difficult for Black to organize himself in a satisfactory manner without moving his g8-knight or his e7-pawn. This strange-looking bishop move is a direct attempt to take advantage of this very problem. Here we look at options for Black where he tries to side-step the issue or mistakenly challenges White to prove his strategy.

2...d6

Black’s main move, 2...g6, is the subject of Games 60 and 61, while the sharp 2...h6 is covered in Games 62 and 63. In our next game we shall see Black challenging White to carry out his strategy with 2...\( \text{\triangle f6} \) 3 \( \text{\triangle x f6} \).

Other 2nd moves are considered in Game 59.

3 \( \text{\triangle c3} \) h6

A very committal decision, as now Black suffers in nearly all the tactics as a result of his weak kingside light squares. However, other moves allow
White to play e4 without any concessions:

a) 3...\(\text{\texttt{d}}d7\) 4 e4 \(\text{\texttt{d}}f6\) and in Voi-
now-Belogortsev, Tomsk 2001, it ap-
ppears White could have achieved a
clear plus with 5 e5!.

b) After 3...g6 4 e4 h6 5 \(\text{\texttt{e}}3 \text{\texttt{g}}7\)
(Bae-J.Berg Jensen, Gausdal 2000)
White should have tested 6 exf5 \(\text{\texttt{x}}f5\)
7 g4!; e.g., 7...\(\text{\texttt{e}}6\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{d}}3 \text{\texttt{f}}7\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{g}}2\)
\(\text{\texttt{c}}6\) (9...c6 10 \(\text{\texttt{e}}4\) \(\pm\)) 10 \(\text{\texttt{e}}4\) g5 11
d5 \(\text{\texttt{e}}5\) 12 \(\text{\texttt{h}}5+\) c6 13 dxc6 bxc6 14
\(\text{\texttt{x}}c6++ \text{\texttt{x}}c6 15 \text{\texttt{w}}c6+ \text{\texttt{f}}8 16 \text{\texttt{g}}ge2
\(\pm\).

4 \(\text{\texttt{d}}d2\) \(\text{(D)}\)

4...\(\text{\texttt{f}}6\)

4...d5? 5 e4 dxe4 (5...fxe4 6 \(\text{\texttt{h}}5+\)
\(\text{\texttt{d}}7\) 7 \(\text{\texttt{x}}d5+\) ++) 6 \(\text{\texttt{h}}5+\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}7\) 7
\(\text{\texttt{x}}f5+\) ++.

5 e4 fxe4 6 \(\text{\texttt{x}}e4 \text{\texttt{f}}5\)

6...\(\text{\texttt{e}}xe4\) 7 \(\text{\texttt{h}}5+\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}7\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{f}}5+\) e6 9
\(\text{\texttt{x}}e4\) \(\pm\).

7 \(\text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{h}}7\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{f}}3 \text{\texttt{bd}}7\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{c}}4\) d5
10 \(\text{\texttt{d}}d3\)

White demonstrates good un-
derstanding. Swapping off light-squared
bishops highlights Black's kingside
weaknesses and is of far greater rele-
vance than White's doubled d-pawns.

10...\(\text{\texttt{x}}d3\) 11 cxd3 c6 12 0-0 \(\text{\texttt{b}}6\)
13 b4 g5

Black is asking too much of his po-
sition. As unsavoury as it may be, he
had to castle queenside and hope to
brave it out.

14 \(\text{\texttt{c}}3\) e6 15 \(\text{\texttt{e}}2\) \(\text{(D)}\)

15...\(\text{\texttt{f}}7\)

Now the end is swift.

16 \(\text{\texttt{e}}5+ \text{\texttt{xe}}5\) 17 dxe5 \(\text{\texttt{d}}7\) 18
\(\text{\texttt{h}}5+\) \(\text{\texttt{g}}7\) 19 \(\text{\texttt{f}}5+\) exf5 20 e6+ 1-0

There's not much to be done about
\(\text{\texttt{f}}7\).

Game 58
Korchnoi – Schlierf
Bad Wörishofen 2004

1 d4 f5 2 \(\text{\texttt{g}}5 \text{\texttt{f}}6\)

Black at once challenges White to
carry out his strategy and give up the
bishop-pair. However, this is simply
misguided, as White gets a much better
version of a Trompowsky where Black
has additional kingside weaknesses.
4...d5

Black has also tried:

a) 4...e7 5 c4 c6 6 c3 d5? 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 wRb3 and White simply wins a good pawn, Kasparov-Wrobel, Katowice simul 1993.

b) 4...g6 5 d3 g7 6 h4 wE7 7 wRb2! c6 (not 7...wB4+ 8 bC3 wXb2? 9 d5 ++) 8 c3 d5?! 9 wRb3 wD6 10 f3 c7 11 c4 dxc4 12 cxc4 ± Caselas-Cabanas-Cabrera Moreno, Spanish Universities Ch 1994.

c) 4...wE7?! doesn’t look natural but there are two small threats (...wB4+ and ...f4) so White should probably be satisfied with a pull after 5 c3 c6 6 wF3 d5 7 d3 g6 8 h3. Following 8...wA6 9 wXa6?! bx6 10 wRg2 wB8 11 a4 wB4+ 12 c3 a5 13 0-0 wD6 14 a3 wB7, Moiseenko-Moroz, Ordzhonikidze 2000 demonstrated a useful tactical idea: 15 e4! dxe4 16 wxe4 ±.

5 d3!?

White’s chances are fairly long-term and c4 cannot be stopped anyway so flexible development makes a lot of sense. Nevertheless, the immediate 5 c4 is more concrete and a theoretically critical continuation:

a) 5...c6 6 wC3 wC6 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 wRb3 wD7 9 wRg2 g5 (9...d6 10 wRb5 wC7?? 11 wRe4 ±) 10 g3 wC6 11 wRg2 wD8 12 wC1 with a clear advantage to White because of the weak d5-pawn, Ricardi-An.Rodriguez, Villa Martelli 1997.

b) 5...wB4+ 6 wC3 0-0 7 wRb3 wXc3+ 8 wC6 9 wXc6 (this temporarily loses a pawn but Black is also worse after 8...wC4 9 wXc4+ wRb8 10 wRb2, when he has no compensation for his structural defects) 9 cxd5 wA5 10 wRb5 b6 11 wRb7 wB7 12 wRf3 a6 13 wRd3 wD7 14 c4 b5 15 cxb5 axb5 16 wRb6 wXc5+ 17 wRb5 wXd5 18 wXe4 wA7 0-0 is a little better for White, although a draw was agreed in Fominikh-Guliev, Russian Team Ch, Kazan 1995.

c) 5...wC6 6 cxd5 wXd5 (6...wXd5 7 wC3 wF7?? {7...wB4?!} 8 wD3 g6 9 wH4 wG7 10 wRd7 11 wRg2 a6 12 wRf4 wB6 13 wF3 ± Kasparov-Bastin, Besaçon simul 1999) 7 wC3 wB4 8 wRg2 wF7 (losing, but White has a very pleasant position in any case; e.g., 8...wF7 9 wA4+ wC6 10 0-0 wXc3?! {10...wA5!!} 11 wXc3 ±) 9 wA4+ wC6 10 0-0 (it is a measure of the drawbacks of the black position that White forces the win of a piece by simply developing!) 10...wA5 11 d5 wXa4 12 wXa4 wE5 13 dxe6 wG4 14 wD7 wXf2 15 wG1 wG4 16 wC3 wXe3 17 wH5 0-0 18 e7 1-0 Wells-Musson, European Clubs Cup, Iraklion 1997.

We now return to 5 d3!? (D):
5...\(\square\!\!c6\)

This wins a tempo due to the ...\(\square\!\!b4\) idea, but otherwise the knight doesn't have very bright prospects here. Alternatives include:

a) 5...\(\square\!\!d6\) 6 \(\mathbb{W}f3\) g6 7 \(\square\!\!e2\) \(\square\!\!e6\) 8 \(\square\!\!bc3\) \(\square\!\!c6\) 9 \(\square\!\!f4\) \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f4\) 10 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f4\) \(\mathbb{W}d6\) 11 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!d6\) cxd6 12 \(\mathbb{W}d2\) \(\square\!\!e7\) 13 a4 a6 14 a5 \(\pm\) Kharlov-Petukhov, Russian Team Ch, Sochi 2005.

b) 5...\(\square\!\!e6\) 6 \(\mathbb{W}f3\) \(\mathbb{W}d7\) 7 \(\square\!\!e2\) \(\square\!\!c6\) 8 a3 0-0-0 (8...g6 transposes to the main game) 9 h4?! (9 \(\square\!\!f4\) \(\mathbb{W}f7\) 10 \(\square\!\!c3\) \(\mathbb{W}b8\) 11 0-0-0 g5 12 \(\mathbb{W}e2\) \(\square\!\!e6\) 13 g3 a6 = Urosević-Ujhazi, Herceg Novi 2001) 9...h5?! (9...\(\square\!\!e5\) is a standard trick in this structure that both sides need to be aware of: after 10 dxe5 fxe5, Black will regain his piece following ...\(\square\!\!e4\)) 10 g3 \(\mathbb{W}b8\) 11 \(\mathbb{W}d2\) \(\square\!\!e7\)?! (the 11...\(\square\!\!e5\) trick was still on) 12 0-0-0 g6 13 \(\mathbb{W}b1\) \(\mathbb{W}f7\) 14 \(\square\!\!c1\) c6 15 \(\mathbb{W}f4\) \(\square\!\!h6\) 16 c4 dxc4 17 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!c4\) \(\square\!\!d5\) 18 \(\mathbb{W}b3\) \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f4\) 19 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f4\) \(\mathbb{W}e7\) 20 \(\mathbb{W}h1\) \(\mathbb{W}h8\) 21 \(\square\!\!e5\) \(\mathbb{W}b6\) 22 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f7\) \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f7\) 23 \(\square\!\!c3\) \(\mathbb{W}d5\) 24 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!d5\) \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!d5\) 25 \(\mathbb{W}\!\!c1\) \(\pm\) Malaniuk-Moroz, Pardubice 1997.

6 a3

White is playing for c4 and must not allow ...\(\square\!\!b4\), so this is mandatory.

6...\(\square\!\!e6\)

6...\(\mathbb{W}d6\) 7 \(\square\!\!c3\) \(\square\!\!e6\) 8 \(\mathbb{W}f3\) \(\mathbb{W}d7\) 9 \(\square\!\!ge2\) a6 10 \(\mathbb{W}f4\) \(\mathbb{W}f4\) 11 \(\mathbb{W}x\!\!f4\) 0-0-0 12 h4 h6 13 h5 \(\square\!\!e7\) 14 \(\mathbb{W}e2\) with a slight advantage for White, Kutirov-Plevris, Khalkida 1998.

7 \(\mathbb{W}f3\) g6 8 \(\square\!\!e2\) \(\mathbb{W}d7\)

Not 8...\(\mathbb{W}e5\)? 9 dxe5 fxe5 10 \(\mathbb{W}b5\) c6 11 \(\square\!\!a4\), when Black doesn't regain his piece.

9 \(\mathbb{W}d2\) \(\mathbb{W}g7\)

Given how difficult his position soon becomes, Black should have considered 9...\(\mathbb{W}e5\) 10 dxe5 fxe5 here, even though it is less clear than in the case of Malaniuk-Moroz above. After 11 \(\mathbb{W}g3\) \(\mathbb{W}d6\), White has problems finding a good square for his queen.

10 \(\mathbb{W}f4\)

Black will not get another chance for the ...\(\mathbb{W}e5\) idea.

10...\(\mathbb{W}e7\) (D)

The knight would like to go via c8 to d6 (and then to e4) but never gets
around to completing this plan since White’s queenside play is quickly becoming too real.

11 c4 c6 12 h3

This prepares g4 at an inconvenient time for Black.

12...dxc4 13 Qxe6 Wxe6 14 Qxc4

Now there can hardly be any doubt that White has achieved his strategic goals from the opening.

14...Wd7 15 Ac1 Ad8 16 g4 fxg4
17 hxg4 Od5 18 Qf1 We7 19 Ab3

White is now clearly better.

19...Ad7 20 Ce4 Cd8 21 Qc5 Ad6
22 e4 b6??

After 22...Qb6 23 d5 White is much better but not necessarily winning.

23 exd5 bxc5 24 dx5 1-0

Game 59
Cebalo – Miton
Biel 1997

1 d4 f5 2 Qg5 c6

Making a bolt-hole for the black queen. Two alternatives:

a) 2...c5 (striking back at the centre) 3 dxc5 Qa6 4 e4 (this is a fundamental attacking move in the Qg5 Anti-Dutch, by which White levered open the centre for his pieces to come flying out) 4...fxe4 5 Qc3 Qxc5 6 Qe3 (D) and now:

a1) 6...e6?? loses a piece to 7 Qxc5 Qxc5 8 Wh5+.

a2) Chris Ward pointed out that 6...b6 can be met by 7 Qxc5(??) bxc5 8 Wh5+ g6 9 Wd5 Ab8 10 We5, arriving at an unusual situation where the white queen is forking both black rooks! However, John Nunn noted that

Black nevertheless comes out on top, and this is confirmed by computer-assisted analysis: 10...Wb6 (10...Qxb2 may also be sufficient) 11 Wxh8 Wxb2; for example, 12 Qd1 (12 Qb1 Wxc3+ 13 Wxc3 Qxb1+ 14 Qe2 Qa6+ 15 Qe3 Qxf1 is very good for Black) 12...Qf6 13 Qge2?! (13 Qd5 is a better try) 13...Qf7 14 f3 (14 Qb1 Wxb1+ 15 Qxb1 Qxb1+ 16 Qd2 Qh6+ 17 Qc3 Qd5+ 18 Qc4 Qb7 19 Wxh7+ Qg7 is winning for Black) 14...e3 and it’s unlikely that White can survive. Fortunately, the safer solution 7 Qxe4 Qxe4 8 Wh5+ g6 9 Wd5 Qb7 10 Wxb7 Qd6 11 Wf3 looks quite promising for White.

a3) 6...Qc6 7 Qxe4 Qf6 8 Qd3 g6 9 h4 (if White prefers a simple structural advantage, then the immediate 9 Qxf6+ is suitable) 9...g7 10 Qxf6+ exf6 11 Qf3 b6 12 We2 Qb7 13 0-0-0 Wc7 14 h5 0-0-0 15 Ah4 and White had a nice initiative to go with his structural plus in the game Miles-Meulders, Amsterdam Zonal 1978.

b) 2...d5 is inaccurate when White hasn’t blocked his c-pawn. In practice,
this has been roughly treated, with White getting a favourable version of
the Queen’s Gambit; e.g., 3 e3:

b1) 3...\( \text{c6} \)!! has been played by
the great Korchnoi but isn’t very con-
vincing: 4 \( \text{d}3 \text{d}7 \text{c}3 \text{g}f6 \text{f}3 \text{h}6 \text{g}4 \text{c}5 \text{d}5 \text{xc}5 \text{b}5 \text{c}8 \text{d}4 \text{d}3+ 12 \text{w}d3
\text{d}7 13 \text{g}e2 \text{g}8 14 \text{e}5 ± Fang-
Kalinichev, Budapest 1996.

b2) 3...\( \text{c}6 \) 4 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) (4...\( \text{d}7 \) 5
\text{cxd}5 \text{cxd}5 6 \text{e}3 \text{g}f6 7 \text{b}3 \text{e}6 8
\text{ge}2 \text{e}7 9 \text{f}4 \text{b}8 10 \text{b}5+ \text{f}7
11 0-0-0 ± Mladenov-Evstatieff, Bulgar-
ian Under-18 Ch, Kazanlak 2005) 5
\text{w}c2 is also very difficult for Black:

b21) 5...\( \text{e}6 \) 6 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 7 \text{cxd}5
\text{cxd}5 8 \text{c}3 \text{e}8 9 \text{d}3 \text{g}f6 10 \text{xf}6
\text{xf}6 11 \text{xf}5 \text{xf}5 12 \text{xf}5 \text{e}6 13
\text{w}c2 \text{b}4 14 \text{a}4+ ± R.Bagirov-

b22) 5...\( \text{e}6 \) 6 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 7 \text{cxd}5 \text{cxd}5
8 \text{d}3 \text{df6} (after 8...\( \text{b}4 \) 9 \text{ge}2
\text{g}f6 10 \text{f}3 0-0 11 0-0 \text{a}6 12 \text{h}1 \text{f}7
13 \text{e}4 \text{h}6 14 \text{h}4 \text{g}5 15 \text{f}2 \text{f}4 16 \text{e}5
White’s advantage was close to win-
ning in Kostiuik-Bogatyriova, Slavu-
tich 1998) 9 \text{f}3 and in Cohen-Curran,
Lyons 1993 Black blundered with
9...\( \text{e}4 ?? \) 10 \text{b}5+ \text{d}7 11 \text{xd}7+ \text{e}5+ 1-0. However, 9...
\text{d}6 10 \text{b}5 or 9...\( \text{d}7 \) 10 \text{e}5 \text{d}6 11
\text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 12 \text{b}5 \text{b}4+ 13 \text{e}2
\text{f}7 14 \text{ac}1 \text{a}6 15 \text{w}c7 would have
left Black with a very difficult posi-
tion.

We now return to 2...\( \text{c}6 \) (D):

3 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{w}b6 \)

Other options:

a) After 3...\( \text{h}6 \), 4 \( \text{e}3 \) is still un-
tested but White plans \text{f}3, \text{f}2, and

play similar to note ‘b’ to Black’s 4th
move.

b) Also after Glek’s 3...\( \text{d}6 \) 4 \( \text{c}3 \)
h6, it seems consistent to try 5 \( \text{e}3 !? \),
with play along the same lines.

c) 3...g6 4 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 5 e4 \text{exe}4 \text{d}5 7 \text{c}3 \text{f}6 8 \text{d}3 0-0 9 \text{e}2
\text{e}6 10 0-0 0\text{d}7 (given how difficult
his position now becomes, Black might
as well try 10...\text{dxc}4) 11 \text{cxd}5 \text{xd}5
12 \text{xf}5 \text{cxd}5 13 \text{w}b3 is much better
for White, Atalik-Pogorelov, Linares
1994.

4 \( \text{w}d2 \) \( \text{d}6 \)

Black continues to ignore White’s
dark-squared bishop for the time being.
Other moves:

a) 4...g6 5 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 6 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 7 e4
\text{xf}6 8 \text{exe}5 \text{xf}5 9 \text{ge}2 \text{bd}7 10
\text{g}3 \text{e}6 11 \text{e}2 0-0 12 0-0 \text{f}7 13
\text{b}3 ± Gazarek-Šale, Poreč 1998.

b) 4...\( \text{h}6 \) (chasing the bishop away)
5 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) (5...\( \text{d}5 \) 6 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 7 \text{f}4 \text{d}7
8 \text{f}3 \text{gf}6 9 \text{c}3 \text{e}6 10 \text{e}3 \text{g}5 11
\text{e}5?! \text{g}7??! (11...g4!) 12 \text{d}6 \text{f}8
13 \text{xf}8 \text{xf}8 14 \text{d}3 ± Kutirov-
Kurajica, Strumica 1995) 6 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}6 
(6...\text{w}b4 7 \text{b}3 \text{f}6 8 \text{f}3 \text{e}5 9 \text{f}2 \text{e}7
10 e3 0-0 11 d3 e6 12 ge2 bd7 with equality in Brynell-E.Berg, Lidköping 1999) 7 f3 g5 (7...wb4 8 f2 xc4 9 d5 b4 10 a3 a5 11 e4 a6 was unclear in Lang-Wulfmeyer, Untergrombach 2003) 8 f2 g7 9 e3 (White builds up patiently because 9 e4 would leave White vulnerable to ...g4 after a capture on e4) 9 a6 10 g2 d7 11 g3 0-0 0-0 12 d3 (giving Black a problem about how to defend f5) 12...f4 (12...e6 13 d5 ±) 13 exf4 gxf4 14 g2 h5 15 a3 c7 16 g6 and White had won a pawn in Atalik-Panagiotopoulos, Ano Liosia 1996.

We now return to 4...d6 (D):

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

5 c3 d7
5...h6 is again answered by 6 e3, transposing to line ‘b’ of the previous note.

6 e4 fxe4 7 xe4 gf6 8 xf6+
White takes a very no-nonsense approach in this game and simply completes development as quickly as possible, and then puts the half-open e-file to good use.

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

8...xf6 9 d3 e5 10 e2 e6 11 0-0 e7 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 wc2 g6 14 fe1 (D)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
B \\
\end{array}
\]

White has a clear positional advantage thanks to Black’s weak isolated e-pawn, so rather than subject himself to a long, painful defence Black stakes everything on a desperate attack.

14 g4?! 15 f4 xf2 16 c5 xc5 17 xe6 h3++ (D)

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

18 f1 xg5 19 xc5 0-0-0 20 xe5 hf8+ 21 g1
The pin on White’s knight looks awkward but Black has no way to exploit it and White simply remains a piece up.

21...\(\text{\textit{c}}6\) 22 \(\text{\textit{e}}3\) \(\text{\textit{d}}5\) 23 \(\text{\textit{e}}1\) \(\text{\textit{e}}5\)
24 \(\text{\textit{e}}2\) \(\text{\textit{f}}5\) 25 \(\text{\textit{c}}3\) \(\text{\textit{h}}5\)
25...\(\text{\textit{d}}7\) allows 26 \(\text{\textit{g}}4.\)
26 \(\text{\textit{h}}1\)

The game is over now that White has finally unpin the knight.

26...\(\text{\textit{w}}d8\) 27 \(\text{\textit{e}}4\) \(\text{\textit{d}}4\) 28 \(\text{\textit{e}}3\) \(\text{\textit{f}}4\)
29 \(\text{\textit{e}}1\) \(\text{\textit{h}}4\) 30 \(\text{\textit{h}}3\) \(\text{\textit{g}}5\) 31 \(\text{\textit{c}}5\) \(\text{\textit{w}}a5\) 32 \(\text{\textit{h}}4\) \(\text{\textit{x}}b4\) 33 \(\text{\textit{x}}e5\) \(\text{\textit{e}}4\) 34 \(\text{\textit{g}}4+\) 1-0

**Main Line: 2...g6**

**Game 60**

**Summerscale – G. Wall**

**London 1994**

1 d4 f5 2 g5 g6

This could be considered the main line of the \(\text{\textit{g}}5\) Anti-Dutch. Black prepares ...\(\text{\textit{g}}7\) and ...\(\text{\textit{f}}6\) without allowing White to inflict doubled f-pawns. A less obvious idea is to prepare ...\(\text{\textit{h}}6\) followed by ...\(\text{\textit{f}}7.\)

3 \(\text{\textit{d}}2\) (D)

B

The point behind putting the knight here rather than c3 is that White retains the option of c4 should Black play ...d5.

3...d5

Black’s main alternative, 3...\(\text{\textit{g}}7\), is examined in Game 61.

3...\(\text{\textit{h}}6\)?! 4 e4 \(\text{\textit{f}}7\) 5 \(\text{\textit{e}}3\) fxe4 6 \(\text{\textit{x}}e4\) d5 was tested in Summerscale-Rawlinson, Oxford 2002: 7 \(\text{\textit{g}}5\) \(\text{\textit{xg}}5\) 8 \(\text{\textit{x}}xg5\) \(\text{\textit{g}}7\) 9 \(\text{\textit{f}}3\) c5 10 c3 \(\text{\textit{w}}b6\) 11 \(\text{\textit{w}}d2\) cxd4 12 \(\text{\textit{c}}x\text{\textit{d}}4\) \(\text{\textit{c}}6\) 13 \(\text{\textit{b}}3\) d4 14 \(\text{\textit{c}}x\text{\textit{d}}4\) \(\text{\textit{c}}6\) 15 \(\text{\textit{c}}d4\) \(\text{\textit{x}}d4\) 16 \(\text{\textit{x}}d4\) \(\text{\textit{x}}d4\) 17 0-0-0 e5 18 \(\text{\textit{b}}5+\) \(\text{\textit{f}}7\) 19 \(\text{\textit{x}}e1\) \(\text{\textit{f}}5??\) (after 19...\(\text{\textit{e}}6\) Black is close to equality) 20 \(\text{\textit{x}}d4!\)

exd4 21 \(\text{\textit{e}}7+\) \(\text{\textit{f}}8\) 22 \(\text{\textit{x}}b7\) \(\text{\textit{c}}8+\) 23 \(\text{\textit{d}}1\) \(\text{\textit{h}}6\) 24 \(\text{\textit{f}}6\) \(\text{\textit{g}}8\) 25 \(\text{\textit{h}}7\) \(\text{\textit{e}}8\) 26 \(\text{\textit{x}}e8\) \(\text{\textit{x}}e8\) 27 \(\text{\textit{x}}d4\) 1-0.

4 c4 c6 5 e3 \(\text{\textit{g}}7\) 6 \(\text{\textit{b}}3\)

6 \(\text{\textit{c}}1\) \(\text{\textit{f}}6\) 7 \(\text{\textit{e}}2\) 0-0 8 \(\text{\textit{f}}4\) \(\text{\textit{e}}4\) 9 \(\text{\textit{x}}e4\) dxe4 10 c5 \(\text{\textit{w}}a5+\) 11 \(\text{\textit{c}}3\) ± e5?

12 \(\text{\textit{c}}4+\) \(\text{\textit{h}}8\) (Torre-Firdaus, Bali 2000) and now the cleanest kill is 13 \(\text{\textit{x}}g6+!\) \(\text{\textit{x}}g6\) 14 h4 followed by h5.

6...h6

Or 6...\(\text{\textit{w}}d6\) 7 \(\text{\textit{f}}4\) e5?! 8 \(\text{\textit{x}}e5\) \(\text{\textit{x}}e5\) 9 dx5 \(\text{\textit{x}}e5\) 10 \(\text{\textit{c}}x\text{\textit{d}}5\) \(\text{\textit{c}}x\text{\textit{d}}5\) 11 \(\text{\textit{g}}f3\)

\(\text{\textit{w}}e6\) 12 \(\text{\textit{c}}3\) \(\text{\textit{f}}6\) 13 \(\text{\textit{d}}4\) 1-0 Olea Perez-Torres Samper, Gijon 2002.

7 \(\text{\textit{h}}4\) \(\text{\textit{f}}6\)

The game Sladek-Miličević, Canadian Ch, Richmond 2002 went 7...g5 8 \(\text{\textit{g}}3\) e6 9 h4 \(\text{\textit{x}}d7\) 10 \(\text{\textit{d}}3\) \(\text{\textit{w}}f6\) 11 \(\text{\textit{x}}g5\) hxg5 12 \(\text{\textit{x}}xh8\) \(\text{\textit{x}}xh8\) 13 \(\text{\textit{e}}2\)

\(\text{\textit{e}}7\) 14 0-0-0 ±.

8 cxd5

It is important to exchange now, before Black has a chance to play ...e6.

8...cxd5 9 \(\text{\textit{b}}5+\) \(\text{\textit{c}}6\) 10 \(\text{\textit{c}}1\) (D)
10...g5
10...d6 was the only way to avoid material loss although White retains a clear edge after 11 g3 we6 12 gxf3.

11 xc6
The move Black missed.
11...bxc6 12 xc6+ d7 13 xa8
xa8 14 g3
White is a clear pawn up.
14...0-0 15 e2 h5
Black may as well try this, as with normal play he is completely lost.
16 e5 h4 17 0-0 h3 18 c1 c6
19 f3 h6 20 g3 d7 21 c2 f4
22 g6+ 1-0

Game 61
Nalbandian – Topalov
Biel Interzonal 1993

1 d4 f5 2 g5 g6 3 d2 g7 4 e4!
This pawn sacrifice is probably too risky for Black to accept.
4 fxe4
4...xd4?! is the only way for Black to try to exploit White’s move-order but it allows White a huge initiative after 5 exf5 xb2 6 fxg6:

a) 6...xa1 7 xa1 f6 8 e4 0-0 9 g7 h8 (9...xh7 10 d3 with a strong attack) 10 h6 is slightly better for White.
b) 6...hxg6 7 b1 (7 d3 is dangerous – for both sides – and for those who want to go all-out) 7...g7 8 d3 and for the price of a pawn White has a dream attacking position.

5 xel
(Please note that the actual move-order of the game was 1 d4 f5 2 g5 g6 3 e4! fxe4 4 c3 g7 5 xe4.)

5...d5 6 c5 (D)

6 b6
Or 6...d6 7 f3 with two main possibilities:

a) 7...e5 asks too much of the black position, which is not well enough developed to support such a thrust. 8 xe5 xe5 9 we2 c6 10 b3 xd4 (this allows Black to keep hold of his important dark-squared bishop) 11 xd4 ef7 12 b5 we6 13 f4 d6 (13...xb2 14 b1 is no better for Black) 14 0-0-0 h6 15 xe6+ xe6 16 xd6 xd6 17 h4 and White
was better because of his bishop-pair and the exposed black king in the game Hodgson-Lim Hoon Cheng, Manila Olympiad 1992.

b) 7...\(\text{\text{Q}}\)f6 8 \(\text{Q}\)d3 0-0 9 \(\text{Q}\)f4 (White is keeping a careful eye on Black's possible pawn-breaks, ...e5 and ...c5)
9...\(\text{Q}\)b6 10 c3 \(\text{Q}\)f5 11 \(\text{Q}\)b3 c6 12 \(\text{Q}\)e2 \(\text{Q}\)bd7 13 0-0 \(\text{Q}\)e4 14 \(\text{Q}\)fe1 \(\text{Q}\)ae8 15 \(\text{Q}\)fe5 \(\text{Q}\)df6 16 f3 \(\text{Q}\)d6 17 \(\text{Q}\)xb6 axb6 and now rather than the over-ambitious 18 g4 of Chekhov-Vyzhmanavin, Moscow 1992, 18 \(\text{Q}\)f1 would have kept White's advantage due to his firm grip on e5 and the backward black e-pawn.

7 \(\text{Q}\)b3 \(\text{Q}\)h6!?  

This turned out very badly for the future FIDE World Champion, but objectively may well be OK. The alternative is 7...\(\text{Q}\)f6 8 \(\text{Q}\)f3 0-0 9 \(\text{Q}\)e2, and now:

a) 9...\(\text{Q}\)e4 10 \(\text{Q}\)e3 \(\text{Q}\)d6 (Black very sensibly goes about completing his development before trying to break out; however, it is still not enough for full equality) 11 0-0 \(\text{Q}\)d7 12 \(\text{Q}\)bd2 \(\text{Q}\)b7 13 \(\text{Q}\)xe4 dxe4 14 \(\text{Q}\)c4+ \(\text{Q}\)d5 15 \(\text{Q}\)d2 \(\text{Q}\)xc4 16 \(\text{Q}\)xc4 \(\text{Q}\)d5 17 \(\text{Q}\)e2 e5 18 dxe5 \(\text{Q}\)xe5 19 \(\text{Q}\)xe5 \(\text{Q}\)xe5 20 \(\text{Q}\)c4+ \(\text{Q}\)h8 21 c3 \(\pm\) Miles-Van Mil, Isle of Man 1995. White has the better chances due to his plan of attacking the weak e-pawn.

b) 9...c5 allows White the better pawn-structure after 10 c4 \(\text{Q}\)e6 11 cxd5 \(\text{Q}\)xd5 12 dxc5 bxc5 (Black might do better to play in dynamic gambit style by 12...\(\text{Q}\)c6, meeting 13 0-0 with 13...\(\text{Q}\)e4) 13 0-0 \(\pm\) Glek-Bronstein, Minsk 1983.

8 h4 \(\text{Q}\)f7 9 \(\text{Q}\)h3 \(\text{Q}\)d6 10 \(\text{Q}\)d2 e5 11 0-0-0 \(\text{Q}\)xg5?

11...0-0 is better. White hasn't found anything really convincing then:

a) 12 \(\text{Q}\)e3 \(\text{Q}\)b7 13 \(\text{Q}\)g5 \(\text{Q}\)xg5 14 hxg5 \(\text{Q}\)d7 15 \(\text{Q}\)b1 a5 16 f3 a4 17 dxe5 \(\text{Q}\)xe5 is unclear, Stimpel-Wohlhart, Germany tt 2001/2.

b) 12 dxe5 \(\text{Q}\)xe5 and now:

b1) 13 \(\text{Q}\)d4? \(\text{Q}\)xh3 14 \(\text{Q}\)xe5 (14 \(\text{Q}\)xh3 \(\text{Q}\)xg5 is also much better for Black) 14...\(\text{Q}\)xe5 15 \(\text{Q}\)xh3 \(\text{Q}\)xg5 16 hxg5 \(\text{Q}\)xf2 \(\pm\) Kindermann.

b2) 13 c3 \(\text{Q}\)xg5 14 hxg5 (or 14 \(\text{Q}\)xg5 c6 15 \(\text{Q}\)d4 \(\text{Q}\)f6! – Kindermann) 14...c6 15 \(\text{Q}\)d3 (15 \(\text{Q}\)e1 \(\text{Q}\)d6 16 \(\text{Q}\)d3 \(\text{Q}\)d7 is unclear according to Kindermann) 15...a5 16 f4 \(\text{Q}\)d6 17 g3 a4 18 \(\text{Q}\)d4 \(\text{Q}\)a6 19 \(\text{Q}\)c2 \(\text{Q}\)c5 can only be described once more as unclear, Stimpel-Krieger, Dresden 2004.

12 hxg5 (D)

This position is very difficult for Black, who is behind in development and somewhat overextended in the centre.

12...e4 13 \(\text{Q}\)f4
Now White is better in view of Black’s insecure king and the pressure on h7.

13...\f8

The alternatives are no better:

a) 13...\f8 14 \h4! ±.

b) 13...\xf4+ 14 \xf4 c6 15 c4 gives White a promising initiative.

c) After 13...\xh3 Ftačnik gives 14 \xd6 cxd6 15 \xh3 0-0 (15...\d7 16 b5 c8 17 dh1) 16 e2! \c6 (16...d7 17 g4 ±; 16...xf2 17 g4 f7 18 c8! ±) 17 f3!!, when after \dh1 White will be somewhat better thanks to Black’s weaknesses on h7 and d5.

14 g3 c6?!

14...e7 15 b1!? ±.

15 f3! \xh3

15...\xf4+ 16 \xf4 exf3? 17 \xg6 g8 18 e1+ f7 19 xf8 xf8 20 xh7 with the idea 20...\xg5? 21 h8+ g8 22 xg8+ xg8 23 e8+ --.

16 \xh3 \xf4+ 17 gxf4 \xd6

17...exf3 18 f5 gxf5 19 xf5 \xd6 20 g6 ±.

18 f5 (D)

\h44+

18...gxf5 19 xf5 f4+ 20 b1 just transposes.

19 b1 xf5

19...0-0 20 xe4 dxe4 21 fxg6 xg6 22 g2 e8 23 de1 e3 24 d5 --.

19...xf3 20 fxg6 0-0 21 gxh7+ g7 22 g6 xg6 23 c8 --.

20 xf5 e3

Black loses after 20...0-0 21 xe4 dxe4 22 xh7+ g7 23 xe4 as 23...\xg5 is met with 24 d5. And after 20...\xg5 21 xe4 dxe4 22 xh7 Black has no good defence against the twin threats of 23 g6+ and 23 xxe4.

21 edg1 e8? 22 g6 1-0

2...h6 3 \h4 g5 4 e4!

Game 62
Summerscale – Santo-Roman
Montpellier 1994

1 d4 f5 2 \g5 h6!? 3 \h4

For readers who are not happy with the very sharp nature of the play after this move, there is a calmer option in 3 f4?!, which also has some nice points of its own, including 3...g5 4 e5 and 3...\xf6 4 c3 d6?! 5 e4!.

However, it is hard to drum up much of an initiative after 3...\xf6 4 c3 d5 if Black plays alertly.

3...g5

This is the most testing response to White’s opening: Black launches an attack on the kingside using White’s bishop as a target. To do so without first developing entails some risk, as you might expect.

4 e4! (D)
Note that most other black third moves here are equally well met this way; for example, 3...c5 4 e4 \( \text{w}b6 \) (giving the king a square!) 5 exf5 \( \text{w}xb2 \) 6 \( \text{g}d2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 7 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{w}xd4 \) 8 \( \text{g}f3 \) \( \text{w}d5 \) 9 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 10.0-0 b6 11 \( \text{xf6} \) gxf6 12 \( \text{h}4 \) h5 13 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{w}d4 \) 14 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 15 \( \text{b}3 \) with excellent compensation for White, Hodgson-Zeidler, Swansea 1999.

This is the key idea: White rips open the centre and offers a piece, should Black want to take it.

4...\( \text{g}7 \)

The alternatives are:

a) 4...\( \text{gxh4??} \) 5 \( \text{w}h5\#.

b) 4...d5 5 \( \text{w}h5+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 6 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{h}4 \) ±.

c) 4...\( \text{f}6 \) is the subject of Game 63.

d) Trygstad’s 4...\( \text{h}7?! \) was recently covered by Simon Williams in Dangerous Weapons: The Dutch. The critical line starts 5 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 6 \( \text{f}3 \) (D):

d1) 6...\( \text{g}7 \) 7 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{f}6 \) 8 \( \text{c}3 \) c6 (8...\( \text{fxe3} \) 9 \( \text{c}4 \) ++) 9 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 10 \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{xg5} \) 11 \( \text{w}xg5 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 12 \( \text{c}4 \) ++.

d2) 6...e6 7 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 8 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{we}7 \) (Williams’s 8...\( \text{w}f6?! \) may be dubious in view of 9 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{xf5}?! \) 10 \( \text{d}3 \)! \( \text{xf2}+ \) 11 \( \text{d}1 \) ++) leads to a semi-endgame where White’s rook and two pawns seem stronger than Black’s knight and bishop.

d3) 6...\( \text{c}6 \) 7 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{fxe4} \) 8 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 9 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{h}6 \) 10 \( \text{cxe4} \) e6 11 h4 ± (S. Williams).

d4) After 6...\( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{c}6 \) (a better try than 7...\( \text{xe4} \) 8 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 9 \( \text{c}3 \), 7...\( \text{d}6 \) 8 \( \text{c}4 \) or 7...e6 8 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 9 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{w}7 \) 10 e5), an option not mentioned by Williams is 8 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 9 dxe5 (D). Then:

d41) 9...\( \text{g}4 \) 10 \( \text{g}3 \) c6 11 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 12 \( \text{c}4 \)?! e6 13 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{xe5} \) 14 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 15 \( \text{h}5 \) is much better for White.

d42) 9...\( \text{xe4} \) 10 \( \text{e}2 \) e6 (10...\( \text{gxh4} \) 11 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 12 f4 ++) 11 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{w}7 \) 12 f3 ±.

d43) 9...\( \text{gxh4} \) 10 \( \text{exe6} \) and now:

d431) 10...\( \text{e}5 \) 11 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{xf6} \) 12 \( \text{w}5 \) ±.
d432) 10...d5 11 exd5 wxd5 12 c3 we6+ 13 e2 d7 14 0-0-0 0-0-0 15 d5 ±.

d433) 10...fxe4 11 e2!? exf6?! (11...d5 is probably best, but after 12 c4! Black is unable to keep his centre intact as 12.c6 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 c3 e6? fails to 15 h5 +--) 12 h5 we7 13 c3 c6 14 0-0-0 and Black is busted after 14...d5 15 xd5! as well as 14...f5 15 d5! cxd5 16 xd5.

5 g3 fxe4

After 5...f4 6 xf4 gxf4 7 h5+ f8 8 f5+ (D) Black is faring badly whatever he plays now; for example:

   d432) 10...d5 11 exd5 wxd5 12 c3 we6+ 13 e2 d7 14 0-0-0 0-0-0 15 d5 ±.

   d433) 10...fxe4 11 e2!? exf6?! (11...d5 is probably best, but after 12 c4! Black is unable to keep his centre intact as 12.c6 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 c3 e6? fails to 15 h5 +--) 12 h5 we7 13 c3 c6 14 0-0-0 and Black is busted after 14...d5 15 xd5! as well as 14...f5 15 d5! cxd5 16 xd5.

5 g3 fxe4

After 5...f4 6 xf4 gxf4 7 h5+ f8 8 f5+ (D) Black is faring badly whatever he plays now; for example:

White has now got a much better version of the Staunton Gambit (1 d4 f5 2 e4) since Black has significantly weakened his kingside. White’s plan is simply to play on these weaknesses as much as possible.

8...d6 9 c4 bd7 10 wd3
10 \( \triangle e5 \) is also an interesting possibility.

10...\( \triangle f8 \) 11 d5

By grabbing further space, I more or less obliged Black to open the centre for my better-developed pieces.

11...e5 12 dxe6 \( \triangle x e6 \) 13 \( \triangle x e6 \) \( \triangle x e6 \) 14 0-0-0 \( w d7 \) 15 \( w c4! \) 0-0-0?

Black cracks under the pressure, but it is easy to understand why he didn’t want to castle kingside: 15...0-0 16 \( \triangle h e1 \) \( \triangle a e8 \) 17 h4 g4?! 18 \( \triangle e5 \) \( w c8 \) 19 \( \triangle g6 \) \( w f7 \) 20 \( \triangle x d6 \) ±.

16 \( \triangle x d6 \) \( w x d6 \) 17 \( \triangle x d6 \) \( w x d6 \) 18 \( \triangle b5 \) \( \triangle b6 \) 19 \( \triangle f d4 \) 1-0

Game 63
Belozeroz – Sterliagova
Samara 2003

1 d4 f5 2 \( \triangle g5 \) h6 3 \( \triangle h4 \) g5 4 e4 \( \triangle f6 \)?

This has proved a tougher challenge than 4...\( \triangle g7 \).

5 e5 e6! (D)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

This is Black’s idea. He wants to take White’s bishop when it suits him.

6 \( \text{exf6} \)

6 \( \triangle g3 \) has some independent points, but 6...f4 7 \( \triangle d3 \) \( \triangle g8 \) 8 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \triangle x f6 \) transposes to note ‘c’ to Black’s 8th move.

6...\( \triangle x f6 \) 7 \( \triangle g3 \)

7 \( \text{wh5+} \) \( \text{wh7} \) 8 \( \triangle e2 \) \( \text{whx5} \) 9 \( \triangle x h5+ \) \( \text{wh8} \) is fine for Black: 10 \( \triangle g3 \) f4 11 \( \triangle e2 \) \( \text{fxg3} \) 12 \( \text{hxg3} \) c5 13 \( \triangle d2 \) \( \triangle c6 \) 14 c3 = Wo.Schmidt-Euler, Germany tt 2004/5.

7...f4 8 \( \triangle d3 \) (D)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

This prevents Black from meeting \( \text{wh5+} \) with...\( \text{wh7} \) and could be the critical line.

8...\( \text{wh7} \)

Black prevents the check but with a non-developing move. Other options:

a) 8...\( \triangle c6 \) 9 \( \text{wh5+} \) \( \text{wh8} \) 10 c3 d5 11 \( \triangle f3 \) \( \text{d7} \) (11...\( \text{fxg3} \) 12 \( \text{fxg3} \)\! \( \text{wg7} \) 13 0-0 \( \triangle d7 \) 14 \( \triangle b d2 \) \( \text{d6} \) 15 \( \triangle a e1 \) ± Orzech-Malaniuk, Barlinek 2006) 12 0-0 \( \triangle \text{d6} \) 13 \( \triangle b d2 \) \( \text{e7} \) 14 \( \triangle a e1 \) ± Moiseenko-Jakubiec, Polanica Zdroj 1999.

b) 8...\( \text{fxg3} \) 9 \( \text{wh5+} \) \( \text{wh8} \) 10 hgx3 \( \text{xd4} \) 11 \( \triangle c3 \) \( \text{e5+} \) 12 \( \triangle g e2 \) \( \triangle c6 \) 13
0-0-0 gives White a very promising attack.

c) 8...g8! was met by 9 w5+ w7 10 wxf7+ xf7 11 c2 fxg3 12 hgx3 d6 13 c3 d5 in Prié-del Rey, San Sebastian 2006, leaving Black at least equal. However, 9 c3 fxg3 10 hgx3 d6 11 e4 could be an improvement for White as 11...wdx4?? fails to 12 b5+.

9 f3

9 e2! also looks promising as 9...h5?! 10 f3 fxg3 11 fxg3 gives White a raging attack.

9 d6 10 0-0 d7 11 e4 c6

11...c6 12 d5 exd5 13 xd5 f6 is probably a better attempt to survive.

12 c3 xe4 13 xe4 c6 14 c4

14 fxg5! hgx5 15 xg5 followed by either xf4 or xe6 works out well for White.

14 d5 (D)

Now it’s suddenly unclear. Black may capture on g3 at the most inconvenient moment.

16 a4 dxe 17 xc4 g7 18 ad1 d7 19 e4 e5?!

This initiates sharp play that slightly favours White.

20 d5 d4 21 xd4 exd4 22 xd4! b5??

It’s hard to imagine what Black was hoping for with this move. It loses in obvious fashion to a number of moves. After 22...hd8 there is still everything to play for.

23 c6 d8 24 d6 cxd6 25 xd6 xd6 26 xd6 e6 27 f7+ 1-0

Alternative Move-Orders

Game 64

Cifuentes – Bricard

Andorra 1991

1 d4 e6 2 f3 f5 3 d5 (D)

15 c3?

This lets Black off the hook. 15 e5+ h5 16 g5 followed by 17 xe6 would have been stronger.

15...0-0-0

16 e5+ h5 17 g5

This move aims to disrupt Black’s normal flow in the Dutch and will be especially effective against Stonewall.
players, who will be at a bit of a loss now. The aim is to gain a small safe
advantage but there are sharper options along the way too.

3..d6
Or:

a) 3...exd5 is the subject of Game 65.

b) 3...Qf6 4 dxe6 dxe6 5 Qxd8+ Qxd8 6 c3 b4 7 d2 c6 8 e4 (this
move seeks to leave Black with a permanent weakness on e6) 8...fxe4 9 
Qxe4 Qxd2+ 10 Qexd2 and, having achieved his objective, White enjoyed
a small advantage in Cifuentes-D. Parr, Hastings 1994/5.

c) 3...Qd6 4 dxe6 dxe6 5 c3 Qf6 6 e4 (again this is the critical pawn-
break for White) and now:

c1) 6...Qb4 7 Qxd8+ Qxd8 8 d2 fxe4 9 Qxe4 Qxd2+ 10 Qexd2 and
again White is better, because he has a straightforward plan of developing
and putting pressure on Black’s weak e-pawn, Ortega-B. Kovačević, Formia
1995.

c2) 6...fxe4 7 Qg5 0-0 8 c4 Qc7 9 Qxe4 Qe5 10 Qxf6+ Qxf6 11 
Qe4 Qg6 12 Qg3 Qxg3 13 hxg3 Qxe4+ 14 Qe2 ± Stroppa-Castaldo,
Turin 2005.

c3) 6...Qc6 7 exf5 Qe7 8 fxe6 
Qxe6 9 e3 0-0-0 10 d3 Qg4 is
equal, Dubkov-S. Williams, Salzburg
2004.

d) 3...Qb4+!? 4 c3 Qd6 is a twin
variation to 3...Qd6. Black hopes to
prove that c3 took away the natural
square from White’s knight, but White
can utilize the open d1-a4 diagonal to
force e4 by tactical means: 5 dxe6
dxe6 6 Qbd2 Qf6 7 e4! fxe4 8 Qxe4 
Qxe4 9 Wa4+ Qd7 10 Qxe4 Qf6 11 
Qc2 Qd7 12 Qd3 with a slightly better
position for White, Utkin-Ulybin, St
Petersburg 2003.

4 dxe6 Qxe6 5 Qg5 (D)

White tries to drive the bishop from
its best diagonal and prepares the way
for e4.

5...Qd7 6 Qc3 Qf6 7 g3
7 e4 is also interesting here.

7...c6 8 Qxe6 Qxe6 9 Qh3 d5 10
0-0 Qbd7 11 Qd3 g6 12 We3 Qe4 13 
Qxe4 dxe4 14 Qc3 Qg8 15 Qe3 0-0-0
16 Qfd1

White is slightly better in view of
his bishop-pair. Against a normal move
like 16...a6 he should continue with a4
and b4, launching a queenside attack.
Black, perhaps lulled into a false sense
of security by the closed nature of the
position, blundered with:

16...Qb8?? 17 Qxa7+ 1-0

The bishop is immune from capture
on account of Qa5+ winning the rook
on d8. Black, probably disgusted with
himself, called it a day.
Game 65
Granados Gomez – Sorroche
Olot 1994

1 d4 e6 2 c3 f5 3 d5 exd5 4 wxd5 d6 (D)

5 g5
White simply continues his development, hoping to exploit the weakness of the light squares later on. White has two other options, one highly materialistic yet hard to refute, while the second is solid but with long-term prospects:

a) 5...g5?! is a very sharp option that wins material at the expense of White’s development. My gut feeling is to leave this one alone. The dangers are illustrated by the following examples: 5...we7 6 whx7 c6 (6...wh7?! 7 wxg8 wh4 8 wb3 wh6 9 c6 wh8 10 e3 f4 11 a3 c6 12 a2 f5 13 c4 0-0-0 gave Black more than sufficient compensation in Celander-Yusupov, Stockholm 2002) 7 wb3 and now:

a1) 7...wh6?! 8 wg3 whh7?! 9 wg6+ wf7 10 whx7 we7 11 wxd2

b) 5 g3! is a low-risk option which still holds hope for a modest advantage: 5...df6 6 wd3 da6 (6...we7 7 wg2 0-0 8 0-0 dc6 9 dh1 wh8 10 c4 de4 11 de3 df6 12 wc2 we7 13 dd4 db5 de6 15 dd2 dxh2 16 dxh2 a6 17 dd4 dxh4 18 dxh4 (Lorscheid-Gallus, Munich 1992) 7 fg2 dc5 8 wc3+ de7 0-0-0 10 c4 dh5 11 dc3 f4 12 wd2 we8 13 b4 de6 14 db2 db8 15 db1 wh8 16 e3 fxe3 17 fxe3 de5?! 18 dxg5 exf1+ 19 exf1 dxg5 20 de4 ± Davies-S.Williams, British League (4NCL) 2003/4.

5...we7
5...df6 is answered by 6 wb3.

6 h4 (D)

6 we7 wxe7 7 dc3 scores quite well too.

With the text-move, White wants to open the h-file for his rook, which would give him some interesting tactical possibilities, as we shall see.

6...df6 7 wb3
White is hoping for ...h6, which would further weaken Black’s light squares on the kingside.

7...xe4 8 dd2 dc6 9 dxh4 fxe4
td2 dxg5 11 hxg5 d5?!
11...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{w}}}}xg5 gives White less to bite on.

12 c4

White rightly goes about undermining Black's big pawn-centre. 12 g6!? also poses awkward problems.

12...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}d4 13 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}}c3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}}e6 14 g6

This is one of the tactical drawbacks of the exchange on g5 for Black, as the pawn becomes a real thorn in his side.

14...h6 15 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}}e5 dxc4 16 e3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}g5 17 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{w}}}}xe4 0-0 18 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}}xc4 \textit{\texttt{(D)}}

White has an attack and an extra pawn to boot.

18...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{h}}}}h8?

18...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}}e8 is better.

19 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}}xe6 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}}e8 20 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{w}}}}d5!

This tactical point enables White to hold on to his extra piece.

20...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{w}}}}f6 21 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}}xe8 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}}xc8 22 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{w}}}}f7
\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}g5 23 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}}f3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}}xe3+ 1-0

There's only one more way for Black to create problems within our repertoire:

Game 66

\textbf{A. Shneider - Summerscale}

\textit{\texttt{European Clubs Cup, Bratislava 1996}}

1 \textit{\texttt{d}}d4 \textit{\texttt{d}}d5 2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}}f3 \textit{\texttt{c}}6 3 \textit{\texttt{c}}c6 \textit{\texttt{e}}6 4 \textit{\texttt{e}}e3 \textit{\texttt{f}}5

A delayed Stonewall, but White has an effective response.

5 \textit{\texttt{c}}c3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}}f6 6 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}d3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}d6 7 \textit{\texttt{h}}3 0-0 8 \textit{\texttt{g}}4 \textit{\texttt{(D)}}

This is the big idea. Black would be foolish to take on g4 and open the h-file and so must find a way to defend against gxf5.

8...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}}e4
This is the most natural move but it does not solve all of Black's problems. 
8...\(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)h8 is the main alternative. After 9 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d2 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e4 10 gxf5 exf5 11 cxd5 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xc3 12 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xc3 cxd5 13 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e5 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c6 14 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d2 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e7 15 f4 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b4 16 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b1 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e6 17 a3 a5!? chances were equal in the game A.Schneider-Moroz, Enakievo 1997.

9 gxf5 exf5 10 cxd5 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xc3

Or 10...cxd5 11 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b3 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e6 12 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g1 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xc3?! (Black can maintain his central presence with the solid 12...\(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)d7) 13 bxc3 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)e7 14 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g5 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d7 15 \(\texttt{\textit{a}}\)a2 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b6 16 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b1 h6 17 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xe6 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xe6 18 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)d1 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c8 19 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)h5 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c7?! (19...\(\texttt{\textit{h}}\)h7 isn't clear) 20 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g6 ± Leriche-Stenal, French Team Ch 2003/4.

11 bxc3 cxd5 12 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b3 (D)

12...\(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e7

After 12...\(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e6, 13 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)xb7 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d7 14 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b3 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)e7 15 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g1 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c8 16 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d2 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b6 17 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g5 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d7 18 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)d1 h6 19 \(\texttt{\textit{f}}\)f3 \(\texttt{\textit{a}}\)a4 (19...f4?!) gave Black fine play for his pawn in Jelen-Buchniček, Tatranske Zruby 2003. Quite likely White should have continued his kingside play with 13 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g1.

13 \(\texttt{\textit{a}}\)a3 \(\texttt{\textit{a}}\)a3 14 \(\texttt{\textit{w}}\)xa3 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c6 15 0-0-0 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c6 16 \(\texttt{\textit{h}}\)h1 \(\texttt{\textit{h}}\)h8 17 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g2 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c8 18 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d1

The white king is surprisingly safe, whilst the g7-pawn is targeted; ...g6 will just encourage the h-pawn to advance, so I defended passively.

18...\(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c7 19 \(\texttt{\textit{b}}\)b2 \(\texttt{\textit{f}}\)f6 20 \(\texttt{\textit{a}}\)a1

White sensibly tucks his king away from the danger zone.

20...\(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g8 21 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g5 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e8 22 \(\texttt{\textit{h}}\)h4 g6? (D)

23 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xf5!

I had overlooked this little combination, which forces a favourable material imbalance for White.

23...gxf5 24 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xg8+ \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xg8 25 \(\texttt{\textit{x}}\)xg8+ \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g8 26 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c5

Two rooks are normally worth at least a queen but here, with the black pawns split on the kingside and in the centre, the white queen and knight form a lethal combination.

26...\(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d7 27 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g2 a6 28 \(\texttt{\textit{f}}\)f4 \(\texttt{\textit{f}}\)fd6 29 c4 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e7 30 cxd5 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)xd5 31 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c8+ \(\texttt{\textit{f}}\)f7 32 \(\texttt{\textit{d}}\)d3 \(\texttt{\textit{g}}\)g7 33 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e5 \(\texttt{\textit{e}}\)e7 34 \(\texttt{\textit{c}}\)c4 1-0
8  Odds and Ends

Here I shall examine the various irregular systems that Black tries from time to time. The key is to keep your cool when faced with these openings. Just develop sensibly and use the space advantage you are invariably given. Above all, don’t expect too much and don’t underestimate your opponent just because he plays a few funny-looking moves in the opening. I used to make a living in intermediate tournaments off opponents who did exactly that!

Game 67
Torre – Winants
Brussels 1986

1 d4 b5
This generally leads to the St George Defence, the cheeky opening immortalized by Tony Miles’s victory in 1980 over reigning World Champion Anatoly Karpov.
2 e4 b7 3 d3 e6 4 f3 a6
The St George used to be in my repertoire and I found it most difficult when White simply played to keep the central tension.
5 bd2 f6 (D)
The actual move-order in the game was 1 e4 a6 2 d4 b5 3 f3 b7 4 d3 f6 5 bd2 e6.
6 0-0 c5
Black has also tried:

a) 6...c7 d5 c3 h5 8 a4 bxa4 9 a4 d5 10 e5 d4 11 e2 exd2 12 cxd2 g5 13 f1 ± Meduna-Novak, Prague 2006.

b) 6...d6 7 c3 c5 8 a4 c4 9 c2 c7 10 e2 0-0 11 e5 dxe5 12 dxe5 f6 13 f4 c6 14 eg5 (15 axb5 axb5 16 d6! ?±) 15...g6 16 h4 fe8 17 h5 f8? (Black should fearlessly play 17...cxe5) 18 axb5 axb5 19 x8 20 x7 xh7 21 hxg6+ fg6 22 xg6+ xg6 23 h4+ with a winning position for White, Zagorskis-Zapolskis, Kaunas 2001.

7 c3
7 dxc5 x5 8 e5 d5 9 e4 has been popular and fairly successful but by delaying the capture White hopes to gain a tempo by having Black’s dark-squared bishop reach c5 in two
moves or else for it to remain on f8 so long that the black king becomes exposed in the centre.

7...\( \text{\textit{Qe}}6 \)

Alternatively:

a) Even though c3 is only semi-useful, 7...\( \text{\textit{R}}7 \) e8 e5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}d5 \) 9 dxc5 \( \text{\textit{X}}c5 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e4 \) would be exactly what White was hoping for.

b) 7...d5 8 e5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e4 \) 9 \( \text{\textit{We}}2 \) \( \text{\textit{Qxd}}2 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{Qxd2}} \) c6 11 dxc5 \( \text{\textit{X}}c5 \) 12 b4 \( \text{\textit{Qb}}6 \) 13 a4 bxa4 14 \( \text{\textit{Qxa}}4 \) \( \text{\textit{Qb8}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{Qaf}}1 \) ± Miles-Chaivichit, Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984.

8 \( \text{\textit{R}}e1 \) cxd4

Or:

a) 8...\( \text{\textit{Wb6}} \) 9 e5 \( \text{\textit{Qd5}} \) 10 dxc5 \( \text{\textit{X}}c5 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{Qe4}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{Qg}}5 \) is extremely dangerous for Black.

b) 8...d5 9 e5 \( \text{\textit{Qd7}} \) 10 \( \text{\textit{Qf1}} \) and now:

b1) 10...\( \text{\textit{Wb6}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{Qe3}} \) a5 12 \( \text{\textit{Qg3}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qa6}} \) 13 \( \text{\textit{Qg5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{Qh5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qxg5}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{Qxg7+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qd8}} \) (15...\( \text{\textit{Qf8}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{Qxe}}6+ \) \( \text{\textit{Qf6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Qf3+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qe8}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{Qxg5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qd8}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{Qf6}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qf8}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{Qxh7}} \) cxd4 21 \( \text{\textit{Qg6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qf7}} \) 22 cxd4 \( \text{\textit{Qxd4}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{Qad1}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qb6}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{Qg7}} \) ± 16 \( \text{\textit{Qxg5+}} \) Browne-Ljubojević, Wijk aan Zee 1972.

b2) 10...\( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{Qg3}} \) h5 12 h3 c4 13 \( \text{\textit{Qc2}} \) a5 14 \( \text{\textit{Qh}}2 \) g6 15 f4 b4 16 \( \text{\textit{Qf3}} \) \( \text{\textit{Wb6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Qg5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qxg5}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{fxg5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qxe5}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{Qf4}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qc6}} \) ? (19...\( \text{\textit{Qd3}} \) blocks off the bishop’s diagonal) 20 \( \text{\textit{Qxg6}} \) fxg6 21 \( \text{\textit{Qxe6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qd8}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{Qxg6}} \) (White has excellent compensation) 22...h4 23 \( \text{\textit{Qf5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qf8}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{Wg4}} \) bxc3 25 bxc3 \( \text{\textit{Wb2}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{Qf1}} \) \( \text{\textit{Wxc3}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{Qd6}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qcb8}} \) 28 g6 \( \text{\textit{Qa6}} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{Qxh4+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qc8}} \) 30 \( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 1-0 Kariakin-V.Popov, Panormo blitz 2002.

9 cxd4 \( \text{\textit{Qc8}} \)

9...\( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 10 a4 b4 11 e5 \( \text{\textit{Qfd5}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{Qc4}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qg6}} \) 13 \( \text{\textit{Qg5}} \) f6 14 \( \text{\textit{Qxg6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qhxg6}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{Qd3}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qf7}} \) (15...\( \text{\textit{Qxg5}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{Qxg6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Qd6}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qb8}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{Qec1}} \) ++) 16 exf6 \( \text{\textit{Qxf6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Qfe5}} \) ± Corkett-Gillibrand, St Helier 2000.

10 a3 \( \text{(D)} \)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram 1}
\end{figure}

Again, this idea of queenside expansion is quite effective.

10...\( \text{\textit{Qa5}} \)

10...\( \text{\textit{Wb6}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{Qb3}} \) a5 12 d5 \( \text{\textit{Qb8}} \) 13 \( \text{\textit{Qc8}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qd8}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{Qxb5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qxe4}} \) 15 dxe6 \( \text{\textit{Qxf6}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qxe6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{Qe5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qf6}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Qd4}} \) was clearly better for White in Fernandez Siles-Sanchez Aller, Campillos 2006.

11 \( \text{\textit{Wc2}} \)

Perhaps 11 e5 \( \text{\textit{Qd5}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{Qe4}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qe7}} \) 13 \( \text{\textit{Qg5}} \) is even more effective; for example, 13...f6 14 exf6 gxf6 15 \( \text{\textit{Qh6}} \) (the immediate 15 \( \text{\textit{Qe5}} \) is promising) 15...\( \text{\textit{Qc7}} \), when 16 \( \text{\textit{Qc1}} \) keeps the advantage with no risk. Instead the game B.Steiner-Beck, Vienna Ch 2004 continued 16 \( \text{\textit{Qe5?!}} \) \( \text{\textit{fxe5}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Qh5+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qd8}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{Qg5}} \) \( \text{\textit{Wb6}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{Qf7+}} \) \( \text{\textit{Qc7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{Qxh8}} \), when 20...\( \text{\textit{Qxd4}} \) would have been very unclear. Instead, Black could well
have resigned after 20...\textbf{ hxh8?? 21 wxe5+}.

\textbf{11...wb6 12 b4 \textbf{ c4?!}}

Black has overlooked a tactic; instead he should swallow his pride and retreat.

\textbf{13 \textbf{ xc4 bxc4 14 \textbf{ xc4 wc6}}}

Black hits c4 and e4.

\textbf{15 \textbf{ a5!} (D)}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\end{center}

\textbf{15...wc7}

15...\textbf{ xe4} loses a piece after 16 \textbf{ wf1 wd5 17 xe5}.

\textbf{16 d5 \textbf{ a8}}

This loses a second pawn, but the black position was pretty disgusting in any case.

\textbf{17 \textbf{ xa6} 1-0}

Game 68

\textbf{Summerscale – Basman}

\textit{British Ch, Plymouth 1992}

\textbf{1 d4 (D)}

\textbf{1...h6}

This is perhaps the most irregular of all the openings we cover. Of course, it is always possible for an opponent to throw something at you that you haven’t seen before, but in most cases sensible development or a little accurate calculation should see you through.

Other attempts to confuse White include:

a) 1...\textbf{ c6} 2 \textbf{ f3} and now:

a1) 2...d5 transposes to the Anti-Chigorin line already discussed in Game 34.

a2) 2...d6 3 d5 \textbf{ e5} 4 \textbf{ xe5} dxe5 5 e4 favours White; e.g., 5...e6 6 \textbf{ b5+! d7} 7 dxe6 or 5...\textbf{ f6} 6 \textbf{ c3} a6 7 f4.

b) 1...e6 (1...b6 can come to the same thing, but shows Black’s hand a move earlier and so gives White more possibilities) 2 \textbf{ f3} b6 (Owen’s Defence is the only variation after 1...e6 that takes us outside the scope of those already analysed; e.g., 2...c5 3 e3 directs the game towards the Colle-Zukertort or the Classical Queen’s Indian) 3 e4 \textbf{ b7} 4 \textbf{ d3} (the best way to meet unusual variations is to play simply – and the clearest plan in this position is to complete development, protect the pawn-centre and then expand
on the queenside) 4...c5 5 c3 \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 6 \( \mathcal{D}bd2 \) \( \mathcal{C}c6 \) 7 a3 \( \mathcal{L}e7 \) 8 0-0 d6 9 b4 cxd4 10 cxd4 \( \mathcal{L}e8 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}b2 \). White has completed all his objectives and stands better.

c) 1...c5 2 d5 is closely related to the Anti-Benoni lines we examined in Chapter 6. There are many possible transpositions to that chapter, while most of the independent options can be comfortably handled over the board by anyone who has studied that chapter and understood the main themes. A couple of lines have a different flavour though:

c1) 2...e5 (an old opening that goes by various names, such as the Semi-Benoni or Benoni Wall) 3 e4 d6 4 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \) \( \mathcal{L}e7 \) 5 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) and now:

c11) 5...\( \mathcal{D}f6 \) is a kind of Czech Benoni (1 d4 \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 2 c4 c5 3 d5 e5 4 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \) d6 5 e4 \( \mathcal{L}e7 \)) where White's access to the c4-square gives him some extra options, and greater freedom on the queenside; like in some Anti-Benoni lines, 6 \( \mathcal{A}b5+ \) is a useful disruptive check to throw in here.

c12) Therefore Black's principal attempt to justify this move-order rests in the immediate attempt to exchange off his king's bishop, which involves tortuous manoeuvres in the regular Czech Benoni. However, 5...\( \mathcal{G}g4 \) 6 h3 \( \mathcal{X}f3 \) 7 \( \mathcal{W}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) 8 \( \mathcal{X}xg5 \) \( \mathcal{W}xg5 \) can be met with the forcing variation 9 \( \mathcal{D}b5 \) \( \mathcal{W}d8 \) 10 \( \mathcal{G}g4 \) \( \mathcal{W}f8 \) 11 \( \mathcal{L}xh6 \) \( \mathcal{L}f6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{C}c8 \) \( \mathcal{W}xc8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{L}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{L}xe4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{A}d3 \) \( \mathcal{D}d7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}xe4 \) \( \mathcal{L}xc8 \) 16 0-0-0 \( \mathcal{G}6 \) 17 d6 b6 18 \( \mathcal{L}he1 \) \( \mathcal{G}7 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}b7 \) \( \mathcal{M}e8 \) 20 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \), when White had a pleasant ending in Baburin-Rochev, Kilkenny 2000.

c2) 2...f5 is the so-called Clarendon Court – a Dutch-Benoni hybrid with which I still have a 100% score as Black, including a victory over Mark Hebden. However, I suspect that this is because none of my opponents have played 3 e4! fxe4 4 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \) \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 5 g4 (White threatens g5, more or less forcing Black’s response) 5...h6 (this is a serious weakening of the black kingside) 6 \( \mathcal{A}g2 \) d6 7 h3 \( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) 8 \( \mathcal{D}ge2 \), when White has every reason to look to the future with confidence. He can recapture on e4 at will and then set about probing those light-square weaknesses.

d) 1...c5 is the Englund Gambit. 2 dxe5 \( \mathcal{C}c6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{W}e7 \) 4 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \) \( \mathcal{X}xe5 \) 5 e4 (a very sensible approach, not attempting a direct refutation but keeping hold of a space and development advantage) 5...c6 6 \( \mathcal{A}e2 \) \( \mathcal{X}xf3+ \) 7 \( \mathcal{A}xf3 \) d6 8 0-0 \( \mathcal{L}e6 \) 9 \( \mathcal{L}e1 \) \( \mathcal{W}d7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{F}f4 \) \( \mathcal{L}e7 \) 11 \( \mathcal{T}d2 \) \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{A}d1 \) gave White a clear advantage in the game Timman-Hendricks, simul 1987.

e) 1...d6 2 e4 \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \) gives Black three non-Pirc options:

e1) 3...c6 4 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{G}g4 \) 5 h3 \( \mathcal{A}h5 \) 6 \( \mathcal{W}e2 \) e6 7 g4 \( \mathcal{G}g5 \) \( \mathcal{A}e7 \) 9 h4!? h5 10 \( \mathcal{X}xf6 \) \( \mathcal{G}xf6 \) 11 \( \mathcal{A}h3 \) ± Hebden-Adams, Hastings 1996/7.

e2) 3...\( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) transposes to ‘e3’ after 4 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) e5, but 4 f4!? is also possible.

e3) 3...e5 4 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) (4 dxe5 is a shade better for White, but the position is barren) 4...\( \mathcal{D}bd7 \) (transposing to a Philidor) 5 \( \mathcal{C}c4 \) (5 g4!? is an interesting and popular gambit) 5...\( \mathcal{L}e7 \) 6 0-0 0-0 7 a4 \( \mathcal{C}e6 \) and then:
e21) 8...a5 9 h3 exd4 10 Qxd4 Qc5 11 Qf4 Qe6 12 Qxe6 fx6 13 e5 keeps Black under pressure, Motylev-Emelin, European Ch, Budva 2009.
e22) 8...b6 9 d5 (9 a2!? ) 9...cxd5 10 Qxd5 Qb7 11 b3 Qc8 12 Qe2 gives White enough of a grip over d5 to claim an edge, Kasparov-Azmaiparashvili, Rethymnon rapid 2003.
f) 1...Qf6 2 Qf3 d6 3 Qc3 d5!? (a move-down Barry where White lacks his regular attacking plan; 3...g6 is a Pirc, while 3...Qbd7 4 e4 {4 Qf4!? is uncharted} 4...e5 and 3...c6 4 e4 are both covered via 1...d6 above; 3...Qf5 was mentioned at the start of Game 17) 4 Qg5 makes it hard for Black to justify his loss of tempo.

2 e4

This game was a bit of a daunting experience for me, as I was up against the guru of unusual opening lines. At least I was forewarned and therefore expecting the unexpected!

2...c5

Basman has also tried 2...g5, 2...e6 and 2...a6 here. All depend on an element of surprise and unpredictability and should be relatively easy to deal with by common sense.

3 c3 exd4 4 cxd4 d6 5 Qc3 g5

Black is playing a strange kind of Sicilian with ...h6 and ...g5 thrown in voluntarily. Needless to say, this idea hasn’t really caught on!

6 Qc4 Qc6 7 Qge2 Qf6

In his next game, Basman was willing to repeat his opening up to this point. In Greer-Basman, British Ch, Plymouth 1992, he varied with 7...Qg7 8 0-0 Qf6 9 h1 a6 10 f4 b5 11 Qd3 Qg4 and although White objectively had the better chances after 12 d5 Qd4 13 h3 Qh5 14 g4 Qxg4!? 15 hxg4 Qxg4, Black was probably happy with his position and went on to win.

8 Qb3 Qh7

Black defends creatively, but his pieces begin to look a little awkwardly placed.

9 0-0 a6 10 Qd3 Qg7 11 Qe3 Qg4

Having more or less completed my development it was time to undertake some action.

12 Qd5 e6 13 Qb6 Qb8 14 Qac1 Intending d5, which Black prevents.

14...d5 15 exd5

Of course White wants to open the centre as the black king is stranded.

15...Qb4 (D)
Index of Variations

1: The Barry Attack

1  d4  d6
2  f3  g6
3  c3  d5
4  f4  g7
5  e3  0-0
5...a6 12
5...h5? 12
5...f5 13
5...g4 15
5...c6 17 6 e2 Bd7 19
6  e2  c5
6...g4 22
6...b6 25
6...c6 33
7  e5
7...cxd4 36
7...c6 39
7...a5 36
7...b6 36
7...b6 36

2: The 150 Attack

Modern Defence

1  d4  d5
2  f3  f6
3  e3  e6
4  d3  c5
5  b3
5...c6 with ...d6 70
5...cxd4 70
5...e7 81
5...d6 with ...bd7 90
5...c6 with ...e7 84
5...a5+ 87
5...others 90

3: The Colle-Zukertort System

1  d4  d5
2  f3  f6
3  e3  e6
4  d3  c5
5  b3
5...c6 with ...d6 70
5...cxd4 70
5...e7 81
5...d6 with ...bd7 90
5...c6 with ...e7 84
5...a5+ 87
5...others 90
4: 1 d4 d5 2 Queen's Bishop: 
Beating the Anti-Colle Systems

1 d4 d5 2 Queen's Bishop
3...e6 137
3...c4 137
3...e6 4 d4 3 d6 (4...e5?! 138;
4...b5!! 138; 4...g6?! 138; 4...exd5
140) 5 e4 142
3...g6 4 3 d3 d4 5 e4 d6 (5...0-0?! 150) 6 b5+ 153
4...e5 157
4...f6 164
4...f5 168
4...f6 161

5: The Classical Queen's Indian

1 d4 g6 123
2...d6 167
2...c5 171
2...c6 171
2...f6 168
2...g6 174
2...d5 171

6: The Anti-Benoni

1 d4 f6 188
2...e6 188
2...b6 188
2...b5 186
2...c5 189
2...e5 188
2...e5 189

7: The Anti-Dutch

1 d4 f5
1...e6 2 f3 f5 3 d5 181
2...g5 h6
2...d6 167
2...c5 171
2...c6 171
2...f6 168
2...g6 174
2...d5 171

8: Odds and Ends

1 d4
Bored with the same old openings? Worried about having to learn too much theory? Then this book will come as a godsend. Aaron Summerscale presents a set of exceptionally dangerous opening weapons for White. Each recommended line is based on a solid positional foundation, yet also promises long-term (and short-term!) attacking chances. The variations are not just easy to learn and play, but they also set Black complex problems.

- A queen’s pawn repertoire based on rapid piece development
- Reveals many lethal attacking ideas and traps
- Features the legendary ‘150’ and Barry Attacks

For this new edition, the publishers enlisted the help of hotshot opening writer Sverre Johnsen, who has updated the coverage where necessary, while retaining the spirit, charm and aims of Summerscale’s original work. The killer repertoire remains easy to learn, and is now more dangerous than ever!

Grandmaster Aaron Summerscale is a prominent figure in UK chess, who won the British Rapidplay Championship in 2000. He is also a renowned chess trainer, who has been involved in coaching some of England’s best junior players. Sverre Johnsen is from Norway, and an enthusiastic chess analyst, researcher, organizer and writer. He is co-author of highly popular works on the London System, Ruy Lopez and the Stonewall Dutch.