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In the second volume of the book “A Practical Repertoire for Black with $\text{d}f6, \text{g}6, \text{d}6$” we will analyse variations in which White plays $1.\text{d}4, 2.\text{c}4$.

As Black’s weapon we will study the King’s Indian Defence. This is not by chance, though... The majority of our readers participate mainly in tournaments played under the Swiss system. One of the important features of these tournaments is that the draw is essentially a step backward in your tournament situation and you must play for a win irrelevant of the colour of your pieces. The King’s Indian Defence is the right opening choice for this. There is some strategical risk involved indeed (Black complies with a somewhat cramped position...), but in all the variations of the King’s Indian Defence there arise in the middle game very complicated positions in which Black thinks not only about equality, but also about seizing the initiative. Meanwhile, as a rule, contrary to White’s actions on the queenside, Black develops his initiative on the kingside. This is always dangerous for White, since his king is the enemy target.

The opening was named like this, because back in the year 1875 a game was published, played a bit earlier in India, between two Brahmins – Saunchery Gottak and Moheshunder. Later, S. Tartakower named the opening used in that game as the King’s Indian Defence. It did not gain popularity right away and was considered to be incorrect for a long time. Still, gradually the King’s Indian Defence began to be used even at tournament at the top level. Several World champions contributed greatly to its development like R. Fischer, G. Kasparov, as well as D. Bronstein, E. Geller, I. Boleslavsky, L. Stein and many other grandmasters.

The readers will notice that we have included in our analyses numerous correspondence games and this is not surprising. It is allowed to use computer programmes in the correspondence games. They have become so strong lately that they can defeat easily even the leading grandmasters in the world.

The author would like to express his gratitude towards Ekaterina Smirnova for her invaluable help in the work over this book.

Alexei Kornev,
city of Vyazniki, September 2016
In Chapters 1-5 we will analyse systems for White, connected with the fianchetto of his lightsquared bishop. These systems are very reliable, because with a bishop on g2, it is very difficult for Black to organise an attack on the kingside. Meanwhile, White exploits the advantage of the first move in the game and occupies space and controls reliably the centre. It is not by chance this system was a favourite opening weapon for White of the World champions M. Botvinnik, V. Smyslov and many other strong grandmasters. Before beginning the analysis of 3.g3, we will have a look at some other, not so popular, alternatives for White on move 3.

About 3.g5 g7 4.c3 or 4.cf3 0-0 5.c3 – see Chapter 7.

3.d2. White plays sometimes like this, but as rule, only when he is absolutely certain that the Black player will choose the Gruenfeld Defence, because in the King’s Indian Defence the knight on d2 is not so well placed as on the c3-square. 3...g7 4.e4 d6 5.gf3 0-0 6.g3 c5. White has already problems with the protection of the d4-square. 7.g2 cxd4 8.xd4, Korchnoi – Grudelius, Rogaska Slatina 2011, 8...wb6!? 9.e2 c6 Black’s prospects are already preferable, because White’s knights are not so well placed on d2 and e2, while Black has a clear-cut plan for the improvement of his position: f6-d7-e5(c5)-d3.

3.d5. White occupies space, but weakens the dark squares in his camp. 3...c6. Black attacks immediately the enemy pawn, which
has crossed the demarcation line a bit too early. 4.\( \mathcal{d} \)c3 cxd5 5.cxd5 d6

\[ \begin{array}{c}
6.g3 \mathcal{g}7 7.\mathcal{g}2 0-0 8.e4. \text{This move leads to the weakening of the f1-a6 diagonal} (8.\mathcal{f}f3 \mathcal{bd}7 \text{— see variation A, 6.d5 c6 7.\mathcal{f}f3 cxd5 8.cxd5 \mathcal{bd}7} 8...\mathcal{a}6 9.\mathcal{ge}2 b5!? 10.\mathcal{x}xb5 \mathcal{c}c5 11.\mathcal{bc}3 \mathcal{a}6 12.0-0 \mathcal{b}b6 13.\mathcal{b}b1 \mathcal{g}4= \text{— Black has full compensation for his minimal material deficit. His pieces are very active and White will remain the defending side for a long time.}} \\
6.e4 \mathcal{g}7 7.\mathcal{f}3 0-0 8.\mathcal{e}2 \mathcal{bd}7 9.\mathcal{e}3 \mathcal{c}c5 10.\mathcal{d}d2 e6 11.\mathcal{d}xe6 \mathcal{x}xe6. \text{White cannot exploit the weakness of the d6-pawn, since his lag in development precludes him from preventing the pawn-advance d6-d5.} 12.0-0 \mathcal{c}8 13.\mathcal{e}1, \text{Alber – Gutman, Frankfurt 1990, 13...d5!? 14.exd5 \mathcal{xd}5 15.\mathcal{xd}5 \mathcal{xd}5 16.\mathcal{f}3 \mathcal{d}6= Black’s prospects are not worse at all, since his bishops exert powerful pressure against White’s queenside.}} \\
3.f3. \text{This move has become popular lately and is aimed at Black choosing the Gruenfeld Defence. If he decides to play the King’s Indian Defence however, the game transposes, as a rule, to the Saemisch system (Chapters 13-14). There arise original variations only if White postpones the development of his knight on b1. We will deal with them now. 3... \mathcal{g}7 4.e4 d6}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
5.\mathcal{e}2 0-0 6.\mathcal{ec}3 (6.\mathcal{e}3 \text{— see 5.\mathcal{e}3}) 6...\mathcal{fd}7!? \text{Black’s plans include e7-e5, followed by \mathcal{h}6, exchanging in a tactical way the dark-squared bishop, which is advantageous for him in this pawn-structure.} 7.\mathcal{e}3 e5 8.d5 \mathcal{h}6 9.\mathcal{d}2 \mathcal{xe}3 10.\mathcal{xe}3 a5. \text{He begins a fight for the c5-square, preventing b2-b4.} 11.\mathcal{d}3 \mathcal{a}6 12.\mathcal{d}2 \mathcal{dc}5 13.\mathcal{c}2 \mathcal{f}5 \mathcal{Nabaty – Pavlidis, Kavala 2013. There has arisen a position with dynamic balance. White has more space, but the dark squares in his camp are weakened. In addition, his light-squared bishop is severely restricted by his own pawns.}} \\
5.\mathcal{e}3. \text{This move seems more reliable. White wishes to protect the strategically important d4-square.} 5...0-0 6.\mathcal{e}2 (6.\mathcal{d}2 a6}
\end{array} \]
1.d4 ½f6 2.c4 g6 3.g3 ½g7 4.½g2 0-0

7.½c3 ½c6 – see Chapter 14) 6... a6!? This move looks more precise than the immediate development of the knight on c6, since Black keeps the possibility to advance c7-c5. 7.½a3 (7.½bc3 ½c6 or 7.½ec3 ½c6 8.½a3 e5 9.½c2 exd4 10.½xd4 ½e5 – see Chapter 14) 7...c5 8.½c2 (8.½d2 ½c6 9.d5 ½e5 10.½c3 ½h5 11.½e2, D.Gurevich – Mazuchowski, USA 1990, 11...f5?!∞) 8...½c6 9.d5 ½e5 10.½c3 e6 11.a4 exd5 12.cxd5 ½h5 13.½e2 f5± and Black has good counterplay. White’s attempt to oust the enemy knight away from the centre 14.f4?! ½g4 15.½xg4 fxg4 16.0-0 ½d7 17.½d3 g3 18.h3 ½h4+ leads to a bad position for him in which he must be constantly on the alert about the possible sacrifice of the enemy bishop on h3 after which Black’s attack might become impossible to parry, Shimano v – Solovjov, St Petersburg 2005.

3...½g7 4.½g2

4.d5 0-0 5.½g2 d6 6.½c3 c6 – see variation A1.

4.½c3 0-0 5.½g2 d6 or 5.e4 d6 6.½g2 c5 – see 4.½g2.

4.½f3 0-0 5.½c3 (5.½g2 d6 – see variation B) 5...d6 6.½g2 ½c6 – see Chapters 2-5.

4...0-0

In this system White has numerous different possibilities and they often lead to transposition of moves.

7.½bc3 ½c6 – see Volume 1, Chapter 3, variation B.

Therefore, in order to systematise all these lines, in the variation A) 5.½c3 we will have a look at the lines in which White does not develop his knight to the f3-square, while we will deal with the rest in the variation with B) 5.½f3.

White has also tried in practice the move 5.e4. He occupies immediately the centre with his pawn 5...d6 6.½e2 (6.½c3 c5 – see 5.½c3) 6...c5

7.½bc3 ½c6 – see Volume 1, Chapter 3, variation B.

Following 7.d5, Black can try advantageously to continue in the spirit of the Benko Gambit. 7... b5!? 8.cxb5 a6 9.bxa6 ½xa6. Now, contrary to the majority of the ba-
sic positions of the Benko Gambit, White’s knight is not on f3, but on e2. In addition, he has advanced a bit too early e2-e4 and that has led to the weakening of the d3-square and Black’s knight will be headed there in the future. 10.0-0 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d7 11.\texttt{\textasciitilde}c2 (11.\texttt{\textasciitilde}bc3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e5 12.f4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d3+) 11...\texttt{\textasciitilde}b6 12.\texttt{\textasciitilde}d1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}fb8 13.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ec3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}g4↑ – Black’s initiative is more than sufficient to compensate his minimal material deficit, Agdestein - Ju. Polgar, Isle of Lewis 1995.

White cannot harm his opponent with the line: 7.0-0 cxd4 8.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xd4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 9.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xc6 (We have already told you how to refute the move 9.\texttt{\textasciitilde}c3?! , in Volume 1, Chapter 3, variation \textbf{B}: 9...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xe4...) 9...bxc6 10.e5 dxe5 11.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xc6 \texttt{\textasciitilde}h3 12.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xd8 \texttt{\textasciitilde}fxd8 13.\texttt{\textasciitilde}g2 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xg2 14.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xg2, Welz - Stammberger, Germany 1992, 14...\texttt{\textasciitilde}d7!??, with the idea f7-f5, e5-e4, \texttt{\textasciitilde}e5. White’s slight lag in the development of his queenside pieces precludes him from the possibility to exploit the advantages of his pawn-structure.

\textbf{A) 5.\texttt{\textasciitilde}c3 d6}

![Diagram]

Now, White has again a choice between: \textbf{A1) 6.e4}, or \textbf{A2) 6.e3}.

After 6.h3, Black can create problems for his opponent to castle with 6...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 7.e3 (7.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f3 a6 – see Chapter 2) 7...\texttt{\textasciitilde}d7 8.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ge2 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c8 and this should provide him with a good game. 9.b3 e5 10.\texttt{\textasciitilde}b2 a5 11.\texttt{\textasciitilde}d2 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e8 12.a3, Tkachiev – Nijboer, Wijk aan Zee 2011, 12...exd4!? 13.exd4 h5∞. The position is beginning to open and White still cannot castle kingside. If he castles queenside, his king will hardly feel comfortable there.

Black obtains very good counterplay following 6.d5 c6 7.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f3 cxd5 8.exd5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}bd7 9.0-0 \texttt{\textasciitilde}a5 10.\texttt{\textasciitilde}d4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b6 11.\texttt{\textasciitilde}b3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}a6 12.h3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}d7∞ – White has much more space, but Black’s piece-activity (\texttt{\textasciitilde}a(f)c8, \texttt{\textasciitilde}a4(c4)) is quite sufficient for him to maintain the balance, Fritzinger – D.Gurevich, Berkeley 2011.

\textbf{A1) 6.e4}

Now, just like after 5.e4, the occupation of the centre cannot provide White with an advantage, since he fails to hold on to the key d4-square.

\textbf{6...c5 7.d5}

This is at least a principled move. White occupies space.

7.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ge2 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 – see Volume 1, Chapter 3, variation \textbf{B}.

7.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 8.d5 (8.0-0 cxd4 9.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xd4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xe4! – see Volume 1,
Chapter 3, variation B) 8...\texttt{a}5 9.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{a}6 10.0–0 \texttt{b}8 – see Chapter 5.

It seems just bad for White to choose here 7.dxc5 dxc5, since he has no compensation for the weakened d4-square and must already fight for equality. 8.\texttt{xd}8 \texttt{xd}8 9.e5 \texttt{d}7 10.f4 \texttt{b}6

11.b3 (11.\texttt{d}5 \texttt{c}6 12.\texttt{e}3, Anastasian – Arizmendi, Ubeda 2000, 12...f6!? 13.\texttt{x}c6 \texttt{x}c6 – White lags in development and Black’s bishops may prove to be very powerful.) 11...f6. The e5-pawn, which restricts Black’s bishop on g7 should better be exchanged immediately. 12.exf6 \texttt{x}f6. This is stronger than capturing with the pawn. Black wishes to play actively, while White will be incapable of exploiting the weakness of the e7-pawn, due to his lag in development. 13.\texttt{ge}2 \texttt{c}6 14.\texttt{x}c6 \texttt{xc}6 15.\texttt{a}3 (Following 15.\texttt{b}2, Graf – Loginov, Tashkent 1983, 15...\texttt{f}5!? 16.\texttt{d}1 a5 17.\texttt{a}3 \texttt{xd}1+ 18.\texttt{xd}1 \texttt{d}7 19.\texttt{dc}3 \texttt{e}5, Black’s two powerful bishops in this open position more than compensate the defects of his queenside pawn-structure.) 15...\texttt{g}4 16.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{d}3 17.\texttt{xc}5, J.P.Gomez – So, Tagaytay City 2010, 17...\texttt{d}7!? 18.\texttt{f}2 \texttt{e}5 – Black has obtained more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, because his pieces are very active, while White has not completed his development yet and his king is stranded in the centre.

7...\texttt{e}6

The position begins to resemble the Benoni Defence.

8.\texttt{ge}2

Unfortunately for White, he cannot develop his knight to a more active position, since following 8.\texttt{f}3 exd5 9.cxd5, the insufficient protection of his e4-pawn would enable Black to inflict a strike from the flank – 9...b5!, seizing completely the initiative. 10.\texttt{d}2 b4 11.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{bd}7 12.0–0 a5, developing later his bishop to thea6-square, Hamlaoui – Bujdak, Lechenicher Schach-Server 2014.

It is bad for White to play 8.
dxe6, because of 8...\(\text{dx}e6\) and Black’s knight gains access to the c6-square, while White will have problems with the protection of his c4-pawn, which has suddenly become very weak.

**8...\(\text{ex}d5\) 9.\(\text{c}xd5\)**

The position remains calmer after the more prudent line: 9. \(\text{ex}d5\) E8 10.0-0 \(\text{bd}7\) 11.b3 \(\text{e}5\) 12.h3 \(\text{g}5\)+ Stefnansson – Berg, Khanty-Mansiysk 2010.

**9...Ee8**

There begin manoeuvres typical for the Benoni Defence. Later, Black plans to follow with a7-a6, \(\text{bd}7\), \(\text{b}8\) and will try to advance b7-b5.

10.0-0

It seems a bit premature for White to play 10.a4, because then Black can change his plan and transfer his knight to the weakened b4-square. 10...\(\text{a}6\)! 11.0-0 \(\text{b}4\) 12.h3 (12.\(\text{g}5\)?! h6 13.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}4\) 14.h3 \(\text{e}5\)+ Arngrimsson – Giri, Reykjavik 2013) 12...b6 13.\(\text{g}5\) h6 14.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 15.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{h}7\) 16.\(\text{fe}1\), Burmakin – Mojzis, Schwarzach 1997, 16...\(\text{d}7\)?? In this complicated position with mutual chances the activity of Black’s minor pieces compensates his slight lack of space. Now, for example, he is threatening \(\text{e}5\), followed by penetration to d3, or to c4.

10...\(\text{a}6\) 11.a4 \(\text{bd}7\) 12.h3

White defends the g4-square from the penetration of the enemy knight.

12...\(\text{b}8\)

13.\(\text{b}1\)

Black’s queenside counterplay cannot be prevented with the line: 13.a5 b5 14.axb6 \(\text{x}b6\) 15.\(\text{h}2\) c4 16.\(\text{a}4\), Heemsoth – Brigelz, Germany 1970, 16...\(\text{c}5\)!?? Here, it would be very risky for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice – 17. \(\text{xc}4\)!!, because of 17...a5 18.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{fd}7\)+ and the unfortunate placement of the rook on c4 will force White to part with the exchange.
13...b5 14.axb5

It is less accurate for him to choose now 14.b4 cxb4 15.axb4 a5 Askarov – Mirzanurov, Kazan 2006.

14...axb5

15.b4. This is a standard move for similar positions. White is trying to neutralise Black’s queenside counterplay. 15...cxb4. It would be a grave positional mistake for Black to continue here with 15...c4?, because this would present White with an excellent strategical outpost for his knight on d4. 16...d4 Black is incapable of parrying simultaneously both White’s threats – to penetrate with the knight on c6 and to capture the pawn on b5. 16.axb4 a5 17.b3 c5 18.b1 d7=

The activity of Black’s pieces compensates the weakness of his pawns on d6 and b5, moreover that White should not forget that his e4-pawn needs protection as well, Tupy – Svatos, Czech Republic 1995.

A2) 6.e3

With this seemingly logical move White fortifies his centre and prepares the development of his knight on e2, where it would not stand in the way of the action of his bishop on g2. Still, it has a serious drawback and it liquidates all the pluses of this move. Contrary to the majority of the positions of the variation with the development of the bishop on g2, White may have serious problems with the defence of his king. In the middle game Black may attack the weakened h3 and f3-squares and begin a dangerous attack. In order to do this, as a rule, he advances e5-e4 and transfers his knight to g5. It can go there via two possible routes: b8-a6-c7-e6-g5 (Black will have to advance c7-c6 before that.), or b8-d7-f8-h7-g5 (following the preliminary move h7-h5).

6...e5

Black has accomplished this thematic pawn-advance not determining yet the placement of his knight on b8.
Chapter 1

7.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}}ge2 c6

\textbf{8.0–0}

8.h3 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}}8 9.dxe5. As a rule, the exchange on e5 and the transfer into an endgame does not promise much to White in the King’s Indian Defence. This position is no exception. (9.b3 – see 8.b3) 9...dxe5 10.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash w}}xd8 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}}xd8 11.b3 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}}6 12.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}}3 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}}8 13.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}}f8 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}}f8= Black’s prospects are not worse and his pawn on c6 covers reliably the pressure of White’s bishop on g2 against the b7-pawn, Kosten – Vassallo Barroche, Andorra 2007.

8.b3 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}}8

Following 9.d5 cxd5 10.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}}xd5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}}xd5 11.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash w}}xd5, White cannot exploit the vulnerability of the d5-square due to his slight lag in development. 11...e4 12.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}}1 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}}6 13.0–0 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g}}4 14.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash w}}d2 d5! Black gets rid of his weak pawn and solves all his opening problems. 15.cxd5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}}e2 16.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}}e2 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash w}}xd5 17.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}}1 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}}5 18.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}}2, Hulak – Fedorov, Rabac 2004, 18...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}}c8!? 19.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}}g7 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}}g7= In this position Black’s knight is not inferior to his opponent’s bishop. White must be on the alert for the enemy knight not to penetrate to the d3-square.


9.h3 e4 10.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}}2 d5= Sergeev – Jedynek, Czech Republic 2006. He has managed to occupy additional space and has protected reliably the e4-pawn, which cramps considerably White’s bishop on g2. His fianchetto has only weakened his kingside.

8...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}}8

9.0–0 e4 – see 8.0–0.
9.\textit{c}2

This is White’s best move. He impedes his opponent’s pawn-advance e5-e4.

Following 9.d5, White cannot even equalise. 9...e4 10.\textit{c}2 cxd5. After the opening of the c-file the placement of his queen on c2 would be unstable. 11.cxd5 \textit{e}7 12.b3 \textit{a}6 13.\textit{a}3 \textit{d}7 14.\textit{d}4 \textit{ac}8\textsuperscript{=} Kurz – Pfrommer, Mannheim 1990. Black has an easy plan in this complicated position: \textit{c}5, \textit{e}5 and eventually \textit{h}5, \textit{h}3, \textit{g}4 with an attack against the enemy king. White should not forget that his d5-pawn is also very weak.

9.h3. After this move, just like after 9.d5, Black can advance e5-e4. 9...e4 10.\textit{f}4 \textit{bd}7 11.\textit{e}1 \textit{f}8 12.\textit{d}2 h5 13.b4 \textit{d}8\textsuperscript{h}7! His knight is headed for the g5-square. 14. \textit{b}1 \textit{f}5 15.b5 \textit{g}5 16.\textit{b}3 \textit{d}7\textsuperscript{f} Colon Romero – Spassky, Nice 1974. White’s pieces are squeezed with the protection of his kingside (the h3-square), while on the queenside he has not achieved anything meaningful. The set-up of Black’s pieces is typical for similar positions.

9.e4. White occupies the centre with his pawn, but has lost a tempo for e3-e4. 9...exd4 10.\textit{xd}4 \textit{bd}7 11.\textit{e}1, Le – Topalov, Astana 2012 (11.h3 \textit{b}6\textsuperscript{z}). There has arisen a well known theoretical position, but with an extra tempo for Black. White has failed to advance h2-h3, so Black can exploit this immediately. 11...\textit{g}4?! 12. \textit{x}g4 \textit{xd}4 13.\textit{d}1 \textit{g}7 14.\textit{xd}6 \textit{e}5 15.\textit{xd}8 \textit{xd}8\textsuperscript{z} – White will have great difficulties to protect his c4-pawn and to complete the development of his queenside pieces.

9.dxe5. This trade seems harmless for Black. 9...\textit{x}e5 10.\textit{x}d8 (White should better refrain from exchanging on d8, for example by playing 10.b3. But even then, after 10...\textit{e}7 11.e4 \textit{d}8 12.\textit{c}2 \textit{a}6\textsuperscript{z} White’s weakness on d4 may hurt him in the future, Petran – Knaak, Zinnowitz 1974.) 10...\textit{xd}8 11.b3 \textit{a}6 12.\textit{a}3 \textit{f}8 13.\textit{xf}8 \textit{xf}8 14.\textit{fd}1, Fossum – Baklan, Calvi 2005, 14...\textit{f}5?!\textsuperscript{z}, Black is eyeing the weakness on d3. If White plays e3-e4, then he would weaken the d4-square.

9.b3 e4 10.\textit{a}3 \textit{f}5 11.\textit{c}1 \textit{d}7 12.b4 \textit{a}6 13.\textit{a}4 \textit{c}7= If Black manages to accomplish the manoeuvre \textit{d}6-g5, his prospects would become preferable, Sznajpik – Hug, Stockholm 1969.

After 9.b4, Black’s simplest reaction would be 9...exd4?! 10. \textit{xd}4 \textit{bd}7 11.\textit{b}2 \textit{b}6. From this square his knight will support d6-d5 and what is even more important, will exert pressure against the c4-pawn. 12.\textit{b}3 a5= Roizman – Dydyshko, Minsk 1978.

9...\textit{a}6?!
Chapter 1

Now, this move seems better than the development of the knight on d7, since it does not close the diagonal of the bishop on c8. In addition, White cannot begin a pawn-offensive on the queenside with b2-b4 and is forced to lose a tempo for the move a2-a3.

10.\(\text{B}d1\) \(\text{e}7\)

Black is preparing e5-e4.

11.a3

Following 11.b3 \(\text{\textit{a}}5\) 12.\(\text{\textit{d}}2\) e4 13.\(\text{\textit{a}}3\) \(\text{\textit{d}}7\) 14.b4 \(\text{\textit{c}}7\) (and then \(\text{\textit{c}}7\)-e6-g5), Black seizes completely the initiative, Anic – Seret, Chambery 1994.

14...h4! 15.b5 (It would be very risky for White to accept the sacrifice, because this would weaken horribly his king’s shelter: 15.\(\text{g}xh4\) \(\text{g}g4\) \(\text{\textit{e}}1\) \(\text{\textit{f}}5\) 17.\(\text{bxc6}\) \(\text{bxc6}\) Grundherr – Kavalek, Germany 1990. Black has good attacking prospects on the weakened light squares on the kingside and the only defender of the f3-square – White’s bishop on h1 is miserably placed, because it is restricted by the pawns on h3 and e4 and has no moves at all.

11...e4 12.b4 \(\text{\textit{c}}7\) 13.a4 h5

B) 5.\(\text{f}3\)

Black’s rook pawn joins into the attack.

14.\(\text{\textit{a}}3\)
White’s knight is more naturally placed here than on e2.

5...d6 6.0–0

In this chapter we will analyse variations after 5.©f3, in which White refrains from the development of his knight to c3. If now, or in the next few moves, he plays 6.©c3, then there would arise positions which will be dealt with Chapters 2-5.

It would be premature for White to play 6.b3, because of 6...e5!? 7.dxe5 (7.©b2 e4 – see Volume 1, Chapter 4, variation A) 7...dxe5=

6...©c6

This move seems more active than the classical development of the knight on d7, since the knight on c6 exerts pressure against White’s centre.

7.d5

White occupies space with tempo and ousts the enemy knight to the edge of the board. It would be misplaced there as Z.Tarrasch mentioned long ago... Still, things are not so simple. From the a5-square it would support Black’s initiative on the queenside and will exert pressure against the weak pawn on c4.

After White’s alternatives, he can hardly fight for an advantage in the opening.

For example: 7.©bd2. Here, White’s knight is not so well placed as on c3. 7...e5 8.d5 ©e7 9.e4 a5 10.©e1 c6∞ Ascic – Muse, Sibenik 2010.

White has tried sometimes in practice 7.h3, preventing the sortie of the enemy knight to g4 and preparing the development of the bishop to e3. 7...a6. We will analyse in details this plan with the preparation of b7-b5, with a white knight on c3, in Chapters 2-5. 8.©e3 (8.©c3 ©e8 – see Chapter 3) 8...b5 9.©c1 (9.b3 ©d7 10.©c1 – see 9.©c1) 9...©d7

10.©h6. White wishes to trade the dark squared bishops. (He should better do this immediately, since following 10.b3 ©c8!? 11.©h2 ©e8 12.©h6 ©h8∞, Black would avoid the exchange and the bishop on h8 would be better placed than the bishop on h6,
since it not only protects the king, but exerts powerful pressure on the long dark diagonal.) 10...\textit{b}8 11.\textit{x}g7 \textit{g}xg7

12.\textit{d}bd2, Gutman – Zapata, New York 1988, 12...\textit{b}xc4!? 13. \textit{d}xc4 \textit{c}8=

12.b3 \textit{c}8!? Black exploits the temporary defencelessness of the pawn on h3 and transfers with tempo his bishop to the queenside. 13.\textit{h}2 \textit{b}xc4 14.\textit{b}xc4 \textit{b}7 15. \textit{e}3 \textit{a}7=, followed by the doubling of the rooks on the b-file.

After 12.d5 \textit{a}7 13.\textit{c}xb5, Gutman – Boehmer, Bad Woerishofen 2015, 13...\textit{a}xb5!? 14.e4 c6= Black has good counterplay against the d5-pawn. After its exchange on c6, his knight will be activated.

It would not be good for White to play 7.b3, since this move does not prevent 7...e5 8.dxe5 (8.\textit{b}2 e4 – see Volume 1, Chapter 4, variation A) 8...dxe5 9.\textit{b}2 (But not 9.\textit{a}3?, because of 9...e4! 10.\textit{xf}8 \textit{xf}8 11.\textit{e}1, Oratovsky – Garcia Luque, Mancha Real 2000. Here, Black could have postponed regaining of the exchange: 11...e3! 12.f3 \textit{h}5 13.\textit{c}2 \textit{f}5 14.\textit{ba}3 \textit{b}2. White has practically no moves, since all his pieces are paralysed. 15.\textit{b}5 \textit{d}8 16.\textit{b}1 \textit{xa}1 17.\textit{xa}1 \textit{xc}2++ 9...\textit{e}7 10. \textit{c}3 (Black should not be afraid of 10.\textit{a}3 \textit{b}4 11.e4, Abdulin – Mamedyarov, Baku 2000, 11...c6=, although that might be White's best reaction, since he at least would not be worse.) 10...\textit{d}8 11.\textit{c}1 e4 12.\textit{e}1 \textit{d}4. Black has seized completely the initiative. 13.\textit{c}2 \textit{xc}2 14.\textit{xc}2 e3! 15. \textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5 16.\textit{xd}5 \textit{f}5 17.\textit{c}1 \textit{xb}2 18.\textit{xb}2 \textit{e}4= Vogel – Ree, Leeuwarden 1975. After the trade of the light-squared bishops, the position of White's king will be unreliable, moreover that he should not forget about the weakness of his d5-pawn.

7...\textit{d}a5

8.\textit{a}4

White not only protects his c4-pawn, but also attacks the enemy knight.

8.\textit{a}3. This development of
the knight to the edge of the board is not adequate at all. 8...c5

8.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}f}d2. This move is not without venom.

Or 9.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}e}1 b5 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xb}5 a6\textit{\textdoteq} – with good compensation for the pawn, Miralles – Heimann, Switzerland 2010.

Following 9.dxc6 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xc}6, Black’s knight leaves the edge of the board and all his problems are over. 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}4, Miralles – Tkachiev, France 1996, 10...\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xd}4?! 11.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xd}4 a6\textit{\textdoteq}

After 9.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}2, Black can try to prepare b7-b5, or can undermine White’s centre with e7-e6. 9...a6 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}b}1 e6 11.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}2, Jussupow – Graf, Osterburg 2006, 11...b5?! 12.dxe6 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xe}6\textit{\textdoteq} In the arising position, it would be too risky for White to accept the exchange sacrifice. 13.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xb}5 axb5 14.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xa}8 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xa}8 15.f3 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}6 16.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}e}1 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}8\textit{\textdoteq} He can hardly introduce his rook into the actions. Black has a clear-cut plan to improve his position – advancing his pawns: d6-d5-d4, c5-c4.

9.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}e}1. White is preparing e2-e4. 9...\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}f}5 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}2 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}7 11.e4 e6 12.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}b}3 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xb}3 13.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}xb}3 exd5 14. exd5 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}g}4 15.h3 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}a}5 16.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}f}4 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}e}5\textit{\textdoteq} – the chances of both sides are approximately equal in the arising position.

Black should not be in a hurry to play 8...c5, because after that his knight might become isolated at the edge of the board. 9.a3!? White is preparing \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}a}2, b4. 9...\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}7 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}a}2 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}e}5 11.b3 a6 12.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}b}2 b5 13.f4 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}g}4 14.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}x}g7 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}x}g7 15. \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}2 f6 16.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}3\textit{\textdoteq} – His space advantage provides him with a slight but stable edge, Husemann – Van Bommel, Lechenicher Schach-Server 2014.

8...\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}7?! This is Black’s most precise move. 9.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}2 (Following 9.a3, Black obtains good counterplay after 9...\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}b}6?!), for example: 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}2 c6 11.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}a}2 cxd5 12.cxd5 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}7 13.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}d}3 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}8. Now, he should not be afraid of b2-b4, since he could counter it with \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}a}5-c4. 14.b3 e6\textit{\textdoteq}. White’s pieces are not so well prepared for the opening of the game in the centre.) 9...c6. Black will try to open the c-file, after which the placement of White’s queen on c2 may turn out to be disadvantageous. 10.\textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}3 (10.e4 cxd5 11.exd5 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}e}5\textit{\textdoteq}) 10... cxd5 11.cxd5 \textit{\textipa{\textdoteq}c}7\textit{\textdoteq} Black parries the threat b2-b4 and equalises,
Sirotkina – Komiagin a, St Petersburg 2005.

8.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}bd2 \textbf{c}5}}

If White does not play 9.e4, then Black advances b7-b5, ending up with a wonderful position.

For example: 9.a3 b5 10.cxb5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}d5}} and the exchange of the flank b-pawn, for the central d-pawn is obviously in favour of Black.

Or 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}}c2 b5. He can exploit the defencelessness of the d5-pawn and accomplish this undermining move without preparation. 10.e4 bxc4 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}xc4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}}xc4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}} The pressure against the b2-pawn provides Black with a good game.

Following 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}e1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}b1 b5 11.cxb5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}xb5 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}}c7 13.b4 cxb4 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}xb4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}}f5 15.e4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{g}}}}}g4 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}e1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}}d7\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}} White has extra space, but Black’s pieces are more harmoniously deployed, Fric – Flores, FICGS 2014.

9.e4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}}d7. This move also prepares b7-b5 and is more useful that a6. 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}}b1 (10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}e1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8 11.h3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}5\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}} Tahirov – Inarkiev, Serpukhov 2002) 10...b5 11.b3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c2 bxc4 13.bxc4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}xb1 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}}xb1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c7 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}}a3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{g}}}}}g4 17.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}}xb1+ 18.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}}xb1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b6 19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}}xb6 axb6= – After the exchange of the queens, there has arisen an end-game in which Black’s prospects are not worse thanks to his superior pawn-structure, Espinoza – Bravo, ICCF 2008.

\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{8...c}5 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}}b2}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}}c7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c5}}

Giving up the centre with the move 9.dxc6 would not create any problems for Black: 9...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}xc6 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}}c3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}f5 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}e3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}e4= Kerrouche – Anderson, ICCF 2004.

\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{9...b}6 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}d3}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}c7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c5}}

Capturing of the knight does not promise anything good to White. 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}xa5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}xa5 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}c3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c2, Morselli – Perman, Arco 2015, 12...a4! Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}xa4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}}f5 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}}c1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}a5= 20

\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{10...e}6}}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}c7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}}b8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}}e6}}

Black exploits the circumstance that the d5-square is insuf-
ficiently protected (White has not developed his knight on c3 yet.) and exerts immediate pressure against it.

11.dxe6

White gives up the centre and wishes to exploit the misplacement of Black’s knight on a8.

Following 11.\( \text{Q} \text{fd2} \) exd5 12. \( \text{cxd5} \), Tadic – Brenjo, Petrovac 2004, 12...\( \text{Q} \text{e8!} \) Black has a very active play in the spirit of the Modern Benoni system.

11...\( \text{Q} \text{xe6} \) 12.\( \text{Q} \text{g5} \)

It would be worse for White to play 12.\( \text{Q} \text{a3} \), since he does not prevent the enemy pawn-advance 12...d5, for example: 13.cxd5 \( \text{Q} \text{xd5} \) 14.\( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \) 15.\( \text{Q} \text{d1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{f6} \) Zhou – Wen, Danzhou 2012. The position has been simplified a bit. White’s knight on a3 is misplaced. After subsequent exchanges Black’s pawn-majority on the queenside may become dangerous for White.

It is possible that White should choose the calmer move 12.\( \text{Q} \text{bd2} \), although even then after 12...\( \text{Q} \text{b8} \) 13.\( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) \( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) 14.\( \text{Q} \text{f6) Qe8=} \) he can hardly rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening, V. Gaprindashvili – Buckley, Baku 2002.

12...\( \text{Q} \text{d7} \)

Black avoids the trade of his bishop with tempo.

13.\( \text{Q} \text{c2} \)

White’s attempt to capture on d6 would not promise anything attractive to him. 13.\( \text{Q} \text{d1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b8} \) 14. \( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \), Garcia Palermo – Avrukh, Turin 2006, 14...h6!? It is useful for Black to oust the enemy knight to the edge of the board. 15.\( \text{Q} \text{h3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xc4} \) 16.\( \text{Q} \text{d3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{h3} \) 17.\( \text{Q} \text{xh3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd3} \) 18.\( \text{Q} \text{exd3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{a5} \). The tactical complications have led to an endgame in which Black’s superior pawn-structure is a more important factor in the evaluation of the position than White’s bishop-pair. His attempt to disrupt his opponent’s queenside pawns – 19.\( \text{Q} \text{xa5} \) \( \text{bx a5=} \) would lead to the loss of his b2-pawn and a long and laborious fight for a draw.

This position was reached in the game Prokopchuk – Belyakov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2010. Black had an interesting exchange sacrifice: 13...\( \text{Q} \text{xc4!} \) 14.\( \text{Q} \text{e4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe4} \) 15. \( \text{Q} \text{xe7} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe7} \) 16.\( \text{Q} \text{xe4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e5} \) 17. \( \text{Q} \text{xa8} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xa8} \) 18.\( \text{Q} \text{d1} \) d5\( \text{=} \) followed by d5-d4, \( \text{Q} \text{d7-h3} \). Black has a pawn for the exchange and good attacking prospects against the enemy king.
In Chapter 2 we begin the analysis of the basic variations of the system with the development of the bishop on g2 in which White develops his knights to the best possible position (f3 and c3).

7.0–0

White will have to castle sooner or later, so he should better do this immediately.

7.e4 \textit{g}4 – see Chapter 15, 6.g3.

If White postpones his castling, he may even end up in an inferior position, for example: 7. b3 e5 8.dxe5 dxe5 9.a3. Here, Black can put in doubt his opponent’s strategy – that is the weakening of the a1-h8 diagonal. 9...

e4! 10.g5 e3! Black destroys his opponent’s pawn-structure. 11. fxe3 \textit{g}4 12.xd8 xd8 13.xc1 \textit{x}e3+ – His pieces are much more harmoniously deployed and the vulnerability of White’s isolated pawn on e2 may tell in the future, Uzhva – Andreikin, Dagomys 2010.

7.h3 a6 8.e3 (8.0–0 \textit{b}8 – see Chapter 4; 8.g5 \textit{b}8 9.c1, Eingorn – Paehitz, Austria 1999, 9...b5 10.cxb5 axb5\textup{=} 8...\textit{b}8. Black prepares his active actions on the queenside. 9.c1 b5 10. d2 a5 11.b3 d7 12.0–0 bxc4 13.xc4 xc4 14.bxc4 c5= Stahlberg – Uhlmann, Moscow 1956. The b-file is in Black’s hands, while White is squeezed with the protection of his d4-pawn. After its exchange on c5, or if it is advanced after d4-d5, Black’s bishop on g7 will become tremendously active.

7.d5. As a rule, this pawn-advance transposes to lines which we will analyse in Chapter 5. 7... a5
3.g3 g7 4.g2 0-0 5.c3 d6 6.f3 c6 7.0-0 a6

8.d3 c5 9.0-0 a6 – see Chapter 5.
8.b3 a6 9.0-0 b8, or 9.b2 b8 10.0-0 b5 – see Chapter 5, variation A.
8.d2 c5

9.0-0 a6 – see Chapter 5, variation B.
9.c2 a6 10.b3 (10.0-0 b8 – see Chapter 5, variation B2) 10... b8 11.b2 b5 12.b1 (12.0-0 e5 – see Chapter 5, variation B2b) 12...e5 13.0-0 h5 – see Chapter 5, variation B2a.

It would be too risky for White to begin a chase after Black’s knight with the move 9.a3, because of 9...a6!? It turns out that Black should not be afraid of the threat of his knight being trapped, since he has a very powerful argument after 10.b4 and this is 10... g4! Now, we see the consequences of the delay of White’s castling – in numerous variations his f2-pawn would be handling. 11.b2 cxb4 12.axb4 b6. White must part with a pawn now; otherwise he may get checkmated, and he has no sufficient compensation for it. 13.0-0 b4+

Following 9.dxc6, White manages somehow to maintain the balance. 9...cxc6 10.0-0 a5 11. h3 b6= Juric – Djukic, Bar 2005.

7...a6

Black prepares his counterplay on the queenside – b8, b7-b5, attacking the enemy pawn on c4. We have to emphasize that one of the basic drawbacks of the system with the development of the bishop on g2 is the vulnerability of the pawn on c4, because the bishop on g2 does not protect it.

Besides its merit however, the pawn-advance a7-a6 has a drawback and this is the fact that Black does not exert pressure against his opponent’s centre and this presents White with free hands for actions. This is why he has a
great choice of possibilities in this position.

In this chapter we will deal with the following alternatives for White: A) 8...e5g5, B) 8...f4, C) 8...e3, D) 8...e1, E) 8...e4, F) 8...d3.

His more popular moves 8.b3, 8.h3 and 8.d5 will be analysed in the following chapters.

8.a4 e5!? 9...d2 c5 10.d5 e6 – see Chapter 5, variation B.

8...e1. Now, White’s bishop eyes immediately Black’s knight, but White’s knight does not control the important central e5-square and Black may make use of this later. 8...b8 9...c2 (9.e3 e5 – see variation C) 9...e7 10...b1, X.Wang – J.Wang, China 2013. Here, Black has an interesting pawn-sacrifice: 10...e5!? 11.d5 d4=, which would be very risky for White to accept, because after 12...xd4!? exd4 13...d5 f5 14...a1 e4+, Black’s pieces would become very active.

White cannot create problems for his opponent with the line: 8...d5 e6 9...xf6+ xf6. As a rule, exchanging pieces in the opening is usually in favour of Black, since this diminishes White’s chances of obtaining an advantage. 10.e3. This move leads to some restriction of the mobility of White’s bishop on c1. (10...e3, Garcia Martinez – De la Paz Perdomo, Santa Clara 1999. This move is insufficient to maintain the control over the strategically important d4-square: 10...e5!? 11.d5 d4= 10...d7 11...d2 e7 12.d5 d8∞, followed by e6-e5, f7-f5, d8-f7, Galuska – Hostinsky, Czech Republic 1991. The adherent of the King’s Indian Defence should be very happy with this position, because Black has excellent prospects with his kingside pawn-offensive.

After 8...e2, the simplest for Black would be 8...f5 9...e4 g4. Having deprived his opponent of the possibility to protect his d4-pawn with the move e2-e3, Black begins to exert pressure against it. 10...e3 d7 11...e2 (11...d2 e5 – see variation E) 11...b4!? 12...d2 c5= Now, it would not work for White to play here 13.d5?, in view of 13...xf3 14...f3 e5++ and he would lose material.

Following 8.a3, it seems very good for Black to choose 8...e5!? and his knight frees with tempo the way forward of his c7-pawn. 9...d2 c5 10.dxc5 (10.d5 g4 – see Chapter 5, variation B) 10...dxc5 11...a4 c7= – The chances are mutual for both sides in this position with a symmetrical pawn-structure, Sulashvili – Sjugirov, Rijeka 2010.

The move 8...d2 is not so popular as the main lines for White,
but has some venom. 8...\texttt{b}b8 9. \texttt{c}c1. White impedes his opponent's pawn-advance b7-b5 making use of the defencelessness of his knight on c6. Black is not obliged to play like this, however. (9.d5 \texttt{a}a5 10.b3 c5 – see Chapter 5, variation A) 9...e5

He exploits the defect of White's move 8 – the lack of control over the d4-square and inflicts advantageously a strike against his centre.

White cannot obtain any advantage after an exchange on e5. 10.dxe5 dxe5 11.\texttt{e}e3 (There arises an approximately equal endgame after 11.\texttt{g}g5 h6 12.\texttt{w}xd8 \texttt{x}xd8 13. \texttt{xf}6 \texttt{xf}6 14.\texttt{d}d5 \texttt{g}7= Black's bishop-pair compensates the presence of his opponent's knight in the centre, while it would be very dangerous for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice, Tregubov – Markowski, Saint Vincent 2000, 15.\texttt{xc}c7?! e4 16.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{d}4\texttt{f}1) 11...\texttt{e}e6 12.\texttt{w}a4 \texttt{c}8 13.\texttt{fd}1, Bochev – Vasilev, ICCF 2010, 13...\texttt{e}8?!= Black has no pawn-weaknesses and his pieces are very well deployed.

10.d5. White occupies space. 10...\texttt{d}d4 11.\texttt{e}e1 c5 12.dxc6 bxc6 13.b3 (13.e3, Blagojevic – Djukic, Herceg Novi 2001, 13...\texttt{e}e6! 14. \texttt{xc}c6 \texttt{xb}2= White does not achieve anything after the exchange of pawns.) 13...\texttt{b}7 14.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{e}7\texttt{f} – If Black manages to advance d6-d5, he can even rely on seizing the initiative thanks to his powerful centre, Kveinys – Markowski, Koszalin 1999.

A) 8.\texttt{g}g5

White wishes to provoke the move h7-h6, but he would be incapable of exploiting this weakening of Black's king shelter.

8...\texttt{h}6

9.\texttt{d}d2

The move 9.\texttt{e}e3 is not so popular, because the bishop can come under attack there by Black's knight: 9...\texttt{g}4 10.\texttt{c}c1 e5 11.d5 \texttt{e}7 12.h3 \texttt{f}6 13.e4 \texttt{h}7 14.\texttt{d}d2 f5= Martin Fernandez – Stoll, Forchheim 2011.
The other retreat of the bishop
9.\textit{\textit{xf4}} has the drawback that later it can be attacked there after e7-e5, or g6-g5. 9...\textit{\textit{xb8}} 10.\textit{\textit{wc1}} (10.\textit{\textit{h3}} \textit{\textit{d7}} 11.\textit{\textit{e4}} \textit{\textit{c8}} 12.\textit{\textit{h2}} g5 13.\textit{\textit{c1}} e5 14.d5, Kupsys – Kazoks, ICCF 2005, 14...\textit{\textit{d4}}!?) 10...\textit{\textit{h7}} 11.\textit{\textit{ed1}} \textit{\textit{d7}} 12.\textit{\textit{d5}} \textit{\textit{e4}}. Black’s plan includes the pawn-advances f7-f5 and e7-e5. 13.\textit{\textit{c2}} f5 14.\textit{\textit{xe3}} e6. Before advancing e5, it would be useful for him to oust White’s knight away from the centre of the board. 15.\textit{\textit{c3}} \textit{\textit{xc3}} 16.\textit{\textit{xc3}} e5 17.d5 \textit{\textit{e7}} 18.b3 g5\textsuperscript{∞} – Black’s kingside pawn-offensive may turn out to be dangerous, Baranowski – Efendiyev, ICCF 2012.

White should better refrain from exchanging his powerful dark-squared bishop for the enemy knight. 9.\textit{\textit{xf6}} \textit{\textit{xf6}} 10.\textit{\textit{d2}} \textit{\textit{g7}} 11.\textit{\textit{fd1}} \textit{\textit{b8}} 12.\textit{\textit{ac1}} \textit{\textit{g4}} 13.e3 \textit{\textit{c8}} 14.\textit{\textit{e2}}, Praxmarer – Efimenko, Deizisau 2003, 14...e5!\textsuperscript{∞} Black’s prospects are not worse at all. If White closes later the centre with d4-d5, this will free Black’s hands for actions on the kingside. After an eventual exchange in the centre, the position will be opened and this would again be in favour of Black, because of his two powerful bishops.

9...\textit{\textit{e5}}

(diagram)

10.\textit{\textit{d5}}

White cannot obtain an advantage after an exchange on e5. 10.\textit{\textit{dxe5}} \textit{\textit{dxe5}} 11.\textit{\textit{c1}} e4. Black ousts the enemy knight away from the centre. 12.\textit{\textit{e1}} \textit{\textit{h7}} 13.\textit{\textit{c2}} (after 13.\textit{\textit{xe4}} \textit{\textit{xe4}} 14.\textit{\textit{xe4}} \textit{\textit{d4}}\textsuperscript{∞}, followed by \textit{\textit{g4}}, or \textit{\textit{h3}}, Black’s piece-activity compensates fully his minimal material deficit, Loginov – Vovk, St Petersburg 2004) 13...\textit{\textit{e6}} 14.\textit{\textit{e3}} \textit{\textit{d4}} 15.\textit{\textit{e1}} \textit{\textit{e7}} 16.\textit{\textit{c4}}. After this move, there arise tactical complications, which lead to almost complete annihilation of the material on the board. 16...\textit{\textit{dxe4}} 17.\textit{\textit{exe4}} \textit{\textit{xc4}} 18.\textit{\textit{xb7}} \textit{\textit{xe2}}+ 19.\textit{\textit{exe2}} \textit{\textit{exe2}} 20.\textit{\textit{xa8}} \textit{\textit{xa8}} 21.\textit{\textit{c3}} \textit{\textit{f3}} 22.\textit{\textit{axg7}} \textit{\textit{xe7}} 23.\textit{\textit{d3}}+ \textit{\textit{f6}} 24.\textit{\textit{f5}}+ \textit{\textit{gxg5}} 25.\textit{\textit{xf3}} \textit{\textit{xb2}}= Holscher – Rada, ICCF 2014.

10...\textit{\textit{d4}} 11.\textit{\textit{e1}}

Black would counter the immediate move 11.e3 with 11...\textit{\textit{xf3}}+ 12.\textit{\textit{xf3}} \textit{\textit{h3}} 13.\textit{\textit{e1}} \textit{\textit{d7}} 14.e4 \textit{\textit{h7}}\textsuperscript{∞} and later f7-f5, \textit{\textit{h7}}-g5, creating very good counterplay on the kingside, Relange – Kasimdzhanov, playchess.com 2004.
11...d7

12.e3

After 12.b4 Wle7 13.eb1 e4 14.a4 Wfe8 15.a5 c6∞, the position remains double-edged, Loginov – Sakaev, Kazan 2005.

Following 12.ed3, Black’s simplest reaction would be 12... Wf8!?∞, preparing e5-e4.

12...f5 13.ed3, Matveeva – Morozevich, Tomsk 1998, 13... Wf8!? White has ousted the powerful enemy knight from the centre, but the threat e5-e4 forces him to let it back there. 14.e4 ed4 15.ed. Naturally, White cannot put up for long with the enemy knight on d4 and is forced to exchange it. 15...c5 16.exd4 exd4 17.We1 Wg4 18.b4 b6 19. h3 We5 20.Wxe5 dxe5 21.bxc5 bxc5= Suddenly, there has arisen a completely symmetrical position on the board. It is closed, so White has no chances of obtaining an advantage.

B) 8.Wf4

This move is becoming very popular lately. White develops harmoniously his pieces and his plans include the moves Wc1 and Wh5, after which Black will have difficulties to create active counterplay.

8...Wb8

9.Wc1

It would not be consistent for White to try here the line: 9.d5 Wa5 10.Wd2 b5 11.cxb5 axb5∞ – Black has managed to advance b7-b5 without any problems obtaining very good counterplay on the queenside, Gendre – Le Goff, Avoine 2005.

After 9.c5 d5, Black has good counterplay against the d4-pawn. 10.Wc1 (10.We5 Wh5= Deneuville – Bohak, ICCF 2014) 10...Wc4 11. Wh1 Wg4= Terreaux – Teeriaho, ICCF 2013.

Following 9.Wd2 b5 10.cxb5 axb5, the trade of the a-pawn for
the c-pawn may turn out to be in favour of Black later. 11.d5 \(\triangle a5\) 12.\(\triangle d4\), Komperda – Berkley, IECC 2000. Here, he could have entered advantageous complications, connected with an attack against the weak white d5-pawn. 12...b4!? 13.\(\triangle cb5\) \(\triangle b7\) 14.\(\triangle x b4\) \(\triangle x d5\) 15.\(\triangle x a5\) (White loses after 15.\(\triangle x d5\)?, due to the intermediate move 15...c5 16.\(\triangle d2\) \(\triangle x d5+\) ) 15...\(\triangle x f4\) 16.gxf4 \(\triangle x g2\) 17.\(\triangle x g2\) \(\triangle d7\). The threat c7-c6, or c7-c5, forces White to part with his extra piece. 18.\(\triangle x c7\) \(\triangle x c7\) 19.\(\triangle x c7\) \(\triangle x d4\) 20.\(\triangle a b1\) \(\triangle b7\). Black is not in a hurry to regain his pawn and wishes to do this under the most favourable circumstances. 21.\(\triangle f c1\) \(\triangle c8\) 22.\(\triangle d5\) \(\triangle x c1\) 23.\(\triangle x c1\) \(\triangle x b2\) 24.\(\triangle x e7+\) \(\triangle f 8\) 25.\(\triangle c6\) \(\triangle c5\) 26.\(\triangle f 3\) \(\triangle x a 2=\)

9...b5

10.\(\triangle d5\)

After the exchange on f6, White is threatening to win a pawn (c4xb5), making use of the defencelessness of the enemy knight on c6.

It would not be so active for White to opt here for 10.b3 \(\triangle d7\) 11.\(\triangle w d3\) (11.\(\triangle d5\), Yevseev – Bodnaruk, St Petersburg 2013, 11...\(\triangle x d5\)? 12.cxd5 \(\triangle b4\), and his pawns on a2 and d5 would be hanging.) 11...\(\triangle e8\) 12.\(\triangle f d1\) \(\triangle b 4\) 13.\(\triangle d5\) \(\triangle x d5\) 14.cxd5 \(\triangle a 7\), preparing the transfer of the knight to the c3-square, Zhao – Ding, Xinghua Jiangsu 2011. Black is ready to sacrifice a pawn in order to accomplish this: 15.\(\triangle x a 6\) \(\triangle b 5\) 16.\(\triangle a 5\) \(\triangle c 3=\)

10.cxb5 axb5 11.e4 (11.d5 \(\triangle b 4\) 12.\(\triangle b 1\), Kurajica – Perez Barreto, Tenerife 2013, 12...\(\triangle a 5\)? 13.\(\triangle a 4\) \(\triangle b 7\) 14.\(\triangle d 4\) \(\triangle c 5\) 15.\(\triangle w d 1\) \(\triangle b 7\), Black has managed to cover reliably the vulnerability of the c6-square.) 11...\(\triangle g 4\) 12.h3 \(\triangle x f 3\) 13.\(\triangle x f 3\) e5 – After this move he can be very optimistic about his future, Kuljasevic – Cheparinov, Plovdiv 2012.

10...bxc4 11.\(\triangle x f 6+\)

11...exf6

This is more precise for Black
than the routine capturing with the bishop, because it is essential for him to free the e7-square for the retreat of his knight.

12.\texttt{\textbackslash bxc4 dxc7} 13.b3

After 13.\texttt{\textbackslash bcl}, Zoler – Kantsler, Beersheba 2014, Black has a very interesting move 13...\texttt{\textbackslash a6}! and the game becomes very sharp after it. 14.\texttt{\textbackslash bxc7 a2} 15.e4 f5 16.e5 \texttt{\textbackslash d5} 17.exd6 \texttt{\textbackslash xf4} 18.\texttt{\textbackslash xf4}. White has an extra pawn, but Black has a powerful bishop-pair and excellent counterplay against the weak enemy d6-pawn. 18...\texttt{\textbackslash b6} 19.d7 \texttt{\textbackslash e6} 20.\texttt{\textbackslash f1} \texttt{\textbackslash xd7} = He has captured White’s weak pawn, which had been too far away from the rest of his forces and in this position Black’s two powerful bishops compensate his doubled f-pawns.

13...\texttt{\textbackslash e6} 14.\texttt{\textbackslash e1}

After 14.\texttt{\textbackslash a4 b6} 15.\texttt{\textbackslash e1}, Black succeeds in protecting reliably his weakness on a6. 15...\texttt{\textbackslash d5} 16.\texttt{\textbackslash d3 \textbackslash a8} =

14...\texttt{\textbackslash f5} 15.\texttt{\textbackslash g5 d5} 16.\texttt{\textbackslash e1 xg2} 17.\texttt{\textbackslash xg2 d7} 18.\texttt{\textbackslash xe7 xe7}. The position has been simplified and White’s slight edge, connected with his superior pawn-structure, gradually evaporates. 19.e3 c5 20.dxc5 dxc5 21.\texttt{\textbackslash c2 b8} 22.\texttt{\textbackslash f4 e5} 23.\texttt{\textbackslash d3 f8} 24.\texttt{\textbackslash fd1 a5} 25.\texttt{\textbackslash c4 d6} 26.\texttt{\textbackslash xe5 xe5} 27.h4 h5 28.\texttt{\textbackslash xd6 xd6} 29.a3 \texttt{\textbackslash e6} = Telepnev – Jones, ICCF 2013.

White has failed to exploit the vulnerability of the enemy pawns on a5 and c5, since his own queenside pawns are also weak. For example: 30.\texttt{\textbackslash b4 axb4} 31.\texttt{\textbackslash axb4 xc4} 32.\texttt{\textbackslash xc4 f8} 33.\texttt{\textbackslash xc5 e7}. Black’s king is in a hurry to attack the pawn on c5. 34.\texttt{\textbackslash f3 d7} 35.\texttt{\textbackslash f2 c6} 36.e4 \texttt{\textbackslash xe4} 37.\texttt{\textbackslash fxe4 b5} =

C) 8.e3

This plan seems to be a bit slow; nevertheless, it is sensible. White wishes to play \texttt{\textbackslash e2}, protecting his c4-pawn. Now, if Black advances b7-b5 and captures on c4, then White would be able to take with his queen.

8...\texttt{\textbackslash b8}

9.\texttt{\textbackslash e2}

9.b3 b5 – see Chapter 3.

After 9.\texttt{\textbackslash e1}, Black will have some difficulties, due to the defenselessness of his knight on c6, but will manage to advance b7-b5. 9...\texttt{\textbackslash a5} 10.b3 c5. You can see now
Chapter 2

the consequences of the removal of White’s knight from the f3-square. Before advancing b7-b5, Black wishes to force his opponent to protect his d4-pawn. 11. \( \text{Cd}3 \) (11.\( \text{Cc2} \), Dvoirys – Khairullin, Kazan 2005, 11...b5?!?\( \text{Cd}2 \)) 11... \( \text{Ag4} \) 12.\( \text{Wd}2 \) b5 13.cxb5 axb5 14. \( \text{dxc5} \) dxc5 15.\( \text{Cxc5} \), Markus – Jones, Tromso 2014. White has succeeded in winning a pawn, but the lag of development of his queenside pieces precludes him from obtaining an advantage in the opening. 15...\( \text{Wc8} \)!

This is the most precise move for Black. He avoids the trade of the queens and forces the pawn-advance b3-b4, after which his knight, which was isolated from the actions at the edge of the board, gains access to the wonderful c4-square. 16.b4 \( \text{Cc4} \) 17.\( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{d7} \) – White should better exchange immediately his opponent’s powerful knight. Black has good compensation for the sacrificed pawn.

9.\( \text{Cd2} \). White plans to transfer his knight to b3 after which he will have so many pieces on the queenside that Black’s chances of developing his initiative there would be minimal. It would seem much more logical for him to seek his counter chances on the opposite side of the board. The shelter of White’s king, after the removal of his knight from the f3-square, does not look so reliable. 9...\( \text{Ad7} \) 10.\( \text{Cb3} \) \( \text{Wc8} \) 11.\( \text{Be1} \) h5 12.a3 \( \text{Be8} \) 13.\( \text{Cd2} \) \( \text{Ah3} \) 14.\( \text{Ah1} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) 15.\( \text{Cc1} \) e5\( \text{Stocl – Sko} \)berne, Rogaska

Slatina 2009.

9...b5

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

10.\( \text{Cd1} \)

10.b3 bxc4 – see Chapter 3.

10.\( \text{Cd2} \) \( \text{Ag4} \) 11.f3 \( \text{Cd7} \) 12.b3 e5 – see Chapter 3.

10...bxc4 11.\( \text{Wxc4} \) \( \text{Bb4} \). Black begins his fight for the important d5-square. 12.a3 \( \text{We6} \) 13.\( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Bd5} \) 14.\( \text{Xd5} \) \( \text{Xd5} \) 15.\( \text{Wxa6} \). White has not achieved much by capturing his opponent’s weak a6-pawn. 15...\( \text{Wd7} \) 16.\( \text{Wd2} \), Hou ska – Gaehwiler, Caleta 2013, 16...\( \text{Fe8} \)!

Black is preparing the pawn-advance c7-c5. 17.b4 c5 18.\( \text{Dxc5} \) dxc5 19. \( \text{Bb2} \) cxb4= He has regained his pawn and the position is completely equal.

D) 8.\( \text{Be1} \)

White does not clarify his plans yet. Later, he may begin ac-
3...\textit{b}8

9...\textit{b}1

9.h3 b5 – see Chapter 4.

It seems too straightforward for White to opt here for 9.a4 – he prevents radically the pawn-advance b7-b5, but weakens seriously the b4-square. 9...a5! 10.e4 \textit{g}4 11.e3 \textit{d}7 12.e2 e5 13.d5 \textit{xf}3 14.d3 \textit{d}7 12.e3 e5 – see 10.e3

The move 9.c2 has the drawback that weakens the control over the d4-square. The best way for Black to exploit this circumstance is the move 9...\textit{g}4, for example: 10.e3, Krasiewicz – Szymczuk, Poland 2006, 10...e5! – It would be difficult for White to hold on to the d4-square, while following d4-d5, it becomes difficult to understand why he has played e1 and e2-e3.

After 9.e4, there arise positions which we will analyse in variation E, but with the inclusion of the moves e1 and e8. This cannot change however the evaluation of this position as approximately equal. 9...\textit{g}4. Black begins to exert immediate pressure against the enemy centre. His plans include \textit{d}7, e7-e5, followed by the deployment of his knight to the d4-square. 10.e3 (10.e3 \textit{xf}3 11.e3 \textit{d}7 12.e3 e5 – see 10.e3) 10...\textit{d}7

11...\text{a}5. He fortifies the key d4-square. Black can change however his plans a bit. 11...\text{c}a5. His knight frees the way forward of his c-pawn. This plan may not seem so energetic, but Black can afford to play like this, since the position is closed and the time factor is not so important as in opened positions. 12.b3 (12...c1 c5 13.b3 \text{c}6 \text{f} Le Roux – Navrotescu, Deauville 2010) 12...c5 13.h3 \text{xf}3 14...\text{xf}3 \text{c}6 15...g2 cxd4 16...xd4 \text{a}5. Black increases his pressure on the dark squares. White decides to sacrifice material in order to neutralise it and wishes to open the position for his powerful bishops. 17...xc6 bxc6 18...b1 \text{xa}2 19.e5 \text{e}5 20.f4 \text{d}7 21...xc6 \text{e}5 22.b4 \text{a}6 23.\text{d}5 \text{fb}8 24...xc5. White parts with his bishop-pair, but regains the e7-pawn. Later, in the game Salcedo Mederos – Tiemann, ICCF 2008, the vulnerability of his first rank was balanced by White’s attack against the f7-square and it all ended with numerous exchanges and a transfer into a drawish endgame with bishops of opposite colours. 24...dxc5 25...xe7 \text{d}4+ 26...h1 \text{xb}4 27...b4 \text{xb}4 28...xf7 \text{b}2 29.\text{f}7+ \text{f}8 30...xb2 \text{xb}2 31...e1 \text{f}2 32...xf2 \text{xf}2=

9...	ext{a}5
Black attacks the vulnerable enemy c4-pawn.
10...\text{a}4
White protects it with tempo.

Following 10.b3 b5 11.cxb5 axb5, Black’s queenside initiative provides him with at least equal prospects. 12.b4. The threat b5-b5 is so unpleasant for White that he loses a tempo (advancing b4 in two moves) and weakens the c4-square. (After 12.e4 b4 13...a4 \text{d}7 14...b2 d5 15.e5 \text{e}4 16.a3 c5 17.dxc5 \text{c}6 18...d3 \text{f}5, Black has good compensation for the sacrificed pawn. His pieces are actively deployed, while White pawns on e5, c5, and a bit later on a2, are comfortable targets for attack, Gomez Esteban – Tkachiev, Las Palmas 1997.) 12...\text{c}4 13.d5 (The move 13.a4 has the drawback that it leads to the appearance of the isolated b-pawn. 13...bxa4 14...xa4 \text{d}7 15.b5 \text{db}6 Salov – Tkachiev, Groningen 1997.) 13...\text{d}7 14...d4 e6 15.e4 \text{e}8 – Later, White must play very carefully; otherwise, the vulnerability of his backward a-pawn may tell, Kveinys – Renet, Saint Quentin 2014.

White cannot prevent his opponent’s plans with 10...d3 b5
11.cxb5 axb5 12.b4 \( \triangle c4 \) 13.d5 (13. \( \trianglexb5?! \) d5 14.\( \trianglea3 \) \( \triangle f5 \), White loses the exchange, Aramil – Vigorito, Las Vegas 2006) 13...\( \triangle g4 \).
Black prepares the transfer of his knight to the e5-square. 14.\( \triangle d4 \) e6 15.\( \triangle d1 \) (15.e3 exd5 16.\( \triangle xd5 \) \( \triangle ge5 \) 17.\( \trianglewe2 \), Adly – Wang, Ningbo 2011, 17...c6?!?, ousting the enemy knight away from the centre) 15...exd5 16.\( \triangle xd5 \). Now, Black has a very promising pawn-sacrifice.
16...\( \triangle d7 \) 17.\( \triangle xc4 \) \( \triangle e5 \) 18.\( \triangle xf7+ \) \( \triangle xf7 \) Yassakov – Morozov, ICCF 2014. Black had very good compensation for the sacrificed material – two powerful bishops and good attacking prospects against the enemy king, because its shelter had become vulnerable after the disappearance of the bishop on g2; nevertheless, White still had an extra pawn and following 19. \( \triangle wc2 \) c6 20.\( \triangle e4 \) \( \triangle c4 \) 21.\( \triangle g5 \) \( \triangle e7 \) 22.a4 \( \triangle e8 \) 23.\( \triangle gf3 \) \( \triangle a8 \) 24. axb5 cxb5 25.\( \triangle b2 \) \( \triangle f7 \), the opponents agreed to a draw.

10...\( \triangle b6 \)

White is fighting for the initiative on the queenside.

11.\( \triangle d5 \) \( \triangle d7 \) 12.\( \triangle wc2 \) c5 13. \( \triangle xf6+ \) \( \triangle xf6 \) 14.dxc5 bxc5= Yetman – Ward, ICCF 2007.

It does not seem so consistent for White to play 11.e4, because after 11...\( \triangle d7 \), his queen will be forced to retreat to its initial position. 12.\( \triangle d1 \) \( \triangle g4 \)? This move looks more reliable than accepting the pawn-sacrifice (12...\( \triangle xc4 \) 13.b3 \( \triangle a5 \) 14.e5 \( \triangle e8 \) 15.\( \triangle f4 \) \( \triangle Ja
nosi – Hervet, ICCF 2002). 13.h3 \( \triangle xf3 \) 14.\( \triangle xf3 \) \( \triangle d7 \) 15.b3 c5 16.\( \triangle e2 \) \( \triangle c6 \). Now, just like in the variation with 9.e4, Black exerts pressure against the d4-pawn. 17.\( \triangle b2 \) \( \triangle xd4 \) 18.\( \triangle xd4 \) \( \triangle xd4 \) 19. \( \triangle xd4 \) cxd4 20.\( \triangle xd4 \). After the numerous exchanges, White has lost his main trump – his bishop-pair. 20...\( \triangle e5 \) 21.\( \triangle g2 \) \( \triangle c6 \). Black is trying to obtain an advantage. He wishes to advance e7-e5 and to deploy his knight on the d4-outpost. White must react precisely; otherwise, he may end up in a bad position. 22.\( \triangle d5 \) \( \triangle c7 \) 23.\( \triangle bd1 \) \( \triangle bd8 \) 24.h4 e5 25.\( \triangle h1 \) \( \triangle d4 \) 26.h5. Now, Black must exchange the queens in order to avoid being attacked on the h-file. 26...\( \triangle c5 \) 27. \( \triangle b7 \) \( \triangle c6 \) 28.\( \triangle xc6 \) \( \triangle xc6 \)= Hunger – Glukhovtsev, ICCF 2014.

11...\( \triangle e8 \)

Black wishes either to exchange, or to oust the enemy
queen, so that his knight may occupy the c4-square.

12. \( \text{c2} \)

The retreat of White’s queen to this square enables Black to have some tactical possibilities, connected with the development of his bishop to f5.

12.cxd6 cxd6 13.\( \text{d1} \) b5 14.a3 \( \text{b7}= \) Nyvlt – Alves, ICCF 2002.

There arise numerous exchanges after 12.\( \text{xe8} \) \( \text{xe8} \) 13.b4 \( \text{c4} \) 14.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 15.\( \text{xd2} \) bxc5 16.bxc5 \( \text{xb1} \) 17.\( \text{xb1} \) dxc5 18.dxc5 \( \text{e6}= \), with an approximately equal endgame, Sanz Velez – Booij, ICCF 2011. The point is that after 19. \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{d8} \) 20.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e8} \), White cannot attack the a6-pawn 21.\( \text{a7}?, \) since Black will counter this with 21...\( \text{xc3} \) 22.\( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{d1+} \) 23.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h3}+= \)

12...\( \text{d5} \)

Naturally, before playing \( \text{f5}, \) Black must prevent e2-e4.

13.\( \text{xb6} \)

This is an energetic move. White is not afraid of the appearance of the enemy bishop on f5, but unfortunately for him the arising complications still maintain the position within approximate equality.

13...\( \text{f5} \) 14.e4 dxe4

White sacrifices a pawn and covers temporarily the diagonal of the enemy bishop. 15.\( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{exf3} \) 16.\( \text{xb8} \) \( \text{xb8} \) 17.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{fg2} \) 18.\( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{xb1} \) 19.\( \text{xb1} \) \( \text{b7} \) 20.\( \text{c3} \) e6 21.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c8} \) Sogin – Cantelli, ICCF 2010.

E) 8.e4

This occupation of the centre is not so popular as the move 8.
h3, which will be analysed in the next chapter, since it allows Black to play \( \text{g}4 \).

8...\( \text{g}4 \) 9.\( \text{e}3 \)

Following 9.h3 \( \text{x}3 \) 10.\( \text{x}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 11.d5 (11.\( \text{e}3 \) c5 – see 9.\( \text{e}3 \)) 11...\( \text{d}4 \) 12.\( \text{g}2 \) c5 13.dxc6, Mathiona – Adler, Germany 2013, 13...\( \text{xc}6 \)!!?, Black’s pressure on the dark squares compensates White’s two-bishop advantage.

9...\( \text{d}7 \)

10.\( \text{d}2 \)

White can increase the protection of his d4-pawn, but this does not provide him with an advantage either. 10.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{a}5 \). Black is preparing c7-c5.

11.\( \text{c}1 \) c5 12.b3 (12.h3 \( \text{x}3 \) 13.\( \text{x}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 14.d5 Dautov – Schoene, Germany 2009, 14...\( \text{ce}5 \)!!? 15.\( \text{g}2 \) b5 16.cxb5 axb5= White has failed to hold on to the c4-square and Black’s chances are not worse at all.) 12...\( \text{c}6 \) 13.d5. It may seem White has achieved a lot. He controls the key d4-square and ousts the enemy knight, but Black enters advantageous tactical complications. 13...\( \text{b}4 \) 14.a3 \( \text{d}3 \) This is a temporary piece-sacrifice. 15.\( \text{x}3 \) \( \text{x}3 \) 16.\( \text{x}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \)!!? This is the point. Black regains the material. 17.\( \text{c}2 \) (17.\( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{x}3 \) + 18.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \)= Tadic – Popovic, Jahorina 2012) 17...\( \text{x}3 \) + 18.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 19.f4 \( \text{d}7 \) 20.\( \text{d}2 \) b5 21.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 22.\( \text{x}3 \), Ozturk – Umudova, Ankara 2010, 22...\( \text{b}8 \)= – The exchanges of the minor pieces are in favour of Black, because now, White’s space advantage is not dangerous for Black. In addition, after the trade on c4, he has counterplay on the b-file.

Black should not be afraid of 11.\( \text{d}2 \) c5 12.f3 cxd4 13.\( \text{xd}4 \) e5. He wishes to oust the enemy knight away from the centre in order to be able later to play \( \text{e}6 \). 14.\( \text{c}6 \) (14.\( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 15.b3 \( \text{c}6 \)= Black has the possibility to organise counterplay with f7-f5 and \( \text{d}4 \) and this compensates the weakness of his d6-pawn, Mikhalchishin – Manik, Leipzig 2002) 14...\( \text{xc}6 \) 15.fg4 b5 16.\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \)= Heilala – Yloenen, ICCF 2012.
Following 10.h3, Black may forget about the plan with c6-c5 and choose instead e7-e5 and \( \text{d}4. \) 10...\( \text{xf3} \) 11.\( \text{xf3} \) e5 12.d5 \( \text{d}4 \) 13.\( \text{g}2 \) c5. His knight in the centre has two pawns – c and e to support it reliably in the centre of the board. 14.dxc6. White begins a fight against the enemy knight. 14...\( \text{bxc}6 \) 15.b4 (15.f4 \( \text{b}8 \) 16.\( \text{d}2 \) f5∞ Becking – Klein, Dudweiler 1996). Naturally, Black cannot support later his knight with the move c6-c5, because this will present White’s knight with the d5-square. 15...\( \text{c}7 \) 16.b1 a5 17.b5 cxb5 18.\( \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{xc}4 \) 19.\( \text{xd}4 \). White has managed to get rid of the enemy knight, but the position is simplified rapidly. 19...exd4 20.\( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 21.\( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) 22.f4 \( \text{ab}8 \) 23.e5 \( \text{fd}8 \) 24.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 25.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xb}1 \) 26.\( \text{xb}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 27.\( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{xb}6 \) 28.\( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{d}1+ \) 29.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{xf}1 \) + 30.\( \text{xf}1 \) a4= – The presence of bishops of opposite colours on the board precludes Black from utilising the power of his outside passed pawn, Valderrama – Bubir, 2007.

10...\( \text{a}5 \) 11.b3 \( \text{c}5 \)

12.\( \text{ac}1 \)

12.\( \text{ab}1 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 13.\( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 14.\( \text{e}2 \), Tunik – Motylev, Samara 2000. Here, Black has a plan, connected with the deployment of his knight to the key d4-square. 14...cxd4!? 15.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 16.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{de}5 \) 17.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 18.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 19.\( \text{e}3 \) e5∞, followed by \( \text{d}4 \) and White’s “bad” bishop may become a cause for great worries for Black.

Here, Black could have fought for the d4-square with: 13...\( \text{xf}3 \)!? 14.\( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 15.\( \text{xd}4 \) cxd4 16.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{de}5 \) 17.\( \text{g}2 \) (This is more precise than 17.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 18.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 19.\( \text{e}3 \) e5?) 17...\( \text{xd}4 \) 18.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 19.\( \text{e}3 \) e5 20.h4 \( \text{d}4 \) – White has some counterplay on the h-file and this may be sufficient for him to maintain the equality, but not more than that.
The idea of this move is that White prevents the pawn-advance b7-b5 and if Black pushes e7-e5, then White will enter an endgame. Still, this plan cannot provide him with an advantage in the opening.

8...e5 9.dxe5

It seems less consistent for White to choose here 9.d5, because Black can win a tempo after the transfer of his knight to the c5-square thanks to the placement of White’s queen on d3. 9...@b4 10.@@d2 (10.@@d1 a5 11.e4 @a6 12.@e2 – see 10.@@d2) 10...a5 11.e4 @a6 12.@e2 @c5 13.@c2. White is preparing the development of his bishop to e3. 13...c6 14.@e3 cxd5 15.@xc5 dxc5 16.@xd5 a4 17. @c3 @a5 18.@e1 @e8∞ De Oliveira – Papenin, ICCF 2010. Black’s two-bishop advantage compensates the vulnerability of the d5-square. If he succeeds in transferring his knight to d4 (@e8-c7-e6-d4), then he will maintain an advantage.

9...dxe5 10.@@xd8 @xd8 11. @g5

It may seem that White can obtain at least a slight edge thanks to his more active pieces, but his initiative gradually evaporates.

11...@e8

12.@fd1

12.h3 @e6 13.@d2 @d7= Melkumyan – Korobov, Konya 2015.

12.@ad1. This move seems less precise than 12.@fd1, because in the closed openings White’s rooks are usually deployed on d1 and c1. 12...h6 13.@e3 @e6 14.b3 @ad8 15.@xd8 (Following 15.@d2, Black has a very good plan, connected with the preparation of f7-f5, e5-e4 and White must play very accurately not to end up in an inferior position. 15...@d7 16.@db1 f5 17.@d5 @c8 18.@d2 e4 19.@f4 @f8 20.h4 @f7 21.@fd1 @e6= Soberano – Petrolo, ICCF 2010) 15...@xd8 16.@d1 @xd1+ 17.@xd1. After the exchange of the rooks, neither side can rely on obtaining an ad-
vantage. 17...\(\text{\texttt{d}7}\) 18.\(\text{\texttt{e}1}\) \(\text{\texttt{d}8}\) 19.\(\text{\texttt{d}2}\) \(\text{\texttt{f}6}\) 20.\(\text{\texttt{d}3}\) \(c6\) 21.\(\text{\texttt{f}1}\) \(\text{\texttt{f}8}\) 22.\(e3\) \(\text{\texttt{f}7}\)= – Black’s prospects are not worse, Novak – Telepnev, ICCF 2014.

After the straightforward move 12.\(\text{\texttt{d}5}\), numerous pieces are exchanged and the position is totally simplified. 12...\(\text{\texttt{x}d5}\) 13. \(\text{\texttt{cxd}5}\) \(\text{\texttt{b}4}\) 14.e4 \(c6\) 15.a3 \(\text{\texttt{d}3}\) 16.\(\text{\texttt{d}x}c6\) \(bxc6\). White cannot exploit the weakness of the enemy \(c6\)-pawn. 17.b4 \(c5\) 18.\(\text{\texttt{f}d}1\). This is a double-edged move. White allows the enemy pawn to the \(c4\)-square and there it may become very strong at any moment, instead of being a weakness. 18...\(c4\) 19.\(\text{\texttt{e}1}\) \(\text{\texttt{b}2}\) 20.\(\text{\texttt{d}c}1\) \(\text{\texttt{e}6}\) 21.\(\text{\texttt{f}1}\) \(\text{\texttt{f}6}\) 22.\(\text{\texttt{e}3}\) \(\text{\texttt{e}c}8\) 23.\(\text{\texttt{c}5}\) \(\text{\texttt{f}8}\) 24.\(\text{\texttt{c}2}\) \(\text{\texttt{x}c}5\) 25.\(\text{\texttt{b}x}c5\) \(c3\) 26.\(\text{\texttt{x}c}3\) \(\text{\texttt{a}4}\)= – After Black has regained his \(c5\)-pawn, it is only he who can play for a win, because White’s bishop on \(f1\) may turn out to be bad, since his central \(e4\)-pawn is deployed on a square with the same colour, Gromark – Zemlyanov, ICCF 2011.

12.\(\text{\texttt{d}2}\). This is a flexible move. From here, the knight may go to \(b3\), to \(e4\) and even to the \(c4\)-square after the preliminary move \(c4\)-\(c5\). 12...\(\text{\texttt{d}4}\) 13.\(\text{\texttt{f}d}1\) \(13.\text{c5}, \text{Meier – Mareco, Buenos Aires 2011, 13...\texttt{b}5!=} \) 13...\(\text{\texttt{b}8}\). Black protects his \(b7\)-pawn and prepares the development of his bishop \(c8\). 14.\(\text{\texttt{a}c}1\) (after 14.\(\text{\texttt{b}3}\), Teterev – Nakar, Eilat 2012, the simplest road to equality for Black would be the line: 14...\(h\)6!? 15.\(\text{\texttt{e}3}\) \(\text{\texttt{c}2}\) 16.\(\text{\texttt{a}7}\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}1}\) 17.\(\text{\texttt{xb}8}\) \(\text{\texttt{xb}3}\) 18.\(\text{\texttt{axb}3}\) \(c6\)=) 14...\(\text{\texttt{e}6}\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{x}f}6\) \(\text{\texttt{x}f}6\) 16.c5. White has some queenside initiative indeed, but you should have in mind that Black has a bishop-pair. 16...\(\text{\texttt{g}7}\) 17.b4 \(\text{\texttt{d}4}\) 18.e3 \(\text{\texttt{c}6}\) 19.\(\text{\texttt{d}5}\) \(\text{\texttt{d}8}\) 20.\(\text{\texttt{c}4}\) \(\text{\texttt{e}6}\) 21.\(\text{\texttt{d}2}\) \(f5\)= Woodard – Belleggotti, ICCF 2014. White’s pieces are more active, but you should not ignore the famous sentence of Z.Tarrasch “Future belongs to the player with the bishops...”.

12...\(h\)6

13.\(\text{\texttt{xf}6}\)

After this move Black obtains the two-bishop advantage which is particularly valuable in the endgame.

Still, even after 13.\(\text{\texttt{e}3}\), Black has a good position. 13...\(\text{\texttt{e}6}\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{d}2}\) \(\text{\texttt{d}4}\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{ac}1}\) \(c6\)= Lovik – Talga, Vila Nova de Gaia 2010.

13...\(\text{\texttt{xf}6}\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{d}2}\)
The character of the fight remains the same following 14.\( \text{d}d5 \text{d}d8 15.\text{c}c5 \text{g}g7 16.\text{d}d2 \text{e}e6 \)\( \text{Hoff} \text{mann} – \text{Talla, Vila Nova de Gaia 2010.} \)

**14...\text{g}g7**

This is a useful move for Black. He takes the important f6-square under control to deprive his opponent of the possibility to play later \( \text{e}4(d5)-f6. \)

**15.a3**

15.\( \text{d}d5 \text{d}d8 16.\text{c}c5 \text{g}g4 17.\text{f}f3 \)\( (17.\text{f}f1 \text{d}d4= \text{Donchenko} – \text{Feller, Montpellier 2015}) 17...\text{e}6 18.\text{c}c4 \text{h}5 19.\text{d}d3 \text{b}b8 20.\text{d}d5 \text{d}4 21.\text{c}cxe6 \text{xe}6 22.\text{f}f1 \text{e}7= \)

White has coped with his opponent’s two-bishop advantage, but Black has consolidated his position and can be very optimistic about his future, Sharpe – Schmidt, ICCF 2011.

He should not be afraid of the eventual penetration of White’s knights to central positions, because Black will gradually oust them from there and later he may not only equalise, but even seize the initiative. 15.\( \text{d}e4 \text{e}7 16.\text{f}f5 \text{d}d8 17.\text{c}c5. \)White’s knights are beautifully placed indeed, but this is just temporary. 17...\( \text{d}d4 18.\text{c}c3 \)\( \)\( \text{(It would be possibly better for White to play here 18.e3, Sharafiev – Belyakov, Kazan 2013 18...\text{e}6!? = and at least he would not be worse.) 18...\text{e}6 19.e3 \text{e}6 20.\text{d}d5 \text{c}c7 21.\text{d}d2 \text{d}d8 22.\text{d}d1 \text{e}xd2 23.\text{d}d2 \text{b}8 24.b4 \text{d}d8 25.\text{c}c5 \text{f}5. \)With the advance of his e and f-pawns, Black diminishes the sphere of action of his opponent’s bishop on g2. 26.\( \text{f}f1 \text{e}4 27.\text{g}2 \text{f}7 28.\text{h}3 \text{e}7 29.\text{b}3 \text{d}7 30.\text{d}d4 \text{e}5 31.\text{a}4 \text{b}6+ \)Evans – Polezhaev, ICCF 2012. Black has gradually restricted his opponent’s minor pieces. He has an advantage in this endgame thanks to his two bishops and extra space in the centre and on the kingside.

**15.h5**

White will have the possibility to trade the bishop on c6 and to
disrupt his opponent’s queenside pawn-structure, so Black prepares in advance counterplay on the opposite side of the board. He wishes to open the h-file and to exploit the compromised position of White’s king.

16.b4
The move h2-h4 would have weakened the g4-square.

16...h4

17.\textit{xc6}

The position would be a bit calmer after 17.ac1 hxg3 18.hxg3 \textit{g4} 19.f1 h8 20.de4 e7 21.d5 d8 22.e3 c8 23.c5 f5 and there would have arisen again a typical position for this endgame in which White’s pieces would be more actively placed, but Black’s hopes would be connected with his two powerful bishops, Woodard – Zylla, ICCF 2013.

17...bxc6 18.ce4 e7 19.\textit{b3} hxg3 20.hxg3 e6 21.a5.

It may seem that White has achieved a lot. He has compromised his opponent’s pawn-structure and his knight are very active. Still, Black has his chances of maintaining the balance. 21...c5 22.xc5 xc5 23.bxc5 h8 24.g2 e4 25.h1 a8 26.xh8 xh8 27.ec1 h3+. Groth – Chumanov, ICCF 2014. After 28.g1 b8 29.cc6 b3= White’s extra doubled pawn is not sufficient for him to obtain the advantage, because Black’s rook is very active.
Chapter 3

1. d4 d6 2. c4 g6 3. g3 g7 4. g2 0–0
5. c3 d6 6. f3 c6 7. 0–0 a6 8. b3

White prepares the fianchetto of his second bishop. His last move may seem to be solid, but has the defect that it does not prevent in any way Black’s plan connected with the pawn-advance b7-b5.

8... b8 9. b2

9. h3 b5 – see Chapter 4.

9. d5 a5 – see Chapter 5.

After 9. d5 xd5 10. cxd5 b4, White fails to exploit the somewhat exposed position of Black’s knight on b4. 11. e4. White is threatening to win this knight with the move a3. (Black’s task would be much simpler after

11. e1 c6 12. xc6 xc6 13. b2 b6. There arise numerous exchanges of minor pieces following 14. d3 xd4 15. xd4 xd4 16. xb4 xb4 17. xc6 h3 18. g2 xg2 19. xg2 fc8= and Black’s prospects are not worse in this endgame with major pieces, Landgren – Krupenski, Hallsberg 2000.) 11... a5!? This move is forced but is not bad at all. 12. a3 a6 13. e5 (13. g5 c6 14. xc6 bxc6= Flores – Meier, Buenos Aires 2011) 13... e6. Black undermines the enemy centre and wishes to remove White’s pawn from the d4-square in order to bring back his knight into the actions with c5. White is preventing this in all possible ways. 14. g5 f6 15. exf6 xf6 16. h6 e8. This is an interesting idea. White sacrifices a pawn hoping to make use of the slightly compromised shelter of the enemy king and also to exploit the circumstance that Black will need to lose several tempi in order to bring his knight on a6 back into the actions. Still, all this proves to be insufficient for White to obtain an advantage.
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17.\( \text{d2 exd5} \) 18.\( \text{a1} \text{xe1} \) 19.\( \text{xe1} \) c6 20.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 21.\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 22.\( g4 \) \( \text{xd7} \) 23.\( h4 \) \( \text{b5} \) 24.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c3} \). Black's knight is coming to help. 25.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h8} \) 26.\( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{g4} \) 27.\( \text{f4} \). White's initiative may seem threatening, but Black can transfer into an equal endgame after a precise play. 27...\( \text{xf3} \) 28.\( \text{e7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 29.\( \text{xb8}+ \) \( \text{f7} \) 30.\( \text{fxe7} \) \( \text{e2} \). Whaley – Ingersol, ICCF 2014.

White's attempt to prevent b7-b5 with 9.a4 leads to the considerable weakening of the b4-square and Black can exploit this immediately with the move 9...a5.

Black has no problems after 10.\( \text{a3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 11.\( \text{d2} \), Appel – Fruebing, Germany 2009, 11...\( \text{c6} \)?

Following the too active move 10.e4, White even fails to equalise. 10...\( \text{g4} \) 11.\( \text{e3} \) e5 12.d5 \( \text{d4} \). Black's knight is very powerful in the centre. Its exchange 13.\( \text{xd4} \) exd4 14.\( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xc3} \) leads to a position in which Black has two powerful bishops, while the dark squares in White's position are vulnerable, Zita – Filip, Bratislava 1957.

9.e3 b5

Following 10.\( \text{d2} \), Black can cause some disharmony in the set-up of White's pieces with 10...\( \text{g4} \). 11.f3 White covers the diago-
3.g3 g7 4.g2 0-0 5.d3 c6 6.d3 f3 0-0 7.d6 a6 8.b3 

...white can offer the exchange of the bishops with 11...xf3, but this cannot cause any problems for Black. 11...xf3 12.xf3 d7= Makarov – Heinatz, Budapest 1996) 11...d7 12.e2 e5 13.d5 e7 14.e4 c6 15.b2 h5 16.f2 h4!? 17.gxh4 h5= Orolin – Mulder, ICCF 2014. Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative on the kingside. His play would be much easier from the practical point of view, because his plans include an attack against the enemy king and this is always unpleasant for the defending side.

10.e2 bxc4

After 11.bxc4, White will hardly manage to exploit the vulnerability of Black’s pawns on a6 and c7. 11...e5 12.d5 (White cannot create any problems for his opponent with the line: 12.dxe5 g4 13.b1 xb1 14.gxe5 15. dxe5= – The position has been simplified a bit and White may have difficulties with the protection of his c4-pawn, Hoffmann – Hernandez Fernandez, ICCF 2012.) 12.e4. Black opens the diagonal for his bishop on g7. 13.dxc6 exf3 14.xf3, Cvitan – Al Modiahki, Biel 2002, 14...e4 15.xe4 xc3 16.b1 xb1 17.exb1 d3 18.d1 e8 19.f3 h5= – The tactical complications have ended and the position has remained very complicated. Black’s bishops are active and White is likely to fail to hold on to his extra c6-pawn.

11.xc4 b4 12.e2 (12.d1 a5 13.e2 – see 12.e2; 12.a3 e6 13.e2 b5 14.xd5 xxd5 15. d2 xg2 16.xg2 e8=, followed by b7, f8, c7-c5 and Black obtains a very good position, Sapis – B.Socko, Glogow 2001) 12...a5. He changes the route of his bishop and develops it to the a6-f1 diagonal. 13.d1 a6 14.d2 c5 15.a3 (After 15.b2 c7 16.e1 cxd4 17.exd4 f8=, Black’s pieces are actively deployed and the vulnerability of White’s isolated d4-pawn may tell in the future, Noriega de la Sierra – Bennborn, ICCF 2013.) 15...c7 16.ac1 (16.e1 cxd4 17.exd4, Tkachiev – Paragua, Bastia 2003, 17...f8=) Now, White must be constantly on the alert about the possible penetration of Black’s knight to the d3-square. If he solves radically this problem with the move e1, then his knight would be passive at the edge of the board. 16...f8 Zoler – B. Socko, Biel 2007.
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9...b5 10.cxb5

About 10.d5 Ʌa5 – see Chapter 5.

Following 10.Ʌe1 Ʌa5, White cannot avoid the exchange on b5 anyway. 11.cxb5 axb5 12.Ʌd3. He prevents the pawn-advance c7-c5. (It seems less precise here for White to opt for 12.Ʌc1 c5 13.dxc5 dxc5= Tatenhorst – Groselj, Bled 1997.) 12...Ʌb7 13.e4, Godes – Gruenfeld, Jerusalem 1996. Now, Black should follow a plan, connected with the preparation of c7-c5: 13...Ʌd7!? 14.Ʌe2 c5 15.dxc5 Ʌxb2 16.Ʌxb2 dxc5=

10...axb5

After the exchange of the a-pawn for the c-pawn, Black has nothing to be afraid of, since his prospects are not worse at all. The point is that White must be on the alert about the possible pawn-advance b5-b4, because after that one of Black’s pawns will hold two of White’s pawns.

Now, White has a choice be-
tween the ambitious move A) 11.d5 and the more prudent B) 11.Ʌc1.

The move 11.Ʌc2 has the drawback that Black can free the way forward of his c-pawn with tempo. 11...Ʌb4 12.Ʌd2 (There arises a complicated strategical fight after 12.Ʌc1 Ʌa6!? 13.Ʌd2 Ʌd7 14.Ʌd4 Ʌh5 15.e3 c6∞ Black’s knights are at the edge of the board indeed, but his chances are not worse, because his c-pawn is more important in the middle game than White’s rook pawn on a2.) 12...c5 After this move Black has no problems whatsoever. 13.Ʌfd1 Ʌb6 14.Ʌa1 c4± Konovalov – Saitov, Moscow 2010.

It seems a bit passive for White to opt for 11.Ʌe1 Ʌd7 12.Ʌc1 e6 13.e3 (The position is simplified considerably after 13.Ʌxb5 Ʌxb5 14.Ʌxc6 Ʌxc6 15.Ʌxc6 Ʌa8 16.Ʌc7 Ʌxa2 17.Ʌd3 Ʌxb3= Modr – Kupka, Czech Republic 1990.) 13...b4 14.Ʌb1, Navrotescu – S.Atalik, Romania 1993, 14...Ʌd5!?∞ – The pawn-advance e3-e4 leads to the weakening of the important d4-square. If White refrains from it, he may have difficulties with the protection of his a2-pawn after Ʌa8 and Ʌc8-a6.

A) 11.d5

White prepares Ʌd4, hoping to exploit the vulnerability of the c6-square.
11...\(\triangle a5\)

[Diagram]

12.\(\triangle d4\)

12.\(\triangle d3\), Simagin – Bronstein, Moscow 1956, 12...\(\triangle f5\)??

After 12.\(\triangledown d2\) b4 13.\(\triangle d1\) c5, Black seizes the initiative. 14.\(\triangle xc6\) \(\triangle xc6\) 15.\(\triangle e1\), Kavalek – Adorjan, Amsterdam 1977, 15...d5??

The move 12.\(\triangle e1\) seems a bit slow. 12.c5 13.\(\triangle xc6\) \(\triangle xc6\) 14.\(\triangle d4\) \(\triangle xd4\) 15.\(\triangledown xd4\), Haas – Vallifuoco, Bern 1979, 15...\(\triangle g4\)!? 16.\(\triangledown d2\) \(\triangledown b6\) 17.e3 \(\triangle b7=\) Black’s pieces are very active and he has no problems at all.

12.\(\triangle c1\) b4 13.\(\triangle a4\). There has arisen a very complicated position. White exerts pressure against the \(c7\)-pawn, but his knights are misplaced at the edge of the board. 13...\(\triangle d7\) 14.\(\triangle d4\) e6 15.\(\triangle xe6\) fxe6 16.\(\triangle c6\) \(\triangle xc6\) 17.\(\triangle xc6\) e5 18. \(\triangle g2\) \(\triangle b5=\) Morley – Terreaux, ICCF 2012. Black has coped with his opponent’s positional pressure and White must be careful to bring back his knight, isolated at the edge of the board, to the focus of the actions.

It may be interesting for White to try here 12.a3. He prevents b5-b4. 12...e6. Black should better get rid immediately of his opponent’s cramping pawn. 13.\(\triangle d4\) exd5 14.\(\triangle xd5\) \(\triangle xd5=\) Exchanging pieces is the simplest road to equality for Black. 15.\(\triangledown xd5\) \(\triangle b7\) 16.\(\triangle xb7\) \(\triangledown xb7=\) His prospects may be even better in the future, because if White does not play precisely, Black may advance quickly his queenside pawns (c5-c4) and create a passed pawn there.

12...b4 13.\(\triangle a4\)

This move is practically forced, since the other retreats of this knight are less adequate.

The retreat 13.\(\triangle b1\) has the defect, in comparison to \(\triangle a4\), that the knight would not cover the a2-pawn from the attack of Black’s rook. 13...\(\triangle b7\) 14.e4 c5 15.\(\triangle xc6\) \(\triangle xc6\) \(\triangle xc6\) 17.\(\triangle d2\), Shamkovich – Sigurjonsson, Lone Pine 1981, 17...\(\triangle a8=\)

13.\(\triangle cb5\)

[Diagram]
Now, Black has a very pleasant choice.

13...\( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} 5 \) 14.\( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{d} 5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{b} 5 \) 15.\( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{b} 5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x} \text{b} 2 \) 16.\( \text{R} \text{b} 1 \) \( \text{g} 7 \). He has more than sufficient compensation for the exchange. 17.a3 c6 18.\( \text{a} \text{x} \text{b} 4 \) cxd5 19.\( \text{b} \text{x} \text{a} 5 \) \( \text{W} \text{x} \text{a} 5 \) 20.\( \text{c} \text{d} 4 \) \( \text{W} \text{b} 6 \). Black's powerful bishops and his pawn, as well as the possibility for him to advance his central pawns and to attack the enemy king on the light squares make his position clearly preferable, Hoang Canh – Shanava, Vietnam 2012.

13...e5!? This move is even stronger for Black. 14.\( \text{c} \text{c} 2 \) After 14.\( \text{c} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{c} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 15.\( \text{d} \text{e} 6 \) \( \text{e} \text{x} \text{e} 6 \) 16.\( \text{d} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{d} \text{d} 7 \) 17.\( \text{c} \text{c} 1 \) – see 12.\( \text{c} \text{c} 1 \) 15...c5 16.\( \text{e} \text{f} 3 \) \( \text{w} \text{e} 7 \). Black’s prospects are preferable, since he has managed to get rid of his backward pawn on the c-file (having advanced c7-c5), while White’s knight on a4 is misplaced. 17.\( \text{d} \text{d} 2 \) \( \text{d} 7 \) 18.\( \text{e} 4 \) e5 19.\( \text{c} \text{c} 4 \) \( \text{c} \text{x} \text{c} 4 \) 20.\( \text{c} \text{x} \text{c} 4 \) \( \text{b} 5 \) 21.\( \text{c} \text{c} 2 \) \( \text{x} \text{f} 1 \) 22.\( \text{x} \text{f} 1 \) \( \text{e} 8 \). Black’s powerful bishop for the enemy knight, placed at the edge of the board. By doing this however, he will compromise White’s queenside pawn-structure and after the removal of his pawn from b3, Black’s knight will gain access to the wonderful c4-square.

Black forces his opponent to clarify his intentions. White must either exchange on e6, or retreat his knight from the centre.

14.\( \text{c} \text{c} 2 \) After 14.\( \text{c} \text{c} 6 \) \( \text{c} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \) 15.\( \text{d} \text{x} \text{c} 6 \), Teske – Roos, Muehlhausen 2003, the c-file will be closed and White will not have the possibility to exert pressure against the c7-pawn. Black’s kingside attack after 15...h5?!†, followed by h4, may become very powerful.

14...\( \text{d} 7 \) Black prepares the exchange of his powerful bishop for the enemy knight, placed at the edge of the board. By doing this however, he will compromise White’s queenside pawn-structure and after the removal of his pawn from b3, Black’s knight will gain access to the wonderful c4-square.

15.\( \text{e} 1 \) It would not be good for White to opt for 15.\( \text{e} 3 \), because after that Black can patiently improve
his position with 15...h5!? 16.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{h}6 Chiu – Chow, Sioux Falls 2001.

After 15.\texttt{c}1, Radjabov – Stryjek, Oropesa del Mar 1999, 15... \texttt{e}8!? , the trade of the b-pawns is very likely in the nearest future and the position would be considerably simplified. 16.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{xa}4 17. \texttt{bxa}4 \texttt{xa}4 18.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{c}4 19.\texttt{x}b4 \texttt{xd}1 20.\texttt{fxd}1 \texttt{xd}2 21. \texttt{e}d2 \texttt{e}4 22.\texttt{d}4 \texttt{fe}8= – The prospects of both sides are approximately equal in this endgame after the simplifications.

12.\texttt{a}4
He should not worry about the fate of his a2-pawn now, but his knight, misplaced at the edge of the board, becomes a juicy target for the enemy bishop.

After 12.\texttt{b}1, White might have problems with the protection of his a2-pawn. 12...\texttt{a}7

Following 13.\texttt{bd}2 \texttt{b}5 14.e4, Lin – Mestel, Luzern 1985, 14... \texttt{a}8!? , Black exerts powerful pressure against the weak enemy pawn.

After 13.\texttt{c}2, he can sacrifice a pawn, obtaining an excellent position. 13...\texttt{f}5!? 14.\texttt{xc}7 \texttt{xc}7 15.\texttt{xc}7 \texttt{b}5 16.\texttt{c}4 \texttt{a}8 17.\texttt{h}4 (17.\texttt{xb}4 \texttt{xa}2 18.\texttt{xb}5 \texttt{xb}2 19. \texttt{bd}2, Van der Put – Schoorl,
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Netherlands 2016, 19...h5

White has an extra pawn, but his defence is difficult. Black’s pieces are very active and he is threatening to double his rooks on the penultimate rank.)

17...e4 18...xe4 dxe4 19.d5 dxe3. He regains his pawn thanks to this simple tactical strike. 20. hxg3 xgb2 21...xb4 d4 22.e3 xe2+ 23...xg2 xxa2= Black has restored the material balance and has a superior pawn-structure. His pieces are active, so he creates serious problems for his opponent. In addition, White has no counterplay and he can only dream for a draw in this endgame.

13...e4. White prepares the transfer of his knight to d3, followed by c4, in order to exert pressure against the b4-pawn. Still, this plan seems a bit slow. 13...b7 14...b7 c4 15.d5 d7. Black transfers his king’s rook to the queenside in order to protect his b4-pawn. 16.c4 (After 16.e3 e6 17...f3 d5 18.e4 d7 19.c4, Black can seize the initiative with the line: 19...f5! 20...xb4 cxb4 21...xb4 c5 22.d3 cxd4= Price – Montgomery, ICCF 2012) 16...c8 17.c1, Romanishin – Erdogdu, Lvov 2006, 17...c6?! ± White must play very carefully now, since if Black manages to protect his b4 once again (c6, or d5) and then to play a6, the vulnerability of the a2-pawn may hurt White.

12...d7!?

13...e6 14.e3
3.g3 g7 4.g2 0-0 5.c3 d6 6.f3 c6 7.0-0 a6 8.b3 b8

14...d5. Black’s knight will be very powerful on this square and White’s attempt to oust it away from the centre with the move 15.e4 would lead to the weakening of the important d4-square. 15...f6 16.e1, Weizsaecker – Joao, ICCF 2012, 16...a5!? 17.d3 (17.xc7?! b5/) 17...xa4 18.bxa4 c6 19.e5 d5∞ Black’s superior pawn-structure provides him with at least equal prospects.
This is a reliable prophylactic move. White prevents the penetration of the enemy minor pieces to the g4-square, so that later he should not be afraid of the pin of his knight (after e2-e4), or of the attack of the knight after e6.

8...\textit{g}b8

We will analyse now \textbf{A)} 9.\textit{e}3 and \textbf{B)} 9.e4.

9..\textit{a}e1 b5 10.cx\textit{b}5 axb5 11.e4 – see 9.e4.

9.b3. The combination of the moves h3 and b3 does not seem so adequate 9...b5 10.cx\textit{b}5 axb5 11.\textit{b}2 \textit{d}7 12.\textit{c}c1 \textit{w}c8= Husek – Pfeifer, Hungary 1995.

Following 9.g5, the simplest road to equality for Black would be 9...\textit{a}5!? 10.\textit{d}2 \textit{d}7 11.e3 b5. He attacks the c4-pawn and prepares c7-c5. 12.cx\textit{b}5 axb5 13.\textit{b}4 c5!= – Black’s prospects are not worse, Smejkal – Kabisch, Kirchheim 1990.

White would fail in his attempt to prevent b7-b5 with 9.\textit{w}c2, because Black would advance 9...b5 anyway and White would not be able to exploit the hanging position of Black’s knight on c6. 10.cx\textit{b}5 axb5

11.\textit{g}5 \textit{d}7 12.\textit{fc}1 b4 13.\textit{d}1, Weber – Pankratov, ICCF 2002, 13...e6!?= with a reliable position.

White cannot obtain an advantage by occupying the centre


The move 9.a4 weakens the b4-square. 9...a5 10.e4 e5 11.e3 (11.g5 exd4 12.xd4 cxd4 13.d4 h6 14.d2, Sehlstedt – Lemoine, Budapest 1959. Here, Black could have transferred his knight to c5. 14...d7!? 15.d3 c5 16.c2 c6∞, followed by b6. He has a very comfortable position. If White’s pawn had been on a3, the he would have the possibility to oust the enemy knight with the move b2-b4. The way it is – this plan is impossible.) 11...exd4 12.xd4, Sanchez – De Greif, Bogota 1969, 12...d7!? Black begins active actions on the dark squares. 13.d5 xd4 14.xd4 c5 15.a3 c6 16.xg7 xg7 17.f4 e8= This is a double edged position. White has a slight space advantage, but he may end up in an inferior endgame, because his pawns on e4, c4 and a4 are placed on squares of the same colour as his bishop and he will hardly manage to redeploy them on dark squares.

A) 9.e3

After White has played h3, his bishop will be stable on this square.

9...b5

10.d2

He protects the c4-pawn and opens the diagonal of his bishop.

White cannot obtain an advantage after an exchange on b5.

10.cxb5 axb5

He would be even worse after the careless move 11.d2, because Black can counter that with the energetic reaction 11...b4! 12.a4 (12.xc6 bxc3 13.bxc3 xh3 14.g2 xg2 15.xg2 d5+) 12...b7
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11...c1 b4 12.a4 b7 – White's knight is misplaced at the edge of the board, Glowinski – Gu­dok, Lechenicher SchachServer 2013.

11.d5. White ousts the enemy knight away from the centre. 11... a5 12.b4 (Unfortunately for White he cannot protect the d4-square with his knight, because of the insufficient defence of the d5-pawn. 12.d4 b4 13.cb5 b7) 12...c4 13.a7 b7 14.d4 e5. Black gets rid of the strong white d5-pawn. 15.dxe6 fxe6 16.g5!? d5 17.f3 c6 – The central c5 and e5-squares are a bit weak in Black’s position, but this is compensated by his powerful knight on c4.

10...d7 11.e1

Following 11.d5, it is only White who may have problems. 11...e5 12.cxb5 (12.c5, Gorbatov – Tseshkovsky, Cappelle la Grande 1994, 12...b4!? 13.a4 b5 – Black has not only ousted his opponent’s knight to the edge of the board, but has also activated his light-squared bishop.) 12... axb5 13.a1 (White should possibly think about equalising already: 13.a4!? c8 14.axb5 xb3=) 13...c8 14.h2, Loginov – Afek, Ajka 1992, 14...b4!? 15.cb1 e6 16.dxe6 xe6 – Black’s b4-pawn restricts severely White’s knight on b1, which will have problems entering the actions. In addition, his a2-pawn is hanging.

11.cxb5 axb5 12.de4 (12. c1? b4 13.a4 a5 14.b3 c8 15.h2 b5 16.f3 b8= Steph­son – Milov, Suncoast 1999. White’s knight is misplaced on a4. If he plays b2, then Black will manage to occupy the c3-square: f6-d5-c3.) 12...xe4 13. xe4 e5 14.dxe5 xe5 15.b3 e8= Black’s pieces are so active that he has no problems at all.

11...e6

Black prepares the e7-square for his knight.

12.b3

It is also possible for White to play immediately 12.d5 e7 13. dx6 (After 13.b3, Black seizes the initiative with 13...b4!? 14.c4 e4 15.cxe4 edx5 16.cxd5 xb5= Now, White suddenly has problems with the protection of his d5-pawn.) 13...e6 14.b3, Chetverik – Teterev, Wunsiedel 20012, 14... d7=

12.cxb5 axb5 13.de4 xe4 14.e4 e7. Black’s knight is perfectly placed here, since it can go later to f5, or to d5.
3...g3 4.g2 0-0 5.c3 d6 6.f3 c6 7.0-0 a6 8.h3 b8

It would not be good for White to choose 15.d3 d5 16.g5 f6 17.d2, Papin – Severiukhina, Voronezh 2010, 17...b4!?± and Black fixes the weakness on a2.

15.c2, Greenfeld – Milov, Haifa 1995, 15...d5!?∞

Following 15.c2 d5 16.g5 f6 17.d2 b4 18.g4, Black may exploit the weakening of White’s kingside with the move 18...f5± Bjuhr – Jakobetz, ICCF 2002.

15.d2 f5. Black begins a chase after the enemy dark-squared bishop. 16.g5 f6 17.f4 b4 18.g4 e7 19.g3 d5= – There has arisen a double-edged fight in which the vulnerability of White’s kingside might worry him later, Blattner – Terreaux, ICCF 2011.

12...e7
(diagram)

13.d5

It seems illogical for White to retreat his knight 13.f3 b4 14.h1, Savic – Zufic, Umag 2005, 14...c6!±?

Following 13.g5, it is only White who may have problems. 13...b4 14.a4 (14.cb1?! h6 15.xf6 xf6 16.e3 g7 17.c5 d5 18.f3 f6 19.e1 e5± and later Black’s two bishop advantage may turn into powerful force, Dubrov – Makarczuk, IECC 2000) 14...h6 15.xf6 xf6. Black’s bishop-pair is very strong and White must think about equality. 16.e3 g7 17.b2 (17.c2!? Adianto – Kengis, Sydney 1991, 17...e5∞ 17.c5 18.f3 c6 19.a4 w c7 20.dxc5 dxc5± – White’s knight on a4 is obviously misplaced, Nogueiras – Khalifman, Luzern 1997.

It seems unreliable for White to opt for 13.f4, because it weakens the g3-square. 13...f5 14.f2 h5 15.de4 (15.h2 xd4!?±) 15...b4 16.e3 bx3 17.g4 xd4!? 18 gxh5 f5 ± – Black may rely on exploiting the weakened position of the enemy monarch, Spassov – Kovalev, Porz 1990.

13...exd5 14.xd5 fxh5

Black must capture with this knight. He needs the other knight to chase the enemy bishop on e3.

15.cxd5 f5 16.xf4 g5 17.e4 gxf4

Black liquidates the important defender of the dark squares.
18. exf5 ∆xf5 19. ∆f3 ∆e5
20. gxf4, Novikov – A.Zhigalko, Peniscola 2002, 20...∆b2!? 21. ∆e1 ∆f6 22. ∆e4 ∆xe4 23. ∆xe4 ∆h8∞ – Black’s prospects are not worse, because his bishop looks much more active than its counterpart.

B) 9. e4

After this active move the position is double-edged. White wishes to advance e4-e5, while Black will be trying to push b7-b5-b4. According to the classical principles it may seem that playing in the centre should be more effective than the counterplay on the flank, but this is an exceptional case. Black’s prospects are at least equal. If White goes too far in his desire to obtain an advantage he may end up even worse.

9...b5 10. cxb5

Following 10. ∆e2, Black obtains quite sufficient counterplay to maintain the equality with 10...

13. ∆e3, P.Nielsen – Berg, Sweden 2016, 13...∆e8!?=

There arises a complicated position with mutual chances after 13. ∆f4 ∆d7 14. ∆e1 b3∞ Khismatullin – M.Krylov, Moscow 2012.

13. ∆g5 h6 14. ∆f4. White has more space indeed, but Black’s position has its pluses too. He can organise active counterplay with e7-e6, or b4-b3. 14... ∆d7 15. ∆e3 ∆b6 16. ∆c1 ∆h7 17. ∆f4 ∆c7 18. ∆e1 ∆e8. After White’s queen has been removed from the c2-square, he should not be afraid of b4-b3, since he can counter that with a2-a3. Therefore, Black goes after the pawn-advance e7-e6. 19. ∆d2 e6 20. ∆d3 exd5 21. exd5 ∆e5 22. ∆xe5 ∆xe5∞ – The trade of a couple of minor pieces has been in favour of Black, since his position was slightly cramped, Marez – Kappes, ICCF 2014.
White can also break immediately in the centre, without the preliminary exchange on b5. 10. e5 d7 11.e6 (11.cxb5 axb5 – see 10.cxb5) 11...fxe6 12.d5

He has sacrificed a pawn and wishes to exploit the vulnerability of the a2-g8 diagonal. Black can defend successfully, though... 12... a5 13.cxb5 axb5 14.d4 e5 15.b4. This move is too hazardous. Now, Black seizes the initiative. (It is more reliable here for White to continue with 15.dxe6 dxe6 16.dxe6, Huebner – Belotti, Switzerland 1998, 16...c6!?∞ and thanks to his pawn-majority in the centre Black’s prospects are not worse.) 15...c5! With this energetic strike he seizes the initiative. 16.dxc6 dxc6. Two of Black’s knights are hanging, but White cannot win a piece, because of the vulnerability of the a1-h8 diagonal. 17.e3 (17.xc6 xxd4 18.xxd4 xc6+ Ippolito – Izoria, Philadelphia 2013) 17...xb4 18.b1 xd4! This is a non-standard decision. Black exchanges his powerful bishop, but now he has the excellent c6-outpost for his knight. 19.xd4 bc6 20.b5

White presents the initiative to his opponent. 11.d5 b4! 12.e2 a5 13.d4 c5! 14.dxc6 e5 15.b3 xc6 16.g5, Hanel – Atalik, Kranevo 1996, 16...e6!± – Black’s pieces are more active and his pawns on b4 and e5 deprive the enemy knight on e2 of the c3 and f4-squares, from which it can be transferred to the strategically important d5-outpost.
It would not be too ambitious for White to opt for 11.\textit{W}c2 b4 12.\textit{Q}e2 \textit{b}b7 13.d5 \textit{Q}a5 14.\textit{Q}ed4, Calo tescu – Gara, Szatmarnemeti 1996. Here, Black could have solved the problem with the weak c6-square in a tactical fashion with the line: 14...c5! 15.dxc6 \textit{Q}c8 16.\textit{W}e2 \textit{Q}xc6=$

It would be a bit passive for White to choose 11.a3 b4 12.a xb4 \textit{Q}xb4. His game is quite free and compensates the weak b2-pawn indeed, but not more... 13.\textit{Q}e1 (13.\textit{W}e2 \textit{b}7 14.\textit{Q}d1 \textit{W}c8= Gonzalez – Williams, ICCF 2005) 13...\textit{Q}d7 14.\textit{Q}g5 \textit{h}6 15.\textit{Q}e3 c5 16.\textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}h7= Kaczorowski – Camper, IECC 1997.

White can try now the elastic move 11.\textit{Q}e1, concealing his further plans. Even then however, he cannot rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening. 11...e6

White would not achieve much with the straightforward approach 12.d5 \textit{Q}e7 13.dxe6 \textit{Q}xe6 14.\textit{Q}d4 \textit{Q}d7 15.\textit{Q}d5 c5 16.\textit{Q}xf6+ \textit{Q}xf6 17.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}e6= – Black's bishops exert powerful pressure against White's queenside, Arkell – Hebden, Kilkenny 2012.

Black should not be afraid of 12.\textit{Q}d2 b4 13.\textit{Q}a4 \textit{Q}d7= Gaprindashvili – Strautins, ICCF 2010.

12.\textit{W}c2 b4 13.\textit{Q}e2 \textit{b}7 14.\textit{Q}f4 \textit{Q}a5 15.\textit{Q}d2 c5. If Black manages in this variation to advance c7–c5, as a rule, he would have no problems in the opening. 16.dxc5 dxc5 17.\textit{Q}ad1 \textit{Q}d7 18.\textit{Q}d3 \textit{W}b6 19.\textit{Q}f4 \textit{Q}bc8= – His pieces are harmoniously deployed.

11...\textit{Q}d7

Black's plans include counterplay against White's pawns on e5 and d4.

12.\textit{Q}g5

12...dxe5!

This piece-sacrifice is Black's simplest road to equality.

13.\textit{Q}xc6 exd4 14.\textit{Q}xb5

If White refrains from capturing this pawn, Black's two central pawns would be sufficient compensation for the piece, since White's knights would hardly find suitable and reliable squares. 14.


3.g3 \( \text{g7} \) 4.\( \text{g2} \) 0-0 5.\( \text{c3} \) d6 6.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 7.0-0 a6 8.h3 \( \text{e}8 \)

\( \text{Qe2} \) h6 15.\( \text{Qf3} \) e5 16.\( \text{Qd2} \) (16.\( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{c5} \) Heim – Helmers, Reykjavik 1981) 16...\( \text{Qc5} \) 17.\( \text{Qg2} \) b4 18.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 19.\( \text{Qe1} \) d3 20.\( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) Raaijmaekers – Mroczek, ICCF 2010.

14...\( \text{Qb6} \)

After this move White’s queenside minor pieces would remain in disarray.

15.\( \text{Qa7} \)

He protects the bishop on c6, but this knight will hardly manage to survive unharmed from the a7-square.

If White restores the material balance, he would have no chances of maintaining even a small edge. 15.\( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 16.\( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \) 17.\( \text{Qe4} \) (17.\( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 18.\( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 19.\( \text{Qfe1} \) \( \text{Qd3} \) \text{=, followed by } \text{Qb7} \) Molina – Fier, Cappelle la Grande 2012. Black’s counterplay on the weakened h1-a8 diagonal compensates White’s passed pawn on the queenside.) 17...\( \text{Qb6} \) 18.\( \text{Qxd8} \) \( \text{Qxd8} \) \text{=} – In this endgame the prospects of both sides are approximately equal, Rawlings – Sutton, ICCF 2014.

15...\( \text{Qb8} \)

Black wishes to remove the enemy bishop from the a4-e8 diagonal and to continue after that with \( \text{Qd7} \), beginning a chase after the knight on a7 (\( \text{Qa6} \)).

16.\( \text{Qe4} \)

Following 16.\( \text{Qg2} \), Black can change his plan and choose 16...\( \text{Qb7} \) 17.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 18.\( \text{Qe1} \) c6. Now, White’s knight on a7 would be practically lost, since Black’s c6-pawn deprives it from the b5-square and the knight would have no other squares to retreat to. 19.\( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 20.\( \text{Qa4} \) h6 21.\( \text{Qxh6} \). White gives back the piece trying to deflect his opponent from trapping the knight (\( \text{Qb6} \)). Still, this would not solve his problem either. 21...\( \text{Qxh6} \) 22.\( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 23.\( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Qb6} \) 24.\( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \) 25.\( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qd5} \)\text{+}. The unfortunate knight finally perishes. 26.\( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \) 27.\( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \) 28.\( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qc2} \) 29.\( \text{b4} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 30.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Qdd2} \) 31.\( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qa2} \\text{-+} \) Deforel – Enricci, ICCF 2011. White has seemingly sufficient material equivalent for the bishop (three pawns), but his position is absolutely hopeless, because one of his rooks is stuck with the protection of the f2-pawn, while the other rook is incapable of defending his queenside pawns against the attack of his opponent’s superior forces.

16...\( \text{Qd7} \) 17.\( \text{h4} \) h6 18.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qa6} \)
White cannot save his knight, so he is trying his chances on the kingside.

19.\textit{\textbf{f4}}

He prepares an attack against the h6-pawn ($\textit{\textbf{c1}}$).

It seems less adequate for him to opt for 19.h5, because after 19...g5 20.$\textit{\textbf{c2}}$, the attack on the b1-h7 diagonal is not so dangerous for Black as it looks at first sight. 20...e5! 21.$\textit{\textbf{x}}$e5 $\textit{\textbf{x}}$e5 22.$\textit{\textbf{d3}}$ f5 23.\textit{\textbf{e1}} $\textit{\textbf{g7}}$ 24.$\textit{\textbf{b5}}$, Anhalt – Isigkeit, ICCF 2013, 24...$\textit{\textbf{h8}}$?! White has saved his knight on a7 indeed, but he had to give his other knight. In the arising complicated middle game the weakened shelter of his king (The removal of his bishop on g2 to the other side of the board is hurting him...) may turn into a very important factor.

19...$\textit{\textbf{xa7}}$ 20.$\textit{\textbf{c1}}$ $\textit{\textbf{g4}}$ 21.\textit{\textbf{e5}} $\textit{\textbf{e6}}$ 22.$\textit{\textbf{xh6}}$

22...$\textit{\textbf{d6}}$. Black ousts the enemy knight away from his king reducing considerably his opponent's attacking potential. (It would not work for him to play 22...$\textit{\textbf{xe5}}$, because of 23.$\textit{\textbf{xf8}}$, followed by the double attack $\textit{\textbf{c5}}$ and Black would suffer material losses.) 23.$\textit{\textbf{d3}}$ $\textit{\textbf{d7}}$ 24.$\textit{\textbf{h5}}$ c5! He sacrifices the g6-pawn and tries to seize the initiative. 25.\textit{\textbf{hxg6}} f5 26.$\textit{\textbf{f3}}$ c4 27.$\textit{\textbf{f4}}$ $\textit{\textbf{b6}}$ 28.$\textit{\textbf{e1}}$ $\textit{\textbf{e8}}$ 29.$\textit{\textbf{g2}}$ $\textit{\textbf{f6}}$ 30.$\textit{\textbf{e1}}$ $\textit{\textbf{c5}}$ 31.$\textit{\textbf{d2}}$ $\textit{\textbf{d3}}$ – Black’s prospects are not worse in this complicated position, because the activity of his pieces compensates with an interest his minimal material deficit, Shetko – Panitevsky, ICCF 2015.
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1.d4 2.f6 2.c4 g6 3.g3 g7 4.g2 0–0
5.c3 d6 6.f3 c6 7.0–0 a6 8.d5

It cannot be asserted this is the strongest move for White, but for sure it is his most principled in this position and forces Black’s knight to go to the edge of the board.

8...a5

Now, White must choose how to protect his c4-pawn. His most popular response is B) 9.d2, but before that we will deal with A) 9.b3.

White’s attempts to defend his pawn with the queen cannot create any problems for Black. 9.a4 c5 10.dxc6 xc6 11.d1 d7 12.c2. You can see now the defect of the move a4 – White must lose a tempo for the retreat of his queen. It is not so well placed on the c2-square either, since after 12...c8, the juxtaposition of his queen and the enemy rook will be rather unpleasant for White. 13.g5, Rausis – Zozulia, Bejaia 2015, 13...a5!? 14.b3 b5

9.d3 c5

It is bad for White to opt here for 10.b3, since following 10...f5, he cannot advance e2-e4, because of the defencelessness of the rook on a1. 11.e3 b5

After 10.b1, Black can save a tempo for the move b8. 10...b5= and it would be very risky for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice. 11.cxb5 axb5 12xb5?! f5 13.a1 c7 14.a4 fb8 – Black’s pieces have created pow-
erful pressure and White's extra pawn is not felt at all, Frowall – Eriksson, Sweden 1995.

Following 10.e4 $\texttt{b8}$ 11.$\texttt{b1}$ (11.$\texttt{e}1$ b5 12.e5 $\texttt{g}4+$ Skatchkov – Simonian, Yerevan 2004), Black has the energetic move 11...b5, seizing the initiative on the queenside. 12.cxb5 c4 13.$\texttt{c2}$ axb5 14.a3 $\texttt{b3}$ 15.$\texttt{f4}$ $\texttt{d}7$, followed by $\texttt{c}5$-$\texttt{d}3$, Morales – Tobar, Puerto Boyaca 2012.

10.$\texttt{d2}$ $\texttt{b8}$ 11.a4. White solves radically the problem with the enemy pawn-advance b7-b5, but weakens the b4-square. 11...e6. The move b7-b5 has become impossible, so Black is trying to open the position from the other side. 12.$\texttt{b1}$ exd5 13.$\texttt{xd5}$, Kekki – Matamoros Franco, Embalse 1981. Here, Black can equalise easily. 13...$\texttt{f5}$! 14.$\texttt{e}4$ $\texttt{xd}5$ 15.$\texttt{x}d5$ $\texttt{xc}4$ 16.$\texttt{xc}4$ d5 17.$\texttt{xc}5$ dxe4= – The position has been simplified considerably after the numerous exchanges.

A) 9.$\texttt{b3}$

White is not afraid of the weakening of the long diagonal. 9...$\texttt{b8}$

It does not work for Black to play here 9...$\texttt{xd}5$?!, because of 10.$\texttt{xd}5$ $\texttt{a}1$ 11.$\texttt{d}2$±. Now, two of his pieces are hanging. Naturally, Black can give his knight for a pawn and there would arise a position in which he would have a rook and two pawns for two mi-

nor pieces. This material ratio may be acceptable for him in an endgame, but in the middle game Black’s rooks can hardly become active, since there is no open file on the board. Therefore, White has the advantage.

10.$\texttt{d2}$

He defends his knight on c3, but now he will be incapable of protecting his c4-pawn with the move $\texttt{d}2$.

10.$\texttt{c}2$ c5 11.$\texttt{d}2$ – see 9.$\texttt{d}2$.

10.$\texttt{b}2$ b5 11.cxb5 axb5 – see Chapter 3, variation A.

Following 10.$\texttt{g}5$ h6 11.$\texttt{d}2$, there arises a position like in the main variation, but with the inclusion of the move h7-h6. This circumstance is not so important for the evaluation of the position. 11...c5 12.dxc6 (or 12.a4 e6 13. dxe6 $\texttt{xe}6$= and Black has no problems at all. After White's imprecise reaction 14.$\texttt{f4}$? $\texttt{h}5$, in the game Stohl – Kindermann, Germany 1996, Black seized the
initiative.) 12...\(\text{a}6\) 13.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 14.\(\text{h}4\), Somogyi – Rabovszky, Budapest 1998. Here, he could have advanced d7-d5, equalising completely. 14...\(\text{e}6\)?! 15.\(\text{d}5\) g5 16.\(\text{x}f6+\) exf6 17.\(\text{f}3\) d5 18.exd5 \(\text{xd}5=\), followed by f7-f5, opening the diagonal for his bishop on g7.

After 10.\(\text{d}4\) c5 11.dxc6, Black should better capture on c6 with his pawn and not with the knight, so that later he could play c6-c5 ousting his opponent’s knight from the centre. 11...bxc6 12.\(\text{d}2\) (12.\(\text{b}1\), Baramidze – Jones, Germany 2011, 12...c5?!=) 12...c5 13.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{b}7\) 14.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{x}g2\) 15.\(\text{x}g2\) \(\text{c}6=\) Kirov – Adorjan, Moscow 1977. In the future, if White removes his knight from the c3-square, Black will have the possibility to begin active actions on the queenside (a6-a5-a4). If White advances e2-e4, then Black can fight for the d4-square (\(\text{f}6\)-e8-c7-e6-d4).

10...c5

Unfortunately for White he will have to give up the centre; otherwise, Black will advance b7-b5 and White will be incapable of holding the c4-outpost.

He fails to exploit the defencelessness of the enemy knight on a5 with 11.\(\text{e}1\) b5 12.\(\text{d}1\) (Following 12.\(\text{x}b5\), Black is saved by the tactical strike 12...\(\text{xc}4!\)\(\text{f}\) Denker – Byrne, Chicago 1994.) 12...b4 13.\(\text{c}1\) e6 14.dxe6 fxe6 15.e4 \(\text{c}6\). Black’s knight comes back to the centre of the board in order to begin the fight for the key d4-square. 16.\(\text{f}4\), Aseev – Inarkiev, Elista 2001, 16...\(\text{h}5?!\) 17.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{e}7=\)

The move 11.a4 weakens the b4-square. 11...e6 12.dxe6 \(\text{xe}6\) 13.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{f}5\) 14.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}8\). All Black’s pieces are very active. 15.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{c}6\). Black transfers his knight to b4 in order to neutralise White’s pressure against the important d5-square. 16.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{b}4\) 17.\(\text{e}1\), Rausis – Tkachiev, Vandoeuvre 2005, 17...\(\text{d}7?!\)\(\text{=}\) – The activity of Black’s pieces compensates the slight weakness of the d5-square.

11...\(\text{xc}6\)

After Black has solved his main problem in this variation – to improve the placement of his knight on a5 – he can be very optimistic about the future.

12.\(\text{c}1\)

White should better remove immediately his rook from the
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juxtaposition with the enemy bishop on g7.

After 12.\texttt{c1}, Markowski – Szelag, Opole 2006, Black has a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 12...b5! 13.cxb5 axb5 14.bxc5 bxc5 15.a6 d7 16.c1 c5 17.e1 b8, with quite sufficient compensation for the minimal material deficit. 18.e3 c8 19. c1 e4 20.d4 h6 21.exd8 e8 22.b2 b6 23.a1 g4 – Black’s pieces are very active.

12...f5

He plans to follow with e4.

13.e1

White increases his control over the e4-square.

After his alternatives Black equalises easily.

13.g5 e4 14.xe4 xe4= Drasko – Ager, Arco 2012.

13.h3 e4 14.xe4 xe4= 15. c3 xxc3 16.xc3 xal 17.xd2 g6 18.f5. Black is preparing the freeing move d6-d5. 18.xc1 d5= Maiorov – Belyakov, Voronezh 2013.

Following 13.d5, Black can occupy advantageously the e4-square not with his knight, but with the bishop. 13...e4 14. xf6+ (After 14.c3 xdx5=, it would be White who must play accurately, because after the imprecise line: 15.cxd5?! xal 16. xal 17.ale4, Maletin – Inarkiev, Ulan Ude 2009, 17... xal 16!?, Black would even maintain an edge thanks to his two bishops.) 14.xf6 15.c3 xxc3 16.xc3 d5 – After this move Black has no problems whatsoever, draw, Martinovic – Pavlovic, Cetinje 1992.

13...d7

He is preparing the trade of the light-squared bishops.

14.d5

After 14.d3 h3 15.xh3 xal 16.xf4 xd7 17.fd5 xd5 18.xd5 e6 19.b6, Matamoros Franco – Bologan, Khanty-Mansiysk 2005, 19...f7=, White is incapable of exploiting the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn.

14...h3 15.c3 xdx5 16.cxd5 e5 (diagram)

17.f4

White ousts the enemy knight from the centre, but weakens a bit the shelter of his king.
4. \texttt{\&g2} 0-0 5. \texttt{\&c3} d6 6. \texttt{\&f3} \texttt{\&c6} 7.0-0 a6 8.d5 \texttt{\&a5} 9.\texttt{\&d2} c5

Still, even after the more reliable move 17.\texttt{\&xh3}, White has no chances of obtaining an advantage. 17...\texttt{\&xh3} 18.\texttt{\&f3} \texttt{\&bc8} 19. \texttt{\&xe5} \texttt{\&xe5} 20.\texttt{\&xe5} dxe5= – All the minor pieces have disappeared off the board and the most likely result of this game would be a draw, Jonsson – Cloodt, ICCF 2012.

17...\texttt{\&xg2} 18.\texttt{\&xg2} \texttt{\&g4} 19. \texttt{\&xg7} \texttt{\&xg7=} Shankland – Nakamura, Baku 2015. White has some space advantage indeed, but it is practically immaterial, since Black has no pawn-weaknesses in his camp. In addition, White must be careful about Black’s possibilities on the kingside (\texttt{\&f6}, \texttt{\&h3}, \texttt{\&g4}).

B) 9.\texttt{\&d2} c5

There has arisen the basic position of the Yugoslavian variation. In his book “The King’s Indian Defence” (Moscow 1980) Efim Geller cited the words of Mikhail Tal who commented on this position in details: “The placement of Black’s knight on a5 may turn out to be either active, or bad. The outcome of the fight depends largely whether Black will manage to use his knight to exert pressure against the c4-pawn, or will succeed in transferring it via b7 and d8 to the kingside. If neither of these two possibilities happens, Black’s position will become difficult.”

White’s basic move here is B2) 10.\texttt{\&c2}, protecting reliably the knight on c3. Still, before dealing with it, we will have a look at some other possibilities for him: B1) 10.\texttt{\&b1}.

It is hardly advisable for White to try to prevent b7-b5 with the move 10.a4. 10...e6!? 11.\texttt{\&c2} exd5 12.cxd5, Shamkovich – Fedorowicz, New York 1977. Here, Black can play 12...c4=, seizing the initiative.

Or 10.e4 \texttt{\&b8} 11.a4 e6 12.\texttt{\&b1} exd5 13.cxd5 \texttt{\&g4∞ Stevanec – Kralj, Otocec 2010.}

Following 10.a3, Black can prevent the pawn-advance b2-b4 with the energetic move 10...\texttt{\&g4}! His knight is going to the e5-


square in order to increase the pressure against the c4-pawn.

11.\textbf{wc2 e5 12.b3 b5! 13.cxb5 axb5 14.\textbf{b2 wb6 15.h3 \textbf{a6o}

\textbf{B1)} 10.\textbf{b1} \textbf{b8 11.b3}

11.\textbf{wc2 b5} – see variation \textbf{B2}.

11...\textbf{b5 12.\textbf{b2}}

12.\textbf{wc2 e5} – see variation \textbf{B2a}.

12...\textbf{h6}

This move is not played with the idea to exchange on d2 and to win a pawn. In fact, Black follows the classical formula of Z.Tarrasch – “The threat is more powerful than its execution”.

13.\textbf{a1}

White avoids the possible knight-fork after capturing on d2 and a pawn-exchange on c4.

The trade 13.cxb5 axb5 cannot be good for White, because his a2-pawn may become weak in the future. 14.\textbf{de4 xe4 15.xe4 b4.}

Black fixes the weakness on a2.

16.e3 \textbf{a6 17.e1 c4 18.bxc4 xc4 19.a1 wb6= – The position is still within equality, but White must play very carefully in order to maintain it, Brunner – Tka­chiev, Biel 1995.\n
There arise numerous exchanges and an approximately equal position following 13.\textbf{cxe4 xe4 14.xe4 bxc4 15.xc4 xc4 16.bxc4 h3 17.g2 xg2 18.xg2 a5= Tunik – Anapolsky, Che­liabinsk 1991.\n
13.e3. This is a reliable move. Now, White should not be afraid of capturing on d2. 13...\textbf{bxc4 14.xc4 xc4 15.bxc4 wa5.} After Black has got rid of his knight on a5, his play has become considerably simpler. 16.a1 (16.\textbf{c2 d7 17.a1 g7} – see 16.a1) 16...d7 17.\textbf{b3} (It is possible that White’s most reliable move here is 17.wc2, for example: 17...g7. After White has played e2-e3, Black’s bishop has nothing to do on h6 and it goes back. 18.h3 fc8 19.e2 wa4 20.b3 b4= – The fight for the b-file is likely to end up in the ex­change of the rooks and consid­erable simplification, Sykora – Pravec, ICCF 2009) 17...g7= Black’s prospects are not worse. After White’s careless move 18. a3?!, eliminating the base under the rook on b3, Black seizes the initiative with 18...\textbf{g4} Ponomariov – Kasimdzhanov, Vitoria Gasteiz 2007.
13...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f5}}}}

Black wishes to provoke the pawns moves e2-e4 and f2-f3, in order to weaken the dark squares in the enemy camp.

\textbf{14.e4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g4}}}} 15.f3}

15.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c2}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd2}}}} 16.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd2}}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{bxc4}}}}

17.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d1}}}}, Kursova – Umudova, Gaziantep 2012, 17...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd1}}}= – White’s two powerful bishops and the misplacement of the enemy knight on a5 compensates the loss of a pawn for him, but not more than that.

15...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e3}}}+ 16.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{h1}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d7}}} 17. \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e2}}}}}}}

After 17.cxb5 axb5, Black’s prospects are not worse, because in the middle game his pawns on b5 and c5 seem stronger than White’s pawns on a2 and b3.

18.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e2}}}}, Aronian – Nakamura, Moscow 2010, 18...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b6}}}?!∞}

17...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c7}}}}

Black is already well prepared for the fight for the b-file.

18.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c2}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{bxc4}}} 19.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}}} 20.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}}}}}}}}

White has managed to avoid the opening of the b-file, but Black’s plan, connected with the advance of his a-pawn (a6-a5-a4), should provide him with counterplay sufficient to maintain the equality.

\textbf{20...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{h6}}}}}

He wishes to transfer the bishop to g7 in order to neutralise the pressure of the bishop on a1 on the long diagonal.

21.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c2}}} a5 22.f4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g7}}} 23.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f3}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{fc8} 24.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g2}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g4}}}}}}}}}}}

White plans an attack on the kingside, so the exchanges of the minor pieces are in favour of Black, since they reduce White’s attacking potential.

25.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xg4}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xg4}}} 26.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g7}}} \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{fg7}}} 27.f5 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xe2}}} 28.\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xe2}}} a4}}}}}}

– There has arisen an endgame with major pieces and White must still prove that his kingside activity is sufficient to compensate his opponent’s initiative on the other side of the board, Talmacsi – Ramponelli, Lechenicher Schach-Server 2012.
B2) 10.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{b8}\)

11.\(\text{b3}\)

White prepares the development of his bishop on b2 and protects his c4-pawn.

His plan to try to exploit the vulnerability of Black's b-pawn would not work: 11.\(\text{b1}\) b5 12.\(\text{xb5}\) (White should better play here 12.b3 e5 — see variation B2a.) 12...axb5 13.b4 cxb4 14.\(\text{xb4}\), because after 14...\(\text{c7}\), White will hardly find a good square for his queen. 15.\(\text{d3}\) \(g4!\) Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 16.\(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{c5}\) 17.\(\text{b1}\), Arkell – Ady, Lewisham 1984, 17...\(\text{f5}\)!? The activity of Black's pieces should provide him with material gains in the nearest future. 18.\(\text{e4}\) (18.e4?! \(d7+\), followed by \(\text{c3}\)) 18...\(\text{xe4}\) 19.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xf2}!\)

White's plan with the preparation of the pawn-advance b2-b4 is not good, because it helps Black to solve the problem with his knight on a5. 11.a3 b5 12.\(\text{xb5}\) axb5 13.b4 cxb4 14.\(\text{xb4}\) \(\text{c4}\) 15.\(\text{xc4}\) bx4 16.\(\text{b1}\), Tibensky – T.Balogh, Sala 1994. In the arising position the power of the passed b and c-pawns is approximately balanced. 16...\(\text{g4}\)!? Black could have played immediately \(\text{d7}\), followed by \(\text{b6}\), but it would be useful for him to provoke the advance of White's pawns on the kingside. 17.h3 \(\text{e5}\) 18.f4 \(\text{d7}\) 19.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{b6}\) Black's knight not only protects the pawn on c4, but also prevents the advance of the enemy b-pawn. The chances are mutual.

By playing 11.a4, White prevents b7-b5 and Black is forced to try his chances on the opposite side of the board. 11...e5!? 12.b3 h5 13.e4 h4 \(\text{L'Ami – Rapport, Aix-les-Bains 2011. We will see}\) Black advancing his h-pawn numerous more times. Later, he can play h4-h3, restricting the enemy light-squared bishop, or can exchange on g3. After White captures hxg3 and advances f2-f4, he would be incapable of ousting the enemy knight from the g4-square.

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

Black’s queenside initiative is developing effortlessly.
In this position White’s most popular move is B2b) 12.\textit{\texttt{ab2}}. Before that however, we will analyse B2a) 12.\textit{\texttt{ab1}}.

Giving up the c4-square does not look good for White: 12.\textit{\texttt{cxb5 axb5 13.\textit{\texttt{ab2 \texttt{e}}e8!}} - Black’s prospects are not inferior, Lauer - Aymard, ICCF 2013.

B2a) 12.\textit{\texttt{b1}}

This is not White’s most flexible move. He removes his rook from the diagonal attacked by Black’s bishop, but determines the placement of the rook a bit too early.

\textit{\texttt{12...e5}}

It would be difficult now for Black to develop his initiative on the queenside, so he fortifies his position in the centre in order to continue with active actions on the kingside: \textit{\texttt{h5}}, \textit{\texttt{f7-f5}}.

13.\textit{\texttt{b2}}

13.e4 \textit{\texttt{d7}} 14.\textit{\texttt{d1}}, Smyslov - Byrne, Monte Carlo 1968. Here, Black obtains a good game after the well familiar advance of his h-pawn: 14...\textit{\texttt{h5!!}} 15.\textit{\texttt{e3 h4}} 16.\textit{\texttt{e1 \texttt{h6}}}

13.\textit{\texttt{dxe6}}. Giving up the centre cannot create any problems for Black. 13...\textit{\texttt{xe6}} 14.\textit{\texttt{cxb5}} (14.\textit{\texttt{d5}}, Tondivar - Adorjan, Groningen 1990, 14...\textit{\texttt{f5}} 15.\textit{\texttt{xh6+ \texttt{xh6}} 10.\textit{\texttt{e4 \texttt{e6}} = - Black’s counterplay against the c4-pawn compensates his weakness on d6.) 14...\textit{\texttt{xb5}}. Now, White would not need to worry about the protection of his c4-pawn, but Black will have the chances of creating a passed pawn on the queenside in the future. 15.\textit{\texttt{de4 \texttt{xe4}} 16.\textit{\texttt{xe4 \texttt{f5}} 17.\textit{\texttt{b2 \texttt{e8}} 18.\textit{\texttt{xg7 \texttt{h7}}}}. The position has been simplified considerably after the exchange of two couples of minor pieces. 19.\textit{\texttt{bd1 \texttt{g8}} 20.g4. White weakens his king, but eliminates the unpleasant pin of his knight. 20...\textit{\texttt{xe4}} 21.\textit{\texttt{xe4}}, Shumiakina – Janjgava, Kishinev 1995, 21...\textit{\texttt{c8}}! - He cannot make use of the weakness of Black’s d6-pawn, because his king is rather unsafe.

Here, White’s play against the weak enemy pawn seems more promising than in the variations, we have analysed in our notes to move 11, and he will not get worse; nevertheless, he can hardly rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening. 13.\textit{\texttt{cxb5 axb5 14.b4 cxb4}} 15.\textit{\texttt{xb4 \texttt{w}}c7}
The diagonal of the bishop on g7 has been covered after the move e7-e5 and the pin of the knight on c3 is not so unpleasant for White.

There arises a complicated position with mutual chances after 16.\texttt{b2} \texttt{f5} 17.\texttt{c1} \texttt{fc8} Civitillo – Efendiyev, ICCF 2010.

It seems less precise for White to play here 16.\texttt{d3}, since following 16...\texttt{f5} 17.e4 \texttt{d7} 18.\texttt{a3} \texttt{h5}↑, Black seizes the initiative, Paredes Prats – Overton, England 2002.

16.\texttt{a3} \texttt{f5} 17.\texttt{b2} e4. Black prepares an exchange-sacrifice. He would not obtain an edge after it, but the activity of his pieces would be sufficient to maintain the equality. 18.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xb5} 19.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xd5} 20.\texttt{b1} \texttt{c3} 21.\texttt{b4} \texttt{c6} (This move seems to be more precise than the immediate regaining of the exchange after 21...\texttt{xb5} 22.\texttt{xb5}.) 22.\texttt{b7} \texttt{e8} 23.\texttt{b6} \texttt{d4} 24.\texttt{a6} \texttt{a5} 25.\texttt{b6} e3 26.\texttt{xd6}. White is forced to seek simplifications in order to try to parry Black’s initiative, which increases with every move. The further developments are forced. 26...\texttt{exd2} 27.\texttt{xa5} \texttt{xe2}+ 28.\texttt{h1} \texttt{h3} 29.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{g2}+ 30.\texttt{xg2} \texttt{a8}+ 31.\texttt{f3} \texttt{xa3} 32.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 33.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xa2}+ 34.\texttt{f2} \texttt{e6}= – The tactical complications have ended and almost all the pieces have disappeared off the board, so it looks like a dead draw, Schwarte – Agrafenin, Lecenicher SchachServer 2013.

13...\texttt{h5} 14.e3 \texttt{f5} 15.\texttt{e2}

After 15.f4, Black obtains again a good position. 15...\texttt{exf4} 16.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{d4}+ 17.\texttt{h1}, Neckar – Vogt, Karlovy Vary 1975, 17...\texttt{f6} 18.\texttt{d1} \texttt{d7} 19.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{cxd4}. White cannot exploit the weakness of the enemy d4-pawn, since his pieces are totally disordinated. 20.\texttt{f2} \texttt{b6} 21.\texttt{fe1} \texttt{f6} 22.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{b5}↓ – His knight is misplaced at the edge of the board, but this is not dangerous for Black, because his other pieces are very active.

15...\texttt{f6} 16.a3 \texttt{d7} 17.\texttt{fc1} \texttt{e8} 18.\texttt{c3} \texttt{b4}. He changes the object of his attack. Instead of the
4. \( \text{g2} \) 0-0 5. \( \text{c3} \) d6 6. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 7.0-0 a6 8.\( d5 \) \( \text{a5} \) 9. \( \text{d2} \) c5

c4-pawn, he increases his pressure against White's b3-pawn. 19. \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 20. \( \text{a1} \) a5 21. \( \text{e1} \) a4† Knobel - Haugen, ICCF 2009. There has arisen a complicated middle game position. There have been made more than twenty moves and not a single piece, or a pawn, has disappeared off the board. Black's queenside counterplay provides him with at least equal game. If pawns are exchanged on b4, Black's knight will have the wonderful c5-square and White's situation would not be improved even after a win of a pawn, for example: 22.axb4 cxb4 23.\( bxa4 \) \( \text{c5} \) 24.\( a5 \) \( \text{a8} \), followed by \( \text{a4} \) and White's a5-pawn, isolated from the rest of his forces, will become an easy prey for Black's pieces.

B2b) 12. \( \text{b2} \)
White develops his bishop to an active position and later, he will try to find a more active square for his queen's rook than b1.

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

13. \( \text{dxe6} \)
White opens the game in the centre.

If he does not do that, he will have to face Black's kingside pawn-offensive.

13. \( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{h5} \) – see variation B2a.

Following 13.e4, Black obtains a good game after the plan, we have already shown you numerous times – 13...h5!? 14.cxb5 axb5 15.a3 b4∞ Pantsulaia – Kovalev, Saint Vincent 2005.

After 13.\( \text{d1} \), Black should advance again his rook-pawn 13...h5?  

It seems premature for White to play 14.f4, since following 14...exf4 15.gxf4 bxc4∞, he cannot capture on c4 with his pawn. 16.bxc4? \( \text{xb2} \)! Black sacrifices the exchange and begins an attack against the enemy monarch. 17. \( \text{xb2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 18.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d4} \)+ 19.\( \text{h1} \) \( \text{h4} \). White's defence is very difficult, because most of his pieces are on the queenside and cannot
come in time to assist in the protection of his king. 20.h3 \( \textit{\&} e3 \) 21. \( \textit{\&} d3 \) \( \textit{\&} e8 \). 22. \( \textit{\&} g1 \) \( \textit{\&} f5 \). All Black's pieces, besides his knight on a5, take part in the attack. 23.\( \textit{\&} a3 \) \( \textit{\&} xg2 \). He exchanges the important defender of the enemy king. 24.\( \textit{\&} xg2 \) \( \textit{\&} e1+ \) 25.\( \textit{\&} f1 \), Kopylov – Chelevitch, Germany 2009. 25...\( \textit{\&} xh3 \)\? 26.\( \textit{\&} xh3 \) \( \textit{\&} f1+ \) 27. \( \textit{\&} h2 \) \( \textit{\&} xe2 \)–

14.e4 h4 15.\( \textit{\&} d3 \) \( \textit{\&} d7 \). Black prepares the advance of his other rook-pawn. He wishes to follow with b5-b4, \( \textit{\&} b7 \), a5-a4. 16.\( \textit{\&} c3 \) \( \textit{\&} b7 \) 17.\( \textit{\&} e3 \) b4 18.\( \textit{\&} b2 \) \( \textit{\&} e7 \) 19.\( \textit{\&} e2 \) a5 20.a4. White should better close the queenside, preventing a5-a4. 20...\( \textit{\&} h6 \) 21.\( \textit{\&} a1 \) \( \textit{\&} b8 \) 22. \( \textit{\&} c1 \) \( \textit{\&} g7 \)– Kovac – Zakharov, ICCF 2014. The chances are mutual in this complicated middle game position. White has more space indeed, but Black can be very optimistic about the future, since he is well prepared for the pawn-advance f2-f4 and White has no other way of developing initiative.

There arises a complicated position after 13.\( \textit{\&} a1 \). White concentrates forces on the kingside. His plan includes \( \textit{\&} d1 \), e4, \( \textit{\&} e3 \), followed by f2-f4. Black must react accurately and energetically. 13...h5

(diagram)

It seems illogical for White to choose 14.cxb5, since it is bad for him to open "a second front"...
f5. White's g3-square is not well protected and he will hardly manage to accomplish the thematic pawn-advance f2-f4.

13...fxe6

After the removal of White's d5-pawn, Black's game has become much easier.

14.cxb5

Following 14..ad1, White's c4-pawn may turn out to be weak. 14...bxc4 15.bxc4 \textcolor{red}{b}b7 16..xb7 \textcolor{red}{xb}7= Rawicz – Zawadzka, Wroclaw 2008.

After 14..ab1 \textcolor{red}{b}7 15..xb7 \textcolor{red}{xb}7, Black only needs to centralise his knight on a5 in order to solve all his problems in the opening. He can do this in the next few moves. 16..fd1 \textcolor{red}{c}6 17..ce4 \textcolor{red}{d}4 18..xd4 cxd4 19..f3 e5∞ – Black's pawns dominate in the centre and this compensates the slight defects of his pawn-structure, Rawicz – P.Martynov, Krakow 2010.

14...axb5

15..ce4

There begin exchanges of minor pieces, which would lead to a material ratio with a bishop on g2 for White against a black knight on a5. Black will have problems bringing back his knight into the actions, since White's bishop controls the c6-square, but he should still manage to equalise thanks to his pawn-majority in the centre.

It seems a bit less precise for White to play 15..de4, since that move does not open the diagonal of his bishop on b2. 15..\textcolor{red}{e}7 16..\textcolor{red}{ac}1 \textcolor{red}{b}7= Antunes – Bologan, Moscow 1994.

Following 15..ad1 \textcolor{red}{b}7 16..xb7 \textcolor{red}{xb}7 17..de4, P.Horvath – Helie, Agneaux 1998, Black can solve the problem with the protection of his d6-pawn with the move 17...\textcolor{red}{b}6!?

15...\textcolor{red}{b}7 16..ad1

White is reluctant to exchange his knight on f6, because this would lead to the trade of the light-squared bishops 16..xf6+ \textcolor{red}{xf}6 17..xf6 \textcolor{red}{xf}6 18..xb7, Carressa – Piersig, ICCF 2011, 18...\textcolor{red}{xb}7!?= – Black's knight will enter easily the actions via the c6-square.

Capturing on f6 with the bishop does not seem attractive to White 16..xf6 \textcolor{red}{xf}6 17..ad1 \textcolor{red}{g}7 18..f3 \textcolor{red}{d}5∞ and later, he should
be on the alert, since Black’s bishop-pair may turn into powerful force, Bronstein – Spassky, Amsterdam/Leeuwarden 1956. 

16...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xe4}

\begin{center}
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17.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xe4}

After 17.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xg7}, Black can win a pawn with the intermediate move. 17...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xg3} 18.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xg3}, Pcola – Komora, Slovakia 1999, 18...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xf1}+ 19.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xf1} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xg7} 20.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xb7} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xb7} 21.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xe4} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}e7} 22.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c3}+ e5= – White can attack the weak e4 and d5-squares. This, together with the misplacement of the enemy knight on b7, compensates his lack of a pawn, but not more than that.

17...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xe4}

Black parts with his powerful bishop, but solves the problem with his knight on a5.

18.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xe4} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xb2} 19.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xb2} d5 20.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}g2}


The attempt to prevent the return of Black’s knight to the c6-square would not bring any particular dividends to White. 20. \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}e5} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}f6} 21.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c7} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}b7} 22.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}g2} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}fc8} 23.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}d7} c4 – Black sacrifices temporarily a pawn, develops his knight to an active position and equalises. 24.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xb5} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c5}= 20...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c6}

21.e4 (White must fight against his opponent’s pawn-centre; otherwise, he may end up in an inferior position, for example: 21.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}fe1}, Schmidt – Sax, Budapest 1977, 21...c4!? 21...d4 22.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c2}, Ftacnik – W.Schmidt, Prague 1985. White wishes to exploit the vulnerability of the enemy c5-pawn. 22...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}d6} 23.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c1} c4. Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 24.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xc4} d3 25.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}fd1} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}bd8}. The far-advanced d3-pawn keeps Black safe from any unpleasant developments. 26.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c3} b4 27.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c5} (27.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}b3}? \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xf2}! 28.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xf2} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c5}+ 29.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}f1} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}f8} – ) 27...\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}d4}. The transfer into an endgame is Black’s simplest road to equality. 28.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xd4} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}xd4} 29.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c4} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}e2}+ 30.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}f1} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c3} 31.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}d2} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}b1} 32.\textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}d1} \textit{\textcolor{white}{\textbf{Q}}c3}= White is incapable of avoiding the repetition of moves, since he cannot hold on to his d-pawn.
In this chapter we will analyse two not so popular systems for White. In one of them (variations A and B1), he refrains from the logical occupation of the centre and chooses the rather passive move e2-e3. In the other system, White develops his bishop to the f4-square (variation B2).

A) 3.\texttt{d}f3 \texttt{g}7 4.e3

Here, we will deal with the lines in which White does not develop his knight on c3 (about 4.\texttt{c}c3 0–0 – see 3.\texttt{c}c3). In all these variations, as a rule, Black obtains effortlessly a very good position by preparing the pawn-advance e7-e5.

4.g3 0–0 – see Chapter 2.

4.d5 d6 5.\texttt{c}c3 0–0 6.e4 – see Chapter 15.

4.\texttt{f}f4 0–0 5.\texttt{c}c3 d6, or 5.e3 d6 6.\texttt{c}c3 c5, or 6.h3 c5 7.\texttt{c}c3 cxd4, or 6.\texttt{e}2 c5 7.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{h}5 – see variation B2.

It seems premature for White to choose a plan connected with the immediate development of his bishop to b2. 4.b3 0–0 5.\texttt{b}2 c5!? Black can exploit the fact that White's kingside pieces are not developed yet and refrain from the plan including the preparation of e7-e5 in favour of more active ideas.

Chapter 6

After 6.dxc5, at first Black regains his pawn and then advances d7-d5, equalising completely. 6... \( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) 7.g3 \( \text{\texttt{xc5}} \) 8.\( \text{\texttt{g2}} \) d5= Yao – Cordara, Topusko 2014.

6.e3 cxd4 7.exd4 (It does not seem so reliable for White to continue with 7.\( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \), because Black can oust the enemy knight away from the centre with the move e7-e5, not only equalising, but even trying to fight for the advantage. 7...d5 8.cxd5 \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) 9.\( \text{\texttt{c4}} \) b6 10.\( \text{\texttt{d2}} \) e5 11.\( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) e7 12.0–0 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) 13.\( \text{\texttt{e2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6+}} \) Shengelia – Hambouchi, Illes Medes 2006.) 7...d5 8.\( \text{\texttt{e2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 9.0–0 \( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) 10.\( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 11.\( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 12.\( \text{\texttt{xc5}} \) dxc5. After the disappearance off the board of White’s important defender of the dark squares, he loses the initiative in the opening and is forced to begin defending. 13.0–0 exd5 14.\( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) c6 15.\( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) 16.h3 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \) 17.\( \text{\texttt{xe5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe5+}} \) – Black has a stable advantage thanks to his powerful bishop-pair, B.Socko – Olaszewski, Warsaw 2011.

White’s bishop on b2 is a bit passive and this precludes him from fighting for the advantage. Black’s further plan is quite simple. He should exchange on c4 at an opportune moment and create pressure against White’s “hanging” pawns. 10.\( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) 11.\( \text{\texttt{e5}} \) dxc4 12.\( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) 13.\( \text{\texttt{xc4}} \) a6 14.h3 \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) 15.d5 b5 16.c5 \( \text{\texttt{d7}} \) 17.c6 \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) 18.\( \text{\texttt{b3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \). Black has realised his plan and won a pawn. Still, White’s far-advanced passed c6-pawn enables him to maintain the equality. 19.\( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) 20.\( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) 21.\( \text{\texttt{ad1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd1}} \) 22.\( \text{\texttt{xd1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b6}} \) 23.\( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) Weber – Tomson, ICCF 2015.

It does not seem logical for White to prepare e2-e4 with the help of the move 4.\( \text{\texttt{c2}} \), because this would lead to the weakening of the d4-square. 4...0–0 5.e4 d6 6.e2 \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) and Black begins to exert immediate pressure against White’s centre. 7.d5. White attacks the enemy knight with tempo, but weakens the dark squares with his last move. 7...\( \text{\texttt{b4}} \) 8.\( \text{\texttt{b3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) 9.\( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c5}} \) 10.\( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) e6 11.\( \text{\texttt{c4}} \) g4 12.\( \text{\texttt{xc5}} \) dxc5. After the disappearance off the board of White’s important defender of the dark squares, he loses the initiative in the opening and is forced to begin defending. 13.0–0 exd5 14.\( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) c6 15.\( \text{\texttt{xc3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) 16.h3 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \) 17.\( \text{\texttt{xe5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe5+}} \) – Black has a stable advantage thanks to his powerful bishop-pair, B.Socko – Olaszewski, Warsaw 2011.

4.\( \text{\texttt{bd2}} \). In positions of this type, White’s knight is not so well placed on d2 as on c3. 4...0–0 5.\( \text{\texttt{b3}} \) (5.e4 d6 – see Chapter 1, 3.\( \text{\texttt{d2}} \)) 5...d6 6.g3, Burmakin – Eljanov, Alushta 2000. Here, Black could have emphasized the bad placement of the enemy knight on b3 with the move 6...a5!?+, and White would be forced either to allow a5-a4, or to play a2-a4, weakening the b4-square.

4.\( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) 0–0 5.e3. White would not obtain an edge in the opening
if he postpones the development of his queen's knight. (5.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 d6 – see Chapter 7, variation B) 5...d6 6.\( \mathbb{B} \)e2 (6.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 c5 – see Chapter 7, variation B) 6...\( \mathbb{D} \)e4 7.\( \mathbb{B} \)h4 c5 8.0-0 cxd4 9.exd4 h6!\( \infty \) – White must be very careful about the advance of the enemy pawns on the kingside; otherwise, he may lose his dark-squared bishop.

White can also play 4.b4 immediately, but then he will need to follow with e2-e3 anyway, so there will arise transposition to the main variation. 4...0-0 5.\( \mathbb{B} \)b2 (5.e3 – see 4.e3) 5...d6

6.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 (6.e3 – see 4.e3. White does not have time to fianchetto his other bishop too. 6.g3 c5 Black opens the game in an attempt to exploit the lag of development of White's kingside. 7.bxc5 dxc5 8.d5 e6 9.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3. Here, in the game Dudley – Belanoff, ICCF 200, Black could have started favourable tactical complications with 9...exd5!? 10.\( \mathbb{D} \)xd5 \( \mathbb{D} \)xd5 11.\( \mathbb{A} \)xg7 \( \mathbb{D} \)e3! He seizes the initiative with this intermediate move. 12.\( \mathbb{W} \)c1 \( \mathbb{W} \)xg7 13.\( \mathbb{W} \)xe3 \( \mathbb{W} \)a5+ 14.\( \mathbb{W} \)d2 \( \mathbb{D} \)c6 15.\( \mathbb{G} \)g2 \( \mathbb{D} \)e6\( \infty \) – White will be faced with a rather unpleasant defence in this endgame, because of his weakened queenside pawn-structure.) 6...c5 Black chooses this energetic move instead of preparing the standard pawn-advance e7-e5. 7.a3 \( \mathbb{D} \)c6 8.bxc5 dxc5 9.d5 White has acquired plenty of space but lags in development. 9...\( \mathbb{A} \)a5 10.\( \mathbb{D} \)d2 e6 11.e4 exd5 12.cxd5, Huebner – Lagno, Marianske Lazne 2009, 12...\( \mathbb{D} \)e8!? White's seemingly powerful \( \mathbb{D} \)e8 needs permanent protection.

4...0-0

5.b4

About 5.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 d6, or 5.\( \mathbb{B} \)e2 d6 6.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 \( \mathbb{D} \)bd7, or 6.0-0 \( \mathbb{D} \)bd7 7.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 e5 – see variation B1.

Following 5.b3 d6 6.\( \mathbb{B} \)b2, Black may play immediately 6...e5, without losing time for the move \( \mathbb{D} \)bd7.

(diagram)

7.\( \mathbb{C} \)c3 exd4 8.\( \mathbb{W} \)xd4 (8.\( \mathbb{D} \)xd4 d5 9.exd5 \( \mathbb{D} \)xd5 10.\( \mathbb{D} \)c1, Abel – Dinstuhl, Germany 2014, 10...)
c5!?= Black ousts the enemy knight from the centre and obtains a very good position.) 8... \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b}}}}\text{d}7\) 9.\textit{e}e2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}5=\). In the game Ljubojevic – Stein, Las Palmas 1973, White underestimated his opponent’s tactical threats and ended up quickly in a hopeless position: 10.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{d}1?!\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}}\text{4} 11.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{d}2? \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}}\text{xf}2!–+
\nAfter 7.\textit{e}e2 exd4 8.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}4 \text{d}5, Black is perfectly prepared for the opening of the game in the centre. 9.0–0 (9.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}1 \text{c}5 10.\textit{f}f3\text{ dxc}4 11.\text{bxc}4 \textit{e}e4 12.\textit{x}xg7 \textit{x}g7 13.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{bd}2 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}2 14.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}2 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}6=\) Black's prospects are not worse thanks to his superior pawn-structure, Mamedyarov – A.Zhigalko, Chalkidiki 2003.) 9...c5 10.\textit{f}f3, Nikolac – Ree, Maribor 1980, 10...\text{dxc}4!?=

7.\textit{dxe}5 \text{dxe}5!? Black sacrifices a pawn for the initiative. 8.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}8 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}8 9.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}}\text{e}5 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}6 10.\text{c}c3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}}\text{e}4 11.\textit{x}xg7 \textit{x}xg7 12.a3 a5 13.\textit{bd}2 \textit{c}c5 14.\textit{e}e2 \textit{f}f5 15.0–0 \text{g}5 16.h3 h5\text{ Bu – Ding, China 2014. He has seized completely the initiative and White’s defence will not be easy at all. It may be best for him to advance \text{b}3–\text{b}4, giving back the extra material in an attempt to fight for a draw with the help of exchanging pieces.

5...d6 6.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b}}}}\text{b}2

6.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}3 \text{e}5 – see variation B1.

6...e5!
This is the simplest for Black. He sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative.

7.\textit{dxe}5

7.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}3 \text{dxe}4 – see variation B1.

It seems rather slow for White to opt for 7.b5 – he deprives the enemy knight of the \text{c}6-square, but lags in development. Black advances \text{d}6–\text{d}5 and equalises easily. 7...\text{dxe}4 8.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}4 \text{c}5 9.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b}}}}\text{b}2 \text{d}5 10.\text{c}xd5 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}5 11.\textit{x}xg7 \textit{x}xg7 12.\text{c}c4, Kaenel – Bischoff, Graevenitz 1999, 12...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b}}}}\text{b}6?=

7.\textit{e}e2 \text{dxe}4 8.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}4 (8.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{xd}4 \text{d}5 9.\text{c}c5 \text{e}e4 10.0–0, Efimov – De la Villa Garcia, Saint Vincent 1999, 10...\text{e}e8?!=) 8...c5 9.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{b}}}}\text{b}5 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}6 10.\text{a}3 (White should not play 10. \text{bxc}5, because after 10...\text{dxc}5\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}}\text{f} Black gets rid of his weak \text{d}6-
pawn.) 10...cxb4 11.0-0, Espig – Savon, Odessa 1976. Here, Black could have continued with 11...d5!? 12.axb4 dxc4=, eliminating his weak d6-pawn.

7...dxe5!? This move is seldom played in practice, but it is Black’s most direct road to equality and may be even to seizing the initiative.

8...xd8 exd8

9...xc3

Black should not worry about his e5-pawn, because after 9...xe5 xc6 10...c3 a5, his initiative compensates the minimal material deficit with an interest. 11.bxa5 xc4 12...xg7 hxg7 13.a3 xa5. White lags horribly in development and his queenside pawns are excellent targets for attack. 14...e2 xe6 15.0–0 g5! Black seizes the initiative on the kingside as well. 16.h3 f5 17.ea2 g4 18.hxg4 fxg4 19...fd2 xd2! Thanks to this tactical strike Black deflects his opponent’s pieces from the protection of the a3-pawn. 20.xd2 (20.xd2? xd2= 20...xd2 21. xd2 axa3 – Black has regained the sacrificed pawn and still maintains the initiative. White’s defence will not be easy in this endgame.

Black obtains good compensation for the pawn after 9...xe5 xf5 10...c3 c5.

It is essential for him to create a target for attack on the queenside before White has completed the development of his pieces. 11.b5 a6 12...e2 e4 13. d5 axb5 14.f3 d6 15.cxb5 d7 16.e7+ f8 17.f5 xf5. White has obtained the two-bishop advantage, but this is just temporary, since the trade of the dark-squared bishop is likely to happen soon. 18.xd7+ xd7 19.xg7+ xg7 Black has long lasting initiative for the pawn. 20.f2 a3 21...d1 (It is worse for White to opt here for 21.e4?!), because after 21...e3 22.hc1 b6 23.ab1 d2 24.b3 xb3 25.axb3 xd2, Black regains the sacrificed pawn and White would have to fight long and hard for a draw.) 21...e7 22.e4 d4 23.c4 b6 –
Chapter 6

Black has sufficient compensation for his minimal material deficit thanks to this powerful knight at the centre of the board and his active rooks.

9...\(\mathcal{Q}c6\) 10.a3 e4 11.\(\mathcal{Q}d2\), Rush – Ustimenko, Internet 2012. Black’s e4-pawn is hanging, but he is not obliged to defend it.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Diagram}
\end{array}
\]

11...\(\mathcal{Q}g4!\)? 12.\(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) f5 13.\(\text{h}3\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe3\) 14.\(\text{fxe3}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 15.\(\text{a2}\) \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) 16.\(\text{xe4}\). The tactical complications have ended and White has an extra pawn. It is an endgame indeed, but Black’s superior development is a very important factor in the evaluation of this position. 16...\(\text{f5}\) 17.\(\text{d2}\) a5 18.\(\text{b5}\) \(\mathcal{Q}d3+\) 19.\(\text{x}d3\) \(\text{xd3}\) 20.\(\mathcal{Q}xg7\) \(\mathcal{Q}xg7\) – White’s pawns are weak, while Black’s pieces are very active.

B) 3.\(\text{c3}\) \(\mathcal{G}g7\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Diagram}
\end{array}
\]

4.\(\mathcal{G}f3\)

4.e4 d6 – see Chapters 8-27.
4.g3 0–0 – see Chapter 1.

4.\(\mathcal{G}g5\) d6 – see Chapter 7, variation A.

4.f3 d6 5.e4 0–0 – see Chapters 13-14.

4.\(\mathcal{G}f4\) 0–0 5.\(\mathcal{G}f3\) d6, or 5.e3 d6 6.\(\mathcal{G}f3\) c5, or 6.e2 c5 7.\(\mathcal{G}f3\) \(\mathcal{G}h5\), or 6.h3 c5 7.\(\mathcal{G}f3\) cxd4 – see variation B2.

Following 4.e3, there may arise original positions only in variations in which White refrains from the natural development of his knight on f3. 4...0–0 5.\(\mathcal{G}d3\) (5.\(\mathcal{G}f3\) d6 – see variation B1) 5...d6 6.\(\mathcal{G}ge2\) (6.\(\mathcal{G}f3\) \(\mathcal{G}bd7\) – see variation B1).

In our later chapters we will analyse a similar position, but
only with a white pawn on e4. The placement of the pawn on e3 is a part of White’s defensive strategy, but it is understandable that he cannot obtain an advantage by defending. 6...e5 7.d5 (There arises a very complicated position after 7.0–0 8.e8 8.f3 exd4 9.exd4 c5 10.d5 fd7+, followed by e5, or b8-a6-c7, b8, a7-a6, b7-b5.) 7...fd7. Black frees the way forward of his f-pawn. 8.h4 f5∞ Gar­­darwinsson – Balabaev, ICCF 2006.

4...0–0

In this chapter we will analyse B1) 5.e3 and B2) 5.f4.

5.g5 d6 – see Chapter 7.
5.g3 d6 – see Chapter 2.
5.e4 d6 – see Chapters 15-27.
5.d5 d6 6.e4 – see Chapter 15.

The move 5.h3 does not look active at all. The simplest reaction for Black would be 5...d6 (It is possible that the move 5...d5!?= is even stronger, transposing to the Grunfeld Defence in which the move h2-h3 is not so useful. The analysis of this opening however, is not a part of out plans.) 6.g5 (6.e4 – see Chapter 16; 6.f4 c5 – see variation B2) 6...h6 – see Chapter 7, variation B.

B1) 5.e3
This is a modest move. White does not occupy the centre with his pawns and protects additionally his d4-pawn.

5...d6
If Black advances later e7-e5, then the position would resemble a variation from the French Defence 1.e4 e6 2.d3 d5 (with colours reversed). It is possible that this is the reason the system with 5.e3 is used by players who prefer the French Defence with Black like Bareev, Dreev, Lysyj etc.

6.e2
White can hardly continue the game without this developing move.

It seems a bit premature for White to try to occupy immediately more space on the queenside
only with a white pawn on e4. The placement of the pawn on e3 is a part of White’s defensive strategy, but it is understandable that he cannot obtain an advantage by defending. 6...e5 7.d5 (There arises a very complicated position after 7.0–0 £e8 8.f3 exd4 9.exd4 c5 10.d5 £fd7+, followed by £e5, or £b8-a6-c7, £b8, a7-a6, b7-b5.) 7...£fd7. Black frees the way forward of his f-pawn. 8.h4 f5∞ Gardarsson – Balabaev, ICCF 2006.

4...0–0

In this chapter we will analyse B1) 5.e3 and B2) 5.f4.

5.g5 d6 – see Chapter 7.
5.g3 d6 – see Chapter 2.
5.e4 d6 – see Chapters 15-27.
5.d5 d6 6.e4 – see Chapter 15.

The move 5.h3 does not look active at all. The simplest reaction for Black would be 5...d6 (It is possible that the move 5...d5!?= is even stronger, transposing to the Gruenfeld Defence in which the move h2-h3 is not so useful. The analysis of this opening however, is not a part of our plans.) 6.g5 (6.e4 – see Chapter 16; 6.f4 c5 – see variation B2) 6...h6 – see Chapter 7, variation B.

B1) 5.e3
This is a modest move. White does not occupy the centre with his pawns and protects additionally his d4-pawn.

5...d6
If Black advances later e7-e5, then the position would resemble a variation from the French Defence 1.e4 e6 2.d3 d5 (with colours reversed). It is possible that this is the reason the system with 5.e3 is used by players who prefer the French Defence with Black like Bareev, Dreev, Lysyj etc.

6.e2
White can hardly continue the game without this developing move.

It seems a bit premature for White to try to occupy immediately more space on the queenside.
with 6.b4, because after 6...e5 7. \( \text{d}b2 \) \( \text{exd}4 \) 8.\( \text{c}xd4 \), Black has the energetic resource 8...c5! 9.\( \text{b}xc5 \) dxc5 10.\( \text{c}b3 \). White attacks the enemy c5-pawn. (10.\( \text{d}b5?! \) \( \text{c}c6 \) 11.\( \text{e}e2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) – The vulnerability of the c4-pawn may hurt White in the future, Ledger – Hebden, Isle of Man 1997.) 10...\( \text{c}c6!? \) White lags in the development of his kingside, so Black can afford to sacrifice a pawn. He would not mind a transfer to an endgame. 11.\( \text{w}xd8 \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 12.\( \text{xc}c5 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 13. \( \text{c}c1 \) b6 14.\( \text{a}5a4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 15.\( \text{e}e2 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) 16.0–0 \( \text{e}e4 \) – Black’s piece-activity compensates fully his minimal material deficit. White has great difficulties protecting his weak a2 and c4-pawns.

It is not good for White to play 6.\( \text{d}d3 \), because later the bishop may come under the threat of a pawn-fork after e7-e5-e4. 6...\( \text{bd}7 \) 7.0–0 e5 8.\( \text{d}d2 \). White develops his bishop and connects his rooks. 8...c6 9.\( \text{w}c2 \). He increases his control over the e4-square. 9...\( \text{e}e8 \) 10.\( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 11. \( \text{g}5 \). White takes some measures against the threat e5-e4, Aung – Khin, Yangon 1999. 11...h6!? This is the simplest reaction. Black provokes the enemy knight to occupy the e4-square and there it comes under attack after f7-f5. 12.\( \text{ge}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 13.\( \text{xe}4 \) f5 14.\( \text{c}c3 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 15.\( \text{c}c1 \) e4 16.\( \text{e}e2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) – If Black manages in the future to advance g6–g5 and f5–f4, then his kingside attack may become very dangerous. White’s prospects on the queenside do not seem so convincing.

\section*{6...\( \text{bd}7 \)}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image}
\end{center}

7.0–0

White refrains sometimes from an immediate castling.

7.\( \text{c}c2 \) e5 8.b3 (8.0–0 \( \text{e}e8 \) – see 7.0–0) 8...\( \text{e}e8 \) – see 7.b3.

7.b4 e5 8.\( \text{b}2 \) (8.0–0 \( \text{e}e8 \) – see 7.0–0) 8...\( \text{e}e8 \)

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image}
\end{center}

9.0–0 \( \text{exd}4 \) – see 7.0–0.

The position is simplified after 9.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{exd}4 \) 10.\( \text{xd}4 \) a5 11.a3 \( \text{axb}4 \) 12.\( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{xa}1+ \) 13.\( \text{xa}1 \) \( \text{e}5 \) = Mikhalkishin – Tratar, Ptuj 1998.
After 9.a4, Black can try to exploit the vulnerability of the pawn on c4 with the line: 9...exd4 10. exd4 a5 11.b5 b6 12.0-0 g4. His prospects are not worse. 13. b3, Mikhalchishin – Mazi, Bled 1999. Here, Black had an attractive pawn-sacrifice – 13...d5!? 14.c5 c4 15.xc4 dxc4 16.xc4 xf3 17.gxf3 h5→ and White would hardly manage to parry the attack of the enemy pieces.

9.dxe5 xe5. The exchange of a couple of knights is Black's simplest road to equality. 10.xe5 dxe5 11.b3 f5 12.0-0 c6 It is useful for Black to cover the d5-square against the possible penetration of the enemy knight. 13. fd1 c7 14.c5, Kempinski – Hunt, Bad Wiessee 2013. The weakening of the d6-square would be important if White could transfer his knight there. Here however, this would not be a simple task at all. 14...e6!? 15.c4 xc4 16.xc4 ad8=, followed by the exchange of the rooks on the d-file. The drawish outcome of the game has become very likely.

7.b3 e5 8.b2 (8.c2 e7 9. b2 e7 – see 8.b2) 8...e8 9.0-0 e4 – see 7.0-0.

9.c2. White has in mind to castle queenside in some variations. 9...e7 10.0-0 (10.0-0 e4 11.d2 f8 – see 7.0-0) 10...c6 11.h3 a6 12.g4 exd4 13.exd4 b5 Black's chances seem preferable in this position with attacks on opposite sides of the board, because his king is more reliably protected, Lobron – Van den Doel, Amsterdam 1996.

9.h3 c6 10.c2 exd4 11.xd4 a5. Black is preparing c5. Now, White cannot oust the enemy knight from there with the move b3-b4. 12.0-0 c5 13.f3 b6. Black's pieces are harmoniously deployed and this compensates the relative weakness of his d6-pawn. 14.ad1 (14.ad1 h5 15.e1 a4∞ – Black creates a weakness on b3 for his opponent, Nitsche – Golubev, Bad Wiessee 1999.) 14... fd7 15.fd1 e5= Svetushkin – Hickl, Chalkidiki 2002.

7...e5
Black's plan is very simple in similar positions. He must prepare e5-e4 after at first e8, e7 and later a transfer of the knight to the g5-square: h5-h4 (and eventually h4-h3), f8-h7-g5. If Black succeeds in realising all his plans then his position would be preferable, because White's queenside offensive would hardly be so effective.

(diagram)

8.c2
White prevents e5-e4.
He has also tried in practice 8.b3. This move has the defect that in order for White to begin an offensive on the queenside he must lose a tempo for the move b3-b4. 8...e8 9.b2 (9.c2 e4 – see 8.c2) 9...e4 10.d2 f8. Black’s play is tremendously simple and easy. 11.b4 (11.c2 e7 – see 8.c2) 11...h5

12.b3 h7 13.f1 g5 14. b5 g4 Bukavshin – Kokarev, Toljatti 2014. The activity of Black’s pieces increases with every move. White cannot exchange on g4, because this would lead to the opening of the h-file.

12.a4 h7 13.b5 h4 14.e1 h3 15.g3 g5 and the vulnerability of the light squares on the kingside may become a telling factor in the future, Artemiev – Ponkratov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013.

12.b5 h7 13.c1 (But not 13.d5?, because of 13..xd5 14. cxd5, Rakhmangulov – Golubev, Kiev 1997, 14...g5! – White’s d5-pawn is hanging and Black is threatening to win the exchange after h3.) 13...f5. It would always be useful for Black to provide additional protection of the important e4-pawn. 14.a4 c6. Black deprives his opponent of the possibility d5. 15.a3 h4 16.b1 g5 17.h1 h3 18.g3 f8 19.b3 d7†, followed by g4, exchanging the important defender of the light squares. Black realises the plan we have explained already and maintains the advantage, Korchnoi – Kasparov, Paris 1990.

It seems preferable for White to play here 8.b4, against which Black can react in the same fashion as against 8.b3, but in a less favourable situation, since White has saved a tempo and has played b2-b4 at once. Black can also choose a more reliable plan, connected with an exchange on d4 and the preparation of the pawn-advances a7-a5, or c7-c5. 8...e8
9.\textit{\textit{\textbackslash c2}} exd4 – see 8.\textit{\textit{\textbackslash c2}}.

Following 9.b5, it seems very good for Black to choose 9...a6!?
10.a4 axb5. The rook on a1 is not protected, so White cannot capture with his a-pawn. 11.cxb5, Spiridonov – Suba, Decin 1977, 11...c6!?

After 9.a4, Black obtains a good position with the line: 9...exd4!? 10.exd4 a5 11.b5 c5 12. bxc6 bxc6. White has some space advantage indeed, but this is not so important because Black has counter chances connected with an attack against the c4-pawn, as well as with the preparation of $\text{\textit{\textbackslash d}f6-e4}$. 13.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash d}f4}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}6}$ 14.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}1}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash e6}}$ 15.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}3}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}8}$ 16.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash a}2}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash f5}}$ 17.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}3}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash e4}}$ 18.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}xe4}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}xe4}$= Black's bishops are tremendously active, Fehmers – Traut, Germany 2001.

9.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}2}$ exd4 10.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash c}x}d4$ (After 10.exd4, Black obtains very good counterplay following 10...a5 11. b5 $\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}6}$ 12.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}1}$ a4= Woschkat – Allen, IECG 2000.) 10...a6!? He is threatening to play c7-c5 at an opportune moment after which White would not have the move $\text{\textit{\textbackslash d}b5}$. 11.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash c}2}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}5}$ 12.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash a}d1}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash g}4}$. Black's position is a bit cramped and the trade of a couple of minor pieces may be very useful for him. 13.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash x}x}g4$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash f}xg4}$ 14.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash h}3}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash f}6}$ 15.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}2}$ c6= Black's d6-pawn is a bit weak, but this is not important at all, Kaenel – Sturua, Biel 1999.

8.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}8}$

(diagram)

9.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}3}$

The character of the position remains more or less the same after 9.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}1}$. Black continues with his standard plan, including the pawn-advance e5-e4, pushing forward the h-pawn and the transfer of his knight to g5, ending up with at least equality. 9...e4 10.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash d}2}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}7}$ 11.b4 $\text{\textit{\textbackslash f}8}$ 12.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}2}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash f}5}$ 13.h3. White does not wish to allow the advance of the enemy pawn to the h3-square. This plan has the drawback that after the transfer of Black's knight to the g5-square, White must be on the alert about the possible piece-sacrifice on h3. 13...h5 14.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}d1}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash h}8}$ 15.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash a}c1}$ h4 16.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}3}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash g}5}$= Rooijen – Alvar, Lechenicher SchachServer 2012.

Following 9.b4, the simplest for Black would be to organise counterplay against the enemy c4-pawn 9...exd4!? 10.exd4 a5 11. b5 $\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}6}$= Nader – Chahrour, Abu Dhabi 2015.

The same plan works well too following 9.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash d}1}$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash e}7}$ 10.b4 a5 11. b5 exd4 12.$\text{\textit{\textbackslash c}x}d4$ $\text{\textit{\textbackslash b}6}$= Bruzon Batista – Vidit, Baku 2015.
9...e4 10.\texttt{d}d2 e7
There has arisen a standard position for this variation in which Black’s play is much easier.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Chapter 6}
\end{center}

11.a3

After 11.b4 f8 12.a3 h5 13.b5 h8 7, Black’s prospects seem preferable. 14.c5 d5 15.a4 d8 16.b6. White sacrifices a pawn with the idea to deflect his opponent from the attack on the kingside. 16...cxb6 17.axb6 d7 18.b3 axb6 19.a6. White transfers his bishop to the h2-b8 diagonal in order to improve the defence of his king. 19...c6 20.f4 f8 21.a1 e6 22.g3, Hoi - Moskalenko, Copenhagen 1995. Here, Black had a very promising pieces-sacrifice – 22...g4!? 23.xb6 xd4! 24.exd4 xb6 25.xb6 xd4 26.b3. He has obtained two pawns for the piece and powerful initiative. 26...e3 27.exf3 xf2+ 28.xf2 xc3 29.xc3 xf2 30.xf2 xa2 31.e3 – White has sacrificed the exchange and has managed to parry his opponent's initiative, but after the fall of his pawn on a2, he will be faced with a very difficult fight for a draw in this endgame.

After 11.b2 f8 12.h3 h5 13.d5, Black can change his plan a bit and advance his g-pawn (g6-g5-g4) with the idea to exploit the exposed placement of the enemy pawn on h3. 13...g5 14.b5 f5 15.d4 g6 16.a1 d7 17.b4 e5 18.b3 g4 → Kurajica - Popovic, Sarajevo 2011.

11...c6
Black does not like to worry about the possible sorties of the enemy knight (d5, or b5).

White maybe had to think about prophylactic. 12.a1 f8 13.f3 exf3 14.xf3 c7= After exchanging the e4-pawn, he is not under the threat of a direct checkmating attack, Ed.Lasker – Kupchik, Chicago 1926.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Chapter 6}
\end{center}

12...h5 13.e1 f8 14.d5 c5 15.b4 b6 16.xc5 bxc5. It would be difficult for White to ob-
tain anything real out of his domination over the b-file. 17.\textbf{b}3 \textbf{h}7 18.\textbf{eb}1 \textbf{g}5 19.\textbf{b}8. The penetration of White's rook to b8 is not dangerous for Black, because after 19...\textbf{xb}8 20.\textbf{xb}8 \textbf{d}7, White's rook cannot preserve its active position and is forced to retreat. 21.\textbf{b}1 h4+ White has not achieved anything on the queenside, while Black's kingside attack may become very dangerous. Malakhov - Gabrielian, Yerevan 2014.

**B2) 5.\textbf{f}4**

We have analysed a similar way of development for White in Volume 1, Chapter 7, except that there he was not in a hurry to play c2-c4 (1.d4 \textbf{f}6 2.\textbf{f}3 g6 3.\textbf{f}4). After White's pawn has been placed on c4, Black can attack the d4-square with the move c7-c5, without being afraid of c2-c3.

5...d6

This is a flexible move. Black does not advance c7-c5 yet, because in some variations he may refrain from this move altogether. He has at his disposal two other plans: \textbf{f}5, followed by \textbf{e}4, achieving an advantageous trade of the knights and the move \textbf{h}5, beginning a chase after the enemy bishop. Naturally, the second plan would be even more effective after the move e2-e3.

![Chess Diagram](image)

6.e3

6.e4 – see Chapter 15.

Black should not be afraid of the plan with the exchange of the dark-squared bishops. 6.\textbf{d}2 \textbf{f}5!? 7.\textbf{h}6 c5 8.d5 e6!? White has not castled yet, so it would be in favour of Black to open the game as quickly as possible. 9.\textbf{g}7 (But not 9.\textbf{h}4??, due to 9...\textbf{x}h6 10.\textbf{x}h6 \textbf{g}4—+) 9...\textbf{x}g7 10.\textbf{h}4 \textbf{e}4 11.\textbf{xf}5+ \textbf{xf}5 12.\textbf{xe}4 \textbf{xe}4= – After the numerous exchanges of minor pieces the position has been simplified considerably. White must already think about maintaining the equality because he lags in development.
White cannot create any problems for his opponent with the rather modest line: 6.h3 c5 7.d5 (7.e3 cxd4 – see 6.e3).

Now, Black can sacrifice a pawn in the spirit of the Benko Gambit 7...b5!? and seize the initiative. 8.cxb5 (It would not be better for White to choose here 8.Qxb5, because after 8...Qxe4, his knight will not manage to come back to the c3-square. 9.Qd2 a5 10.a2 f5↑ Stocek – Rasik, Ostrava 2010) 8...a6 9.e3 (9.bxa6 Qfb6!? +) 9...Qh5!? This is a very energetic move.

Now, White is faced with a rather unpleasant choice. After 10.Qh2 axb5 11.Qxb5 a5 12.a4 Qxc3+ 13.bxc3 Qxc3+ 14.Qd2 Qa6↑, Black restores the material balance and obtains a better position, because White’s passed a4-pawn is not strength but a weakness.

10.a4. White complies with the exchange of his powerful bishop but preserves his extra pawn. 10...Qxf4 11.exf4 a5∞ – Black has the two-bishop advantage for the sacrificed pawn (his dark-squared bishop is particularly powerful, since it has no opponent), as well as the possibility to increase his pressure on the queenside.

6...c5

7.h3

White must take care immediately about the possible retreats of his dark-squared bishop.

After 7.Qe2 Qh5 8.Qg5, Black can advance his queenside pawns with tempo. 8...h6 9.Qh4 g5 10.Qg3 g4 11.Qd2 cxd4 12.exd4 f5 13.Qb3 Qc6 14.0–0 e5 15.dxe5 dxe5∞ – The placement of White’s bishop on g3 may be the cause of great problems for him in the future, Malmstroem – Benlloch Guirau, ICCF 2007.
7.d5 Qh5 8.Qg5 h6 9.Qh4 g5 10.Qd2 (After 10.Qg3, there arise positions from Chapter 7, variation B1, but with an extra tempo with Black, since White’s bishop has come to g3 not in three moves, but in four.) 10...Qb6 11.Qb1 Qf5! Black transfers his bishop to the kingside with tempo in order to fortify his somewhat weakened pawn-structure there. 12.e4 Qg6 13.Qg3 Qd7 14.Qd3 Wa5 15.0-0 a6 16.Qb3 Qc7∞ – Black’s prospects are not worse. He can exchange on g3 at any moment, ending up with the two-bishop advantage, Le Roux – Ryska, ICCF 2013.

7...cxd4 8.exd4 Qf5
This is the simplest for Black. He prepares the move Qe4.

9.Qd3
White prevents his opponent’s plans.

There arises a very interesting situation after 9.g4!? White ousts the enemy bishop from its active position, but weakens his king-

side pawn-structure in the process. 9...Qe6 10.d5 Qd7 11.Qd4 Qa6 12.Qe3 Qc8 13.Qc1 e6 14.dxe6 Qxe6∞ – In this complicated position with mutual pawn-weaknesses both sides have chances in the forthcoming battle, Almarza Mato – Ribes Colom, ICCF 2014.

Black has no problems at all after 9.Qe2 Qe4 10.Qxe4 Qxe4. After the exchange of the knight on f6, Black’s bishop on g7 exerts very powerful pressure against the enemy pawn on d4. 11.0-0 Qc6 12.Qe3 d5 13.c5, Kargoll – Solomunovic, Germany 1994. Here, Black’s simplest way to equality is to advance immediately 13...e5!?

9...e5!?N

This powerful move has not been tested in practice yet. White has not castled, so Black accomplishes immediately this pawn-break in the seemingly well-protected point.

10.Qxf5
Playing in this way, White can
at least avoid ending up in an inferior position.

This cannot be said however about the line: 10.dxe5?! dxe5 11.\textit{xf5} (after 11.\textit{xe5}, it would be interesting for Black to continue with 11...\textit{h5} 12.\textit{xf5} \textit{xf4+} and two of White’s minor pieces are hanging as well as his g2-pawn) 11...\textit{exf4} 12.\textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 13.\textit{c2} \textit{c6} 14.0–0 \textit{b4} 15.\textit{b3} \textit{d7,} followed by \textit{c5}. The queens have been exchanged indeed, but Black’s initiative is still very powerful.

(diagram)

10...\textit{exf4} 11.\textit{d3} \textit{e8+} 12.\textit{e2} \textit{c6} 13.0–0 \textit{e4} 14.\textit{e1} \textit{g5?} – Black exerts pressure against the d4-square and this compensates his doubled f-pawns. If White advances d4–d5, then the entire dark-squared complex in his position would be weakened.
This chapter will be devoted to the analysis of a system named after World Champion number 7, Vasily Smyslov who has contributed greatly to its development.

What is the idea of this system? The answer to this question is very simple. Black is playing the King’s Indian Defence, while White is playing the Queens Gambit: \( f3, g5, e3 \). The placement of the pawn on e3 here is more justified than in the previous chapter, because he makes this move only after his bishop has been developed to an active position and the pawn on e3 does not restrict it.

As a rule, in the Smyslov system, White develops at first his knight \( B) 4.\texttt{f3} \). Still, before that, we will analyse \( A) 4.\texttt{g5} \).

\( A) 4.\texttt{g5} \)

White wishes to play \( e2-e3 \) and Black will not have the possibility, after \( h7-h6 \) and \( g6-g5 \), to attack the enemy bishop on g3 with the move \( \texttt{h5} \), since White’s queen will control the h5-square from d1.

\( 4...\texttt{d6}!? \)

It seems less precise for Black to play \( 4...0-0 \), because after \( \texttt{d2} \ d6 \ e4 \), contrary to the variations, we will analyse in Chapter 8, he fails to oust the enemy bishop from g5 with the move \( h7-h6 \), because of his premature castling.
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5.e3

5.e4 h6 – see Chapter 8, variation A.

5.\(\text{f}3\) 0–0 – see variation B.

5.h3 0–0 6.e4 (6.\(\text{f}3\) h6 – see variation B) 6...c5 – see Chapter 9, variation B.

After 5.\(\text{d}2\), Black must deprive immediately his opponent of the possibility \(\text{h}6\). 5...h6 6.\(\text{h}4\) (Following 6.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{h}5\) 7.\(\text{e}3\), the placement of White’s bishop in front of his e2-pawn is not good at all. 7...\(\text{c}6\) 8.\(\text{f}3\), Galinsky – Kosikov, Kiev 2005. Here, Black’s simplest road to equality would be to prepare the exchange of the knight. 8...\(\text{f}6\)?! 9.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{f}5\)–, followed by \(\text{e}4\).) 6...\(\text{bd}7\) 7.\(\text{f}3\) 0–0 8.e3 e5. In this chapter we will analyse Black’s plan to undermine the enemy centre with the move c7-c5. Still, the pawn-advance e7-e5 would not be bad either. The point is that White needs the d2-square for his knight in the Smyslov system. Here, his queen has occupied it, so White will have to lose a tempo for the move \(\text{c}2\). 9.dxe5 dxe5 10.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}8\) 11.\(\text{c}2\) c6 12.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}7\) 13.0–0 a5 14.\(\text{a}4\), Troianescu – Hort, Venice 1969. Now, it seems logical for Black to trade a couple of knights 14...\(\text{b}6\)?? 15.\(\text{x}b6\) \(\text{xb}6\)–. The position is approximately equal and later, Black only needs to prevent the transfer of White’s knight to the d6-square (\(\text{d}2\)-e4-d6, or \(\text{d}2\), c4-c5, \(\text{d}2\)-c4-d6).

5...0–0

6.\(\text{d}3\)

This move has the defect that White’s queen does not control the important d4-square any more.

6.\(\text{f}3\) c5 – see variation B.

After 6.e2 c5 7.d5 (It looks more reliable for White to opt here for 7.\(\text{f}3\) h6 – see variation B2.) 7...\(\text{a}5\), White fails to play \(\text{d}2\), since his knight is still on g1 and is forced to parry Black’s threat \(\text{e}4\) in a less favourable fashion. 8.\(\text{d}2\) a6 9.a4 White prevents b7-b5, but weakens the b4-square. (It would not be logical for him to play here 9.f4, because after 9...\(\text{b}5\) 10.\(\text{f}3\) b4 11.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}4\)\(=\), the important central e4-square would remain in Black’s hands, Unglaub – Busek, ICCF 2000) 9...\(\text{bd}7\) 10.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{b}4\) 11.a5 b5\(=\) – White lags in development,
while Black’s queenside initiative is running effortlessly, Sjoberg – Schutz, Sweden 1993.

6...c5 7.d5

After 7.\(\text{Ge2}\), White loses his control over the h5-square and this enables Black to begin a chase after his opponent’s dark-squared bishop. 7...\(\text{Cc6}\) 8.0–0 \(\text{h6}\) 9.\(\text{h4}\) cxd4 10.exd4 \(\text{g5}\) 11.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{h5}\), followed by f7-f5-f4, or \(\text{g3}\), obtaining at least the two-bishop advantage, Hill – Bergmanis, Melbourne 1971.

7...\(\text{Fa5}\) 8.\(\text{Ge2}\) \(\text{bd7}\)

Black’s plans include the pawn-advance b7-b5, but before that he wishes to trade his opponent’s light-squared bishop.

9.0–0 \(\text{Ge5}\) 10.f4 \(\text{xd3}\) 11.\(\text{xd3}\)

Black must be in a hurry. If he plays too slow, White will advance e3–e4–e5 seizing completely the initiative.

12.\(\text{xb5}\) a6. Black is having a favourable version of the Benko Gambit, since he has managed to exchange his knight for the enemy bishop. 13.\(\text{a4}\). White must already think about defending. (It is obviously worse for him to continue with the straightforward line: 13.e4?! \(\text{xb5}\) 14.e5, Berezjuk – Sejkora, Tatranska Lomnica 1998, because after 14...b4 15.exf6 exf6 16.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{a6}\) 17.\(\text{d2}\) bxc3 18. bxc3 f5–+, White’s material losses would be unavoidable.) 13... \(\text{xb5}\) 14.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 15.\(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{xa1}\) 16.\(\text{xa1}\) \(\text{xa1+}\) 17.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{a7}\), followed by \(\text{d7}\), \(\text{b8}\), \(\text{ab7}\), \(\text{xb5}\). White must already think about survival, since after the fall of the b5-pawn, his pawn on b2 is unlikely to hold on for long.

B) 4.\(\text{f3}\) 0–0 5.\(\text{g5}\) d6

6.e3

This is White’s most popular move and it is in the spirit of the Smyslov system, which is not aggressive at all. White does not oc-
cupy the centre with e2-e4 and wishes at first to control the dark squares.

6.e4 h6 – see Chapter 15, variation A.

6...d2 \textit{f5} 7.h4. White wishes to remove the enemy bishop from the f5-square in order to deprive Black of the possibility to play \textit{d}e4. The placement of White's knight however, is not so advantageous at the edge of the board. (7.h6 c5 – see Chapter 6, variation B2) 7...d7 8.e4 e5= The position is approximately equal. The point is that it would be bad for White to play 9.d5?! , because of 9...h6 and he would have to present Black with the two-bishop advantage exchanging on f6. It would be a blunder for White to opt for 10.xh6?? \textit{x}e4! 11.xxe4 xh4++ and he would lose a piece.

The move 6.h3!? has some venom. White solves radically the problem with his bishop on g5. Now, if Black begins a chase after it (h7-h6, g6-g5, \textit{h}5), it can always go to h2. 6...h6 7.h4 (7.f4 \textit{c}6 8.e3 \textit{d}7 9.xg3, Brooke – Pleasants, Birmingham 2016, 9...e5=) 7...c5 8.e3 (following 8.d5, Lysyj – Gladyshev, Tula 2003, Black obtains a comfortable position after 8...g5 9.xg3 \textit{f}5=) 8...xd4 9.xd4 (There arises a more complicated position if Black captures with his pawn 9.exd4 \textit{c}6 10.d5, Rath – Berg, Esbjerg 1982, 10...b4!? 11.a3 \textit{a}6\textit{Z}, followed by \textit{c}5 and eventually \textit{fe}4.) 9...\textit{c}6 10.e2 \textit{xd}4 11.e4= d5. Black complies with entering a position with an isolated pawn. 12.0–0 dxc4 13.xc4 xh6 14.b3 e6. The position is about equal and Black only needs to develop his bishop on c8. 15.xg3 \textit{d}7 16.e5, Garcia Ilundain – Arizmendi, Cala Mendia 2001, 16...\textit{c}6?!= – Black’s prospects are not worse at all.

The move 6.h3!? has some venom. White solves radically the problem with his bishop on g5. Now, if Black begins a chase after it (h7-h6, g6-g5, \textit{h}5), it can always go to h2. 6...h6 7.h4 (7.f4 \textit{c}6 8.e3 \textit{d}7 9.xg3, Brooke – Pleasants, Birmingham 2016, 9...e5=) 7...c5 8.e3 (following 8.d5, Lysyj – Gladyshev, Tula 2003, Black obtains a comfortable position after 8...g5 9.xg3 \textit{f}5=) 8...xd4 9.xd4 (There arises a more complicated position if Black captures with his pawn 9.exd4 \textit{c}6 10.d5, Rath – Berg, Esbjerg 1982, 10...b4!? 11.a3 \textit{a}6\textit{Z}, followed by \textit{c}5 and eventually \textit{fe}4.) 9...\textit{c}6 10.e2 \textit{xd}4 11.e4= d5. Black complies with entering a position with an isolated pawn. 12.0–0 dxc4 13.xc4 xh6 14.b3 e6. The position is about equal and Black only needs to develop his bishop on c8. 15.xg3 \textit{d}7 16.e5, Garcia Ilundain – Arizmendi, Cala Mendia 2001, 16...\textit{c}6?!= – Black’s prospects are not worse at all.

6...c5
must make a choice between the ambitious move B1) 7.d5 and the more prudent B2) 7.\&e2.

7.h3 h6 8.\&h4 cxd4 – see 6.h3.

Naturally, Black will have no problems after a transfer into an endgame. 7.dxc5 dxc5 8.\&xd8 \&xd8 9.\&e2 \&c6 – Inkiov – M. Ivanov, Besancon 1998.

The move 7.\&d3 seems less reliable than 7.\&e2, because on this square the bishop impedes his queen to control the d4-square and following \&g4, it does not prevent the pin of his knight. 7... h6 8.\&h4 cxd4 9.exd4 \&g4 10.0–0 \&c6. Black’s pieces have created pressure against the d4-square and he only needs to play \&d7. 11.\&e2. White must lose a tempo in order to get rid of the pin. 11...\&d7 12.\&d2?! \&xf3 13.\&xf3 \&xd4 14.\&xb7 \&xb8 15.\&e4 g5 16.\&g3, Askarov – Amonatov, Kazan 2007, 16...\&c5 – Black’s pieces are very active and White must be constantly on the alert about the threat f7-f5-f4.

B1) 7.d5 h6 8.\&h4 g5 9.\&g3 \&h5

The position is double-edged. Black controls the dark squares and White is dominant on the light squares.

(diagram)

10.\&d3

His bishop will be active on this square.

10.\&e2 f5. As a rule, Black should not be in a hurry to exchange on g3 before White has castled kingside; otherwise, his rook may take part in an attack against Black’s king on the opened h-file. 11.0–0, Speelman – Lawton, England 2014 (11.\&c2 \&e8 – see 10.\&c2; 11.\&d2 \&xg3 12.hxg3 e6 – see 10.\&d2) 11...\&xg3. Now, the exchange has become possible. 12.hxg3 \&xc3!? This is a typical resource for the King’s Indian Defence. Black exchanges his powerful dark-squared bishop, but doubles his opponent’s pawns and what is even more important – now, White cannot develop any initiative on the queenside, since the move b2-b4 has become impossible. 13.bxc3 e5 14.dxe6 \&xe6 15.\&b1 \&e7 16.\&d2 \&c6 – Black’s king is a bit weakened, but White’s queenside pawn-structure is not perfect either, so these two defects balance each other.

10.\&c2. This is a flexible move and here Black must consider the possibility of his opponent’s castling on either side of the
board. 10...f5 11.\textbf{e}2 (Following 11.\textbf{d}3, Black may even try to seize the initiative. 11...e5 12.dxe6 \textbf{x}e6 13. \textbf{d}1 \textbf{c}6 14.\textbf{e}2 f4 15. exf4, Lysyj – Bragin, Tula 2003, 15...\textbf{x}f4! \textbf{c}8 and Black’s piece-activity compensates with an interest the vulnerability of his d6-pawn.) 11...\textbf{e}8. Black defends his knight on h5. Now, he does not need to be afraid of any tactical threats connected with the move \textbf{g}5.

12.\textbf{d}1 (The move 12.0-0-0 seems less reliable, because after 12...\textbf{a}6 13.a3 \textbf{c}7 14.\textbf{d}2, Danielian – Hirneise, Cappelle la Grande 2008, 14...\textbf{d}7! ?\textbf{c}, Black will be perfectly prepared to open the b-file with the move b7-b5.) 12...a6 13.\textbf{d}2 \textbf{d}7 14.0-0, Tomashevsky – Ding, St Petersburg 2012. Here, Black had the interesting possibility 14...f4!? 15.exf4 \textbf{x}f4, followed by \textbf{e}5. His pieces are very active, while White will hardly be able to exploit the vulnerability of the light squares in his opponent’s camp.

10.\textbf{d}2. White forces the immediate exchange on g3. 10...

\textbf{g}xg3 11.hxg3 f5. It is best for Black to cover immediately the weakened b1-h7 diagonal.

12.\textbf{e}2 e6 13.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{a}6 14.a3 \textbf{c}7 15.dxe6 \textbf{x}e6 – Black’s two-bishop advantage may become a telling factor in the future, Solomunovic – Nenezic, Kragujevac 2015.

It would be too risky for White to choose 12.f4, because this would weaken his e3-pawn. 12...e5 13.dxe6 \textbf{x}e6 14.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{c}6 15.a3 \textbf{a}6 16.\textbf{d}3 g4\textbf{f} Furman – Sylvan, Pardubice 2014.

After 12.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{a}6, Black would be threatening to counter \textbf{d}3 with \textbf{b}4, so he would win a tempo for the transfer of his knight to c7. 13.a3 \textbf{c}7 14.\textbf{d}3, Petran – Wittmann, Balatonlelle 2008, 14...e6!?\textbf{c}

12.\textbf{d}3 \textbf{a}6 13.e4. White begins active actions in the centre. His task is to open the b1-h7 diagonal. His last move weakens considerably the dark squares in his camp, however. 13...e6 14. dxe6 \textbf{b}4 15.\textbf{b}1 f4 16.gxf4 gxf4 17.e5 \textbf{x}e6= Sargissian – Inarkiev, Kemer 2007.

10...\textbf{a}5!?
This move is seldom played, but is not bad at all. Black pins the enemy knight and deprives White of the possibility to play \( \text{Nx}b5 \), after \( b7-b5 \).

11.\( \text{Bc1} \)

White will not be able to castle queenside any more.

After 11.\( \text{Bc2} \), Black obtains a very good game if he sacrifices a pawn in the spirit of the Benko Gambit. 11...\( b5 \) 12.\( \text{cxb5} \) a6 13.0-0 axb5 14.\( \text{Bxb5} \) \( \text{Bxg3} \). Now, at least he has the two-bishop advantage for the sacrificed pawn. 15.\( \text{hxg3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16.\( \text{fc1} \) \( \text{a4} \) 17.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{a6} \) 18.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 19.\( \text{a3} \) \( \text{fb8} \). Black has good compensation for the pawn. 20.\( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{e5} \) 21.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 22.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g7} \) 23.\( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{xa6} \) 24.\( \text{fxg5} \) hxg5 25.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c8} \). His queen is headed for the weakened kingside. 26.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{g4} \)= Black’s pieces are very active, while White has numerous pawn-weaknesses in his camp, Molo – Civitillo, ICCF 2014.

11...\( \text{d7} \)

Black does not need to be in a hurry to play \( b7-b5 \).

12.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xg3} \) 13.\( \text{hxg3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 14.\( \text{e2} \) \( f5 \) 15.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 16.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{fxg4} \) 17.\( \text{fxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \)

His kingside pawn-structure is a bit weakened, but his bishops are very powerful.

18.\( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 19.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e5} \)

White is incapable of exploiting the temporary isolation of the enemy rook in the centre of the board.

20.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b6} \) 21.\( \text{c2} \)

21...\( \text{f5} \) 22.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 23.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \)

White’s doubled g-pawn seems a bit useless.
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24.\textbf{\textit{f1 \textit{f7}}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\end{center}

25.\textbf{\textit{d3}} (25.\textbf{\textit{e3 \textit{h8}}} 26.\textbf{\textit{d3 \textit{xg3}}} 27.\textbf{\textit{f1+ \textit{e8}}} 28.\textbf{\textit{we2 \textit{g8}}} 29.\textbf{\textit{f5 \textit{e5=}}} Black has regained the sacrificed pawn and his position is at least equal thanks to his two powerful bishops, Hofstetter – Rogetzer, ICCF 2007.) 25...\textbf{\textit{f8}} 26.\textbf{\textit{e2 \textit{a6}}} 27.\textbf{\textit{b3 \textit{b5.}}} Black begins active actions on the queenside. 28.\textbf{\textit{e3 \textit{bxc4+}}} 29.\textbf{\textit{xc4 \textit{b5}}} 30.\textbf{\textit{f1+ \textit{g8}}} 31.\textbf{\textit{xf8+ \textit{xf8}}} 32.\textbf{\textit{d2 \textit{xc4}}} 33.\textbf{\textit{bxc4 \textit{a5=}} – Both kings are vulnerable and neither side can afford to play for a win in view of the possibility of a perpetual check, Podvoysky – V.Kuzmin, ICCF 2014.

\textbf{B2)} 7.\textbf{\textit{e2}}

(diagram)

This move leads to a calmer position. White is reluctant to weaken the dark squares in his camp and plans later to play not d4-d5, but dxc5.

7...\textbf{\textit{h6}}

Black’s plan is already well familiar to us. He wishes to attack his opponent’s dark-squared bishop as soon as possible.

8.\textbf{\textit{h4 \textit{g5}}} 9.\textbf{\textit{g3 \textit{h5}}}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board_2.png}
\end{center}

10.\textbf{\textit{dxc5}}

This is a logical continuation of White’s opening treatment.

10.d5 f5 – see variation \textbf{B1}.

It is bad for White to play 10. \textbf{\textit{c2}}, because he weakens his control over the important d4-square with his last move. Black exploits this immediately. 10...g4 11.\textbf{\textit{h4 \textit{cxd4}}} 12.\textbf{\textit{exd4 \textit{c6}}} 13.d5 \textbf{\textit{d4}} 14. \textbf{\textit{d2 \textit{e5}}} 15.\textbf{\textit{dxe6 \textit{xe6}}} 16.\textbf{\textit{d1 \textit{g5=}}} – It would be quite sufficient to compare the power of the knights on d4 and h4 in order to evaluate

10.\textit{d}d3. This move seems a bit artificial. 10...g4. Before capturing on d4, Black ousts the enemy knight from the f3-square. 11.\textit{d}d2 cxd4 12.\textit{xd}4 \textit{c}c6 13.\textit{b}3 a5 14.a4 \textit{f}5 White’s defence would not be easy at all, since Black’s threats, connected with e7-e5 and f5-f4, would be very unpleasant, Kostin – Sapunov, Tula 2004.

10.\textit{c}c1. This move leads to an approximately equal and calm position. 10...cxd4 11.\textit{xd}4 \textit{x}g3 12.hxg3 \textit{c}c6= Black’s two-bishop advantage compensates the slight weakening of his king’s shelter, Tomashevsky – Giri, Olginka 2011.

White cannot create any serious problems for his opponent with the line: 10.0–0 \textit{x}g3 11.\textit{x}g3 cxd4 12.\textit{xd}4 (The position would be much more complicated after 12.exd4 \textit{c}c6 13.d5 \textit{e}5 14.\textit{d}d4 \textit{b}6 15.\textit{b}3 \textit{d}7\infty and later Black will place one of his rooks on c8, exerting powerful pressure against the c4-pawn, Diekmann – Goeke, Frankfurt 2004.) 12...\textit{c}6 13.\textit{d}2 \textit{d}7 14.\textit{f}d1 \textit{c}8 15.\textit{ac}1, Nikolishvili – Gagunashvili, Tbilisi 2002, 15...\textit{e}5!\infty – Once again Black’s two powerful bishops compensate the feeble shelter of his king.

10...\textit{x}g3 11.hxg3 dx\textit{c}5

White would only lose time with the move 13.\textit{h}5, because Black would defend easily against the threat \textit{g}5 with 13...\textit{f}5, for example: 14.\textit{g}4 \textit{c}6 15.\textit{d}1, Cori Tello – Wang, Athens 2012, 15...\textit{f}6!?\infty

After 13.g4, Black equalises with a precise play. 13...\textit{c}6 14.a3 \textit{e}7 15.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}8. After Black’s king has gained access to the f8-square, he will not be afraid of his opponent’s threats on the kingside. 16.\textit{h}7+ \textit{f}8 17.\textit{e}4 \textit{d}7 18.g3 \textit{e}8= – It is now White who should play very carefully; otherwise, Black’s two-bishop advantage would become a telling factor.
in the future, Orsag – Heinrich, Germany 2013.

13...\texttt{W}e7

\textbf{14.g4}
White impedes the enemy pawn-advance \texttt{f7-f5}.

His alternatives do not promise him anything meaningful.

14.\texttt{Q}e4. White prepares penetration to the d6-square, but this manoeuvre would take too much time. 14...\texttt{f}5 15.\texttt{Q}d6 \texttt{Q}c6 16.0-0 \texttt{Q}d8 17.\texttt{Q}xc8 \texttt{Q}axc8= Luise – Tasic, LSS 2008.

Black has no problems at all after 14.0-0 \texttt{Q}c6 15.\texttt{Q}d2 \texttt{Q}d8= Balashov – Poluljahov, Krasnodar 1996.

14.\texttt{Q}d2. This move seems too academic. 14...\texttt{Q}c6 15.g4 b6 16.a3 \texttt{Q}b7 17.\texttt{Q}de4 \texttt{Q}ad8 18.0-0 \texttt{Q}e5= Black has defended against the penetration of the enemy knight to the d6-square and his prospects are not worse in the forthcoming fight thanks to his bishop-pair, Nielsen – Maliangkay, Denmark 1998.

14...\texttt{Q}c6 15.a3
White prevents \texttt{Q}b4.

15.\texttt{Q}d2 b6 – see 14.\texttt{Q}d2.
15.\texttt{Q}e4 f5\texttt{\infty} Camara – Trois, Blumenau 1972.

15...\texttt{b}6 16.\texttt{Q}d3

\textbf{16...\texttt{Q}d8!}
After a check on h7, it is important for Black to have the possibility to go with his king to f8.

17.\texttt{Q}h7+ \texttt{Q}f8 18.\texttt{Q}xd8+ \texttt{Q}xd8
White’s attacking potential diminishes with the exchange of every rook.

19.\texttt{Q}e4 \texttt{Q}b7 20.0-0 \texttt{Q}e7 21.\texttt{Q}d1 \texttt{Q}d8 22.\texttt{Q}xd8+ \texttt{Q}xd8 23.\texttt{Q}d2 \texttt{Q}d7= Black has parried his opponent’s initiative, having traded the rooks, and has no difficulties in the forthcoming battle, Lechtynsky – Znamenacek, Czech Republic 2002.
Beginning with this chapter, we will analyse White's strongest and most logical move – 4.e4. He emphasizes the basic drawback of the King's Indian Defence and occupies immediately the centre.

4...d6

Now, we will deal with the moves A) 5.g5, B) 5.ge2 and C) 5.d3, while White's main lines will be analysed in the following chapters of our book.

His alternatives usually lead to transpositions:

5.d5 0–0 6.d3 (6.f3 c6 – see Chapter 15; 6.e2 a6 – Chapter 10) 6...bd7 – see variation C.

5.g3 0–0 6.g2 c5 – see Chapter 1, variation A1.

5.e3 0–0

6.f3 c6 – see Chapter 14. 6.f4 g4 – see Chapter 11. 6.h3 e5 – see Chapter 9, variation A. 6.e2 c5 – see Chapter 10, variation A. 6.f3 e5 – see Chapter 15, variation B.

A) 5.g5

This move is often played by I. Sokolov and V. Milov. It does not promise an advantage to White, because he reveals his plans a bit too early.

5...h6
This is Black's most precise move. He wishes to clarify immediately the intentions of the enemy bishop on g5.

\textbf{6.}\texttt{e}3

Here, the bishop will come under attack after \texttt{g}4, but the other retreats of the bishop look even worse. For example after 6.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{c}6 7.d5 e5 8.e3, Cebalo - Bukic, Borovo 1981, Black has a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 8... \texttt{d}4!? 9.xd4 exd4 10.xd4 0-0x\texttt{.} He has a lead in development and two powerful bishops for the pawn. White must be very careful about the weak dark squares in his camp.

After 6.h4, the bishop remains isolated from the queenside. In addition, in some variations, the insufficient protection of the f4-square may hurt White (\texttt{h}5-f4). For example: 6...c5 7.d5 \texttt{a}5 8.d2 (8.d3 \texttt{bd}7 9.f4 \texttt{h}5! 10.\texttt{ge}2 \texttt{xf}4. Black gains access to the e5-square with this temporary piece-sacrifice. 11.xf4, Bisguier - Henley, Lone Pine 1977, 11.g5!? 12.0-0 gxh4 13.xc1 \texttt{d}4+ 14.h1 \texttt{e}5+ - White's dark squares are catastrophically weak in this position.) 8.bd7 9.e2 (9.f4 \texttt{h}5 Erlandsen - Csillik, Budapest 1993) 9...\texttt{b}6. Black's knight is headed for the a4-square in order to trade the defender of the e4-pawn. 10.f3 \texttt{a}4 11.xa4 \texttt{b}a4 12.d3, Kopta - Zelinka, Prague 1995. Here, it seems very good for Black to enter an endgame with the line: 12...\texttt{b}4!? 13.xb4 cxb4+, (followed by \texttt{d}7-c5) - Black's pieces exert powerful pressure against White's kingside.

\textbf{6...}\texttt{g}4 7.\texttt{c}1

Naturally, White should better not allow the exchange of his powerful dark-squared bishop.

\textbf{7...c}5

Black begins a fight for the d4-square.

\textbf{8.d}5

Here, White should better forget his ambitious plans and try to equalise transferring into an end-
8...\textit{d}d4

Before advancing e7-e5, Black occupies with his bishop an active square in the centre of the board.

9.\textit{h}h3

White must place his knight at the edge of the board in order to protect the f2-square.

9...\textit{e}5 10.dxe6

After this exchange of pawns, Black obtains the c6-square for his knight and completes quickly the development of his queenside pieces.

It is possible that White should better not open the position in the centre: 10.\textit{d}d3 f5 11.f3 \textit{g}f6 12.\textit{b}b5, Cramling – Lokander, Stockholm 2012, 12...\textit{a}6!?=

10...\textit{x}xe6 11.\textit{xe}2 \textit{h}4 12.0–0 \textit{c}6 13.\textit{d}d5 0–0–0

Black's pieces are very active. White can hardly obtain anything meaningful out of his centralised knight on d5.

14.\textit{d}df4

In his book about the King's Indian Defence Viorel Bologan considered that White would obtain an edge after 14.\textit{f}f4. This is not true however, because after the simple response 14...\textit{g}ge5\textbullet, followed by \textit{f}7-\textit{f}5, \textit{h}h8 and \textit{e}e8, Black has the edge. We must also mention that he should not be tempted to capture the enemy knight \textit{x}h3, since he would lose his queen after g2-g3.

14...\textit{g}ge5 15.\textit{x}xe6 \textit{fxe}6 16.\textit{h}1 \textit{g}5\textsuperscript{†} – Black's pieces have occupied the centre of the board, while White's knight on h3 is misplaced, I.Sokolov – Solleveld, Netherlands 2001.

B) 5.\textit{ge}2

White prepares the transfer of his knight to g3, but this plan seems a bit slow. He will need to waste two tempi for this (contrary to the development of his knight to f3), moreover that the knight on g3 can be attacked after h5-h4 in numerous variations.
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5...0–0

6.\( \text{\textit{g3}} \)

6.h3 a6 – see Chapter 9.

6.f3 \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) – see Chapter 13.

Following 6.\( \text{\textit{g5}} \), just like in variation A, Black should better clarify immediately the intentions of the enemy bishop on g5. 6...h6, for example: 7.\( \text{\textit{f4}} \) (7.\( \text{\textit{e3}} \ \text{\textit{g4}} \) 8.\( \text{\textit{c1}} \) c5 9.d5 e6 10.h3 \( \text{\textit{e5}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{f4}} \) exd5, Larsen – Gligoric, Leningrad 1973, 12.\( \text{\textit{fxd5}} \) \( \text{\textit{bd7}} \) 13.\( \text{\textit{e2}} \ \text{\textit{b6}} \) = – with good counterplay for Black) 7...\( \text{\textit{c6}} \) 8.d5 (8.\( \text{\textit{d2?!}} \) e5 9.\( \text{\textit{exh6}} \) \( \text{\textit{exh6}} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{exe6}} \) \( \text{\textit{dxe6}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{d2}} \) c5\( \text{\textit{f}} \) – The exchange of a rook pawn for a central pawn is a serious positional achievement for Black, Jussupow – Shaked, Linares 1997.) 8...\( \text{\textit{e5}} \) 9.\( \text{\textit{d4}} \) c6\( \text{\textit{c}} \) Bolz – Morozov, ICCF 2013.

The plan with the fianchettto of the bishop – 6.g3 used to be popular, but lost its adherents, since it became clear that after 6...c5, White should fight for equality.

\[ \text{\textit{g2}} \ \text{\textit{c6}} \] – see Volume 1, Chapter 3, variation B.

After 7.d5, it seems very good for Black to sacrifice a pawn: 7...b5!? 8.cxb5 a6 9.bxa6 \( \text{\textit{xa6}} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{f4}} \) \( \text{\textit{a5}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{d2}} \) \( \text{\textit{bd7}} \) 12.\( \text{\textit{xa6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa6}} \) and he has obtained an excellent version of the Benko Gambit, since White’s king is stranded in the centre, Makarichev – Rashkovsky, Moscow 1982.

7.dxc5 dxc5 8.\( \text{\textit{xe2}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6}} \). Black is reluctant to waste time for the protection of his c5-pawn. 9.\( \text{\textit{g2}} \) (Following 9.\( \text{\textit{xd8}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd8}} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) his pieces become very active: 10...\( \text{\textit{d7}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{a3}} \) \( \text{\textit{de5}} \) 12.\( \text{\textit{g1}} \) \( \text{\textit{g4}} \) 13.\( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{d4}} \)\( \text{\textit{f}} \) and White is beyond salvation.) 9...\( \text{\textit{g4}} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{xd8}} \) (10.\( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) \( \text{\textit{a5}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{a3}} \) \( \text{\textit{ge5}} \) 12.\( \text{\textit{d5}} \) \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) 13.0–0 \( \text{\textit{e6}} \) Pomar Salamanca – Gligoric, Madrid 1960) 10...\( \text{\textit{xd8}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) \( \text{\textit{ge5}} \) 12.0–0 \( \text{\textit{xc4}} \)\( \text{\textit{f}} \) Black regains his pawn and preserves all the advantages of his position, Pomar Salamanca – Reshevsky, Munich 1958.

6...\( \text{\textit{h5}} \) (diagram)

This is an energetic move. Black wishes to advance this pawn all the way forward to the h3-
square in order to deprive his opponent’s king of a reliable shelter on the kingside.

7.\(\texttt{\textgambit e2}\)

After 7.\(\texttt{Ag5}\), Black can oust the enemy bishop with 7...\(\texttt{Ae7}\) and will advance h5-h4 anyway. 8.\(\texttt{Af3}\) e5 9.d5 (The transfer into an endgame following 9.dxe5 dxe5 10.\(\texttt{Exd8 Exd8}\), would not bring anything to White, due to the weakness of the d4-square. 11.\(\texttt{Ed5}\) \(\texttt{Ed7}\)? 12.0-0-0 \(\texttt{Eg8}\) 13.\(\texttt{Ed3}\) \(\texttt{Ee6}\) 14.\(\texttt{Af4}\) \(\texttt{Ed6}\) Biel – Levandovska, ICCF 2013) 9...h4 10.\(\texttt{Ge2}\) f5\(\infty\) Vorobiov – Ashwin, Mumbai 2010.

7.h4. White solves radically the problem with h5-h4, but weakens the g4-square. 7...\(\texttt{Ec6}\) 8.d5 \(\texttt{De5}\) 9.\(\texttt{Af4}\) c6 10.\(\texttt{Ee2}\) \(\texttt{Ed7}\)? 11.\(\texttt{Ed2}\) \(\texttt{Ec8}\\infty\)

7...h4 8.\(\texttt{Ef1}\) h3 9.\(\texttt{G4}\)

This is an ambitious move.

After the more modest try 9.\(\texttt{G3}\), Black solves easily his opening problems. 9...\(\texttt{Db7}\) 10.\(\texttt{Ee3}\) e5 11.

9...b5!? Black sacrifices a pawn and opens files on the queenside depriving the enemy monarch of the possibility to seek a shelter there in the future.

10.\(\texttt{Cxb5}\) a6 11.\(\texttt{Gg5}\) \(\texttt{Dfd7}\) 12.\(\texttt{Ee3}\) axb5 13.\(\texttt{Ixh5}\) \(\texttt{Gb7}\). There has arisen a complicated position with mutual chances.

14.\(\texttt{Gg1}\) \(\texttt{Ee4}\) 15.\(\texttt{Gg3}\) \(\texttt{Da6}\) 16.\(\texttt{Ec3}\) \(\texttt{Gg2}\) 17.\(\texttt{Gxg2}\) hxg2 18.\(\texttt{Exg2}\) c5 19.\(\texttt{Gc3}\) \(\texttt{Wa5}\\infty\) – Black has powerful initiative for the sacrificed pawn, while White will hardly find a safe shelter for his king, Runting – Ciciotti, ICCF 2013.

C) 5.\(\texttt{Ed3}\)

This line has venom and is often used by A. Dreev, A. Moiseenko, I. Sokolov. After White’s bishop has been developed to an ac-
tive position, he wishes to play $\text{d}ge2$ and his pieces will be harmoniously deployed.

Still, the move $5.d3$ has the drawback that in the future Black will have the possibility to attack this bishop with his knight and will either exchange it, or will force White to retreat it losing time for this.

5...0–0

6.$\text{d}ge2$

This is White’s most natural move.

6.h3 $\text{c}6$ – see Chapter 9.
6.f4 c5 – see Chapter 11.
6.f3 c5 – see Chapter 13.
6.$\text{f}3$ $\text{g}4$ – see Chapter 15.

It is bad for White to play here 6.$\text{d}3$?!, because after 6...$\text{g}4$, his bishop would not be able to retreat from the e3-square in view of the defencelessness of the d4-pawn. 7.$\text{d}d7$ $\text{f}3$ 8.$\text{c}5$ $\text{c}2$, Archambault – Watson, ICCF 2007, 8...$\text{f}d7$! 9.$\text{e}3$ e6

White only weakens unnecessarily the dark squares after 6.$\text{d}5$ $\text{bd}7$ 7.$\text{f}3$ $\text{c}5$ 8.$\text{c}2$, Archambault – Watson, ICCF 2007, 8...$\text{fd}7$! 9.$\text{e}3$ e6

Following 6.$\text{g}5$ h6 7.$\text{h}4$ $\text{c}6$, Black obtains good counterplay organising pressure against the enemy d4-pawn. 8.$\text{d}ge2$ (8. $\text{d}5$? $\text{e}5$ 9.$\text{e}2$ c6 10.$\text{f}4$ $\text{ed}7$ 11.$\text{f}3$, Rudnev – Blumberg, Minsk 1993, 11...$\text{wb}6$! – The vulnerability of the dark squares in White’s camp has become quite obvious, moreover that he lags in development.) 8...$\text{h}5$? This is an energetic move. Black’s plans include $\text{g}6$-$\text{g}5$, e7-e5, f7-f5 and $\text{f}4$. 9.$\text{c}2$ g5 10.$\text{g}3$ e5? 11.$\text{d}4$ $\text{d}4$ 12.0–0 $\text{xc}2$ 13.$\text{wx}c2$ f5 14. exf5 $\text{x}f5$ 15.$\text{e}4$ $\text{f}4$ – He has realised his plans and can be quite optimistic about the future.

6...c5

Black undermines the enemy centre and wishes to provoke d4-d5, in order to prolong the diagonal of his bishop on g7 and what is even more important to obtain the e5-square for his knight.

7.$\text{d}5$ e6

Black undermines immediately the enemy centre. He wishes to open the e-file for his rook and will decide only later which knight to deploy on e5.
White has a great choice of moves here. As his main lines, we will analyse: C1) 8...g5 and C2) 8.0–0.

8.f3 exd5 – see Chapter 13.

8.dxe6 fxe6 9.0–0 g4 – see variation C2.

8.g3. This is a good move. White provides additional protection of his e4-pawn. His further plans include the preparation of the pawn-advances f2-f4 and e4-e5, seizing completely the initiative in the centre, therefore Black must play very precisely. 8...exd5 9.cxd5 a6 10.a4 b7d7 11.0–0 (following 11.f4, V.Georgiev – Nedev, Plovdiv 2011, Black can try a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 11...c4!? 12.xc4 h5 13.h3 h4 14.ge2 xc5+) 11...e8. This knight is headed for the c7-square from where it will support b7-b5. In addition, he will have the possibility to push f7-f5, preventing the development of his opponent’s initiative in the centre and on the kingside. 12.f4 b8 13.e3 c7 14.e5 f5. Black deprives White’s knights of the e4-square. 15.exf6 xf6 16.f5 b5 17.axb5 axb5 18.d2 (18.fxg6? g4!!+) 18...c4 19.e2 xf5 20.xf5 gxf5 21.xf5 e7. The position is very complicated and is still within equality. Black’s queenside counterplay balances White’s initiative on the opposite side of the board. 22.f3 b4 23. e2 e4 24.xf8+ xf8 25.xb4. In the game Schafer – Panitevsky, ICCF 2014, the opponents agreed to a draw, since after 25...c3 26.bxc3 xe3+ 27.f1 xd3 28. xd6 xd5 29.g1 xc3 30. xd3 cxd3 31.xc3 xc3 32.a8 xa8 33.xa8 d2=, there would arise a dead drawish endgame with bishops of opposite colour on the board.

It seems reliable, but somewhat slow for White to choose 8.h3. He solves radically the problem with the manoeuvre g6-g4-e5, but at the price of a tempo. 8...exd5

9.exd5 fd7 10.f4. White prevents e5. (After his alternatives, Black equalises effortlessly. 10.b3 e5 11.c2, Videki – Danailov,
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Vienna 1990, 11...b5!? Black is playing very actively. 12.cxb5 a6 13.b6 a5 14.0-0 Qa6 15.a3 \(\text{w}x\text{b}6\#) 10.0-0 Qe5 11.b3 b5!? He seizes the initiative with a pawn-sacrifice. 12.cxb5 Qxd3 13. \(\text{w}x\text{d}3\) a6 14.b6, Garcia Alarcon – Ostos, Cali 2007. White gives back the pawn and prevents the appearance of the enemy bishop on the a6-square. Now however, he would be incapable of fighting for the advantage in the opening. 14...Qd7!? 10...\(\text{w}h4\) 11.g3 \(\text{w}e7\) 12.0-0 Qa6 13.a4 Qc7 14.a4. White has more space and his game is freer, but Black has no pawn-weaknesses in his camp and the position becomes gradually equal. 14...f5 15.\(\text{g}e1\) Qf6 16. \(\text{g}g1\) \(\text{w}d7\) 17.\(\text{h}d2\) b6 18.\(\text{f}f3\) \(\text{b}b8\) 19.\(\text{h}b5\) \(\text{b}b7\) 20.\(\text{g}g5\) \(\text{w}d8\) 21.\(\text{x}c7\) \(\text{x}c7\). The trade of a couple of knights is in favour of Black, since his position is a bit cramped. Later, he must be on the alert about the possibility Qe6. 22.a5 \(\text{e}e7\) 23.\(\text{x}e7\) \(\text{xe7}\) 24.\(\text{b}b3\) \(\text{c}c7\) 25.\(\text{x}c3\) h6. Black ousts the enemy knight from the g5-square and equalises completely. 26.axb6 axb6 27.\(\text{f}f3\) \(\text{h}7\) 28.\(\text{e}e1\) \(\text{d}8\) 29.\(\text{c}c2\) \(\text{e}8\) 30. \(\text{a}a1\) \(\text{e}7\) 31.\(\text{a}a4\) Qe4=. – After Black has stabilised his knight in the centre, his prospects are not worse at all, Lednev – Telepnev, ICCF 2011.

There arises a more complicated fight if White captures with his other pawn. The pawn-structure becomes typical for the Modern Benoni. 9.cxd5 \(\text{e}bd7\) 10.0-0 a6 11.a4 Qe5 12.\(\text{x}c2\) \(\text{b}8\) 13.\(\text{f}f4\) \(\text{f}6d7\) 14.a5 \(\text{h}5\) 15.axb6 \(\text{xb}6\) 16.\(\text{g}4\). It looks like White would triumph on the kingside, but Black would have his trumps as well. 16...\(\text{b}4\) 17.\(\text{g}3\) Qe8. He prepares the transfer of his knight to b5. 18.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 19.\(\text{g}e2\) \(\text{b}5\) Toca – Gillar, ICCF 2015. White must be very careful about the possible penetration of the enemy knight to the d4-outpost. In addition, it is unclear how he can develop his initiative on the kingside, because the pawn-advance f4-f5 would present the strategically important e5-square to Black’s pieces.

C1) 8.\(\text{g}5\)

White pins the enemy knight and impedes the manoeuvre \(\text{g}4\)-e5.

8...h6

Black ousts his opponent’s bishop from g5. If White manages to play \(\text{d}2\), Black would have great difficulties to do this.

\[9.\text{h}4\]
It seems less logical for White to opt here for 9.f4, because Black's knight would not be pinned any more. 9...exd5 10.cxd5 h5 11.e3, Krmelj – Stevanec, Slovenia 1992, 11...d7!/? In this complicated position White cannot play 12.g4?, because of 12...exf5! and capturing of the knight would lead to a checkmate. 13.gxh5?? f3+ 14.f1 h3#

9...exd5

10.exd5

Black will hardly have any problems if White captures with the other pawn. 10.cxd5 a6 11.a4 bd7 12.0–0 e5 13.f4 (Following 13.c2, White may even fail to equalise. 13...g5 14.g3 h5 15. xe5 xe5 16.a3 b8 – The dark squares in White’s camp are horribly weak, A.Fominyh – Khomyakov, Moscow 1994) 13...xd3 14.xd3, Krysztofiak – Persowski, Ustron 2003, 14...b6!/? – Black’s two powerful bishops compensate White’s extra space.

GM Moiseenko tried in some of his games the move 10.xd5, but Black should not be afraid of it if he plays precisely. 10...c6 11.0–0 (After 11.c3, Moiseenko – Bacrot, Tromsoe 2013, it seems very good for Black to choose 11...g5!/? getting rid of the pin of the knight and obtaining an excellent position.) 11...g5 12.g3 xd5 13.exd5 (13.cxd5 e5, with the idea xd3, f7-f5. The activity of Black’s pieces compensates the slight defects of his pawn-structure.) 13...b4 14.c3 f5 15.f4 xd3 16.xd3 a6 – Black’s chances are not worse thanks to his two powerful bishops; Moiseenko – Van Kampen, Germany 2016.

10...bd7 11.f4 g5

Black sacrifices a pawn and begins the fight for the e5-square.

12.g3

12.fxg5. It would be too risky for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice, because after 12..g4 13. d2 de5 14.h7+ Black may pretend to fall into his opponent’s
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trap: 14...hxh7! 15.g6+ fxg6 16.\textit{ax}d8 {\textit{cx}}c4. He has overwhelming initiative for the sacrificed queen. 17.c1 \textit{ge}5 18.bd1 {\textit{xb}}2. Black’s minor pieces annihilate all possible resistance in their way. 19.eb3 \textit{bd}3+ 20.ed2 \textit{xd}8 21.\textit{ab}1 a6 22.ee4 b5. The advance of Black’s queenside pawns settles the issue. 23.eb1 c4 24.eb1 b4 25.h3 a5 26.\textit{f}6+ \textit{h}8. White has no defence against \textit{a}6 and c4-c3. 0–1 Keber – Mondry, Schachserver 2010.

12.e3

Black has eliminated the pin of his knight and wishes to exploit the weakness of the e3-square.

13.0–0

This is an interesting exchange sacrifice, but is still insufficient to maintain an advantage for White.

13.d2, Moiseneko – Munoz Pantoja, Berlin 2015, 13...d4!? 14.fxg5 e3 15.c2 xg5\textit{=} – In this complicated position the threat of the penetration of Black’s knight to the e3-square compensates his compromised kingside pawn-structure.

13...e3 14.d2 xf1 15.xf1, Moiseneko – Bacrot, Tromsoe 2013. Here, the simplest for Black would be 15...e7!? 16.fxg5 hxg5\textit{=} White’s pieces are active and Black’s king is vulnerable. All this compensates White’s exchange sacrifice, but not more than that.

C2) 8.0–0

One of the defects of this natural move is the fact that it does not prevent Black’s plans.

8...g4

19.e2

This is a prophylactic move. White retreats his bishop in advance, before it has been attacked by the enemy knight.

His alternatives cannot promise him an advantage in the opening either.

It is not good for White to play
here 9.h3, because Black's knight is headed for the e5-square anyway. 9...dxe5 10.f4 dxe3 11...wxd3, Boensh – C. Ionescu, Stará Zágora 1990, 11...f5!? Black prevents f4-f5 and obtains a good position. 12...g3 a6∞

Following 9.dxe6 fxe6, White is incapable of exploiting the weakness of the pawns on e6 and d6 and therefore, it becomes unclear why he has given up the centre in the first place. 10.f4 c6 11.h3 f6 12...e3 b6 13...d2, Dumitrache – Moldovan, Bucharest 1995. Here, Black obtains a good position with the line: 13...b4!? 14.b1 a6 15.a3 c6 16.a2 w7∞ and exerting pressure on the f1-a6 diagonal, Black manages to send his opponent’s bishop to a disadvantageous position.

After 9...f4, Black’s simplest reaction would be 9...f6!?, for example: 10.d2 (Following 10. b1 exd5 11.fxd5 cxd5 12.xd5, White cannot achieve much, despite his powerful knight in the centre of the board, because after Black has presented his opponent with the d5-square, he has gained the control over the important d4-square. 12...c6 13.f4 e6 14.wd2 wd7 15.fe1 fe8 16.b3 b6 17.c3 a6. White’s knight is deprived of the b5-square. 18.h6 d4 19.bc1 ab8= – The prospects of both sides are approximately equal, Glukhov – Trofimov, ICCF 2012) 10...exd5 11.exd5 bd7. Black’s knight is headed for the e5-square. 12.c2 a6 13.e1 e5 14.b3 g4. He provokes a weakening of the enemy king shelter. 15.f3 d7 16.a4 b5!? This temporary pawn-sacrifice is Black’s simplest road to equality. 17.axb5 axb5 18.cxb5 b6 19.d3 xa1 20.xa1 xb5 21.xe5 dxe5 22.e4, Dessaulles – Nogal, ICCF 2012, 22...d7= The vulnerability of the pawns on c5 and b3 is approximately balanced.

Following 9.f4, White prevents e5 indeed, but weakens the g1-a7 diagonal. 9...exd5

![](image)

It is bad for White to choose here 10.cxd5?, in view of 10...c4! 11.xc4 wb6+ 12.h1 f2+ 13.xf2 xf2+ and White’s compensation for the exchange is insufficient.

The e-file is opened advantageously for Black after 10.exd5 xe8 11.h3 (Following 11.f3, Black can force a draw by a perpetual check with the line: 11...d4+ 12.xd4 wh4 13.de2 xh2+ 14.fl wh1+ 15.g1 h2+ 16.xf2 e4=) 11...e3 12.xxe3 xe3. Black has exchanged the powerful enemy
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bishop. 13.\texttt{Wd2} \texttt{He8} 14.\texttt{h2} \texttt{a6} 15.\texttt{ae1} \texttt{c7} 16.\texttt{g1}, Seirawan – Wojtkiewicz, Tilburg 1992, 16...f5!?=. He impedes White’s active play on the kingside. He would be incapable of exploiting the weakness of the e6-square, because two of Black’s pieces are protecting it.

After 10.\texttt{xd5}, White cannot obtain anything much out of his dominance over the d5-square. 10...\texttt{c6} 11.\texttt{h3} \texttt{f6} 12.\texttt{dc3} (12.\texttt{f5} \texttt{xd5} 13.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{e5} Dumitrache – Nevednichy, La Fere 2002) 12...\texttt{b6}. Black prepares the development of his bishop to b7. 13.\texttt{e3} \texttt{b7} 14.a3 (White would not achieve anything by a transfer of his bishop to h4: 14.\texttt{f2} \texttt{d7} 15.\texttt{h4} \texttt{ae8} 16.\texttt{g3} \texttt{d4} – Black’s knight is very powerful in the centre and he exerts pressure against the e4-pawn, so he has a very good game, Chatalbashev – Markus, Cetinje 2010.) 14...\texttt{e8} 15.\texttt{f2} \texttt{d7} 16.\texttt{c1} \texttt{h5} – White can hardly exploit the vulnerability of the d6-pawn, because Black’s pieces are very active, Trembecki – Grigoryev, ICCF 2011.

9...\texttt{e5} 10.\texttt{b3} \texttt{xd5} (diagram)

11.\texttt{xd5}

This is a solid move.

The move 11.cxd5 leads to a more complicated fight. 11...\texttt{b5}. Black begins immediate active actions on the queenside. His plans include the quickest possible development of his bishop to a6 from where it would exert powerful pressure against the enemy position. 12.\texttt{b1}. White removes prudently his rook from the juxtaposition with the enemy bishop on g7. (12.\texttt{f4}, Grigore – Marin, Bucharest 1994, 12...\texttt{g4}!? 13.\texttt{b1} b4 14.\texttt{a4} \texttt{d7} – Black’s knight is very powerful in the centre and he exerts pressure against the e4-pawn, so he has a very good game, Chatalbashev – Markus, Cetinje 2010.) 14...\texttt{e8} 15.\texttt{f2} \texttt{d7} 16.\texttt{c1} \texttt{h5} – White can hardly exploit the vulnerability of the d6-pawn, because Black’s pieces are very active, Trembecki – Grigoryev, ICCF 2011.

14.\texttt{f4} (The character of the position would remain more or less the same after 14.a3, E.Hansen – Charbonneau, Lloydminster 2010 and Black’s simplest reaction against that would be 14...a5?!) 14...\texttt{g4} 15.\texttt{h3} \texttt{gf6} 16.\texttt{b2}. White has ousted the enemy knight from the centre and prepares the transfer of his knight to
the c4-square. 16...a6 17.c4 We7 18.g3 b6. Black increases his pressure against the c4-square. 19.d3. It may look like White has consolidated his position, but Black’s active resources are not exhausted yet. 19...h5! Black wished to displace the enemy knight from its active position by marching forward his rook pawn. 20.e1 h4 21.f1 e8 22.d2 h5 White will have great difficulties to neutralise the initiative of Black’s pieces, Papenin – Strautins, ICCF 2011.

11...e8

12.f4
12.a6
From this square Black’s knight may go to c7, or to the b4-square.
13.d2

13.f5
Black restricts considerably his opponent’s minor pieces with this move.

14.ffe1 db4
This knight-sortie introduces disharmony in White’s set-up.

15.b1. Naturally, White is reluctant to exchange his powerful bishop for the enemy knight, but after this retreat his rooks remain disconnected. 15...b5!? Black must play energetically; otherwise, White will oust the enemy knight with the move a2-a3, obtaining better chances. 16.cxb5 db7. This move opens the way for actions of Black’s rook and bishop. 17.a3 dx5. This is the point! Black exploits the insufficient protection of White’s rooks and inflicts a tactical strike.
18.dx5 xa1 19.xf5 g7 20.xc8 xc8∞ – White has sacrificed the exchange and has succeeded in neutralising his opponent’s initiative, but has hardly anything more than equality, Schafer – Ciciotti, ICCF 2014.
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Makogonov Variation

This seemingly modest move is in fact very unpleasant for Black. At first this variation was suggested by Richard Reti and then analysed by Vladimir Makogonov and Alexey Sokolsky. It is named the Makogonov variation in the contemporary theory of the openings. With the move 5.h3 White prepares the development of his bishop to e3 without being afraid of Black’s knight-sortie ♞f6-g4. In addition, in numerous lines, White can play g2-g4, occupying space on the kingside and depriving the enemy knight of the h5-square and also impeding Black’s counterplay, connected with f7-f5. Still, the move h3 has a drawback – it does not contribute to the development of White’s pieces and later his lag in development may tell.

In this chapter we will deal only with the lines in which White is not in a hurry to develop his knight to the f3-square. The rest of the variations will be analysed in Chapter 16. Black should watch carefully for the different transpositions of moves, so that later, when White plays ♞f3, transposing to Chapter 16, he may not do it under favourable circumstances. Therefore, I would recommend to the readers who get acquainted for the first time with the King’s Indian Defence, to study at first Chapter 16 and to deal with this chapter only later.

5...0–0
Now, White must decide where he will develop his dark-squared bishop: A) 6.\textit{e}3, or B) 6.\textit{g}5.

6.\textit{e}2 e5 – see Chapter 10.

6.\textit{f}3 e5 – see Chapter 16.

6.\textit{g}e2. This move, in combination with h2-h3, seems a bit slow. 6...a6!? Black is preparing b7-b5. 7.\textit{g}3. White increases his control over the b5-square, but his knight would be very unstable on the g3-square. (7.\textit{e}3 b5\textsuperscript{2} Romero Holmes – Zelbel, Pula 2012) 7...h5 8.\textit{g}5 \textit{bd}7 9.\textit{w}d2 c5 10.d5 \textit{h}7. Black outst the enemy bishop from its active position. 11.\textit{h}4. The bishop will prevent here the pawn-advance h5-h4, but White must remain constantly on the alert about the possibility g6-g5. 11...\textit{e}8∞ Shishkov – Eschert, ICCF. 2014.

6.\textit{d}3. This move does not combine well either with h2-h3. 6...\textit{c}6. This is an energetic move. Black exploits his opponent’s somewhat slow play and creates immediately counterplay against the d4-square. 7.\textit{g}e2 (7.d5 \textit{e}5 8.\textit{f}3, Stoeck – Solovjov, St Petersburg 2013, 8...\textit{xf}3!?) 9.\textit{w}f3 \textit{d}7 10.\textit{e}2 \textit{c}5\textsuperscript{2}, with good counterplay on the dark squares) 7...e5 8.d5 \textit{d}4. Black’s powerful centralised knight provides him with at least equal prospects.

After the careless move 9. \textit{xd}4?! , White will even fail to equalise. 9...\textit{ex}d4 10.\textit{e}2 \textit{e}8 11. \textit{g}5 (11.f3 c5 12.\textit{g}5 h6 13.\textit{d}2 \textit{d}7\textsuperscript{2}, followed by \textit{e}5. Black has seized the initiative.) 11...h6. Now, White must comply with the unfavourable exchange of his powerful dark-squared bishop; otherwise, he would lose a pawn. 12.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 13.0-0 c5\textsuperscript{2} – Black has two powerful bishops and a protected passed pawn in the centre of the board, V.Georgiev – Sellitti, Campobasso 2010.

9.0-0 \textit{h}5∞ - Black is perfectly prepared for the pawn-advance f7-f5, Sahin Toth – Kovacs, Hungary 1999.

9.\textit{e}3 \textit{h}5 10.0-0, Redman – Markoja, Budva 2013, 10...\textit{h}4→ – White’s king has become rather unsafe and the sacrifice of Black’s bishop on h3 is an imminent threat.

\textbf{A) 6.\textit{e}3}

The bishop is not so active here as on g5, but later it will support White’s queenside offensive (the pawn-advance c4-c5).
This is White’s most logical and strongest move. He occupies space.

About 7.\texttt{d}f3 4c6, or 7.dxe5 dxe5 8.\texttt{d}f3 4c6 – see Chapter 16.

7...4a6
Black increases his control over the important c5-square.

Now, we will analyse in details A1) 8.g4 and A2) 8.4d3.

8.\texttt{f}f3 4h5 – see Chapter 16, variation B1.

Following 8.\texttt{g}e2, it seems interesting for Black to opt for 8...4h5 9.4c1 4e8 10.a3 f5± and exploiting his opponent’s somewhat slow play, he seizes completely the initiative on the kingside, Van Osmael – Markauss, Belgium 1992.

A1) 8.g4
This is a thematic move and it is much rather prophylactic than attacking.

8...4c5

9.4c2
The lack of development of White’s knight on g1 has become obvious. He does not have the move 4d2.

9.f3, M.Gomez – Topalov, Seville 1992, 9...c6!? Black opens the c-file in case his opponent castles queenside. 10.4d2 cxd5 11.4x5 4d7±

9.4g2 a5 10.4ge2 (10.4d2 4f5± Karpov – Korotylev, Moscow 2007) 10...h5. White is beginning to have problems with the protection of his g4-pawn. 11.g5 (White can try an interesting pawn-sacrifice, but it is insufficient for him
to obtain an advantage in the opening: 11.\texttt{e}d2 h\texttt{x}g4 12.\texttt{g}3 c6∞ – He has some compensation for the pawn, but not more than that, Zablotsky – Fedorov, Voronezh 2007.) 11...\texttt{f}d7. After White’s pawn has reached the g5-square, Black wishes to open the f-file with f7-f6. 12.0–0 \texttt{b}6 13.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{d}7 14.\texttt{c}2 f6 15.\texttt{x}xf6 \texttt{x}xf6 16.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{ac}8∞ – There has arisen a complicated double-edged position with mutual chances. White’s slight space-advantage compensates Black’s counterplay against the h3-pawn.

9...c6

Black wishes to open the c-file after which the placement of White’s queen on c2 would become unstable.

10.\texttt{g}e2

Following 10.b4 cxd5 11.cxd5, Lomaya – Liberzon, USSR 1963, Black has an interesting piecesacrifice at his disposal: 11...\texttt{c}xe4?! 12.\texttt{x}xe4 \texttt{xe}4 13.\texttt{xe}4 \texttt{c}5 14.\texttt{c}2 f4 15.\texttt{c}1 e4 16.\texttt{b}2 \texttt{xb}2 17.\texttt{xb}2 \texttt{h}4∞ – He has a pawn for the sacrificed piece, an overwhelming lead in development and excellent attacking prospects against the enemy king, stranded in the centre.

10...cxd5 11.cxd5 \texttt{d}7

(diagram)

12.b4

White should better oust immediately his opponent’s knight from its active position.

12.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{c}8 13.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{h}5 14.\texttt{x}h5 \texttt{gxh}5 15.\texttt{d}2, Grivas – Nunn, Athens 1991, 15...f5?! – Black has seized completely the initiative at the price of some weakening of his kingside pawn-structure.

12...\texttt{a}6 13.\texttt{b}3 h5 14.f3 \texttt{h}7. Black’s plans include \texttt{f}6-g5, exchanging the important defender of the dark squares in the enemy camp. 15.a4 \texttt{f}6 16.\texttt{x}h5 \texttt{g}5 17.\texttt{x}g5 \texttt{x}g5 18.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{xb}5 19.axb5 \texttt{h}4+ 20.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{c}7 21.\texttt{e}3 \texttt{xh}5∞ – White’s king seems rather unsafe in the centre of the board, Aykent – Kazoks, ICCF 2013.

A2) 8.\texttt{d}3
White fortifies the strategically important e4-square.

8...d7

Black's knight frees the way forward of his f-pawn, moreover that he increases the control over the c5-square. Later, depending on circumstances, he may occupy it with one of his knights.

9.g4

White prevents f7-f5.

After the careless move 9. gxe2 f5∞, Black has no problems at all, Raznikov – Smirin, Acre 2013.

9.a3 dxc5 10.c2 f5 11.b4 dxe4 12.xe4 fxe4 13.xe4, Barlov – Ki.Georgiev, Arandjelovac 1991, 13...f6!?∞ (followed by f5) – White's lag in development precludes him from establishing firm piece-control over the key e4-square.

10...d2

The move 10.b1 has the defect that White's rook on a1 is temporarily isolated from the actions. 10...f5 11.exf5 (11.a3 fxe4 12.xe4 dxe4 – see 10.c2) 11...gxf5 12.gxe2, Avshalumov – Kupreichik, Blagoveshchensk 1988 (12..d2?! e4↑ – Black has seized the initiative, Iljin – Loskutov, Moscow 2007) 12...e4!?∞ – White must lose plenty of tempi in order to evacuate his king to the queenside.

10...f5 11.a3 fxe4 12.xe4 dxe4 13.xe4

13...d5!

Black is not inclined to wait for the pawn-advance b2-b4 and begins a fight for the initiative with an energetic pawn-sacrifice.

14.xc5 dxc5 15.xc5

This move is at least principled.

15.e2, Grishchenko – Shimanov, Olginka 2011, 15...e7!? 16.c2 e4!∞ – Black's two power-
ful bishops compensate the slight defects of his pawn-structure.

This position was reached in the game Todorovic – Efimenko, Vrnjacka Banja 2010. 15...\textit{Ef7}?! 16.\textit{De2 Wh4}. Black’s queen is very well placed here, attacking the weak pawns on h3 and f2. 17.\textit{Dd3 e4}. It is essential for him to activate his bishop on g7. 18.\textit{Dg3} (18.\textit{Dxe4}?! \textit{Df5}↑ – Black’s piece-activity increases with every move.) 18...\textit{Dxg3} 19.\textit{Dxg3 b6} 20.\textit{De3 Dxb2}. The game has entered an endgame in which Black’s prospects are not inferior thanks to his two powerful bishops. There may follow: 21.\textit{Da2 Dc3+} 22.\textit{Dd1 Dg7} 23.\textit{Dxe4}. White has managed to win a pawn, but this is practically harmless for Black. 23...\textit{Da6} 24.\textit{Dc2 c6}! He activates his rooks with the help of a temporary sacrifice of a second pawn. 25.\textit{Dxc6 Dc7} 26.\textit{Dc1 Dxc6}. Black has regained one of his pawns and White is unlikely to hold on to his e4-pawn for long. 27.\textit{Dd1 Dxc4} 28.\textit{Dxc4 Dxc4=}. After Black has regained the sac-}

ised material it has become evident that White must fight for a draw.

**B) 6.\textit{Dg5}**

With this move White impedes the pawn-advance e7–e5, but undermining the centre with the c-pawn is also very good for Black.

6...\textit{Dc5}

Naturally, it is very bad for him to play here 6...e5?, because of 7.dxe5 dxe5 8.\textit{Dxd8} \textit{Dxd8} 9.\textit{Dd5±} and he suffers material losses.

7.\textit{Dd5 e6} 8.\textit{Dd3}

Following 8.\textit{Df3} exd5 9.cxd5 (9.exd5 \textit{Dxe8}+ 10.\textit{Dxe2} h6 11.\textit{Dxe3 Df5} – see Chapter 10, variation B2a2) 9...\textit{Dxe8}, White will have to transpose to the variation 8.\textit{Dd3} (10.\textit{Dd3} c4 – see variation B2), because after the careless move 10.\textit{Dd2}?, Black has the crushing tactical strike: 10...\textit{Dxe4}! 11.\textit{Dxd8 Dxc3+} 12.\textit{Dxe2 Dxd1++}

8...\textit{exd5}
Now, White must make up his mind what pawn-structure to choose: **B1) 9.exd5**, or **B2) 9.cxd5**.

**B1) 9.exd5 \(\text{\underline{\text{Bd7}}}\)**

This is an essential fine point. Black does not check with his rook before White has developed his knight to f3.

10.\(\text{\underline{\text{f3}}}\)

White covers the e5-square from its occupation from Black's knight.

10.f4. This move looks a bit careless. 10...\(\text{\underline{\text{a5}}}\) 11.\(\text{\underline{\text{d2}}}\) (After 11.\(\text{\underline{\text{ge2}}}\), Black has the energetic resource 11...b5\(\uparrow\) Kunin – Yarmolenko, Moscow 2010, while following 11.\(\text{\underline{\text{f2}}}\) a6 12.a4 \(\text{\underline{\text{h5}}}\)\(\uparrow\) the unsafe position of White’s king may become a telling factor in the future, Potapov – Yuffa, Pardubice 2011.) 11...a6. Black is preparing b7-b5. It is essential for him to begin a direct fight, before White has completed his development and evacuated his king away from the centre. 12.\(\text{\underline{\text{ge2}}}\) b5 13.\(\text{\underline{\text{cxb5}}}\) axb5 14.\(\text{\underline{\text{xb5}}}\), Suba – Sznnapik, Dortmund 1981. Here, Black could have fought for the advantage with the line: 14...\(\text{\underline{\text{e4}}}!!\) 15.\(\text{\underline{\text{xe4}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xb5}}}\) 16.\(\text{\underline{\text{e7}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xb2}}}\) 17.\(\text{\underline{\text{xb2}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xb2}}}\) 18.\(\text{\underline{\text{b1}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{e8}}}\) 19. \(\text{\underline{\text{xd6}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xe7}}}\) 20.\(\text{\underline{\text{xb2}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{a6}}}\) 21.\(\text{\underline{\text{f2}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xe2+}}}\) 22.\(\text{\underline{\text{xe2}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xe2}}}\) 23.\(\text{\underline{\text{xe2}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xa2\uparrow}}}\) – The tactical complications have ended in a slightly better endgame for Black due to the vulnerability of White’s d5-pawn.

10...\(\text{\underline{\text{e8}}}\)

**11.\(\text{\underline{\text{f1}}}\)**

This is an ambitious move.

There arises a calmer position after 11.\(\text{\underline{\text{e3}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{h5}}}\) 12.0–0 \(\text{\underline{\text{e5}}}\) 13. \(\text{\underline{\text{xe5}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{xe5}}}\). The exchange of a couple of minor pieces is in favour of Black, since he has less space. 14.\(\text{\underline{\text{e1}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{d7}}}\) 15.\(\text{\underline{\text{e4}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{f5}}}\) 16.\(\text{\underline{\text{c3}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{d7}}}\) 17.\(\text{\underline{\text{e4}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{f5}}}\) 18.\(\text{\underline{\text{c3}}}\). White would not mind already repetition of moves, but Black could be more ambitious... 18...\(\text{\underline{\text{xd3}}}\) 19. \(\text{\underline{\text{xd3}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{h4}}}\) 20.\(\text{\underline{\text{f1}}}\) \(\text{\underline{\text{ae8}}}\) – All his pieces are very active and White must play accurately, Fagerstrum.
After 13. \textit{f}4 \textit{e}8 14.\textit{g}4, Black has an interesting pawn-sacrifice: 14...\textit{d}7!? 15...\textit{x}d6 \textit{xc}3 16.\textit{bxc}3 \textit{b}5. White has not solved the problem with his king yet, so Black reacts energetically and attacks fiercely the pawns on c4 and d5 equalising completely. 17. \textit{e}2 \textit{bxc}4 18.\textit{b}1. White prevents the development of Black’s bishop on b7. (18.\textit{f}3, \textit{Teplyi – Ochsner, Aarhus 2016, 18...\textit{b}7)} 18...\textit{f}6 19.\textit{xc}5 \textit{e}4 20.\textit{d}4 \textit{xd}5 21.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}7 22.\textit{g}2 \textit{c}6=

\begin{center}
\textbf{3. \textit{d}2}
\end{center}

13...\textit{b}5!? Black sacrifices a pawn, deflecting White’s knight from the control over the e4-square. 

14.\textit{xb}5 \textit{e}4 15.\textit{xe}4

But not 15.\textit{xd}8, because of 15...\textit{xd}2+ 16.\textit{g}1, \textit{Stankovic – Dann, Basel 2015, 16...\textit{f}5! 17. \textit{xf}5 \textit{xc}4!} – Black regains the piece and White is left to worry about his weak pawns on d5 and b2.

15...\textit{xe}5 – Black’s two powerful bishops are excellent compensation for his minimal material deficit, moreover that White must lose a lot of time to improve the placement of his king, \textit{Movsesian – Ding, Antalya 2013.}

\textbf{B2) 9.\textit{cxd}5}

This is a more ambitious move after which there arises a position from the Modern Benoni Defence.

\textbf{9...\textit{e}8}

White has not completed his development yet, so Black must try to advance his queenside pawns (c5-c4 and b7-b5). With his last move he forces White’s bishop to defend the e4-pawn, so that later it cannot prevent Black’s queenside pawn moves.

10.\textit{f}3

10.\textit{ge}2 \textit{bd}7. Black exploits the fact that White’s knight on e2 does not control the e5-square
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and sends his own knight there immediately. 11.0–0 (11..c1, Erdos – Delemarre, Deizisau 2010, 11...\(e5\) 11...a6 12.a4 \(e5\) 13.\(c2\) (After the move 13.f4, Black obtains the two-bishop advantage. 13...\(xd3\) 14.\(xd3\) \(b6\) 15.\(h1\), Olszewski – Vocaturo, Senigallia 2009, 15...\(d7\) ) 13...\(b8\). Black is preparing b7-b5. 14.\(b1\) h6 15.\(c1\) b5 16.axb5 axb5 17.b4 \(a6\) 18.f3 \(fd7\) – The prospects are about equal in this complicated position, Straka – Papenin, ICCF 2013.

10...c4 11.\(c2\) b5

12.a3
White prevents b5-b4.

Following 12.0–0 b4 13.b5 h6 14.\(xf6\) \(xf6\), White has a very interesting exchange-sacrifice, which leads to a very complicated and rather unclear position. 15.\(d2\) c3 16.bxc3 \(a6\) 17.c4 \(xa1\) 18.\(xa1\) \(xb5\) 19.cxb5 \(f6\) 20.\(b1\) \(d7\) Sage – Sobry, ICCF 2013.

12...\(bd7\)

Black’s knight is headed for the c5-square in order to increase the pressure against the e4-pawn.

13.0–0 \(e5\) 14.\(e1\)

About 14.\(d2\) \(b6\) 15.\(e1\) \(fd7\) – see 14.\(e1\).

The character of the position remains more or less the same after 14.d4 \(b6\) 15.\(e1\) \(b7\) 16.\(e3\) a6∞ Rusev – Jianu, Belgrade 2010.

14...\(b6\)

15.e5
This pawn-break in the centre cannot promise much to White.

He cannot rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening even after his alternatives. For example: 15.\(e3\) \(fd7\) 16.\(d4\) \(xd4\) 17.\(xd4\) a5. If Black succeeds in advancing b5-b4, then he will maintain the advantage. 18.\(e3\). White is preparing \(h6\) and \(g5\). 18...\(a6\) 19.\(h6\) \(d8\). Black’s pieces must come quickly to assist in the defence of his king. 20.\(g5\) \(f8\) 21.\(e3\) b4. He has seized com-
pletely the initiative on the queenside and White must try his chances in an attack against the enemy king. 22.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 23.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}3\) 24.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{cxb}2\) 25.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{bxa}3\) 26.\(\text{x}a3\) \(\text{b}7\) – Black’s knight on f8 protects reliably the h7-square, so it is inconceivable how White can continue his initiative on the kingside, Biedermann – Gnutov, ICCF 2012.

There arises a complicated double-edged position following 15.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}7\) 16.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 17.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{xd}4\) 18.\(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{a}6\) – Black’s knight on f8 protects reliably the h7-square, so it is inconceivable how White can continue his initiative on the kingside, Biedermann – Gnutov, ICCF 2012.

15...\(\text{dxe}5\) 16.\(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{b}7\)

After the e4-pawn has disappeared off the board, Black begins an attack against the enemy d5-pawn. 17.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{h}6\)

18.\(\text{f}4\)

18...\(\text{a}5\) 19.\(\text{ad}1\) \(\text{ac}8\)

The main part of this chapter will be devoted to the Averbach system B) $6 \text{Ag}5$. Before that however, we will analyse the move A) $6 \text{Ae}3$.

6.f4 c5 – see Chapter 11.

It seems premature for White to play 6.d5, because after this Black's knight obtains access to the c5-square. 6...c6 7.e3 (7. $\text{Af}3 \text{Ac}5 8.\text{Ac}2 \text{e}6 9.\text{Ag}3 \text{Ag}4 10.\text{Ax}c5 \text{dx}c5 11.0-0 \text{ex}d5 12. $\text{Ax}d5 \text{c}6=$ – White has no compensation for the vulnerability of the dark squares, B.Socko – Olszewski, Warsaw 2011.) 7...e6 8. $\text{Af}3 \text{ex}d5 9.\text{ex}d5 \text{Ac}5 10.0-0 \text{Ae}8 11.\text{A}d4 a5 12.\text{Ae}1 \text{Ad}7 13.h3 b6 14.b3 $\text{Ae}4=$ M.Socko – Azarov, Tromsoe 2010.

After 6.h3, Black can exploit his opponent's somewhat slow play with the move 6...c6!? creating pressure against the d4-square. 7.$\text{Af}3 \text{e}5 8.\text{Ag}3 (8.\text{d}5 \text{Ad}4 9.\text{Ad}x\text{d}4 \text{ex}d4 10.\text{W}x\text{d}4 \text{Ae}8 11. \text{Ad}3, Bennett – Bisson, Canberra 2002, 11...\text{Ae}7 12.\text{f}3 \text{A}h5© with initiative on the dark squares) 8...\text{ex}d4 9.\text{Ad}x\text{d}4 \text{Ae}8 10.\text{A}x\text{c}6 \text{b}x\text{c}6 11.\text{Ac}2 \text{Ab}8= Devos – Prins, Dubrovnik 1950.

Black should not be afraid of the advance of White's g and h-pawns. This infringes the classical principle not to begin flank attacks in positions with a volatile centre.

For example: 6.h4 c5. Black must begin immediate actions in the centre, before White has the possibility to organise something on the possibly open h-file. 7.d5 e6 8.h5 \text{ex}d5 9.hxg6 f\text{fg}6 10.\text{cx}d5 $\text{Ae}7 11.\text{A}g5 \text{Ab}d7? Black's prospects are not worse in this complicated position. White must
play very accurately. For example it would be bad for him to opt for 12...\texttt{g4}?!., due to 12...\texttt{e5} 13.\texttt{xc8} \texttt{xc8} 14.\texttt{f3}, Williams – Gallagher, Birmingham 2001, 14...\texttt{b5}!? and White's centre is under tremendous pressure.

Or 6.g4 \texttt{c5} 7.d5 (7.g5 \texttt{e8} 8.d5 \texttt{e6} – see 7.d5) 7...\texttt{e6} 8.g5 \texttt{e8} 9.h4 (following 9.\texttt{f3} \texttt{exd5} 10.cxd5, Ulvestad – Toran Albero, Torremolinos 1962, 10...\texttt{e7}!? it has become quite obvious that White has only weakened his kingside with the premature advance of his g-pawn.) 9...\texttt{exd5} 10.cxd5 (After 10.exd5, it would be interesting for Black to try 10...\texttt{xc3}+! 11.\texttt{bxc3} \texttt{g7} 12.h5 \texttt{f5}! – White’s queenside pawn-structure has been weakened and his bishops are not active at all.) 10...\texttt{e7} 11.\texttt{c2} \texttt{f5} 12.h5 \texttt{fxe4} 13.hxg6 hxg6 14.\texttt{xe4} \texttt{f5} 15.f3 \texttt{a6}! – White's attack on the kingside had backfired, moreover that his king is stranded in the centre and this will tell very soon, Thurmer – Kovari, Hungary 2005.

\textbf{A) 6.\texttt{e3}}

White's bishop on e2 controls the g4-square, so he develops his other bishop to an active position, without being afraid that Black may attack it with the move \texttt{g4}. This line is beginning to attract followers lately. In the years 2014-2015 A.Ryazantsev played like this rather often. Black equalises after an accurate play indeed, but he is not without certain problems.

\textbf{6...\texttt{c5}}

This move seems to be the most reliable.

Black would not equalise so easily after 6...\texttt{e5} 7.d5. The position in the centre has been stabilised and White's flank attacks after h2-h4-h5, or g2-g4 would not be so harmless for Black as in our comments to move six.

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

\textbf{7.d5}

7.dxc5 \texttt{a5} 8.\texttt{d2} \texttt{xc5} – see variation \textbf{B1}.

It is bad for White to play 7.\texttt{f3}, because he will fail to hold the d4-square anyway. 7...\texttt{g4} 8.\texttt{g5} cxd4 9.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{b6}! After this energetic move Black seizes the initiative. 10.\texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4} 11.\texttt{xb2} 12.0–0 \texttt{c3} 13.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xd4} 14.\texttt{xf8} \texttt{xf8} 15.\texttt{c8}. Black’s two minor pieces seem obviously stronger than White’s rook. Black can solve the problem with the
pin of his knight on b8 with the line: 15...c5 16...xb7 c6 Toth – Zaninotto, Milan 1985.

7...e5. This attempt by White to open the position in the centre leads to a double-edged game with mutual chances. 7...e8 8. dxc5 (It is not so precise for White to opt here for 8.exd6, because after 8...cxd6 9.dxc5 a5 10...xd8 cxd8, he would hardly manage to preserve his extra pawn. 11.d5 a6 12.0–0–0 e6 13.f3 cxe3 14.fxe3 a6 15.dxc5 – Black has restored the material balance and has better prospects thanks to his superior pawn-structure and a more active bishop, Gyimesi – Manhardt, Medellin 1996.) 8...xe5 9.d3 c3+ 10.bxc3 d7 11.h6, Lima – Sanabria Rangel, Cali 2010. Black had here an interesting sacrifice: 11...xc5!? 12.xf8 xf8= and he would have a pawn for the exchange, a better pawn-structure, while White would have difficulties to activate his rooks, because there would be no open files on the board.

7...e6 8.f3

White is trying to develop his kingside pieces.

He has no chances of obtaining an advantage after 8.dxe6 xe6, because he would be incapable later of exploiting the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn. 9.f3 (9.h3 a5 Kiselev – Glad-kiy, Volgodonsk 2007) 9...d6 10. 0–0 g4 11.g5 f6 12.h4 g5 13.d2, Taimanov – Suetin, Leningrad 1967, 13...d7?!∞ (followed by f7-f5) – The activity of Black’s pieces compensates with an interest the slight weakness of his d6-pawn.

8...exd5

There has arisen a position from the Modern Benoni in which White has played a bit prematurely f3.

Black should not be afraid of 9.exd5, since following 9...f5 10. 0–0 e4, he would exchange a couple of minor pieces and then White’s space advantage would not be so important. 11.xe4 xe4 12.d3 xf3 13.xf3 d7 14.g3 e8= Mason – Hebden, Birmingham 2015.

9...g4

Black’s position is a bit cramped, so he should better trade a couple of minor pieces.
White cannot achieve much if he exchanges the light-squared bishops. 10.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}2 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{x}}}e2 11.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{xe}}}2 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}8 12.0-0 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{a}}}a6 13.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{h}}}1 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{c}}}7 14.a4 a6 15.a5 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{b}}}8 16.f3 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}7. The previous moves were very typical for the Modern Benoni. Black is trying to advance b7-b5, in order to organise counterplay on the queenside. 17.g4 b5 18.axb6 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{xb}}}6+!

Both sides must play precisely in this double-edged position. For example, after the careless move 19.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{a}}}a2?! in the game Duric – Antunac, Bjelovar 1979, White could have had great problems if Black had played 19...\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}4! Suddenly, the juxtaposition between the queen and the enemy rook on the e-file would play a decisive role. 20.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}d1 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{c}}}xd5! Black has seized completely the initiative and White must defend accurately. 21.exd5 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}xd5 22.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{a}}}a3 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{xe}}}3 23.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{exe}}}3 (23.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{exe}}}3 d5 24.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{b}}}1 c4 25.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{df}}}1 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{b}}}6+) 23...\textit{\textipa{\texttt{xe}}}3 24.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{exe}}}3 d5 25.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}d3 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{b}}}4 26.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{xd}}}5 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{xb}}}2 27.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}e4 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{xd}}}5 28.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{xd}}}5 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{g}}}7+ After the tactical complications there has arisen an endgame in which Black’s rook and a couple of pawns are stronger than White’s two knights, because it is well known that knights are nor very capable of fighting against passed rook pawns. In addition, White must be constantly on the alert about the possibility of Black doubling his rooks on the penultimate rank.

White has more space and the two-bishop advantage, but the dark squares in his camp are seriously weakened. This enables Black to obtain very good counter chances.

12...\textit{\textipa{\texttt{bd}}}7 13.a4 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}5 14.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}2 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{ed}}}7 15.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{b}}}1 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}7 16.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}3 a6 17.a5 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{h}}}5+!

He is perfectly prepared the trade after \textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}4 the important defender of the enemy dark squares. 18.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{c}}}1

18...\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}4! In this sharp position Black's prospects are not worse. 19.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{c}}}2 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}5 20.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{d}}}2 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{ab}}}8 21.a4 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{e}}}7 22.\textit{\textipa{\texttt{xd}}}7 \textit{\textipa{\texttt{xd}}}7 23.
\[\text{Chapter 10}\]

\[\text{Ea4} \text{ } \text{xe3} \text{ } 24.\text{fxe3} \text{ } \text{f4} \text{ } 25.\text{g4} \text{ } \text{xe3} \text{ } 26.\text{fxe3} \text{ } \text{g7} \text{ } 27.\text{b4} \text{ } \text{cxb4} \text{ } 28.\text{exb4} \text{ } \text{c8} – \text{Both sides have} \text{pawn-weaknesses and they practically balance each other, Aguiar Garcia – Tarrio Ocana, ICCF 2013.}\]

\[\text{B)} 6.\text{g5}\]

This scheme was named after the Soviet grandmaster Yuri Averbach, who contributed greatly to its development. Nowadays the move 6.\text{g5} is not played so often in the tournament practice, but is dangerous for Black and requires precise play by him.

\[6...\text{c5}\]

White has prevented e7-e5 with his last move.

\[6...\text{e5?} \text{ } 7.\text{dxe5} \text{ } \text{dxe5} \text{ } 8.\text{xd8} \text{ } \text{xd8} \text{ } 9.\text{d5±} \text{ and Black suffers material losses. Therefore, he inflicts a strike against the enemy centre with his other pawn.}\]

Now, White must choose what king of a pawn-structure he would prefer – the exchange B1) 7.\text{dxc5}, or the occupation of space with B2) 7.\text{d5}.

\[\text{B1) 7.\text{dxc5}}\]

This is a reliable move. White does not attempt to obtain a big advantage and tries to reach a calm position relying on his freer game and slightly extra space.

\[7...\text{wa5}\]

\[8.\text{d2}\]

He must lose a tempo to retreat his bishop.

Following 8.\text{d2} dxc5, the vulnerability of the d4-square even precludes White from equalising. 9.e5 (9.\text{f3} \text{c6} 10.0–0 \text{d8!?)} 9...\text{d8} 10.\text{e3} \text{g4}. Black sacrifices material and seizes the initiative. 11.\text{xe4} \text{xe4} 12.\text{xe7} \text{e8} 13.\text{xc5} \text{xc5} 14.\text{xc5} \text{d7} 15.\text{d4} \text{xe5} – He has regained one of the pawns and thanks to his two powerful bishops and considerable lead in development will create great problems for White.
8...\(\text{\texttt{wh}}x\text{c}5\)

The arising position resembles the Maroczy system in the Sicilian Defence, but in a more favourable version for Black, because White has lost tempi for moves with his bishop.

9.\(\text{\texttt{df}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{fg}}4\)

Black would not mind exchanging later on \(f3\). This would present White with the two-bishop advantage indeed, but his knight on \(f3\) controls important squares in the centre of the board (\(d4\) and \(e5\)), so its exchange is in favour of Black.

10.\(\text{\texttt{ie}}3\)

10.\(\text{\texttt{0-0}}\) \(\text{\texttt{ic}}6\) 11.\(\text{\texttt{ie}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{wa}}5\) – see 10.\(\text{\texttt{ie}}3\).

10...\(\text{\texttt{wa}}5\) 11.0–0

11.\(\text{\texttt{dd}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}2\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{we}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{fd}}7\) 13.\(\text{\texttt{ec}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{xc}}3!\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{xc}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{wa}}2\) 15.0–0 \(\text{\texttt{dc}}6\) – see 11.0–0.

11...\(\text{\texttt{dc}}6\)

12.a3

White is preparing to acquire extra space on the queenside with the move \(b2-b4\).

After 12.\(\text{\texttt{dd}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}2\) 13.\(\text{\texttt{we}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{wh}}5\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{f3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{dd}}7\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{ac}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{c}}5\) 16.\(\text{\texttt{db}}3\) \(b6\) 17.\(\text{\texttt{dd}}5\), Serper – Hebden, Dhaka 1995, 17...\(e6\)=, there arises an approximately equal position in which Black has his counter chances, connected with \(\text{\texttt{de}}5\) and \(f7-f5\).

12.\(\text{\texttt{ec}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{dd}}7\) 13.a3 (13.\(\text{\texttt{dd}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}2\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{we}}2\). Now, Black can capture bravely the pawn on \(a2\). 14...\(\text{\texttt{xc}}3\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{xc}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}}2\) 16.\(\text{\texttt{db}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}4\) – White’s initiative is sufficient only for maintaining the equality, Saint Amour – Lorentzen, Chessfriend.com 2004.) 13...\(\text{\texttt{dc}}5\). With this transfer of the knight Black increases his pressure against the enemy centre and his queenside. 14.\(\text{\texttt{dd}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}2\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{we}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{da}}4\) 16.\(\text{\texttt{db}}1\). Without this move, after the trade of the knights, Black’s bishop will exert powerful pressure against the \(b2\)-pawn. 16...\(\text{\texttt{dd}}4\). His pieces are very active and White is forced to
exchange his important defender of the dark squares. Naturally, after that he cannot even dream about maintaining an advantage. 17.\(\text{exd}4\) \(\text{exd}4\) 18.\(\text{f}d1\) \(\text{g}7\) 19. \(\text{xa}4\) \(\text{xa}4\) 20.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{b}3\) Moskalenko – Hazai, Budapest 1991.

12...\(\text{fc8}\)

Black is preparing \(\text{d}8\)-f8, followed by \(\text{h}6\), trading the important enemy bishop. This manoeuvre is often used in the Maroczy system of the Sicilian Defence.

13.\(\text{b}4\)

Black should not be afraid of 13.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xe}2\) 14.\(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{h}5?!\)

13...\(\text{d}8\) 14.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{f}8\) 15.\(\text{h}3\)

15.\(\text{ad}1\) \(\text{h}6\) 16.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{xf}3\) 17. \(\text{hxh}6\) \(\text{xh}6\) 18.\(\text{xf}3\), Sorin – Cativelli, Buenos Aires 1999, 18... \(\text{h}4?!\)\(\text{f}2\), with excellent counterplay for Black on the dark squares.

15...\(\text{xf}3\) 16.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{h}6\) 17. \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{xe}3\) 18.\(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{xf}6\) 19. \(\text{xe}3\), Jelic – Arsovic, Belgrade 2003. The weaknesses of the pawns on d6 and c4 practically balance each other and the position is approximately equal. 19... \(\text{a}5\) 20.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{e}5\) 21.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{xc}4\) 22. \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 23.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 24.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{d}8\) 25.\(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{xd}7\) 26.\(\text{xf}6\).

White has regained his pawn, but he does not have more than equality. 26...\(\text{d}5\) 27.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{ad}8\) 28.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{c}7\) 29.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}4\) 30.\(\text{b}6\) \(\text{c}5+\) 31.\(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) – Black is not worse in this endgame with four rooks due to the weakness of White’s pawn on a4.

B2) 7.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{h}6\)

Before undermining the enemy centre with the move e7-e6, it is essential for Black to oust the enemy bishop from its active position, because if White manages to play \(\text{d}2\), Black would not be able to do this any more.

Now, we will analyse in details B2a) 8.\(\text{e}3\) and B2b) 8.\(\text{f}4\).

It is not good for White to play here 8.\(\text{h}4\), because his bishop is
removed from the queenside and Black obtains effortlessly a very good position. 8...a5 9.d2 a6. Black is preparing b7-b5. 10.f3 b5 11.xf6. White is forced to exchange his bishop in order to eliminate the enemy attack against his e4-pawn. 11.xf6 12.0-0 b4 13.d1 g7 – Black’s two powerful bishops are more than sufficient compensation for White’s dominance in the centre, Nyee – Khin, Yangon 1999.

Meanwhile, it seems very good for White to try here the seldom played move 8.d2. His bishop would not be so active here, than on e3, but later it would not stand in the way of his pieces to fight for the e-file and would not come under an attack after the move g4. 8...e6 9.f3 exd5 10.exd5 f5 14.f4 f6 15.a3 e8+, Black seizes the initiative and his bishops and queen are threateningly poised against the enemy queenside, Lalith – Kovalev, Chennai 2011.

11.h4. White places his knight at the edge of the board, but ousts the enemy bishop from its active position. 11...d7 12.0-0 a6 13.f3 (There arises a complicated position after the line: 13.g3 c7, for example: 14.a4. White prevents b7-b5, but weakens the b4-square. 14...h3 15.e1 d1 16.c1, Kryakvin – Kotenko, Taganrog 2013. Here, Black had to continue with 16...g5!? 17.g2 g4? 13...e8 14.d3, Szabo – Larsen, Dallas 1957. Now, there could have arisen very interesting complications in the line: 14...b4!? 15.b1 b5 After for example: 16.a3 a6 17.c1 h7 18.xb5 xb5 19.cxb5 c7 20.a4 fx d5∞, there would arise a position with mutual chances. White can hardly achieve anything meaningful out of his bishop-pair, because after a7-a6, Black exchanges the important b5-pawn and can exert powerful pressure on the b-file.

B2a) 8.e3
This is the most natural retreat of White’s bishop.

8...e6
(diagram)
We will deal now with B2a1) 9.dxe6, B2a2) 9.h3 and B2a3) 9.d2.
White's kingside is not developed, so he should nod start active actions in the centre with 9.e5 dxe5 10.\(\texttt{\textit{dxc5 \textit{xe8 11.d6 \textit{c6 12.}}\texttt{\textit{f3 b6?}}\texttt{\textit{13.a3 a6.}}\texttt{\textit{Naturally, Black should better not allow \textit{b5-c7. 14.c1 b7 15.0-0 \textit{d7}}\texttt{\textit{– White's passed pawn has been reliably blocked, while Black has an easy plan for actions: f7-f5, e5-e4, after which he will seize completely the initiative.}}\texttt{\textit{Following 9.f3 exd5 10.cxd5, there arises a position, which may be reached in the Benoni Defence, as well as out of the Saemisch system, but not in a favourable version for White. His bishop has been deployed to the e2-square a bit too early and he has difficulties with the development of his knight on g1. 10...a6 11.a4 \textit{h7 12.d2 h5. Black is not in a hurry to play \textit{d7, in order to prevent the development of White's knight on h3. 13.d1. He is preparing \textit{ge2. 13...d7 14.ge2 b8 15.a5, Jussupow – Dolmatov, Wijk aan Zee 1991, 15...e5?! 16. b3 f5∞ – Black's kingside initiative provides Black with excellent counterplay.}}\texttt{\textit{9.f3 exd5}}\texttt{\textit{10.exd5 \textit{f5 11.0-0 (White must comply with \textit{e4, since his attempt to oust the enemy bishop from the f5-square can be countered by Black with a tactical strike: 11.h4 \textit{xd5! 12.xd5 \textit{yh4 13.c7, Murshed – Steel, Cape Town 2014, 13...xb2! 14. xxa8 c3+ 15.f1 xa1 16.xa1 c8 17.d1 c6∞ – White will fail to save his knight on a8. Black has the advantage, because White cannot regain simultaneously his pawns on c5 and d6 and solve at the same time the problem with his king on f1 and the rook on h1.) 11...e4 12.xe4 xxe4. If Black manages to accomplish this exchange in the Averbach system, he solves completely all his problems in the opening. 13.d3 xf3 14.xf3 d7 15.h3 f5= Kholmov – Stein, Moscow 1964.}}\texttt{\textit{Following 10.cxd5, Black succeeds in realising advantageously the typical tactical strike for similar positions 10...b5!, equalising completely.}}\end{verbatim}
Black obtains very good compensation for the pawn after 11.e5 \( \text{g}4 12.\text{xb}5, \text{Khismatullin – Van Foreest, Moscow 2016}, 12...\text{d}7!? 13.e6 \text{xe}3 14.fxe3 \text{e}5 15.\text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 16.0–0 \text{b}8 16.0–0 \text{b}8 – Black’s bishop on e5 is very powerful in the centre of the board exerting pressure on both flanks on the board.

11.\text{xb}5. After this there arises a combinational storm and almost all the pieces disappear off the board. 11...\text{xe}4

Naturally, this piece-sacrifice is temporary, because Black regains the bishop on b5. 12.\text{xe}4 \text{a}5+ 13.\text{d}2 \text{xb}5 14.\text{xd}6 \text{xb}2 15.\text{xb}2 \text{xb}2 16.\text{b}1. There has arisen an endgame and White’s initiative gradually evaporates. 16...\text{g}7 17.0–0 \text{d}7 18.\text{fc}1 \text{a}6 19.\text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 20.\text{xc}5. He has won temporarily a pawn, but

Black has two powerful bishops and a clear-cut plan for actions against the weak enemy d5-pawn. 20...\text{ab}8 21.\text{b}3 \text{fd}8 22.\text{c}6 \text{b}5! This is the last fine point. 23.\text{xb}5 \text{xd}5 24.\text{bd}4, Sciallero – Soh, ICCF 2014. Following 24...\text{xb}3 25.\text{xb}3 \text{xd}4 26.\text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 27.g3 \text{b}4=, the rook and pawn ending is a dead draw.

6. \text{c}3 7.\text{g}7 8.\text{e}4 d6 9.\text{e}2 0–0 10.\text{d}2

\textbf{B2a1) 9.dxe6} White gets rid of his d5-pawn in order to try to fight later against the weak enemy pawn on d6.

\textbf{9...\text{xe}6}

Black should not be afraid of 10.\text{f}3 \text{g}4 11.\text{f}4 \text{e}5 12.\text{xe}5 dxe5. He gets rid of the weakness on d6. 13.\text{e}3 \text{b}6 14.\text{a}4 \text{d}7 15.\text{c}2 \text{c}6 16.0–0–0 \text{d}4. Draw, Dzagnidze – Banikas, Athens 2008.
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(11.\textit{d}2 \textit{c}6 – see 10.\textit{d}2) 11.\textit{e}8!? 12.\textit{f}3 \textit{a}6! Black removes with tempo his queen to c6 in order to attack the pawn on e4. 13.b3 \textit{c}6 14.\textit{d}3 \textit{f}5+

\textbf{10...\textit{a}5}

Black would not mind the exchange of the pawn on h6 for the enemy e4-pawn.

\textbf{11.\textit{x}h6}

11.h3 \textit{c}6 12.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}4! After this energetic move, Black obtains an advantage. 13.\textit{x}d4 \textit{c}xd4 14.\textit{b}5, Faizrakhmanov – Sattarov, Moscow 2015 (14.\textit{x}d4 \textit{c}xe4 15.\textit{x}e4 \textit{a}xd2+ 16.\textit{x}d2 \textit{a}xd4+ – Black’s prospects are preferable thanks to his two powerful bishops.) 14...\textit{a}xd2+ 15.\textit{x}d2 \textit{d}7+ 16.\textit{c}xd6. White has even managed to win a pawn, but the dark squares in his camp are too weak. 16...\textit{e}e5 17.\textit{b}5 a6 18.d4 (18.\textit{a}3? d3 19.\textit{x}d3 \textit{xb2}+) 18...\textit{a}xb5 19.fxe5 bx4 20.\textit{x}xc4 \textit{a}x d8 21.a3 \textit{a}c8. White’s lag in development hurts him, despite the fact that it is an endgame. 22.b3 \textit{c}7 23.\textit{b}1 \textit{g}7 24.\textit{f}1 \textit{x}c4 25.\textit{xc}4 \textit{xe}5+ – Black has restored the material balance and has preserved all the advantages of his position.

\textbf{11...\textit{x}h6 12.\textit{x}h6}

(diagram)

\textbf{12...\textit{e}4}

In this complicated position White cannot exploit the vulnerability of the enemy king, because his own king needs protection.

\textbf{13.\textit{x}c1 \textit{x}c3 14.\textit{x}xc3}

It would be worse for White to opt for 14.bxc3?! \textit{e}8. Here, he loses after 15.\textit{d}2? \textit{c}6 16.h4 \textit{d}4 17.\textit{h}5 \textit{xa}2+ 18.\textit{d}1 \textit{c}xc4 and Black would crush the enemy monarch. 0–1 Balcazar Novoa – Lindsalu, LSS 2008. There might follow this exemplary variation: 19.\textit{xc}4 \textit{a}4+ 20.\textit{d}2 \textit{xc}4 21.\textit{c}xd4 \textit{b}4+ 22.\textit{d}1 \textit{e}1+ 23.\textit{c}2 \textit{c}xd4 24.\textit{xe}1 \textit{xe}1 25.\textit{d}2 \textit{c}8+ 26.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}3+-

\textbf{14...\textit{a}2}

This is a sharp position with mutual attacks, but material should not be forgotten as a factor.
15.\textit{c1}. White must bring his queen back to assist in the defence of his queenside. 15...\textit{a5} 16.\textit{h4} \textit{c6}. Black wishes to centralise his knight. 17.\textit{h5} \textit{d4} 18.\textit{f1} \textit{g7} 19.\textit{hxg6} \textit{fxg6} 20.\textit{h6+} \textit{f6} 21.\textit{f4+}, Zawadski – Polovnikov, ICCF 2005. Here, Black had better comply with the repetition of moves: 21...\textit{g7}! = – White has nothing more than a perpetual check.

\textbf{B2a2) 9.\textit{h3}}

White solves radically the problem with the enemy knight-sortie \textit{g4}, but lags in development a bit.

9...\textit{exd5} 10.\textit{exd5} \textit{e8}

Black deploys his rook on the open file. In similar positions his plan is connected with \textit{f5} and \textit{e4}. The trade of a couple of minor pieces would be in his favour, because his position is a bit cramped. After this his bishops would exert powerful pressure against the enemy queenside.

11.\textit{f3} 11.\textit{d2} \textit{h7} – see variation B2a3.

White’s attempt to prevent \textit{e4} with 11.\textit{d3} would not be good, since he would make a second move with an already developed piece and would lag in development anyway. 11...\textit{b5}. Black sacrifices a pawn and deflects the enemy knight from the protection of the \textit{e4}-pawn. 12.\textit{xb5} (12.\textit{cxb5} \textit{bd7} 13.\textit{ge2} \textit{b6} = – White has problems with the protection of his \textit{d5}-pawn, Kamenets – Efimenko, Alushta 2000.) 12...\textit{e4} 13.\textit{e2} \textit{xb2}. Black has regained his pawn and can be very optimistic about the future. 14.\textit{b1} \textit{g7} 15.0–0 \textit{a6} 16.\textit{a3}. White’s knight has been ousted to an unfavourable position. 16...\textit{d7} 17.\textit{f4} \textit{f8} 18.\textit{c2} \textit{f5} 19.\textit{b3} \textit{g5} 20.\textit{d2} \textit{d7} 21.\textit{g3} \textit{e5} 22.\textit{e2} \textit{gf7}. Black defends against the fork \textit{f2}-\textit{f4}. 23.\textit{f4}. White has succeeded in ousting the enemy knight from the centre, but his weakness on \textit{e4} may be the cause of worries for him in the future. 23...\textit{d7} 24.\textit{d3}, Krouzel – Matousek, ICCF 2004, 24...\textit{h5}!? 25.\textit{f3} \textit{f6} \textit{=}, followed by \textit{h4}, \textit{e4}.

11...\textit{f5} (diagram)

12.\textit{g4}

White is trying to enter a complicated fight. Still, with his last move he risks too much, because it is well known that pawns cannot go backward and the weaken-
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ing of his kingside might hurt him later.

12.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{h}7\) – see variation B2a3.

There arises a calmer position after 12.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 13.\(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{x}e4\) 14.0–0 (14.\(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{x}e4\) 15.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}5\) 16.0–0 \(\text{d}7\)= Dao – Fier, Jakarta 2011) 14...\(\text{x}f3\). Black exchanges the defender of the e5-square. The position is closed and White’s two-bishop advantage is not so important. 15.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{d}7\) 16.\(\text{ab}1\) \(\text{e}5\) 17.\(\text{wd}1\) \(\text{h}4\) 18.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{f}5\) – Black’s centralised knight is very powerful and he has good prospects for active actions on the kingside, so this provides him with excellent prospects in the forthcoming battle, Tomecek – Babula, Czech Republic 1996.

12.0–0 \(\text{e}4\) 13.g4. This move only leads to unnecessary weakening of White’s position. (13. \(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{x}e4\) 14.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{xf}3\) – see 12.\(\text{d}3\); 14.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{h}7\) – see variation B2a3). 13...\(\text{xc}3\) 14.bxc3 \(\text{e}4\) 15.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 16.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}5\). Black is reluctant to lose tempi for the protection of his h6-pawn. 17. \(\text{xf}6\), Vovk – Ezat, Abu Dhabi 2015, 17...\(\text{xf}3\)? 18.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{h}4\) 19. \(\text{g}7\) \(\text{x}g7\) – White’s extra pawn is practically immaterial. His pawn-structure on both sides of the board is compromised, while Black has excellent attacking prospects against the enemy king.

12...\(\text{e}4\)

13.0–0

13.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{bd}7\) 14.0–0 \(\text{xf}3\) – see 13.0–0

Following 13.\(\text{eg}1\), White’s king will remain stranded in the centre of the board for long. 13...\(\text{xf}3\) 14.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 15.\(\text{f}1\). He is preparing an artificial castling, but loses too much time for that. 15...\(\text{bd}7\) 16.\(\text{d}2\), Mikenas – Dydyshko, Gomel 1973. Here, Black can try an interesting temporary pawn-sacrifice: 16...\(\text{h}7\)? 17.\(\text{xh}6\) \(\text{e}5\) 18.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{h}4\) 19.\(\text{xg}7\) \(\text{xh}3+\) 20.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{xg}7\) – He has regained the sacrificed pawn, while White will have great
difficulties to solve the problem with the safety of his king. In addition, his kingside pawn-structure is seriously weakened.

13...\texttt{bd}7 14.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xf}3

This move is forced, because White was threatening to remove his knight and to follow this with f2-f3.

15.\texttt{xf}3 h5 16.g5 \texttt{h}7

If White’s g5-pawn had been on its initial placement, his position would have been preferable. Now, Black has very good counterplay. 17.\texttt{h}1 \texttt{xc}3! Black exploits the insufficient protection of the g5-pawn and compromises his opponent’s queenside pawn-structure. 18.bxc3 \texttt{e}5 19.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{d}7 20.\texttt{h}2 \texttt{f}5 – Black's two knights fight quite successfully against White’s bishop-pair. Later, in the game Lputian – Gufeld, Moscow 1983, there followed 21. \texttt{f}4, but Black found an interesting tactical argument against that: 21...\texttt{e}4! 22.\texttt{ae}1 \texttt{xc}4 23. \texttt{xc}4 \texttt{xc}4 – White's compensation for the pawn is insufficient.

B2a3) 9.\texttt{d}d2

This is the best move for White. He wishes to win a tempo attacking the pawn on h6 and will think what to do later.

9...\texttt{ex}d5 10.\texttt{ex}d5

Following 10.\texttt{cxd}5 \texttt{e}8 11.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{h}7, White will have problems with the development of his knight on g1. 12.\texttt{b}5 Now, he must lose another tempo for a move with his knight. (It seems too risky for White to begin a pawn-offensive on the kingside when his pieces are not developed: 12.h4 h5 13.g4 hxg4 14.h5 \texttt{d}7 15.hxg6 fxg6\infty Fedorowicz – Watson, Hastings 1985.) 12...\texttt{d}7 13.\texttt{h}3. White has managed to activate his knight, but now Black acquires space on the queenside with tempo. 13...a6 14.\texttt{e}2 b5 15. 0–0 h5 16.\texttt{f}2 b4 17.\texttt{a}4 a5 18. \texttt{ac}1 \texttt{b}6 19.\texttt{xb}6 \texttt{xb}6 20.\texttt{h}1 a4\infty – Black’s queenside initiative provides him with excellent counter chances, Li Shilong – Ding Liren, Xinghua Jiangsu 2011.
10...\textit{h7} 11.h3

White defends against the knight-sortie \textit{g4}.

Black has no problems after 11.\textit{f3} \textit{f5} 12.0–0 \textit{e4} 13.\textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 14.\textit{ae1} \textit{d7} 15.h3 (15.\textit{f4} \textit{fe6} 16.b3 \textit{fe8} 17.h3= Heimbrot - Weissleder, Email 2007) 15...b5! He sacrifices material trying to fight for the d5-square. 16.cx\textit{b5} \textit{b6} 17.b4, Galliamova - N. Kosintseva, Nalchik 2011. Here, the most reliable route to equality for Black would be 17...\textit{xf3}!? 18...\textit{xf3} \textit{c4} 19.\textit{xc2} \textit{e3} 20.\textit{xe3} cx\textit{b4}=

11...\textit{e8}

12.\textit{f3}

It seems too slow for White to choose here 12.\textit{d3}, because of 12...b5! and Black seizes the initiative with a pawn-sacrifice.

(diagram)

13.\textit{xb5} \textit{e4} 14.\textit{xe4} \textit{xe4}. Black has two powerful bishops for the sacrificed pawn. 15.\textit{c1} a6 16.\textit{a3}. This is at least a principled move. (White's attempt to regain the pawn would not provide him even with equality: 16.\textit{c3} \textit{xc4} 17.a3 \textit{d7} 18.\textit{f3} a5= – White has no compensation for his opponent's two-bishop advantage, Ponomariov - Grischuk, Beijing 2011.) 16...\textit{d7} 17.\textit{f3}, Skare - Dziuba, Belgrade 2009, 17...\textit{e5}!? 18.\textit{xe5} \textit{xe5} – Black's bishops are very active, while White's knight is misplaced at the edge of the board.

Following 13.cx\textit{b5}, Black has also very good compensation for his minimal material deficit. 13...\textit{bd7} 14.\textit{ge2} (After the careless move 14.\textit{f3}, White will have problems with the protection of his d5-pawn. 14...\textit{b6} 15.0–0 \textit{b7} 16.\textit{ad1} \textit{d7} Hradeczyk – Adorjan, Hungary 1972. 14.\textit{d1}, Hort – Sznapik, Decin 1979, 14...a6!??) 14...\textit{e5}. Black prevents his opponent from castling kingside. 15.\textit{d1} (It would be bad for White to play here 15.0–0, in view of 15...\textit{h3}!!; while after 15.\textit{g3} \textit{xd3}+ 16.\textit{xd3} a6 17.0–0 \textit{xb5} 18.\textit{xb5} \textit{b7} 19.\textit{f4} \textit{xd5} 20.\textit{xd6}, Gilimshin – Konovalov, RCCA 1997, Black can obtain excellent attacking prospects after a transfer of
his queen to the c6-square. 20... 
\[ \text{ strain} \] 21.\( \text{f} \)d1 \[ \text{f} \]c6 22.\( \text{w} \)xd5 \[ \text{f} \]e1+ 23.\( \text{h} \)h2 \( \text{w} \)xd5 24.\( \text{w} \)xd5 \( \text{w} \)xa1 25. 
\[ \text{f} \]xc5 \[ \text{f} \]8xa2−+. He has all the chances of realising his extra exchange.) 15...a6 16.a4 \( \text{c} \)xd3+ 17. 
\[ \text{f} \]xd3 axb5 18.axb5 \[ \text{f} \]d7+ - Black is preparing the transfer of his knight to the e5-square, Berdichesky - Copie, Email 1999. He has two powerful bishops, while White's queenside pawns are weak.

12...\( \text{f} \)f5

13.0–0

The position is simplified after 13.\( \text{d} \)d3 \( \text{e} \)e4 14.\( \text{f} \)xe4 \( \text{f} \)xe4 15. \[ \text{f} \]xe4 \( \text{f} \)xe4. White cannot achieve anything meaningful out of his space advantage. 16.\( \text{w} \)c2 \( \text{f} \)5 17. 0–0 \( \text{f} \)d7 18.\( \text{d} \)d2 \( \text{e} \)e7 19.\( \text{f} \)ae1 \[ \text{f} \]c7 20.\( \text{f} \)f4 \[ \text{f} \]ae8 21.\( \text{f} \)xe7 \[ \text{f} \]xe7 22.\( \text{b} \)3 \[ \text{f} \]a6 23.\[ \text{f} \]b1 \[ \text{f} \]b5= - Black has good counterplay on the queenside, Kuhne – Flores, FICGS 2013.

13.\( \text{f} \)e4 14.\( \text{f} \)xe4 \( \text{f} \)xe4 15.\( \text{f} \)ae1

It is just bad for White to opt for 15.\( \text{f} \)e1, due to 15...b5!? 16. 
\[ \text{f} \]xb5 \( \text{f} \)d7 17.\( \text{f} \)c1 \( \text{f} \)b6 18.\( \text{f} \)c4 a6 19.\( \text{f} \)e2 axb5 20.\( \text{f} \)xb5 \[ \text{f} \]e7+ - Black's pieces are more actively placed and he will restore the material balance on his next move, Grivas – Gazis, Athens 1984.

15...\( \text{f} \)d7

16.\( \text{f} \)b3

After White's alternatives, Black will obtain a very good position following the pawn-advance b7-b5. For example: 16.\( \text{f} \)d1 b5↑ Grachev – Adhiban, Biel 2012, or 16.\( \text{f} \)f4 b5! 17.\( \text{f} \)xd6 bxc4 18.\( \text{f} \)g3 \( \text{f} \)b6 19.d6 \[ \text{f} \]d7 20.\[ \text{f} \]c1 \[ \text{f} \]d5= Ritsema – Bauer, ICCF 2014.

16...b5 17.\( \text{f} \)h2

If White captures the pawn 17.\( \text{f} \)xb5 \( \text{f} \)f6 18.\( \text{f} \)d1 \[ \text{f} \]e7, the only way in which he can protect his d5-pawn is to weaken his queenside pawn-structure, Molo – Civitillo, ICCF 2013.
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This position was reached in the game Yermolinsky – Edelman, New York 1993. Here, Black could have obtained a very good position with 17...b4!? He is threatening to win the exchange with the move \( \text{c}3 \) and later he will have good counter chances on the queenside (a7-a5-a4). White’s prospects on the kingside seem quite problematic at the moment.

B2b) 8.f4

With this retreat of his bishop White wishes to impede the possibility for the opponent to undermine his centre with the move e7-e6.

8...e6

Black is playing like this despite everything! He is ready to sacrifice his d6-pawn in order to obtain an active piece play after this.

9.dxe6

This is the logical continuation of White’s plan.

The move 9.\( \text{w}d2 \) seems less consistent. 9...exd5 10.exd5 \( \text{h}7 \) 11.f3 (White should better avoid 11.0-0-0, because of 11...b5! 12.\( \text{cxb5 a6} \) 13.b6 \( \text{xb6}+ \) and it is rather unclear what his king is doing on the queenside, Moehring – Tal, Halle 1974.) 11...\( \text{h}5 \). Black exploits the unfavourable placement of the enemy bishop on f4, winning a tempo for the development of his kingside initiative. 12.e3 f5 13.d1, Tan Zhongyi – Ju Wenjun, China 2014, 13...\( \text{xc3}+! ? \) 14.bxc3 f4 15.e2 \( \text{f5} \)∞ The position is closed and White cannot exploit his two-bishop advantage. Later however, the vulnerability of his queenside pawn-structure might hurt him.
3. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 4.e4 d6 5.\( \text{e2} \) 0-0 6.\( \text{g5} \) c5 7.d5 h6 8.\( \text{xf4} \) e6

The move 9.\( \text{f3} \) leads to a complicated fight with mutual chances. 9...exd5 10.cxd5 (Black should not be afraid of White’s capturing with the other pawn 10.exd5, since after that Black prepares effortlessly \( \text{f6-e4} \) and equalises completely. 10...\( \text{e8} \) 11.0-0 \( \text{e4} \) 12.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 13.\( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14.\( \text{b1} \), Levin – Polzin, Germany 2013, 14...\( \text{e8} \) 15.h3 \( \text{f5} \) 16.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d7} \)=) 10...b5!?

11.\( \text{xb5} \). If White wishes to capture on b5, he should better do it with his bishop. 11...\( \text{xe4} \) 12.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{a5} + \) 13.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 14.\( \text{xd6} \), Christiansen – Mar, Berkeley 1977. He has managed to win a pawn, but following 14...\( \text{a6} \)?, he will have problems to castle kingside. 15.\( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 16.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a4} \) 17.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{b5} \) – White will hardly have anything better than the repetition of moves.

11.\( \text{d2} \). White complies with the occupation of space of his opponent on the queenside. 11...\( \text{a6} \). Black is not in a hurry to push b5-b4, because this would present White’s knight with the important c4-square. 12.0-0 (Following 12.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{e8} \) 13.0-0, Black can already play 13...b4\( \mathbb{2} \) and White cannot counter that with 14.\( \text{d1} \)!, because of 14...\( \text{xd5} \)!

15.\( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 16.\( \text{xe3} \) a5 17.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 18.\( \text{c4} \), Sorin – Marcussi, Acasuso 1991, 18...\( \text{e3} \)? 19.\( \text{dxe3} \) \( \text{xb2} \mathbb{2} – \) Black’s two bishops and two pawns are more than sufficient compensation for the exchange.) 12...\( \text{e8} \) 13.\( \text{d3} \), Gligoric – Malich, Munich 1958, 13...\( \text{c7} \)? 14.h3 \( \text{bd7} \). This complicated position is with double-edged chances. White has more space, but Black’s active counterplay on the queenside should not be underestimated.

9...\( \text{xe6} \)

Here, White can gobble a pawn with \( \text{B2b2} \) 10.\( \text{xd6} \), or can choose the calmer move \( \text{B2b1} \) 10.\( \text{d2} \).
About 10.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{f3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{b6}}\) 11.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{d2} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{c6}}\) – see 10.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{d2}}.

**B2b1) 10.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{d2}}**

White refrains from capturing the pawn on d6, relying on the classical principle that “The threat is more powerful than its execution”.

10...\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{b6}}\)

Black is eyeing the enemy b2-pawn and increases his control over the d4-square.

11.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{f3}}\)

White wishes at first to complete the development of his kingside.

It seems too risky for White to play here 11.0–0–0, because of 11...h5 12.h3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{c6}}\) and the placement of his king on the queenside might turn into a cause of worries for him in the future, Kayser – Bensiek, ICCF 1995.

The exchange of the h and b-pawns after 11.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{hxh6}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xh6}}\) 12.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{hxh6} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xb2}}\), is not dangerous for Black, because in the variations after this White will not have time to open the h-file. 13.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{c1} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{c6}}\) 14.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{h4} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{b4}}\). Black will soon emphasize that White’s king can hardly be safe in the centre of the board.

15.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{d1}}\) (After the humble decision 15.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{d2} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xd2}}\) + 16.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xd2}}\), Bykhovsky – Bagaturov, Moscow 1991, 16...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{ae8}}\)!? – Black’s pieces are better mobilized, while White’s pawns on a2 and c4 are weak.) 15...\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{d4} 16.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{f3}}\) (After 16.h5, Black will succeed in ousting the enemy queen from its active position. 16...\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{g4} 17.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{g5} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xe4} 18.\text{hxg6} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xe6}}\) – Black’s queen has come back to assist in the defence of his king and White is unlikely to create any serious threats on the kingside. Later, Black’s extra pawn may become an important factor, C.Horvath – Zimmerman, Hungary 1997.) 16...\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{xe4} 17.\(\text{}\textit{\textbf{}}\text{g5} \text{\textit{\textbf{}}\text{e5}}\)
18.\texttt{\textbf{c}3}, Khalifman – Babula, Germany 2001, 18...\texttt{\textbf{b}2} 19.\texttt{\textbf{d}d1} \texttt{\textbf{a}8}. The position is very complicated and both kings are seriously endangered. 20.h5 (The game would end in a draw after 20.\texttt{\textbf{f}f1} \texttt{\textbf{f}5} 21.h5 \texttt{\textbf{xe}3}! 22.\texttt{\textbf{x}e}3 \texttt{\textbf{d}3} 23. \texttt{\textbf{x}d}3 \texttt{\textbf{xd}3} 24.\texttt{\textbf{x}d}3 \texttt{\textbf{a}1}+ 25.\texttt{\textbf{e}e}2 \texttt{\textbf{x}h}1 26.\texttt{\textbf{x}g}6 \texttt{\textbf{g}2}=) 20...\texttt{\textbf{b}2} 19.\texttt{\textbf{d}d3} \texttt{\textbf{a}8}. The position is very complicated and both kings are seriously endangered. 20.h5 (The game would end in a draw after 20.\texttt{\textbf{f}f1} \texttt{\textbf{f}5} 21.h5 \texttt{\textbf{xe}3}! 22.\texttt{\textbf{x}e}3 \texttt{\textbf{d}3} 23. \texttt{\textbf{x}d}3 \texttt{\textbf{xd}3} 24.\texttt{\textbf{x}d}3 \texttt{\textbf{a}1}+ 25.\texttt{\textbf{e}e}2 \texttt{\textbf{x}h}1 26.\texttt{\textbf{x}g}6 \texttt{\textbf{g}2}=) 20...\texttt{\textbf{x}c}4! Black begins a counter attack with the help of this tactical strike. 21.\texttt{\textbf{x}c}4 (21.0-0 \texttt{\textbf{e}e}2 22.\texttt{\textbf{x}g}6 \texttt{\textbf{h}5}=) 21...\texttt{\textbf{e}e}3+ 22.\texttt{\textbf{f}f1}. White is reluctant to accept this sacrifice. (22.\texttt{\textbf{x}e}3? \texttt{\textbf{e}e}3+ 23.\texttt{\textbf{f}f1} \texttt{\textbf{x}c}4+ 24.\texttt{\textbf{g}g}1 \texttt{\textbf{e}2}−) 22...\texttt{\textbf{x}f}2+. Black simplifies the position with this temporary sacrifice of the queen and there arises an endgame. 23.\texttt{\textbf{x}f}2 \texttt{\textbf{g}4}+ 24.\texttt{\textbf{g}g}1 \texttt{\textbf{x}h}6 25.\texttt{\textbf{x}g}6 \texttt{\textbf{g}7}oo – The queens have disappeared off the board, but the position is still very sharp. Black’s prospects are not worse at all thanks to his three passed pawns on the queenside.

11...\texttt{\textbf{c}6}

This knight is headed for the d4-square in order to cover the weakness on d6.

12.0-0 \texttt{\textbf{d}d4}

It is possible that the simplest decision of the opening problems for Black here is the move 12...g5?!, for example: 13.\texttt{\textbf{g}g}3 \texttt{\textbf{h}h}5. He exchanges immediately his opponent’s key bishop. The weakening of his king here is not important at all, since White cannot exploit this. 14.\texttt{\textbf{a}b}1 \texttt{\textbf{g}g}3 15.\texttt{\textbf{x}g}3 \texttt{\textbf{a}6} 16.\texttt{\textbf{b}b}3 \texttt{\textbf{a}5} 17.\texttt{\textbf{d}d}5 \texttt{\textbf{x}d}2 18. \texttt{\textbf{d}d}2 \texttt{\textbf{x}d}5 19.\texttt{\textbf{c}c}5 \texttt{\textbf{d}d}4 20.\texttt{\textbf{d}d}3 \texttt{\textbf{b}5}= – Black’s knight is very powerful at the centre of the board and if he manages to create a passed pawn on the queenside, White will be forced to defend, Cumming – Booij, ICCF 2014.

13.\texttt{\textbf{c}c}4

After 13.\texttt{\textbf{f}f}1, Slugin – Onoprienko, Zvenigorod 2008, the simplest reaction for Black would be 13...\texttt{\textbf{e}e}2+!? 14.\texttt{\textbf{x}e}2 \texttt{\textbf{a}d}8= and his two-bishop advantage would compensate the slight weakness of the d6-pawn.

Following 13.\texttt{\textbf{b}b}3 g5 14.\texttt{\textbf{e}e}3 \texttt{\textbf{e}e}2+ 15.\texttt{\textbf{x}e}2, Loeffler – Lanz Calavia, ICCF 2013, 15...\texttt{\textbf{c}c}6?!oo, Black will have not only the two-bishop advantage, but will exert powerful pressure against the e4-pawn.

13...\texttt{\textbf{c}x}d4

There have appeared doubled isolated pawns in Black’s position, but his pieces are very active.
14.\( \texttt{\texttt{d5 xd5 exd5 e4}} \)
Black transfers his knight to c5 with tempo. 16.\( \texttt{\texttt{c2 e5 d3}} \)
(17.\( \texttt{\texttt{fe1 fe8 ed1 e4 d2 a5}} \) - The activity of Black’s pieces compensates the defects of his pawn-structure, Pawlowski – McCartney, ICCF 2011.) 17.\( \texttt{\texttt{a5}} \)
(18.\( \texttt{\texttt{ad1 e4 d2 a5}} \) - It would be difficult for White to exploit the vulnerability of the enemy pawns on d4 and d6, because they are reliably protected at the moment. White’s b3-pawn however, is very weak, Fier – Kotronics, Cappelle la Grande 2015.

B2b2) 10.\( \texttt{\texttt{xd6 e8}} \)

11.\( \texttt{\texttt{df3}} \)
White is trying to diminish his lag in development.

11.\( \texttt{\texttt{xc5}} \).
He wins a second pawn, but this is hardly an achievement at the moment. 11...\( \texttt{\texttt{a5 b4 a6 d4 (13.c1 xc4 f3 ad7 xc4 xd7 Gerusel – Maeder, Amsterdam 1969) xc4. Black has regained one of the two sacrificed pawns, while White has not completed his development yet. 14.e5 h5 15.b5 e6 xc4 xc4 17.ge2 d7 18.0-0 ad8 19. b3 xe5 – Black has restored the material balance and will have very good prospects in the future, Garriga Nualart – Buerger, ICCF 2012.}

Following 11.e5 \( \texttt{\texttt{fd7 f4 (12. df3?! c6) 12...c6 f3, Black begins immediate actions against White’s pawns on f4 and e5. The best way to do this is the undermining move 13...g5, for example: 14.g3 (14.ge2, Krysa – Supi, Buenos Aires 2014, 14...d4?! 14...f6 15.0-0 xf4 16.gxf4 exe5 17. h1, Zeihen – Hansen, ICCF 2015, 17...exe4?! =}

11...\( \texttt{\texttt{b6}} \)
Black has protected his c5-pawn and creates the threat \( \texttt{\texttt{d8}} \), followed by \( \texttt{\texttt{e8}} \).

(12.\( \texttt{\texttt{xb8}} \)
White solves radically the problem with his bishop on d6.)
After this however, the vulnerability of the dark squares in his camp might become horrible for him.

Following 12.0–0 $d8 13.e5 $e8, Black will gradually regain the pawn and his prospects in the forthcoming battle may become even preferable. 14.$d5 (White would be even worse after 14.$b3 $xd6 15.$ad1 $c6 16.exd6, Ubilava – Zaichik, Tbilisi 1980, 16... $xb3!? 17.axb3 $d7 18.$d2 $ad8 19.$fd1 $a5+ – White has temporarily an extra pawn indeed, but he would hardly manage to hold on to his pawn-weaknesses on b3 and d6 and after their loss Black would have a material advantage.) 14...$xd5 15.$xd5 $xd6 16. $ad1 $c6 17.exd6, Aleksandrov – Wojtaszek, Warsaw 2009, 17...$d7!? 18.b3 $e8 19. $d2 $e6 20. $fe1 $b4 21.a4 $exd6+ – The material balance has been restored and White must play very carefully later in order to neutralise his opponent’s initiative.

Black should not be afraid of 12.e5 $fd7

After 13.0–0 $c6 14.$a4 $a5 15.a3 $dxe5, Black regains the sacrificed pawn and his chances are preferable thanks to his more harmoniously deployed pieces. 16.$xe5 $xe5 17.b4 cxb4 18.axb4 $d8 19.$ec1 $c6 20.$c5. White has managed to activate his pieces a bit, but is incapable of countering the penetration of the enemy knight to the d4-square. 20... $c8 21.$f3 $d4 22.$g3 $b6 23. $e4, Alburt – Hebden, Hastings 1983, 23...$g4!? 24.$xg4 $xe4 25. $e1 $ae8 26.$xe4 $xe4+ – The powerful centralisation of Black’s pieces is a more important factor than White’s two-bishop advantage.

13.$b5 $c6 14.$c7 $a6. White’s initiative is only temporary. He is incapable of preserving the e5-pawn. 15.0–0 $ec8 16.$b3 $dxe5 17.$xe5 $xe5= Nejstadt – Nesis, ICCF 1984.

12...$axb8 13.$c2 $h5

Black is preparing the transfer of his knight to the f4-square.
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14.g3

Naturally, White should not allow $\text{d}f4$.

After the careless reaction 14. $\text{d}d2 \text{f}4\uparrow$, Black's pieces become very active. White's defence will be very difficult. He loses after 15.$\text{f}3\uparrow$, in view of 15...$\text{w}xb2! 16. $\text{w}xb2 \text{d}3+ 17. $\text{w}e2 $\text{w}xb2 18. $\text{d}5$, Farago – Sznapik, Helsinki 1981, 18...$\text{xc}4$–+

After 14.0–0 $\text{f}4$, White must already think about equality. 15.$\text{fe}1 \text{xe}2+ 16.$\text{xe}2 (16.$\text{xe}2 \text{xc}4$ Ryskin – Sutovsky, Ljubljana 1994) 16...$\text{w}b4 17.$\text{d}5 $\text{w}xb2 18.$\text{xb}2 $\text{xb}2 19.$\text{ab}1 $\text{g}7 20. $\text{e}3 $\text{d}7$ – Black has regained the sacrificed pawn and his prospects seem preferable thanks to his powerful bishop-pair, Lputian – Petrushin, Krasnodar 1980.

14...$\text{g}4 15.\text{h}3$

15.0–0 $\text{xc}3 16.$\text{xc}3 $\text{xe}4=$ Selle – Grandt, DDR 1987.

15...$\text{xc}3+$

16.$\text{x}c3$

16.$\text{xc}3$, Schreiber – Gustafsson, ICCF 1981, 16...$\text{d}7!?\text{=} – Black has very good compensation for the sacrificed pawn, because White's queenside pawn-structure has been compromised and the insufficient protection of the $\text{h}3$-pawn impedes his castling kingside.

16...$\text{xf}3 17.$\text{xf}3 $\text{f}6 18. 0–0 $\text{xe}4$

Black has parted with his powerful bishop-pair, but has regained the sacrificed pawn.

19.$\text{xe}4 $\text{xe}4 20.$\text{fe}1 $\text{be}8=$ – Both sides lack pawn-weaknesses and there is just a few material left on the board. The most likely outcome of the game would be a draw, Efremov – Polezhaev, ICCF 2008.
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1.d4 d6 2.c4 g6 3.d3 g7 4.e4 d6  
5.f4  

The Four Pawns Attack

With this seemingly threatening move White demonstrates his aggressive intentions. It is not by chance that this opening bears the word attack in its name. White has a powerful pawn-centre, but lags a bit in development. Therefore, Black must organise quickly counterplay against the enemy centre; otherwise, White will complete his development and his central pawns will crush the opposition on their way forward. The contemporary tournament practice has shown that the four pawns variation is not dangerous for Black. In addition, White's seemingly beautiful pawn-centre is an excellent target for an attack by Black's pieces and brings White only worries.

5...0–0  
Black can not continue the game without this preparatory move.

6.d3  
This is White's most natural response. He develops his kingside pieces. Additionally, the placement of his knight on f3 may help him in the pawn-advance e4-e5.

6.e2 c5 7.d5 (7.d3 cxd4 – see 6.d3) 7...e6 8.dxe6 (8.d3 exd5 – see variation C2) 8...fxe6 9.g4. This pawn-attack seems not well prepared (White should better play here 9.d3 c6 – see variation C1). 9...c6 10.h4 d4 11. h5, Mariotti - Gligoric, Praia da Rocha 1969, 11...g5!? Black sacrifices a pawn and impedes his opponent's attack and what is more important obtains the important e5-square for his pieces. 12.fxg5 d7++, followed by d6.

It is just bad for White to play 6.e3, since following 6...g4, he must either lose time for the re-
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of holding the strategically important e5-square. 12.e6 (12.0-0 dxe5? – His compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient.) 12...fxe6 13.dxe6 Qf6!?? White’s e6-pawn is too far away from the rest of his forces and is likely to become an easy prey for Black’s pieces. 14.f5 gxf5 15.Qg5 Qe4 16. Qxe4 fxe4 17.Qd5 Qe7 ++ Rozakis – Nikolaidis, Aegina 1996.

After 10.Qxd5 dxe5 11.Qxe5 Qc6 12.Qc2 f5 13.exf6 Qxf6, Black’s prospects are preferable, since he leads in development. 14.0-0 Qf5. He develops his bishop with tempo. 15.Qb3 Qe8. Black’s pieces are better coordinated and his advantage is obvious even to the naked eye. White tried to enter tactical complications in the game Zylla – Pintor, ICCF 2008, but all that ended in a catastrophe: 16.Qg5 Qxe2 17.Qxb7 Qa5 18.Qb5 Qe4 19.Qad1 a6 20. Qxc5 Qb7 21. Qxf6 Qxf6 22.Qc6 Qxd5 23.Qxd5 Qe7 24.b4 Qe6 25. Qa4 Qd6 ++, White’s two pawns are evidently insufficient to compensate the loss of his knight.

9...Qe8 10.0-0 Qf5 11.Qd3

White wishes to eliminate the blockade of his f-pawn.

It seems less adequate for him to opt for 11.Qh4, because the edge of the board is not the best place for his knight. 11...Qe4 12.f5 (12.Qxe4?! Qxe4 13.g3 f5? – Black dominates over the e4-square and has the advantage, Varga – Lenic, Novo Mesto 2000) 12...Qbd7 13. Qf6, Dahm – Bartosik, Poland 2007, 13...hxg6!? 14.Qg5 Qb6∞

11...Qd7

12.Qc2

White would not mind losing a tempo in order to force the exchange on d3.

After 12.Qh4 Qxd3 13.Qxd3 Qa6 14.a3, Simmelink – Engber- sen, corr. 1989, 14...Qg4!? 15.Qf3 Qh5∞, Black’s pieces become tremendously active.

Following 12.Qxf5 Qxf5 13. Qb3, he can ignore the threat against his b7-pawn. 13...Qa6 14.a3. White will need to lose time to prevent Qb4. (14.Qxb7? Qd4 15.Qg5 Qh5 16.Qh1 Qc2++ Andersen – Moza, ICCF 2011) 14...Qb6 15.Qb5 Qd7 16.f5 Qc7 17.Qxc7 Qxc7 18.fxg6 hxg6 19.Qf4 Qe4 20.Qa1 f5= – Black’s position is not worse thanks to his powerful knight at the centre of the board, Baumgartner – Pugh, ICCF 2011.
treat of his bishop, or comply with its exchange.

7.\Lad2 \Lxe3 8.\Lexe3 c5!\U With this energetic pawn-sacrifice Black seizes completely the initiative. 9.dxc5 dxc5 10.\Lxc5. White tries to win material, but lags in development, so this seems rather dubious. Still, even after a calmer play by him, he would have no compensation for the vulnerability of his d4-square and for Black’s two bishops. 10...\Ld4 11.\Lb5 \Lxc3+ 12.bxc3 \Lc7 13.\Lxe5 \Lxe5 14.fxe5 \Ld7 15.\Lf3 \Lc5\T – White is worse, despite his material advantage, since most of his pawns are a sorry sight.

7.\Lc1 c5 8.d5 \Ld4. Black has managed to occupy the d4-square, while White was just roaming with his bishop here and there. 9.\Lh3, J.Balogh – Szittar, Zala­karos 1993. White is defending against \Lf2, but as it is well known the edge of the board is not the best place for a knight. 9...e5!? Black wishes to open the position as quickly as possible so that his other minor pieces can come to assist his knight on g4 and the bishop on d4. 10.dxe6 \Lxe6 11.\Lb5. Naturally, White can hardly put up with the enemy bishop on d4 for long. 11...\Lc6 12.\Lxd4 cxd4 13.\Lg5 \Lxe3 14.\Lxe3 dxe3 15.\Ld3 \Lf6. Black would not mind exchanging his e3-pawn for his opponent’s two queenside pawns. 16.\Lxe3 \Lxb2 17.\Ld1 \Lxa2\T – White is a pawn down and lags in development too.

6.\Ld3. At first White deploys his bishop and then he wishes to place his knight on e2. Still, as it is well known, in the majority of the openings the knight is better placed on f3 than on e2. 6...c5 7.d5 e6

Now, White must choose the pawn-structure in the middle game.

8.\Lf3 exd5 – see variation C.

He cannot create problems for his opponent with 8.dxe6, because after the removal of White’s pawn from d5, Black’s knight gains access to the c6-square and from there it controls the important e5 and d4-squares. White is incapable of exploiting the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn. 8...f6e6 9.\Lge2 (9.\Lf3 \Lc6 – see
variation C1) 9...c6 10.0-0 b6 11.\text{c}g3 \text{2}e7∞ Black’s prospects are not worse. After the risky move 12.f5, Ljubisavljevic – Grigory, Amantea 2010, he could have even obtained the advantage with 12...\text{d}d7!?, after which his minor pieces would have occupied firmly the e5 and d4-squares.

8.\text{d}ge2 exd5 9.exd5. White is forced to capture with his e-pawn. (Following 9.cxd5, Black can exploit the insufficient protection of the enemy e4-pawn and advance quickly his queenside pawns seizing completely the initiative. 9...\text{g}e8 10.0-0 c4 11.\text{d}c2 b5 12.a3, Kubon – Sturdik, Slovakia 2009, 12...a5!? 13.\text{e}e3 \text{a}6+) 9...\text{f}h5 10.0-0 f5. After this move it would be difficult for White to organise any active actions on the kingside. 11.\text{f}d2, Keres – Panno, Los Angeles 1963, 11...\text{d}d7!? 12.\text{b}b3 \text{d}f6∞ – The weaknesses of the e4 and e6-squares are nearly balancing each other.

6...c5

Black inflicts an immediate strike against the enemy centre. Naturally, he would not mind to trade his c-pawn for the enemy central d-pawn. If White’s pawn is removed from d4, Black’s bishop on g7 will enjoy an enlarged scope of action.

Here, the most logical continuation of White’s strategy in the opening would be C) 7.\text{d}5, but before that we will analyse his less ambitious alternatives A) 7.\text{e}e2 and B) 7.dxc5.

A) 7.\text{e}e2 cxd4 8.\text{d}xd4
There has arisen a variation from the Maroczy system of the Sicilian Defence, but in which White has advanced prematurely f2-f4. This circumstance precludes him from fighting for an opening advantage.

8...\text{c}c6

Black continues to increase his pressure against the enemy centre. He is threatening \text{d}xe4 winning a pawn.

9.\text{e}e3
White parries this threat.
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The move 9.\(\text{c}c2\) may seem purposeful (White has extra space and should avoid exchanges), but is a bit too slow. 9...\(\text{d}d7\). Black prepares the transfer of his knight to c5. 10.0-0 \(\text{c}c5\) 11.\(\text{f}f3\) \(\text{xc}c3!?!\) He exchanges his powerful bishop and weakens the position of his king, but destroys his opponent’s queenside pawn-structure. 12. \(\text{bxc}3\) \(\text{a}a5\) 13.\(f5\), Darga - Toran Albergo, Luxembourg 1955 (The character of the position remains the same after 13.\(\text{d}d2\), Mikhaletz – Onischuk, Ukraine 2008, 13...\(\text{e}e6!??\)) 13...\(\text{e}e5!??\) – White does not have sufficient compensation for the defects of his pawn-structure.

9...\(\text{g}4\)

This is the simplest for Black. He exploits the insufficient protection of the enemy knight on d4 and succeeds in simplifying advantageously the position equalising completely.

10.\(\text{xc}c6\)

10.\(\text{x}g4\) \(\text{x}g4\) 11.\(\text{w}xg4\) \(\text{xd}4\) 12.\(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{e}e6\) 13.\(\text{c}c1\). Two couples of minor pieces have disappeared off the board and although White still has some extra space, Black has no problems at all, Hort – Vladimirov, Moscow 1963. Here, Black has an interesting idea – 13...\(\text{c}c5!?!\) 14.\(\text{d}d4\) \(e5\) 15.\(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{dx}c5\). It becomes evident now that White cannot achieve anything despite his dominance over the d5-square. 16.\(f5\) \(\text{gxf}5\) 17.\(\text{xd}8\) \(\text{a}x\text{d}8\) 18.\(\text{ex}f5\) \(e4!\) Black opens the scope of action of his bishop on g7. 19.\(\text{e}e2\) \(\text{xc}3\) 20.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{g}7=\) The prospects are about equal in this endgame with four rooks. In addition, if White reacts too slow and allows his opponent to deploy his king on e5 and to double his rooks on the d-file, he will end up in an inferior position.

10...\(\text{xe}2\) 11.\(\text{xd}8\) \(\text{xd}1\)

12.\(\text{xd}1\)

12.\(\text{xb}7?!\) \(\text{c}2\) 13.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xe}4+\) Noiroux – Beijerinck, Maastricht 2009.

12.\(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{g}4?!\) 13.\(\text{g}5\) \(h6\) 14. \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{h}5=\) – White is incapable of protecting his f4-pawn.

12...\(\text{fxd}8\)
The position has been simplified considerably.

13.\texttt{\textipa{e}2} \texttt{\textipa{d}7} 14.\texttt{\textipa{d}4}

With this move White neutralises the pressure of the enemy bishop on the long diagonal, but must comply with another exchange.

Following 14.\texttt{\textipa{d}3} \texttt{\textipa{dc}8} 15.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{\textipa{c}5} 16.\texttt{\textipa{x}c}5 \texttt{\textipa{xc}5} 17.\texttt{\textipa{hd}1}, the simplest road to equality for Black would be 17...\texttt{\textipa{x}c}3 18.\texttt{\textipa{xc}3} \texttt{\textipa{ac}8} = Uhlmann – Starck, Schkopau 1958.

14...\texttt{\textipa{a}6} 15.\texttt{\textipa{x}g}7 \texttt{\textipa{x}g}7 16.\texttt{\textipa{d}5}, Dozsa – W. Schmidt, Marianske Lazne 1962. Black is still not afraid from capturing on \texttt{c7} (He can counter that with \texttt{\textipa{e}8}.), so he can begin immediate active actions on the queenside. 16...\texttt{\textipa{b}5}!? 17.\texttt{\textipa{x}b}5 \texttt{\textipa{ax}b}5 18.\texttt{a}3 \texttt{\textipa{c}5} 19.\texttt{\textipa{f}3} \texttt{\textipa{e}6} 20.\texttt{\textipa{c}7} \texttt{\textipa{a}7} 21.\texttt{\textipa{xd}6}.

White has won a pawn thanks to some tactical tricks, but he is incapable of preserving it. 21...\texttt{\textipa{c}8} 22.\texttt{\textipa{x}b}5 \texttt{\textipa{b}7} 23.\texttt{\textipa{d}4} \texttt{\textipa{xb}2} 24.\texttt{\textipa{e}1} \texttt{\textipa{b}3} 25.\texttt{\textipa{x}b}3 \texttt{\textipa{xb}3}+ 26.\texttt{\textipa{e}3} \texttt{\textipa{cc}3} 27.\texttt{\textipa{x}c}3 \texttt{\textipa{xc}3}+ 28.\texttt{\textipa{f}2} \texttt{\textipa{xa}3} =

B) 7.\texttt{\textipa{xc}5} \texttt{\textipa{xc}5}!?  

This is the simplest for Black, because he would not mind transferring into an endgame. The point is that the vulnerability of the \texttt{d}4-square may become a telling factor in the future, since White would not be able to oust any enemy piece from there.

The move 7...\texttt{\textipa{a}5} is much more often played, but is less reliable, because Black loses too much time to regain his pawn.

8.\texttt{\textipa{xd}8}

Following 8.\texttt{\textipa{d}3}, the play, as a rule, also enters an endgame, since later White's bishop is removed from \texttt{d}3. 8...\texttt{\textipa{c}6}

9.0–0 \texttt{\textipa{h}5} 10.\texttt{\textipa{e}5} f6 11.\texttt{\textipa{e}4} \texttt{\textipa{xd}1} 12.\texttt{\textipa{xd}1} fxe5. The queens have been exchanged, but the position remains very complicated. 13.\texttt{\textipa{d}5+} \texttt{\textipa{h}8} 14.\texttt{\textipa{xe}5} \texttt{\textipa{xf}4}!? This is a very promising exchange-sacrifice. 15.\texttt{\textipa{f}7}+ \texttt{\textipa{xf}7} 16.\texttt{\textipa{xf}7} \texttt{\textipa{g}4} 17.\texttt{\textipa{f}1} \texttt{\textipa{d}4+} 18.\texttt{\textipa{h}1} \texttt{\textipa{d}3}. Black has a pawn for the sacrificed exchange and his pieces are very ac-
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tive. White's defence is not easy at all. 19.\textit{h}3 \textit{\texttt{f}5} 20.\textit{d}5 \textit{h}5 21.\textit{b}5 \textit{\texttt{f}2}+ 22.\textit{h}2 \textit{\texttt{e}5}+ 23.\textit{g}1 \textit{d}3 24.\textit{h}1 \textit{c}b4 25.\textit{c}3 \textit{xd}5 26.\textit{xd}5 \textit{e}6 27.\textit{e}3 \textit{e}4 28.\textit{d}1 \textit{d}4! – Black's minor pieces have occupied dominating positions and White can hardly manage to complete the development of his queenside pieces without material losses, Karacsony – Gnutov, ICCF 2012.

9.\textit{e}5 \textit{\texttt{b}4} 10.\textit{b}1 \textit{\texttt{xd}1}+ 11.\textit{xd}1 \textit{h}5 12.\textit{e}3 (It is possible that White should already think about equalising. 12.0–0 \textit{f}6 13.\textit{e}4 \textit{f}xe5 14.\textit{fxe}5 \textit{\texttt{f}5} 15.\textit{xf}5 \textit{\texttt{g}5} 16.\textit{f}2 \textit{c}6= – The vulnerability of White's e5-pawn is compensated by the misplacement of Black's knight at the edge of the board, Farkas – Strautins, ICCF 2009.)

17.\textit{gxf}4 \textit{\texttt{xf}4} 18.\textit{g}5 \textit{\texttt{xf}1}+ 19.\textit{xf}1 \textit{\texttt{f}8}+ 20.\textit{g}2 \textit{\texttt{f}6} 21.\textit{f}2 \textit{d}7! White's knight and his b2-pawn are hanging. He is forced to part with his material gains. 22.\textit{\texttt{h}7} \textit{\texttt{h}7}+ – Black's bishop exerts rather unpleasant pressure against White's b2-pawn, Karacsony – Schoen, ICCF 2010.

8...\textit{\texttt{xd}8} 9.\textit{e}5 \textit{\texttt{e}8}

12...\textit{f}6! Black sacrifices a pawn, but solves his basic problem – to activate his bishop on g7. In addition, his knight on h5, which was idle up to now, joins in the actions. 13.\textit{xc}5 (13.0–0, Jianu – Hagen, Legnica 2013, 13...\textit{f}xe5?!?) 13...\textit{c}6 14.\textit{exf}6 \textit{\texttt{xf}6} 15.\textit{g}3 \textit{\texttt{g}4} 16.0–0 \textit{\texttt{xf}4}! Black sacrifices a piece and seizes the initiative.

Now, Black's main task is to prepare the undermining move \textit{f}7–\textit{f}6, in order to exchange the enemy e5-pawn, which restricts considerably the bishop on g7 and the knight on e8.

10.\textit{e}3 \textit{b}6 11.\textit{e}2

White cannot obtain an advantage even if he fianchettoes his bishop: 11.g3 \textit{c}6 12.\textit{g}2 \textit{b}4 13.\textit{e}2 \textit{b}7 14.\textit{ad}1 \textit{f}6∞ Alcaraz Soriano – Bolado Saez, Albacete 2003.

It is also possible for White to play here 11.\textit{d}5, preparing castling queenside. 11...\textit{c}6 12.0–0 \textit{b}7 13.\textit{e}2 (13.\textit{d}3?! \textit{e}6 14.\textit{c}3
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\(\text{d4 15.dxe4 fxe3 16.gxf3 cxd4+} - \text{The vulnerability of the f4-pawn will be the cause of constant worries for White, Studen - Wang, Santa Clara 2014.) 13...f6 14.exf6 dxf6= - having exchanged the cramping e5-pawn, Black can be very optimistic about the future, Kulcsar - Kiss, Budapest 1998.}

11...\text{c6}

12.g2

12.\text{d1} e6+ 13.\text{d1}, Meinert - Stoppacher, Moers 2009, 13...f6!?∞

Following 12.0-0 f6 13.exf6 exf6, Black’s prospects are not worse. 14.\text{d1} (It seems less reliable for White to choose here 14. \text{d2}, Jakab - Nanu, Harkany 2002. After 14...e6!?∞, his pieces are in complete disarray.) 14...e6 15.b3, Martinsen - Kjolberg, Drammen 2010, 15...d6!?∞ Later, Black may either prepare the transfer of his knight to the d4-square (\text{d6-f5-d4}), or open the diagonal for his bishop on g7 with f6-f5.

12...\text{f6}

As the variations below will show White cannot even equalise.

13.exf6

Following 13.\text{d1}, Chytilek – Oral, Usti nad Labem 1996, it seems very good for Black to opt for 13...\text{b7!} 14.exf6 \text{xf6}+

13.\text{d1} \text{d1} 14.\text{d1} fxe5 15. fxe5 \text{xe5} 16.\text{xe5} \text{xe5} 17.\text{f3}. White’s pieces are active, but Black still has an extra pawn. 17...\text{b8} 18.\text{b5} a6 19.\text{a7} \text{b7} 20. \text{d7}, Vokac - Svatos, Luhacovice 1993. Here, the best way for Black to neutralise the activity of his opponent’s pieces is the line: 20...\text{d6}!? 21.\text{c6} \text{xc6} 22.\text{xc6} e6!?∞ - White has a bishop-pair indeed, but this does not compensate the loss of a pawn.

13...\text{xf6} 14.h3 \text{e8}

Black prepares the transfer of his knight to the d4-square.
15.\texttt{Ad}d1 $\texttt{Ad}$6 16.\texttt{Gg}5 $\texttt{Bb}$8 17.\texttt{Bb}5. This pawn-sacrifice cannot promise a good position to White. His alternatives also lead to an advantage for Black. 17... $\texttt{Ax}$xb2 18.\texttt{Gxd}6 $\texttt{Gxd}$6 19. $\texttt{Gxd}$6 exd6 20.\texttt{Ad}1 $\texttt{Ad}$4 21.\texttt{Ax}d4 $\texttt{Ax}d$4+ 22.\texttt{Gg}3 $\texttt{Af}$5 23.\texttt{Ff}3 $\texttt{Be}$3 24.\texttt{Gxd}6 $\texttt{Gf}$8\textsuperscript{+} – White has restored the material balance, but Black’s prospects are preferable thanks to his two powerful bishops, Karacsony – Hefka, ICCF 2010.

C) 7.d5

This is the best. White occupies space.

7...e6

Now, we will deal in details with C1) 8.dxe6 and C2) 8.\texttt{Ge}2.

It is not good for White to choose here 8.e5, because he lags in development and is not well prepared for the opening of the game in the centre. 8...dxe5 9.fxe5 $\texttt{Gg}$4 10.\texttt{Gg}5 (10.\texttt{Ff}4? exd5 11.exd5 $\texttt{Gd}$7\textsuperscript{+}) 10...$\texttt{Gb}$6 11.$\texttt{Gb}$2 $\texttt{Gd}$7. White cannot protect his e5-pawn, while if he sacrifices it 12.\texttt{Je}e2 $\texttt{Gd}$xe5 13.\texttt{Gxe}5 $\texttt{Gxe}$5 14.0-0, Williams – Hendriks, London 2009, 14...f5?\textsuperscript{+}, his compensation would be insufficient.

Following 8.\texttt{Ad}3 exd5 9.cxd5, there arise positions which we will analyse in the next chapter, but with a bishop on d3. This difference is much rather in favour of Black, since he will manage to advance c5-c4 with tempo. 9...$\texttt{Ge}$8 10.0–0 c4 11.\texttt{Ac}2 (But not 11.\texttt{Gxc}4 $\texttt{Gxe}$4 12.\texttt{Gxe}4 $\texttt{Fxe}$4\textsuperscript{+}) 11...$\texttt{Gd}$6. From here Black’s knight may go to c5 in order to attack the enemy e4-pawn, as well as to the c7-square for the sake of the preparation of the pawn-advance b7-b5. 12.h3 b5 13.a3 $\texttt{Gb}$7 14.\texttt{Ge}3, Cox – Perez Conde, ICCF 2006. Here, Black could have obtained a very good position with 14...$\texttt{Gc}$7!? 15.$\texttt{Ge}$1 a5\textsuperscript{+} and the threat b5-b4 would be very unpleasant for White.

C1) 8.dxe6

This move leads to a calmer position in comparison to 8.\texttt{Je}e2. White decides not to defend his pawn-centre and gets rid of his d5-pawn.

8...fxe6

This capturing seems more reliable than taking with the bishop, because the pawn on e6 will control the d5-square against the penetration of the enemy knight.
3. \( \square c3 \) \( \square g7 \) 4.e4 d6 5.f4 0-0 6.\( \square f3 \) c5 7.d5 e6

9.\( \square d3 \)

9.e5. Transferring into an endgame would be harmless for Black. 9...dxe5 10.\( \square x d8 \) \( \square x d8 \). White lags in development and cannot exploit the slight weakness of the e6-pawn. 11.fxe5 (11.\( \square x e5 \) \( \square f d7 \) 12.\( \square x d7 \) \( \square x d7 \) 13.\( \square c3 \), Martic – Jurkovic, Pula 1999, 13...\( \square c6 \)! Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 14.\( \square x c5 \) \( \square a6 \) 15.\( \square e3 \) \( \square b4 \) 16.\( \square c1 \) e5† – It is already an endgame, but White’s defence is difficult, since he lags considerably in development, while Black’s pieces are very active.) 11...\( \square g4 \). He is eyeing the weak e5-pawn. 12.\( \square g5 \) \( \square d7 \) 13.\( \square e4 \) \( \square x e5 \) 14.\( \square x c5 \) (14.\( \square x e5 \) \( \square x e5 \) 15.\( \square f6+ \) \( \square x f6 \) 16.\( \square x f6 \) \( \square f7 \) 17.\( \square c3 \), El Gindy – Khairallah, Cannes 2007, 17...e5?!†, followed by \( \square c6-d4 \). White has the two-bishop advantage indeed, but this is insufficient to compensate fully his lack of a pawn.) 14...\( \square x f3+ \), G.Kuzmin – Bilek, Reggio Emilia 1976, 15.gxf3 \( \square x b2 \)†

9.\( \square e2 \). Now, contrary to the variation with 9.\( \square d3 \), White does not close the e-file and will organise easily pressure against the d6-pawn, but his e4-pawn will not be so reliably protected. 9...\( \square c6 \) 10.0-0 b6. Black is preparing the development of his bishop on b7, or on a6.

Following 11.a3 \( \square e7 \) 12.\( \square d3 \) \( \square a6 \), Black plans to organise the pawn-advance d6-d5 and to maintain an advantage. 13.\( \square d2 \) \( \square a 8 \) 14.\( \square a e 1 \) d5† Novak – Wunderlich, ICCF 2010.

There arises a very complicated position after 11.\( \square g 5 \) \( \square d 4 \) 12.\( \square d 3 \) \( \square e 7 \) 13.\( \square e 1 \), Fridman – Conquest, Liverpool 2008, 13...\( \square h 5 \)?∞, or 11.\( \square d 3 \) \( \square b 7 \) 12.\( \square g 5 \) \( \square d 4 \) Kouatly – Minasian, Teheran 1992.

11.\( \square h 1 \) \( \square b 7 \). From this square the bishop will exert pressure against the e4-pawn. 12.\( \square e 3 \) \( \square e 7 \). Black’s queen frees a square for his rook. 13.\( \square d 2 \) \( \square a 8 \) 14.\( \square a e 1 \) \( \square d 4 \) 15.\( \square d 1 \) e5. This is an interesting move. Black would not mind weakening the d5-square, since it is controlled by two of his minor pieces. 16.\( \square d 5 \) \( \square x d 5 \) 17.exd5 \( \square x f 3 \) 18.\( \square x f 3 \), Rahde – Lahdenmaeki, LSS 2008, 18...\( \square h 4 \)!?'†
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9...c6 10.0-0 a6

It would be useful to deprive White of the possibility to play b5 in the future. In addition, in some variations he would have to consider the possible pawn-advance b7-b5.

11.g5

After the careless move 11.e1, Black would seize the initiative with the line: 11...b5! 12.cxb5 cxb4 13.b1 axb5 14.e5 dxe5 15.xe5 d5+ Bonnmann - Zimmermann, Porz 1989.

The move 11.a4 leads to the weakening of the b4-square. 11...b6 12.g5 a7!? Black wishes to transfer his rook to e7 in order to protect his e6-pawn, after which his bishop may go to b7. 13.a3 e7 14.b1 d4 15.e3 b7+ Hjar- tarson - Larsen, Reykjavik 1986.

11.d2 b8 12.c1 c7 13.e2 h5 14.g3 b6 15.g2 b7= Do- than - Ponomarev, ICCF 2007.

11.h1 d4 12.e3 g4 13.

11...e7

Black’s plan includes d7, ad8 after which his d6-pawn will be reliably protected.

12.e1

White plans to deploy his queen on h4 from where it will exert powerful pressure against Black’s king position.

12.d2 d7 13.c1 c8 14. e1 h6. Black ousts the enemy knight from its active position. The g6-square is weakened a bit, but this is immaterial, because he will place his bishop on e8 on his next move. 15.h3 e8 16.h1 d4 17.e2 c6 18.c3 d4 19. e2 c6 20.c3= Eman – Oberg- tin, ICCF 2015.

12...d7 13.h4 h5

(diagram)

14.d2

After the hazardous line: 14.g4?! h6 15.gxh5 hxg5 16.g4
This is a calm move. White gets rid of his potentially weak e4-pawn, which can be attacked by Black on the semi-open e-file. White's later plans are based on his space advantage.

His hanging f4-pawn is very important for the subsequent development of the fight. White will try to prepare f4-f5, which would open the f-file and would enlarge the scope of action of his bishop on c1. Black will try to prevent f4-f5 and will seek his counter chances in exploiting the vulnerability of the e4-square (\(e_8, f5\)).

The basic move for White – 9. cxd5 will be analysed in the next chapter.

It would be too risky for White to play here 9.e5?! , since Black may exploit the circumstance that his d5-pawn controls the e4-square and centralise his knight with the move 9...\(d4\).

Now, no matter how White continues, Black already has the advantage.

Following 10.cxd5 \(\triangle x c 3\) 11. bxc3 \(\triangle d 7\), White will be incapable
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of holding the strategically important e5-square. 12.e6 (12.0–0 dxe5? – His compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient.) 12...fxe6 13.dxe6 Qf6?! White’s e6-pawn is too far away from the rest of his forces and is likely to become an easy prey for Black’s pieces. 14.f5 gx5 15.Qg5 Qe4 16. Qxe4 fxe4 17.Qd5 Qe7 –+ Rozakis – Nikolaidis, Aegina 1996.

After 10.Qxd5 dxe5 11.fxe5 c6 12.Qc2 f5 13.exf6 Qxf6, Black’s prospects are preferable, since he leads in development. 14.0–0 Qf5. He develops his bishop with tempo. 15.Qb3 Qe8. Black’s pieces are better coordinated and his advantage is obvious even to the naked eye. White tried to enter tactical complications in the game Zylla – Pintor, ICCF 2008, but all that ended in a catastrophe: 16.Qg5 Qxe2 17.Qxb7 Qa5 18.Qb5 Qe4 19.Qad1 a6 20. Qxc5 Qb7 21.Qxf6 Qxf6 22.Qc6 Qxd5 23.Qxd5 Qe7 24.b4 Qe6 25. Qa4 Qd6 –+, White’s two pawns are evidently insufficient to compensate the loss of his knight.

9...Qe8 10.0–0 Qf5 11.Qd3

White wishes to eliminate the blockade of his f-pawn.

It seems less adequate for him to opt for 11.Qh4, because the edge of the board is not the best place for his knight. 11...Qe4 12.f5 (12.Qxe4?! Qxe4 13.g3 f5 – Black dominates over the e4-square and has the advantage, Varga – Lenic, Novo Mesto 2000) 12...Qbd7 13. fxg6, Dahm – Bartosik, Poland 2007, 13...hxg6! 14.Qg5 Qb6

11...Qd7

12.Qc2

White would not mind losing a tempo in order to force the exchange on d3.

After 12.Qh4 Qxd3 13.Qxd3 Qa6 14.a3, Simmelink – Engber sen, corr. 1989, 14...Qg4!? 15.Qf3 Qh5, Black’s pieces become tremendously active.

Following 12.Qxf5 Qxf5 13. Qb3, he can ignore the threat against his b7-pawn. 13...Qa6 14.a3. White will need to lose time to prevent Qb4. (14.Qxb7? Qb4 15.Qg5 Qh5 16.Qh1 Qc2 – Anders en – Moza, ICCF 2011) 14...b6 15.Qb5 Qd7 16.f5 Qc7 17.Qxc7 Qxc7 18.fxg6 hxg6 19.Qf4 Qe4 20.Qae1 f5= – Black’s position is not worse thanks to his powerful knight at the centre of the board, Baumgartner – Pugh, ICCF 2011.
There arises a complicated fight, but advantageous for Black following 12.h3. White wishes to advance g2-g4, solving radically the problem with the f5-square. His king is considerably weakened after that, though... 12...\textit{a}6 13.a3 \textit{c}7 14.g4

Now, Black has a very pleasant choice.

14...\textit{x}d3!? This is a calm move. 15.\textit{w}xd3 \textit{b}5. Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative on the queenside. 16.cxb5, Heimbrodt – Berndt, DDR 1975, 16...\textit{e}ac8!? He is preparing c5-c4. 17.a4 c4 18.\textit{w}d1 \textit{e}e4 19.\textit{x}xe4 \textit{xe}4\textit{c} - Black’s play is much easier in this complicated position. His pieces are very active, while White must be constantly on the alert about his king, moreover that the weakness of his d5-pawn may tell in the future.

It also deserves attention for Black to try here the piece-sacrifice: 14...\textit{x}g4 15.xg4 \textit{w}xg4+ 16.\textit{h}2 \textit{b}5!?? and he has two pawns for the piece, while the shelter of White’s monarch is not reliable at all, Conquest – Mestel, Hastings 1986.

12...\textit{x}d3 13.\textit{w}xd3 \textit{a}6
Black’s knight is headed for the c7-square to support the pawn-advance b7-b5.

14.a3

It is worse for White to play here 14.\textit{d}d2 \textit{b}4 15.\textit{b}1, Valveny – Verdes Nadal, Mollerusa 1997. He has weakened his control over the d5-square and now Black can push advantageously 15...\textit{b}5!? 16.\textit{x}b5 \textit{b}xd5+ and the exchange of a flank pawn for a central pawn is obviously in his favour.

14...\textit{c}7

15.f5
This is an energetic and straightforward move.

There arises a calmer position following 15.\textit{d}d2 \textit{ab}8 16.\textit{ae}1 (16.b4 cxb4 17.axb4, Malesevic – Kauppila, Sweden 2006, 17...\textit{a}6!? 18.h3 \textit{bc}8?? – Black has good counterplay against his opponent’s weak c4-pawn.) 16...\textit{b}5. His queenside activity provides him with an excellent position. 17.b3
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bxc4 18.bxc4  b3 19.c2  xa3 20.b2  a6 21.b7  b6 22.xa7  eb8= – After the trade of the weak pawns on the a-file, neither side can rely on obtaining an advantage, Caporali – Denisov, ICCF 2014.

15...  ab8 16.a4
White prevents b7-b5, but strengthens the b4-square.

There arises a much more complicated position after 16.fxg6 hxg6 17.b3 b5± Glembek – Hildner, ICCF 2000.

16...  a6

Black’s knight is in a hurry to occupy the weakened b4-square.

17.fxg6 hxg6 18.g5  b4 19.g3  c2
He continues with the manoeuvre of his knight. Now, it will be transferred to the centre of the board.

20.b1  d4 21.h4  f5
Here already, White cannot sacrifice the exchange on f6.

22.h3

22...e7. Black prepares the doubling of his rooks on the e-file and protects additionally his f7-pawn. 23.d2  be8 24.h1  a6∞ – White can hardly achieve anything meaningful on the kingside, because Black’s pieces protect reliably all the squares in the vicinity of his king, Mesquita – Gorokhov, ICCF 2013.
In the theory of the chess openings this position is classified as belonging to the Modern Benoni Defence. The adherents to the King's Indian Defence should be ready for similar developments in the opening...

9...\textit{Be}8

Black should better attack immediately the enemy centre. Therefore, he develops his rook on the semi-open e-file and eyes the e4-pawn.

Here, White has a choice between two possibilities: A) 10.\textit{Cd}2 and B) 10.e5.

He ends up even worse after his alternatives.

10.0–0. This pawn-sacrifice is obviously not well prepared. 10...\textit{Cxe}4 11.\textit{Cxe}4 \textit{Be}4 12.\textit{Cd}3 \textit{Be}8 13.\textit{f}5 \textit{Cd}7 14.\textit{Cg}5 \textit{Ce}5. Black's knight protects reliably the f7 and g6-squares. In the game Kutliev – Chernov, Voronezh 2011, White decided to continue his attack against the enemy king with a sacrifice of his knight, but all this did not end well for him at all: 15. \textit{Cxf}7 \textit{Cxf}7 16.\textit{fxg}6 \textit{Cxe}5 17.\textit{Cf}h5 h\textit{Xg}6 18.\textit{Cxe}6 \textit{Cxe}6 19.\textit{Cxe}6 \textit{Bc}5 20.\textit{Cf}h6 \textit{Be}7 21.\textit{Cxe}7 \textit{Bxe}7 22. \textit{Bxd}6 \textit{Bh}3++. Black neutralised the attack and was clearly winning.

The move 10.\textit{Cc}2 can be refuted by Black in a tactical fashion. 10...\textit{Cxe}4! 11.\textit{Cxe}4 \textit{Cf}5 12. \textit{Cd}f2 \textit{We}7 13.\textit{Cf}3 \textit{Cxe}4 14.\textit{Cxe}4 \textit{f}5. The consequences of the delay of White's castling have become obvious. Black exploits the pin of the enemy knight and regains the piece and ends up with an advantage. 15.0–0 fxe4 16.\textit{Be}1 \textit{Bd}4+ 17.\textit{Ch}1, Artsukevich – Korchnoi, Leningrad 1953, 17...\textit{Cd}7 18.\textit{Cxe}4 \textit{Bf}7 19.\textit{Bxe}8+ \textit{Be}8 20.\textit{Cd}2 \textit{Cf}6
21...b3  e4+ – Black’s pieces are evidently more active and White’s defence will be difficult.

A) 10...d2  d7!

This is not the most popular move for Black, but is interesting. His bishop frees the way for his rook and creating the threat b7-b5 forces White to play a2-a4, which leads to the weakening of the b4-square. Black’s subsequent plan includes: a6, c8, c5-c4, b4(c5) with powerful initiative on the queenside.

11.a4

Naturally, White should not allow b7-b5.

11.0–0 b5 12.xb5  xe4 13. xe4  xe4+ – The exchange of the flank b-pawn for the central e-pawn is obviously in favour of Black, Geissler – Beckmann, Email 2007. The move 14.xd6 would not work, because of 14... a4+.

11...a6 12.0–0

12...c8

13.g4

White begins active actions on the kingside and the position becomes very sharp.

There arises a complicated position following 13.h3  b4+ Guerrero – Guevara, ICCF 2009.

13...h6

Black frees the h7-square for his knight.

14.g5

It seems less consistent for White to choose here 14.h1, because he will have to play g4-g5 anyway, while it would remain unclear whether the move h1 would be useful later or not. 14... c4 15.g5 hxg5 16.fxg5 h7 17. xc4 xc3. This is a non-standard decision. Black exchanges his powerful bishop for the enemy knight, which protects the impor-
tcant e4-pawn. 18.bxc3 $h3 19.$f3 $xc4. Black exploits the misplacement of the enemy rook on the h5-d1 diagonal and sacrifices temporarily the exchange. 20.$xc4 $g4 21.$xa6 $xa6 22.$f1 $xf3+ 23.$xf3 $xg5 24.$xg5. White would lose his e4-pawn without this move. 24...$xg5+ Thompson – Babic, ICCF 2014. The tactical complications are over. In the arising endgame with major pieces Black has the advantage, because his king is well protected, contrary to its counterpart.

14...hxg5 15.fxg5 $h7 16. $c4 $e7

17.$d2. White prepares the transfer of his queen to the f-file. 17...$b4 18.$f4 $d4+ 19. $h1 $xc3. Black exploits in a tactical way the insufficient protection of the enemy bishop on e2. 20.bxc3 $xd5 21.$xd5 $xe2 22.$d2 $d3 23.$xf7+ $h8. The loss of the f7-pawn is not dangerous for Black, since his king is still very well protected. 24.$f4 $f8. Black cannot allow $h4. 25.$xd7 $xf4

26.$xf4 $f8 27.$xd6 $f3+ 28.$g1 $xf4= Now, White is forced to give a perpetual check in order to prevent the threat $g4. 29.$e5+ $g8 30.$e6+, draw. Junge – Sikorsky, ICCF 2014.

B) 10.e5

This is White’s most ambitious and principled move. Still, playing like this he risks too much and not only does not obtain an advantage in the opening, but in numerous variations he even fails to equalise.

10...dxe5 11.fxe5 $g4

No doubt, White’s pawn-cen-
tre is very beautiful, but now what? How can he protect the e5-pawn? Besides all that, his king is stranded in the centre. Later, he must lose a tempo for castling and also in many variations for the move \( \text{h1} \) too, in order to remove his king from the dangerous g1-a7 diagonal.

As the main lines for White we will analyse: **B1)** 12.0-0, **B2)** 12.e6 and **B3)** 12.\( \text{g5} \).

It may be an interesting move for him to try here 12.\( \text{f4} \)?, after which Black will have to play accurately. 12...\( \text{xe5} \) 13.\( \text{xe5} \) (13.0-0 – see 12.0-0) 13...\( \text{xe5} \) 14.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 15.0-0. He has an extra pawn, but lags in development of his queenside pieces. 15...\( \text{f5} \) 16.\( \text{d2} \). From here White’s queen can go to h6 as well as to the f4-square (16.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 17.\( \text{xd3} \) 18.\( \text{d6} \) \( \text{b6=} \) – His powerful passed d-pawn compensates the loss of the pawn, but not more than that, De Lagontrie – Dufrasie, France 1988.). 16...\( \text{d7} \) 17.\( \text{g4} \). White ousts the enemy bishop from the f-file, Van Seben – Costanzo, IECG 2007, 17...\( \text{e4} \) 18.\( \text{f4} \) f5. Black solves radically the problem with the protection of his f7-pawn and the bishop on e4. White will be incapable of exploiting the slight weakening of the shelter of Black’s king. 19.\( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{h4} \) 20.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d3} \)?! After this concealed tactical trick the position is simplified considerably. 21.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 22.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{g4=} \) 23.\( \text{h1} \)

\( \text{xb5} \) 24.\( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{c4} \). This is the point! White cannot protect simultaneously his rook and knight. 25.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{xb5=} \) – He is two pawns down, so White must give a perpetual check.

**B1)** 12.0-0 \( \text{xe5} \) 13.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{xf3} \) + 14.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 15.\( \text{d6} \)

White has sacrificed a pawn and has some initiative for it. Later, the fate of the d6-pawn would be crucial for the outcome of the game. It seems to be a powerful passed pawn, but Black can try to isolate it from the rest of his opponent’s forces and gobble it. If he manages to do this he will maintain an advantage.

15...\( \text{e5} \) 16.\( \text{b5} \)

White is threatening to win the exchange after \( \text{c7} \).

There arises a calmer position after 16.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 17.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 18.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 19.\( \text{xe4} \), M.Socko – Cmilyte, Beijing 2012, 19...\( \text{e6} \)?? 20.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd6} \) – Black has realised his plan to capture the d6-pawn.
16...\textit{\$d7}!?
This is an interesting exchange-sacrifice.
17.\textit{\$c7 \$xf3}+
Black exchanges the important enemy bishop.
18.\textit{\$xf3 \$c6}
His bishop will be very powerful on this square.
19.\textit{\$d3}

It would be worse for White to choose here 19.\textit{\$b3}, because of 19...\textit{e2} 20.\textit{\$d5 \$d4}+, Lapse – Trzeciak, ICCF 2000, 21.\textit{\$h1 \$e8}++ White is helpless against the attack of Black’s pieces against the g2-square. White cannot exchange the bishop on c6, because Black will counter 22.\textit{\$e7}+ with 22...\textit{\$xe7}! 23.dxe7 \textit{\$xg2}#

19...\textit{\$xb2}. This is the point. Now, Black will have two pawns for the exchange and this, in addition to his powerful bishop-pair, will be more than sufficient compensation. 20.\textit{\$ad1 \$d4}+. This is the ideal square for Black’s bishop. It cuts off White’s major pieces from his d6-pawn. 21.\textit{\$h1}

\textbf{B2) 12.e6 fxe6}

13.d6

It would be worse for White to play here 13.0–0, since following 13...\textit{exd5}, Black’s light-squared bishop would not be restricted by his e6-pawn. 14.\textit{\$xd5 \$e6} 15.\textit{\$f4} (15.\textit{\$c4 \$e5} 16.\textit{\$g5 \$xf3}+ 17.\textit{\$xf3 \$xg5} 18.\textit{\$ae1 \$c6} 19.\textit{\$xe6}, Rogers – Van der Wiel, Wattignies 1976, 19...\textit{\$f8}!? 20.\textit{\$f4 \$h8}+ – White does not have compensation for the pawn.) 15...\textit{\$f7}. From this square, the bishop will cover reliably the a2-g8 diagonal. 16.\textit{\$xd8 \$xd8} 17.\textit{\$g5}. White sacrifices the exchange in an attempt to seize the initiative. 17...\textit{\$d4}+ 18.\textit{\$h1 \$f2}+ 19.\textit{\$xf2 \$xf2} 20.\textit{\$xf7 \$xf7} 21.\textit{\$c4}+ \textit{\$e8}. Black’s
king is not reliably placed, but there are no queens on the board and White would be incapable of creating any threats with his active pieces. 22.\textit{d}d5 \textit{d}d7 23.\textit{g}g5 \textit{f}f8 24.\textit{f}f1 \textit{f}5 25.\textit{f}f6+ \textit{c}6 26.\textit{x}xh7, Pena – Restrepo, Medellin 2014. Winning the h7-pawn can be only a small consolation for White, because after 26...\textit{d}d4?! \textit{f}5, Black’s great advantage is doubtless.

Still, it is possible for White to opt here for 13.\textit{g}g5. He develops with tempo his bishop to an active position. 13...\textit{b}6 14.\textit{d}2 c4 (It would be too risky for Black to play here 14...\textit{x}xc3 15.\textit{b}xc3 exd5 16.h3 \textit{f}6 17.0–0 c4+ 18.\textit{h}h1. He will have two extra pawns, but the dark squares in his camp would be hopelessly weak. 18...\textit{b}d7 19.\textit{a}e1. White brings patiently his pieces in an attack against the enemy monarch. 19...\textit{c}5 20.\textit{d}d4 \textit{e}4 21.\textit{f}3!± – Black can hardly bring into the actions his queenside pieces, Haugen – Sadowski, ICCF 2012.) 15.0–0 0 exd5 16.\textit{h}e1. White is trying to keep the position complicated and is not in a hurry to regain material. (After 16.\textit{x}xd5, the position is simplified considerably. 16...\textit{xb}2+ 17.\textit{xb}2 \textit{xb}2+ 18.\textit{xb}2 \textit{xe}2+ 19.\textit{c}3 \textit{c}3 20.\textit{h}e1 \textit{xe}1 21.\textit{xe}1 \textit{h}6 22.\textit{f}4, Koval – Drenthen, ICCF 2015. Following 22...\textit{f}5 23.h3 \textit{f}2 24.\textit{x}xh6 \textit{h}7=, Black would be incapable of preserving his extra c4-pawn.) 16...\textit{c}6 17.\textit{xc}4 \textit{f}5 18.\textit{xd}5+ \textit{h}8 19.\textit{h}4, I.Pov – Inarkiev, Dagomys 2008, 19...\textit{d}7!? 20.\textit{xe}8+ \textit{xe}8 21.\textit{f}7 \textit{f}8 22.\textit{xd}7 \textit{xc}3 23.\textit{b}xc3 \textit{c}5 24.\textit{d}4 \textit{xd}4 25.\textit{d}4 \textit{xf}7= – In this endgame, in actions on both sides of the board, the bishop is stronger than the knight, but here White cannot exploit this, since his queenside pawn-structure has been compromised.

13...\textit{d}d7

Black is trying to develop his queenside pieces as quickly as possible. Meanwhile, his bishop on d7 blocks reliably the enemy passed d6-pawn.
squares in the centre and his bishops control important diagonals, Karacsony – Rudenko, ICCF 2012.

14...\texttt{b6} 15.\texttt{e1}

White does not conceal his aggressive intentions. He wishes to transfer his queen to the h4-square in order to begin an attack against the enemy king.

It seems weaker for White to choose 15.\texttt{e4}. Following 15...\texttt{c6} 16.\texttt{fg5} \texttt{e5} 17.\texttt{g4} \texttt{bd7} 18.\texttt{c3}, Barbosa – Nasanjargal, Tagaytay City 2011, Black could have obtained an advantage with 18...\texttt{c4}?! 19.\texttt{h1} \texttt{c5}. The e6-square has been protected and White’s compensation for the pawn is insufficient.

Still, it is quite possible for him to continue with 15.\texttt{h1} \texttt{f8} 16.\texttt{h3} \texttt{f6} 17.\texttt{e5} \texttt{c6} 18.\texttt{c4} \texttt{d8} 19.\texttt{e3} b6 20.\texttt{a4} \texttt{b8}. There has arisen a complicated position. Black has an extra pawn, but White’s passed d6-pawn, supported by his knight on e4, is very powerful.

15...\texttt{c6} 16.\texttt{h4} h5

This is the best defence for Black.

(diagram)

17.\texttt{h3}

White ousts the enemy knight from its active position.

After 17.\texttt{g5}, he wins the g6-pawn, but does not obtain an advantage. 17...\texttt{f8}. Black transfers his rook to the f5-square in order to defend his h5-pawn. 18.\texttt{xg6} \texttt{f5} 19.\texttt{h3}. The placement of White’s queen on g6 may turn out to be precarious, so he does not lose time and tries to evacuate it from there. 19...\texttt{ce5} 20.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} 21.\texttt{g3} \texttt{xf1}+ 22.\texttt{xf1} \texttt{f7} 23.\texttt{e4} c4+ 24.\texttt{e3} \texttt{xb2} 25.\texttt{d1} \texttt{e5} 26.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} – There has arisen a complicated endgame in which White’s powerful passed pawn on d6 compensates the loss of his pawn, Jones – Larsen, ICCF 2011.

17...\texttt{ge5} 18.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} 19.\texttt{e4} \texttt{f8} 20.\texttt{f6}+

20...\texttt{xf6}?!
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With this exchange-sacrifice Black shows his aggressive intentions.

If he complies with the draw, he can play 20...\texttt{b}xf6 21.\texttt{xf}6 \texttt{g7} 22.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{xb}2 23.\texttt{af}1 \texttt{xe}2 24.\texttt{xf}8, draw, Brooks – Galytzky, ICCF 2015. Indeed, after 24...\texttt{xf}8 25.\texttt{xf}8 \texttt{xf}8 26.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}8 27.\texttt{f}6 \texttt{d}1+ 28.\texttt{h}2 \texttt{f}3+ 29.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{e}2+ 30.\texttt{h}1 \texttt{e}1=, the outcome of the game would be a draw.

21.\texttt{xf}6 \texttt{xd}6

Black has two pawns for the exchange and a solid position. 22.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{d}4+ 23.\texttt{f}2 \texttt{h}4 24.\texttt{hx}4 \texttt{c}6 25.\texttt{f}6. White exchanges his opponent’s important bishop. 25...\texttt{xf}6 26.\texttt{xf}6 \texttt{d}5. Black’s pieces and pawns are perfectly coordinated. White’s rooks can hardly be activated. 27.b3 \texttt{g}7 28.\texttt{f}2 \texttt{d}8 29.\texttt{c}1 b6 30.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{d}7 31.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{c}7 32.\texttt{d}1 \texttt{c}6 33.\texttt{xc}6 \texttt{xc}6 34.\texttt{h}4 b5 35.\texttt{c}1 c4. Black wishes to create a passed pawn on the c-file. 36.bxc4 bxc4† – Black’s bishop is supported by his e6-pawn and is very powerful at the centre of the board, while White’s rooks are squeezed in the fight against Black’s passed c4-pawn, Anderson – Catt, ICCF 2012.

B3) 12.\texttt{g}5

(diagram)

After this active move, White’s b2-pawn remains unprotected. 12...\texttt{b}6 13.0–0

The plan with White castling queenside 13.\texttt{d}2 seems too risky for him, because after the fall of the e5-pawn, Black’s bishop on g7 will exert very powerful pressure against White’s queenside. 13...\texttt{xe}5 14.0–0–0 (14.0–0 \texttt{g}4 – see 13.0–0) 14...\texttt{xf}3 15.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{d}7 16.\texttt{d}6 \texttt{e}5 17.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}6 18.\texttt{hf}1 \texttt{d}7 19.\texttt{e}7 \texttt{a}5†

13...\texttt{xe}5

Black has an extra pawn and White will hardly manage to obtain sufficient compensation for it.

14.\texttt{xe}5

White ends up in a bad position after 14.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{g}4 15.\texttt{hl
\( \text{dxf3 16.axf3} \text{ dxf3 17.axf3.} \) The exchange of two couples of minor pieces has diminished considerably White’s attacking potential and he remains a pawn down. 17... \( \text{d5} \) 18.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{f6} \) 19.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 20.\( \text{xf5} \). Black’s knight was very powerful at the centre of the board, but now he would rely on the superiority of his bishop over the enemy knight. 20...\( \text{xe5} \) 21.\( \text{d6} \) \( \text{d8} \) 22.\( \text{d3} \), Ochkoos – Mihaljevic, Toronto 1992, 22...f5!+, opening the scope of action of the bishop on g7.

After the energetic move 14.\( \text{d6} \), White cannot even equalise. 14...\( \text{xf3} + \) 15.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xb2} \). White’s passed d6-pawn is very powerful indeed and Black lags in development, but he has already two extra pawns after all. 16.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{d4} + \) 17.\( \text{h1} \) \( \text{xa1} \) 18.\( \text{xa1} \) \( \text{xa1} \) 19.\( \text{xa1} \) \( \text{e5} \). Black has a great material advantage. Later, he will part with some of it, but will neutralise his opponent’s initiative. 20.\( \text{f4} \) (Following 20.\( \text{e7} + \) \( \text{g7} \) 21.\( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{d7} \) 22.\( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{b8} \) 23.\( \text{c6} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 24.\( \text{xd7} \) \( \text{c4+} \), there would arise an endgame in which Black’s rook and a pawn would be stronger than White’s two minor pieces. He would not be able to play 25.\( \text{xa7?} \), because after 25...\( \text{c3} \), Black’s passed c-pawn would cost a piece for White. 26.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 27.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{c2} \) 28.\( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{xc2+} \) Matisson – Bensiek, ICCF 2003.) 20...\( \text{xd5} \) 21.\( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c6} \) 22.\( \text{xc6} \). White cannot even dream about having an advantage in the opening and is trying to make a draw in an end-game with bishops of opposite colours and rooks present on the board. Still, it would not be easy for him to achieve that. 22...\( \text{bxc6} \) 23.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e6} \) 24.\( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{d5} \) 25.\( \text{a5} \) (It is worse for White to opt here for 25.\( \text{g5?!} \), because after this move Black can sacrifice a pawn and win tempi for the activation of his king: 25...f6! 26.\( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf7} \) 27.\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e6+} \) 28...\( \text{f8} \) 26.\( \text{a6} \) \( \text{e8}+ \) – The most likely outcome of this game is a draw indeed, but Black has an extra pawn and can still try to torment his opponent a bit, Rain – Larsen, ICCF 2008.

14...\( \text{xe5} \)

![Diagram]

15.\( \text{c4} \)

White develops his bishop to an active position.

15.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f5} \)

(diagram)

16.\( \text{xf5} \). This exchange-sacrifice seems premature. 16...\( \text{gxf5} \) 17.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 18.\( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{c4+} \) 19.\( \text{h1} \)
\[ \text{This is the point – Black's queen comes back to assist in the defense of his king and parries White's attack.} \]

\[
20.\text{f3}, \text{Mariotti} - \text{Biyiasas, Manila 1976, 20... c5!??}
\]

Even after the calmer line:

16.ae1 d7 17.\text{h1, Black succeeds in developing his knight and maintains the advantage:} 17...
\text{f6?? Christiansen} - \text{Biyiasas, Columbus 1977.}

16.b5 d4+ 17.h1 d7 18.\text{a4. Black was threatening xc3, winning a piece.} 18...\text{b4 19.xf5 xc3. He wishes to trade pieces and to simplify the position.} 20.\text{bxc3 xa4 21.f4 a6 22.d6 e2}
\text{23.d5 e6?? – Naturally, White's passed d6-pawn is powerful, but there are just a few pieces left on the board, so his compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient, Tombette - Lebedev, ICCF 2012.}

15...f5 16.b5

This move seems to be too risky, because Black can win the exchange.

Still, even after 16.d6 d7??, Black is better.

His position would be preferable too following 16.b5 d7 17.\text{f3 f6?? Kahn} - \text{Pinter, Budapest 1996.}

16...xb2?? 17.b1 xb1 18.\text{xb1 d4+ 19.xd4 cxd4 20.}
\text{xb6 axb6}

There has arisen an endgame. Naturally, White can regain the exchange, but Black has some extra pawns besides the extra exchange.

21.d6 f8 22.e7

White's other possible attack against the enemy rook is not any better. 22.h6 b5 23.d5 c6
24.xf8 xf8 25.f4 g7 26.d7 g5
27...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}c6} 28...\textcolor{red}{\text{c}x} c6 \textcolor{red}{\text{b}c} c6 29.\textcolor{red}{\text{b}x} c6 \textcolor{red}{\text{f}c} f6 30...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} d6+ \textcolor{red}{\text{e}e} e5 31...\textcolor{red}{\text{c}x} c6 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}d} d7 ⊕ – Black has all the chances of realising his extra pawn in this rook and pawn ending, Schinke – Moll, ICCF 2003.

22...\textcolor{red}{\text{c}c} c6 23...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}x} f8 \textcolor{red}{\text{f}x} f8 24.\textcolor{red}{\text{b}b} b1 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} d8 25...\textcolor{red}{\text{x}x} b6 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}x} d6 26.\textcolor{red}{\text{x}x} b7

\textcolor{red}{\text{b}b} 26...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} d3!

This is the point! Black ignores the f7-pawn and advances his passed pawn.

27.\textcolor{red}{\text{b}b} 1

27...\textcolor{red}{\text{x}f} f7+ White has no time for this capturing. 27...\textcolor{red}{\text{f}f} f8 28.\textcolor{red}{\text{b}b} 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} d2 29...\textcolor{red}{\text{f}f} f7+ \textcolor{red}{\text{e}e} e8 30...\textcolor{red}{\text{f}f} f1 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} d4 31...\textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} 1. White’s rook and bishop are squeezed with the protection of the d1-square. 31...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}e} e6 32...\textcolor{red}{\text{f}f} f2 \textcolor{red}{\text{b}b} 5. Black is preparing to transfer his knight to c3. 33...\textcolor{red}{\text{h}h} h1 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}c} c3 34.a4 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}d} 8++ Black’s king copes easily with the enemy a-pawn.

27...\textcolor{red}{\text{e}e} e5 28...\textcolor{red}{\text{b}b} 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}g} 7+ – White will have to fight long and hard for a draw, Benejam – Wilhelmi, ICCF 2008.
Chapter 13 1.d4  ¤f6 2.c4 g6 3.¤c3  ¤g7 4.e4 d6 5.f3
The Saemisch System

After this move there arises on the board a system which was named after the Austrian chess player Franz Saemisch. It appeared during the 20ties of the 20th century. With his last move White fortifies the key e4-square. In addition, the move f2-f3 will be useful for the organisation of a pawn-offensive on the kingside (g2-g4, h2-h4-h5). Still, besides all the merits of the Saemisch system it has an obvious drawback. The pawn on f3 prevents the usual development of White’s king knight to the f3-square. Therefore, many chess players are sceptical about the move 5.f3. E. Gufeld was one of them and in his comments to one of his games against V.Bagirov (which he won brilliantly...) he wrote “If you dear readers do not share my opinion concerning the evaluation of the move 5.f3, which is fundamental for the Saemisch system, then ask what is the opinion about it of ... White’s knight on g1!”.

5...0–0 6.¢g5
The bishop will be more active here than on e3, but the d4-square would not be protected so reliably.

The basic line 6.¢e3 will be analysed in the next chapter.

It seem less appropriate for White to play here 6.¢d3, because after 6...c5 7.d5, he will incapable of preventing the manoeuvre ¤d7-e5, which would lead either to the exchange of his bishop on d3, or will force him to lose time for its retreat. 7...e6 8.¢ge2 exd5 9.cxd5 (9.exd5 ¤bd7 10.0–0 ¤e5 11.¢g5 h6 12.¢h4, Petrosian – Suetin, Moscow 1959, 12...¢xd3 13.¢xd3 ¤e8∞ – Black’s two-bishop advantage compensates his slight lack of space.) 9...a6 10.a4 ¤bd7 11.0–0 ¤e5 12.¢c2 ¤b8.
Black has active prospects on the queenside, connected with the preparation of the pawn-advances b7-b5 and c5-c4. 13.f4 ♂c4 14. b3 ♦a5. White has managed to oust the enemy knight away from the centre, but his pawn-structure has become less reliable. 15.f5 c4 Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the imitative on the queenside. 16. b4 ♦b3 17.♦xb3 cxb3 18..yyb1 ♦e8=} – His two powerful bishops and the pressure against the e4-pawn provide him with counterplay sufficient to maintain the equality, Ramos – Ramirez, ICCF 2014.

As a rule, the move 6.♦g e2 does not lead to original positions, because later White must make up his mind anyway where to develop his bishop on c1. 6... ♦c6 7.d5. This move weakens the dark squares. (It is better for White to opt here for 7.♦g5 a6 – see 6.♦g5, or 7.♦e3 a6 – see Chapter 14, variation B). 7...♦e5 8.♦g3 (8.♦d4 c5 9.♦c2, Djukic – Eric, Kragujevac 2016, 9...e6=} – The time, White has lost on manoeuvres with his knight, may tell later.) 8...c6. Black undermines the d5-pawn and prepares to develop his queen to b6, or a5. 9. ♦e2, Arat – Koziol, Albena 2015, 9...ywa5!?∞ – White has more space, but lags in development and the dark squares in his camp are weakened. The chances of both sides are about equal.

6...♦c6

Black begins to exert immediate pressure against the d4-square. 7.♦ge2

White must be on the alert about his opponent’s possibility e7-e5, after which Black’s knight may be deployed on the d4-outpost.

It seems less precise for him to choose 7.❖d2, because after 7...e5 8.d5 ♦d4, White will hardly manage to oust the enemy knight from the centre. 9.♦ge2 c5! This pawn-sacrifice is typical for this variation. 10.0—0 0 (Meanwhile, it would be rather risky for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice. 10. dxc6 bxc6 11.❖xd4 exd4 12.❖xd4 h6 13.❖xf6 ♦xf6. After the disappearance of White’s bishop on g5 off the board he will have chronic problems with the protection of his dark squares. 14.❖d2 ♦b8 15. ♦c1, Azmaiparashvili – Thorsteins, Chicago 1983, 15...yfe8!?∞ – Black’s pieces are very active and White will have to lose plenty of time to evacuate his king away from the centre.) 10...a6 11.♣b1 b5↑ – Black’s queenside pawn-of-
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fensive, supported by his knight on d4, looks threatening, Zaichik – G.Kuzmin, Kharkov 1985.

White should better avoid 7.d5, since this weakens the a1-h8 diagonal. 7...\(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)e5 8.\(\text{\texttt{W}}\)d2 c6 9.\(\text{\texttt{C}}\)c1 (9.\(\text{\texttt{K}}\)h6 \(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)xh6 10.\(\text{\texttt{W}}\)xh6, Strikovic – Pancevski, Obrenovac 2011, 10...\(\text{\texttt{B}}\)b6!? – The vulnerability of the dark squares in White’s camp may become a telling factor in the future.) 9...b5!? Black exploits his lead in development and begins immediate active actions in the centre and on the queenside. 10.cxb5 cxd5 11.\(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)xd5 12.exd5 a6?! – White has an extra pawn, but his kingside pieces are not developed and his king is vulnerable, stranded at the centre of the board, Raicevic – Brenjo, Nis 1997.

7...a6
Black is preparing b7-b5.
8.\(\text{\texttt{W}}\)d2
This is the best square for White’s queen in this variation. Now, he will have the possibility to play \(\text{\texttt{K}}\)h6, trading the important enemy bishop. In the Sämisch system the bishop on g7 exerts powerful pressure against the d4-square and also protects reliably Black’s king.

Following 8.a3, Black obtains a good position after 8...\(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)a5!? and then c7-c5.

8.\(\text{\texttt{C}}\)c1 \(\text{\texttt{B}}\)b8 9.\(\text{\texttt{W}}\)d2 \(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)d7 – see variation B.

8...\(\text{\texttt{B}}\)b8

Now, as White’s main lines we will analyse A) 9.d5 and B) 9.\(\text{\texttt{C}}\)c1.

About 9.\(\text{\texttt{K}}\)h6 b5 – see Chapter 14, variation B1.

Besides these two moves, White has many other possibilities.

The move 9.\(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)d5 has the drawback that it does not impede Black’s plans. 9...b5= He has equalised completely. White must play very carefully not to end up in an inferior position, since he lags in development and his king is stranded at the centre of the board. For example, following 10.cxb5 axb5 11.\(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)xf6+ exf6 12.\(\text{\texttt{K}}\)h6?! \(\text{\texttt{Q}}\)xh6 13.\(\text{\texttt{W}}\)xh6, Nestorova – Choisy, Oropesa del Mar 2000, 13...d5!??, the centre is opened and Black’s lead in development becomes a very important factor in the evaluation of the position.

White cannot harm his oppo-
3. \textit{c3} \textit{g7} 4.\textit{e4} \textit{d6} 5.\textit{f3} 0-0 6.\textit{g5} \textit{c6} 7.\textit{ge2} \textit{a6} 8.\textit{wd2} \textit{eb8}

After 9.\textit{ebl}, White’s plan, connected with the advance of his b-pawn would not promise him much, because his undeveloped kingside pieces cannot support his initiative on the opposite side of the board. 9...\textit{d7} 10.b4 b5 11.\textit{xb5} axb5 12.d5 (After the move 12.\textit{g3}, White loses his control over the important d4-square and Black can exploit this immediately with: 12...\textit{e5} 13.d5 \textit{d4\textasciitilde} Kuzubov – Demchenko, Krasnodar 2004.) 12...\textit{e5} 13.\textit{d4}, Cmilyte – Chocenka, Siauliai 2005, 13...\textit{e6}\textasciitilde

After the double-edged move 9.0–0–0, White risks at least as much as his opponent. 9...b5

10.h4. This is an aggressive move, but is not the best for White. (He should better play 10.\textit{h6} – see Chapter 14, variation \textbf{B1}; 10.\textit{e3} bxc4= Schlette – Benner, Bochum 1990). 10...\textit{a5}!? With this timely counter attack against the c4-square, Black seizes the initiative. 11.\textit{f4} \textit{h6} 12.\textit{xf6}. This move is forced, since the retreat of the bishop would have lost a piece for White, but now the vulnerability of the dark squares in his camp would hurt him. 12...\textit{exe6} 13.\textit{xb5} axb5 14.\textit{xb5} c6 15.\textit{a3} f5. Black opens the position for his bishops. 16.\textit{exe5} \textit{xe5} 17.g4 \textit{d7\textasciitilde} – White’s extra pawn is absolutely immaterial. His knight is misplaced at the edge of the board and his king will soon come under attack by the enemy forces, Ozmen – Samerdokas, ICCF 2014.

Following 9.h4, Black should better prevent h4-h5, because after this move White’s attack may become dangerous. 9...\textit{h5}

About 10.\textit{h6} \textit{hxh6} – see Chapter 14, variation \textbf{B2b}.

10.\textit{d5} \textit{h7}. Black plans to advance e7-e6, but before that it would be useful for him to oust the enemy bishop from the h4-d8 diagonal. 11.\textit{h6} \textit{hxh6} 12.\textit{wh6} e6. White’s knight is ousted from the centre. 13.\textit{e3} (13.\textit{df4} \textit{f6}= S. Atalik – Istratescu, Peristeri 1994) 13...\textit{f6}. Black’s queen
comes to help in the defence of his king. 14.0–0–0, Ghitescu – Westerinen, Roskilde 1978, 14...
\[\text{\textit{\ldots}}\text{g7?! 15.}\text{\textit{\ldots}}\text{xg7+ }\text{\textit{\ldots}}\text{xg7= – White has some space advantage indeed, but this is balanced by the vulnerability of his dark squares in the centre.}\]

10.0–0–0 b5

11.\textit{h6 }\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{hx6 12.}\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{xh6 e5 – see Chapter 14, variation }\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{B2b.}\n
There arises a complicated position with mutual chances after 11.\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{e3 }\textit{a5 12.}\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{g3 }\textit{xc4 13.}\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{xc4 bxc4 14.e5 }\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{h7∞ – White will not have an easy task to organise an attack on the kingside, while Black has already an extra pawn, the two-bishop advantage and good attacking prospects against the enemy king on the semi-open b-file, Mastrovasilis – Hagesaether, Chania 1994.}\n
11.\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{d5 bxc4∞ In this complicated position White must prepare the attack against the enemy monarch with accurate moves, because the straightforward attempt 12.g4?! would not work in view of 12...\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{xd5 13.exd5 c3! Black provokes disharmony in the enemy set-up with the help of his pawn-sacrifice. 14.bxc3 }\textit{a5 15.}\textit{g3 c5∞ – Black’s attack is developing obviously faster, Franco Alonso – San Emeterio Cabanes, Madrid 1999.}\n
\textbf{A) 9.d5}\n
As a rule, this pawn-advance is not good for White in the Sämisch system, because Black’s knight gains access to the e5-square in the middle of the board. 9...\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{e5}\n
10.\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{d4}\n
White’s knight will come under an attack after c7-c5 on this square, but its other possible retreats have also their drawbacks.

It would be too passive for White to play here 10.\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{c1 c6 11.}\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{e2 b5 12.\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{xb5 cxd5∞ – Black has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, Botsari – Ki.Georgiev, Katerini 1992.}\n
After 10.\textit{\textit{\ldots}}\textit{g3, Black will obtain a good position following the plan, connected with c7-c6 and}
b7-b5. 10...c6 11...e2 (The move 11.f4 would weaken the e4-square. 11...d7 12...e2 cxd5 13.cxd5 b5 14...c1 h6 15...h4, Hort – Thiede, Germany 1999, 15...b7!?∞ The placement of White's bishop on h4, with a knight on g3, does not seem so aesthetic at all. If Black prepares g6-g5, White will end up a piece down, because the knight cuts off the possible retreats of the bishop.) 11...b5 12.cxb5 cxd5 13.exd5 (It does not seem good for White to play 13...xf6, Polugae­svky – Nunn, Plovdiv 1983, because after 13...exf6! 14...xd5 axb5, the dark squares in White's position are horribly weak.) 13...axb5 14...xb5 b7 – White's d5-pawn is weak, while Black's pieces are very active, so this is sufficient compensation for his minimal material deficit, Novikov – Smi­rin, Las Vegas 1999.

10...c5

11...c2

It is worse for White to play here 11.dxc6 bxc6, because the trade of central pawn for a flank pawn is evidently in favour of Black. 12...b1 c5 13...e2, Kliun – Berezin, Kiev 2004, 13...e6!?∞

11...h5 12...e2

It seems less reliable for White to choose here 12.a4 f5 13.exf5 xf5 14...e2, Zhukova – Xie, New Delhi 2000, 14...h6!? 15...e3 g5 16.0–0 f4! – Black's minor pieces are considerably more active than their counterparts.

It would be bad for White to opt for 12.f4, Babu – Saravanan, Kol­kata 2000, because of 12...f6! 13.fxe5 fxg5 14.e6 b5 15...e3 d4+ and the dark squares in his camp would be catastrophically weak.

This position was reached in the game Summermatter – Nij­boer, Luzern 1989. Here, Black had to continue with 12...f6!? 13...e3 f5 14.exf5 gxf5 15...h6 f4 16...xg7 xg7 17.0–0 e8∞ – White has more space indeed, but Black's kingside initiative increases with every move.
B) 9.\textit{\texttt{ac1}}
This plan is much more popular for White with a dark-squared bishop on e3.

9...\textit{\texttt{d7}}
Black protects his knight and prepares b7-b5.

10.b3
White plays another prophylactic move on the queenside and ignores the development of his kingside pieces.

10.\textit{\texttt{d5}} e6 11.\textit{\texttt{xf6+ xf6}} 12.\textit{\texttt{h6 xe8}} 13.\textit{\texttt{g3 e5}}. The vulnerability of the d4-square has become quite obvious. 14.\textit{\texttt{d4}} 15.\textit{\texttt{xd4 exd4}} 16.\textit{\texttt{d3 c5}} 17.0-0 b5† Banikas – Golubev, ICC 2009.

10.\textit{\texttt{d1}}. White plans to counter b7-b5, with c4-c5, avoiding the opening of the b-file; nevertheless, this move is still possible. 10...b5 11.c5, Bykhovsky – Gelfer, Israel 2007, 11...d5!? 12.e5 (12.\textit{\texttt{f2 e5}}) 12...\textit{\texttt{e8}} 13.g3. Now, you can see the misplacement of White’s bishop on g5. Black can accomplish with tempo the freeing pawn-break 13...f6= equalising completely.

Following 10.\textit{\texttt{d5}} \textit{\texttt{a5}}, Black advances effortlessly b7-b5. 11.\textit{\texttt{d4}} (11.\textit{\texttt{g3 b5??}}) 11...c5 12.\textit{\texttt{c2}} b5 13.b3, Lemanczyk – Nowik, Duesseldorf 1995, 13...e5!? He stabilises the situation in the centre. Black’s later plans include the preparation of f7-f5. 14.\textit{\texttt{d3 c7}} 15.0-0 \textit{\texttt{h5∞}}

10...b5

11.cxb5
White’s position would not be any better after 11.d5 \textit{\texttt{e5}}.

12.cxb5 axb5 – see 11.cxb5.
12.f4. White ousts the enemy
3. \textit{d}c3 \textit{g}7 4.\textit{e}4 \textit{d}6 5.\textit{f}3 0-0 6.\textit{g}5 \textit{c}6 7.\textit{ge}2 \textit{a}6 8.\textit{d}2 \textit{b}8

knight, but it is well known that pawns do not come back, so later his centre will need additional protection. 12...\textit{eg}4 13.\textit{g}3 \textit{h}6 14.\textit{h}4, Dreev – Golubev, Alushta 1994, 14...b4 15.\textit{d}1 e5! Black is threatening to win a piece after the exchange on f4 and g6-g5. 16.\textit{dx}e6 \textit{fxe}6 17.\textit{h}3 g5 18.\textit{fx}g5 \textit{h}7 19.\textit{hx}g4 \textit{hx}g5 20.\textit{h}5 \textit{gx}h4 21. \textit{x}g7 \textit{x}g7! The complications are over and there has arisen a complex position with mutual chances. Black’s king is vulnerable, but all White’s pawns are deployed on squares with the same colour as his bishop and this does not beautify his position at all.

11...\textit{ax}b5 12.\textit{d}5 \textit{e}5 13.\textit{d}4

Following 13.\textit{g}3 \textit{e}8 14.f4 \textit{h}6 15.\textit{h}4, Linna – Rohde, ICCF 2002, Black can try a very promising pawn-sacrifice – 15...g5!?

13...\textit{we}8

He is preparing c7-c5, in order to get rid of his backward pawn on the c-file.

14.\textit{e}2 b4 15.\textit{d}1 c5 16.\textit{dx}c6 \textit{xc}6 17.\textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6= – Black’s b4-pawn holds two enemy pawns on the queenside, Andersson – Hoehne, Lechenischer SchachServer 2014.
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1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 g6 3.♘c3 ♘g7 4.e4 d6 5.f3 0–0 6.♗e3

The Saemisch System

This is White’s most popular move in this position. The bishop protects the strategically important d4-square.

6...♗c6

This is an aggressive move. Black wishes to attack the d4-square with e7-e5. Besides this, his plans include the pawn-advance b7-b5 (after the preparatory moves a7-a6 and ♖b8), which would be very useful if White castles queenside.

Later, White can hardly continue the game without the move B) 7.♗ge2, beginning the development of his kingside pieces and increasing his control over the d4-square. Before that however, we will analyse A) 7.♗d2.

It is not good for White to choose here 7.♗d3, because after 7...e5 8.d5 (8.♗ge2 ♘g4! 9.fxg4 exd4+) 8...♗d4, Black’s knight occupies a powerful position in the centre and White will have to do a lot in order to oust it from there. 9.♗ge2 ♘d7

Follows 10.♗b5 ♘xb5 11.cxb5, White will have problems to develop his queenside initiative, because after the disappearance of his pawn from the c4-square, he will not have the possibility c4-c5. 11...♗c5!? 12.♗c2 ♗h6. This is a typical resource in the King’s Indian Defence. Black trades favourably the dark-squared bishops in a tactical fashion. 13.♗xh6 ♗xh4+ 14.g3 ♗xh6=

10.0–0 c5 11.dxc6 (11.♗b1 f5

A) 7.Bd2 a6

8.0–0–0

8.Be2 Bb8 – see variation B.


Following 8.d3 e5, White is forced to let the enemy knight to occupy a square at the centre of the board 9.d5 (after 9.Be2 Bg4!? 10.fxg4 exd4= Black obtains a quite acceptable position,


8...b5!?

This is a promising pawn-sacrifice.

9.cxb5


The move 9.g4 can only create difficulties for White, because after 9...e5 10.d5 Be4, he cannot develop his knight on g1 due to the vulnerability of his f3-pawn. Following 11.Bce2, Black has an
interesting piece-sacrifice. 11...
\( \textit{\#xf3!} \) 12.\( \textit{\#xf3 \textit{\#xg4}} \) 13.\( \textit{\#eg1 \textit{\#xe4}} \) 14.\( \textit{\#g2} \) \( \textit{f5+} \) and he will have three
pawns for the knight and excellent attacking prospects against the enemy king, Petkov – Miciak, ICCF 1999.

9...axb5 10.\( \textit{\#xb5} \) \( \textit{\#a5} \)

11.\( \textit{\#h6} \) (The character of the position remains more or less the same after 11.\( \textit{\#b1} \), Petursson –
Gufeld, Hastings 1986, 11...c6!? 12.\( \textit{\#d3} \) \( \textit{\#e6}\) (11...\( \textit{\#xh6} \) 12.\( \textit{\#h6} \) \( \textit{c6} \) 13.\( \textit{\#d3} \) \( \textit{\#b6} \) 14.\( \textit{\#ge2} \) \( \textit{\#a6} \) 15.\( \textit{\#xa6} \) \( \textit{\#xa6}\)∞ A. Fischer –
Leistner, freechess.de 2013. Black is a pawn down indeed, but has the initiative. White’s kingside attack has backfired and he will be soon forced to defend passively.

B) 7.\( \textit{\#ge2} \)

This is a logical and strong move. It has a drawback however, because White’s knight on e2 impedes the development of his bishop on f1.

7...\( \textit{\#a6} \)

8.\( \textit{\#d2} \)

This is his most popular move. White prepares castling queenside and is ready to exchange his opponent’s fianchettoed bishop. If he does not play \( \textit{\#d2} \), he not only does not obtain chances of an advantage in the opening, but may end up even worse.

8.\( \textit{\#b1} \) \( \textit{\#d7} \) 9.\( \textit{\#d2} \) \( \textit{\#b8} \), or 9.b4
\( \textit{\#b8} \) 10.\( \textit{\#d2} \) \( \textit{\#e8} \) – see variation B2.

After 8.a3, it would be interesting for Black to try 8...\( \textit{\#d7}?! \) – he wishes to follow with \( \textit{\#b6} \), attacking the enemy c4-pawn. In addition, his plan includes \( \textit{\#a5} \) and c7-c5.
9.\(\text{f2?!}\) \(\text{e5}\) 10.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{c5}\) 11.\(\text{dxc5}\) dxc5 12.\(\text{c2}\) e6 ↑ Thys – Demchenko, ICCF 2011. White lags in development. Black has a clearcut plan for actions, connected with the transfer of his knight to the weakened d4-square (\(\text{c6-d4}\)), as well as with the opening the f-file (f7-f5) and the organisation of an attack against White’s king.

9.b4 \(\text{b6}\) 10.\(\text{c1}\), Rodriguez – Llanos, Buenos Aires 1992, 10...f5!?↑

8.\(\text{wc2}\). This is an interesting attempt by White to avoid the well trodden paths. He intends to play \(\text{d1}\), exploiting the juxtaposition of his rook and Black’s queen on the d-file. 8...\(\text{d7}\) 9.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{b8}\) 10.\(\text{c1}\) e5. This is a standard reaction for this variation – the moment White removes his knight from e2, Black inflicts a strike against the d4-square. 11.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 12.\(\text{c5}\), S.Atalik – Bayram, Ankara 1995 (12.\(\text{e2}\), S.Atalik – Foisor, Satu Mare 1994, 12...b5!?∞) 12...\(\text{e7!}\)↑ 13.\(\text{cxd6}\) cxd6. White lags in development and is incapable of exploiting the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn. White prepares to castle kingside and in the meantime Black succeeds in advancing d6-d5, solving all his opening problems. 14.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{xd3}\)+ 15.\(\text{xd3}\) d5=

8.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{d7}\)

9.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{b8}\) – see variation B4.
After 9.d5 \(\text{e5}\) 10.\(\text{g3}\), Korchnoi – Wiersma, Rogaska Slatina 2011, it seems very good for Black to continue with 10...h5!?∞, emphasizing the unstable placement of the enemy knight on g3.

9.a3. White is preparing b2-b4. 9...\(\text{b8}\). This is an interesting idea. Black wishes to accomplish the thematic pawn-advance with the help of his queen and not his rook. With the move 10.d5 White occupies space and frees the d4-square for his knight (after the straightforward approach 10.b4 b5=, the chances of both sides would be approximately equal) 10...\(\text{e5}\) 11.\(\text{d4}\) c5 12.\(\text{dxc6}\) bxc6= – Black’s queen has joined in the actions on the b-file, Jezek – Grodzensky, USSR 1987.

It would be too straightforward for White to opt for 8.d5 \(\text{e5}\) 9.\(\text{g3}\) h5 10.\(\text{e2}\) h4 11.\(\text{f1}\),
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Rustemov – Korotylev, Nizhnij Novgorod 1998. Here, Black has a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 11...b5!? 12.cxb5 axb5 13.cx b5 c6 14.dxc6 cxc6 15.\(\text{b7}\) – he has seized completely the initiative and White will hardly manage to evacuate his king away from the centre without material losses.

Following 8.h4 h5 9.\(\text{d1}\) (9.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{b8}\) – see variation B5) 9...\(\text{d7}\), White will have problems to protect his d4-square. 10.\(\text{b3}\) a5 11.a4. He cannot allow a5-a4, but now Black’s knight gains access to the wonderful b4-square. 11...\(\text{b4}\) 12.\(\text{e2}\) b6 13.g4. This attack by White is doomed to failure. 13...hxg4 14.fxg4 c5 15.h5 cxd4 16.\(\text{xd4}\) (He should better play here 16.\(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{e5}\)) 16...\(\text{c5}\) 17.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{b7}\) – White is unlikely to manage to organise an attack, because he will have difficulties to transfer his queen to the h-file and the weaknesses of his pawn-structure will hurt him, Spassky – Fischer, Belgrade (m/30) 1992.

8.\(\text{c1}\) e5 9.d5. White lags in development and should avoid opening of the game (following 9.\(\text{b3}\) exd4 10.\(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 11.\(\text{e2}\) c6 12.0–0 b5 13.cxb5 axb5 14.a3 d5, Black’s prospects seem preferable, O’Kelly de Galway – Geller, Havana 1963). 9...\(\text{d7}\) 10.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{xb3}\) 11.\(\text{xb3}\) (11.axb3 c5 12.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{h5}\)) Kuzubov – Areshchenko, Aarhus 2005) 11...\(\text{d7}\) 12.0–0–0 f5 13.\(\text{e2}\) b6= Salov – Dorfman, Lvov 1984. White will hardly manage to prepare the pawn-break c4-c5 and without this his initiative on the queenside cannot succeed.

8...\(\text{b8}\)

We will analyse now B1) 9.\(\text{h6}\), B2) 9.\(\text{b1}\), B3) 9.\(\text{c1}\), B4) 9.\(\text{c1}\) and B5) 9.h4.

9.0–0–0 b5 10.h4 (10.g4 bxc4 – see 9.g4; 10.\(\text{h6}\) bxc4 – see variation B5) 10...h5 – see variation B5c.

The b3 and b4-squares are seriously weakened in the line: 9.a4 \(\text{d7}\) 10.\(\text{c1}\) e5 11.d5 \(\text{d4}\) – Neumann – Schmidl, DDR 1977.

9.\(\text{d5}\) b5 10.cxb5 axb5 11.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{d7}\) – After the exchange of the a-pawn for the c-pawn, Black’s prospects are not worse, Nielsen – Pedersen, Copenhagen 1991.

9.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d7}\) 10.\(\text{c1}\) e5 11.dxe5 \(\text{xe5}\) 12.\(\text{e2}\) b5 13.c5 b4= – Black has a very good position and in
fact, White must be very careful in the further developments. For example, after 14.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qxd5} 15.\texttt{exd5} \texttt{Qc4!}+, Black would seize the initiative, Ramos Isasi – Servert Sanchez, Spain 1984.

The position would be approximately equal after 9.d5 \texttt{Qe5} 10.\texttt{Qg3} (10.\texttt{Qd4} c5 11.\texttt{Qc2} e6 12.\texttt{exf6} bxc6 13.\texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Qf5}+, Ibragimov – Ferenc, Portoroz 1996) 10...b5 11.\texttt{Qg5} c6 12.\texttt{Qxe7} bxc5= Markotic – Petit, Toulouse 1993.

After 9.a3, Black can obtain a good position by transferring his knight to the b6-square. 9...\texttt{Qxd7}? 10.b4 \texttt{Qb6} 11.\texttt{Qb4} e6. Black wishes to advance d6-d5. 12.c5 (12.\texttt{Qd1} d5∞) 12...\texttt{Qd7} 13.\texttt{Qd1} dxc5 14.\texttt{bxc5}, Alterman – Sutovsky, Haifa 1996, 14...b6 15.cxb6 \texttt{Qxb6}∞ – White lags in development and is incapable of exploiting the slight weakening of Black’s queenside pawn-structure.

There arises a complicated double-edged position after 9.g4 – White is preparing a pawn-offensive on the kingside. 9...b5. Black should begin his queenside counterplay immediately.

10.g5 \texttt{Qh5} 11.\texttt{Qg3} e5 12.\texttt{Qxe5} \texttt{Qxe5} 13.\texttt{Qe2} f5= – White has provoked a weakening of the kingside pawn-structure of his opponent, but this has taken too much time and Black has succeeded in advancing his central pawns, Varberg – Dauga, corr. 1991.

If 10.h4, the move 10...h5 prevents White’s thematic pawn-advance h4-h5. 11.\texttt{Qg3}. He increases the pressure against the h5-square, but reduces the protection over the d4-square. Black exploits this immediately. 11...e5! 12.dxe5 \texttt{Qxe5} 13.\texttt{Qe2} hxg4 14.f4 \texttt{Qf3}+ 15.\texttt{Qxf3} gxf3 16.h5 \texttt{Qg4} 17.0–0–0 bxc4 18.\texttt{Qxf1} \texttt{Qxe3} 19.\texttt{Qxe3} \texttt{Qg4} 20.h6 \texttt{Qf6} 21.\texttt{Qd1} \texttt{Qe8}≈ Koegeler – Booij, ICCF 2013. The tactical complications are over. White has failed to achieve anything real on the kingside and Black’s prospects are preferable. He has two powerful bishops and extra material.

10.0–0–0 bxc4 11.h4 \texttt{Qb4}!? 12.\texttt{Qg3} c5 13.h5, Hoi – Coudari, Buenos Aires 1978, 13...\texttt{Qe6}?!∞ – In this complicated position with mutual attacks with castling on different sides, both opponents have their chances.

**B1) 9.\texttt{Qh6}**

(diagram)

White deprives his opponent of the possibility to counter h2-h4 with h7-h5.

9...\texttt{b5} 10.\texttt{h4}

10.0–0–0 bxc4 11.h4 \texttt{Qb4} – see 10.h4.
It does not seem logical for White to refrain from attacking 10...\text{xg7} 11.cx\text{b}5 axb5 12.\text{c}1 \text{d}7 13.g3, Ivkov – Mestrovic, Sarajevo 1968, 13...e5!?++ – the exchange of the bishops has only led to the weakening of the dark squares in White’s camp and he also lags in development.

10...bxc4

Black not only wins a pawn, but opens the b-file for his rook.

11.\text{xg7}

It seems less precise for White to choose here 11.h5 \text{b}4 and he would be incapable of preventing the penetration of Black’s knight to d3, or c2. 12.\text{g}3 \text{xh6} 13.\text{xh6} \text{c}2+ 14.\text{d}1 \text{xa}1 15.hx\text{g}6 fxg6 16.\text{d}5, Murey – Zhelin, USSR 1974, 16...f7!?++, Black has removed his king away from the danger zone and White has no compensation for his material deficit.

There arises a complicated position, but advantageous for Black after 11.0–0–0 \text{b}4 12.\text{g}3 \text{xh6}!? 13.\text{xh6} c5! He wishes to join his queen into the attack as quickly as possible. 14.\text{xc}4 \text{b}6 15.\text{d}2. White must bring his queen back to assist in the defence. 15...\text{c}xd4 16.\text{xd}4 \text{c}7++

11...\text{xg7} 12.h5 \text{b}4 13.\text{f}4

13.\text{g}3 c5\text{c}3 Iaiilian – Gunawan, Sibenik 1989.

13...e5 14.\text{fd}5

White wishes to trade the enemy knight on f6, the important defender of Black’s king, but this leads to considerable simplifications. 14...\text{b}xd5 15.\text{xd}5
\( \text{exd5} \ 16.\text{exd5} \text{e4!} \ 17.\text{fxe4} \ (17. \text{hxg6? e3}\#) \ 17...\text{we8} \ 18.\text{hxg6} \ \text{wxe4+} \ 19.\text{we2} \ \text{wxg6} \ 20.0-0-0 \ \text{ef5}\# \) Lahlum - Cavajda, ICCF 2011. Black’s queen and bishop protect reliably the h7-pawn and White can hardly continue effectively with his attack. There are just a few pieces left on the board and Black has good counterplay on the semi-open b-file.

**B2) 9.\text{eb1}**

This is a quiet positional move. White refrains from double-edge plans, connected with castling queenside.

9...\text{ed7} 10.\text{b4} \text{ee8}!?

According to Aron Nimzowitsch’s terminology – this is “a strange rook-move...”. Black prepares the thematic pawn-advance e7-e5.

11.\text{b5}

The b4-square is weakened in the line: 11.a4 a5 12.b5 \text{eb4} 13. \text{eg3} e5 14.d5 b6 15.\text{e2} h5\# – and it is rather unclear how White can break on the queenside, while Black has the initiative on the other side of the board, Dreev – Golubev, playchess.com 2004.

White’s attempt to leave the knight on e2 and to develop his bishop on g2 does not promise him an advantage. For example: 11.g4 e5 12.d5 \text{d4=} Ribli – F. Portisch, Hungary 1975, or 11.g3 b5 12.cxb5 axb5 13.\text{g2} e5 14.d5 \text{e7} 15.0-0 \text{c8} 16.\text{c1} \text{b6=} – Black’s knight is headed for the weakened c4-square, Fahnen Schmidt – F. Portisch, Oberhausen 1980.

11...\text{da5} 12.\text{ec1}

12.\text{f4}?! axb5 13.cxb5 c6 14. d5, Haba – Fahnen Schmidt, Germany 1991, 14...g5?!?

12...\text{axb5} 13.\text{xb5}

This position was reached in the game Bodiroga – Dostan, Gyula 2000. 13...\text{c6}?! The preparation of the pawn-advance b7-b5 is the simplest road to equality.
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for Black. 14.\text{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslash}}a3 \textbf{\texttt{b}}5 15.\texttt{\textbackslashcxb5}} \texttt{\textbackslashcxb5} It would be very risky for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice 16.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxb5}}} because after 16...\texttt{\textbackslashd5} 17.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{e}}5 \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{c}}4} 18.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxc4 \texttt{dxc4}}}}} Black would seize completely the initiative. White’s try to win material would end in a disaster for him. 19.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{exf6}}}?! \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{exf6}}} 20.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{a4}}}?

\textbf{B3) 9.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{c1}}}}

Now, contrary to variation B5, White’s kingside has not been weakened by the move h2-h4 and therefore, he as a rule, does not leave his king in the centre and castles kingside.

\texttt{9...\textbf{\texttt{e5}}} 10.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{d5}}}

It would be too slow for him to continue with 10.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{b3}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{exd4}}} 11.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4}}} The exchange on d4 is in favour of White, but in order to provoke it he has lost two tempi (\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashg1-e2-c1-b3xd4, instead of \textbackslashg1-e2xd4)}}) 11...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4}}} 12.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{c6}}} Now, White must lose two more tempi (\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashe2}}} and 0–0), in order to evacuate his king away from the centre. In the meantime, Black succeeds in creating pressure against the enemy c4-pawn (b7-b5, \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashe6)}}) 13.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashe2}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{b5}}} 14.0–0 \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashe6}}} 15.b3 \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashwa5}}} 16.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{cxb5}}} After the exchange of the pawn on c4, Black has his hands free to prepare and advance d6-d5. 16...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{axb5}}} 17.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashac1}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashfd8}}} 18.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashfd1}}, Valve – Pihlajinen, Finland 1976, 18...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{d5}}?!}=

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram B3}
\end{figure}

10...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{d4}}} 11.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{b3}}}

11.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashe2}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{c5}}} 12.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxc6}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{bxc6}}} 13.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4 \texttt{exd4}}}} – see 11.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashb3}}}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram 10...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{d4}}} 11.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{b3}}}}
\end{figure}

\texttt{11...\textbf{\texttt{c5}}} 12.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxc6}}}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram 11...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{c5}}} 12.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxc6}}}}
\end{figure}

12...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{bxc6}}} Black sacrifices a pawn for the initiative.

13.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4 \texttt{exd4}}} 14.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4}}} \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{d5}}}}

Black must provoke a fight in the centre, before White has castled.

It seems less precise for Black to opt for 14...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\textbackslashe8}}}, because then White will have the possibility to fight for the advantage with 15.
15. cxd5 cxd5

16. e5

White lags in development, so he should better avoid opening of files.

16. exd5 e8+ 17. e2 b4 18. 0–0 e4 19. fxe4 xd4+ 20. h1 e5!= Black’s piece-activity and his excellent prospects on the weakened dark squares compensate fully his two sacrificed pawns. 21. f3 g4 22. e3 xe2 23. xe2 b8 24. f1 xb2 25. xa6 e7 26. d3 a7 27. ef3 xh2. Black has gradually restored the material balance. 28. g3 e5 29. d1 bxa2= White’s e4 and g3-pawns are weak, so he is incapable of capturing unpunished the trapped enemy bishop on g3, Voetter – Nitsche, BdF 2010.

16...e8 17. e2

White’s king will not be safe on the queenside. 17.0–0–0 d7 18. f4 a5 19. f2 f8. Black is preparing c5–a4. 20. g4 c5 21. f5 a4 22. xa4 xa4 23. b3 a3+ 24. b2, Adelseck – Westera, ICCF 2011. Now, the simplest way for Black to equalise is to regain the pawn: 24...gx5!? 25. xf5 xf5 26. d3 g6= – There have remained just a few pawns on the board and after the trade of the queens the draw would be the most likely outcome.

17...d7 18. f4 h6

Black is threatening to capture on e5.

19. e3

It is bad for White to play here 19. e3?! in view of 19...xe5! 20. fxe5 xe3 21. xe3 d4 22. f2 dxc3 23. bxc3 xe5 24.0–0 c7= and his c3-pawn would be very weak, Panocki – Rozum, Herceg Novi 2008.

White has no chances of obtaining an edge after 19.0–0 xe5
20.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}d1 \textit{\textbackslash{A}}c6= Wornath – Stets, Germany 2010.

19...\textit{\textbackslash{D}}f8!?

Black wishes to play \textit{\textbackslash{D}}e6 and from this square his knight will exert pressure against the bishop on d4 and the pawn on f4.

19...f6?! 20.\textit{\textbackslash{F}}f3 fxe5 21.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}xd5+ \textit{\textbackslash{F}}h8 22.\textit{\textbackslash{F}}xe5 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}g7 23.e6 \textit{\textbackslash{A}}h4+ 24.\textit{\textbackslash{F}}f2 \textit{\textbackslash{A}}e7 25.0-0, Yang – Kiewra, Richardson 2013, 25...\textit{\textbackslash{D}}e5 26.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}d2± – Black must still work hard for equality.

20.b3 \textit{\textbackslash{B}}b4 21.0–0 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}e6 22.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}ad1

22...\textit{\textbackslash{B}}xd4! The exchange-sacrifice is the simplest way for Black to equalise. 23.\textit{\textbackslash{B}}xd4 \textit{\textbackslash{B}}b6 24.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}d3 \textit{\textbackslash{B}}xe3+ 25.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}xe3 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}xf4 26.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}d1. White is incapable of saving his rook from the attack of the enemy minor pieces without suffering material losses. 26...\textit{\textbackslash{D}}g7 27.\textit{\textbackslash{F}}f2 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}xg2 28.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}g3 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}f4 29.\textit{\textbackslash{D}}xd5 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}xe2 30.\textit{\textbackslash{D}}xe2 \textit{\textbackslash{A}}xe5+ 31.\textit{\textbackslash{D}}f2 \textit{\textbackslash{B}}b7 32.\textit{\textbackslash{A}}gd3 \textit{\textbackslash{D}}f5+ 33.\textit{\textbackslash{D}}g1 \textit{\textbackslash{B}}g5= – Black has a pawn for the exchange and his pieces are very active, while White’s rooks are squeezed with the protection of the knight on d5.

\textbf{B4) 9.\textit{\textbackslash{F}}c1!?}

This move was played as early as during the 60ies of the past century and it did not attract popularity right away. It was only after Black succeeded in proving how solid his position was in attacks on different sides of the board (9.h4 and 9.0–0–0), as well as after the positional move 9.\textit{\textbackslash{D}}c1, White began to turn his attention to the prophylactic move 9.\textit{\textbackslash{F}}c1.

He wishes at first to prevent Black’s counterplay, connected with the pawn-advance b7-b5. If we have in mind that at least in the next few moves White plans to leave his knight on e2 and to keep his control over he d4-square, Black’s second thematic pawn-advance e7-e5, would be also senseless. He will have to fight against White’s centre in some
other way. We will have a look at all that little by little...

9...\textit{d7}
Black protects his knight and is threatening again b7-b5.

\textbf{10.\textit{d1}}
White continues to adhere to a prophylactic approach. He plans to counter b7-b5 with c4-c5, preventing the opening of the b-file and occupying additional space on the queenside.

It is not good for him to play 10.\textit{g3}, because this weakens the control over the d4-square. 10...e5 11.d5  \textit{d4∞}

10.d5  \textit{a5} 11.b3 c5 12.\textit{h6}  \textit{xh6} 13.\textit{xh6} b5= – Black’s counterplay against the c4-pawn promises him good prospects, Ljubojevic – Nunn, Monte Carlo 1994.

The move 10.b3 has some venom. White prepares d4-d5 and protects before that his c4-pawn. 10...\textit{e8}. Black should better not be in a hurry to advance e7-e5, since the e5-square may be handy for his knight. 11.d5 (11.g3 b5 12.\textit{xb5} a\textit{xb5} 13.\textit{g2} e5 14.dxe5  \textit{xe5∞} Haba – Kozlitin, Pardubice 2015) 11...\textit{e5} 12.h3. After this move Black’s knight cannot retreat to g4 if White plays f3-f4. 12...b5! Now, Black is not afraid of f3-f4 any more. 13.\textit{g3} (following 13.f4?!, Black has a very promising piece-sacrifice: 13...\textit{xc4}! 14.\textit{bxc4} b4 15.\textit{d1}  \textit{xe4} 16.\textit{c2}  \textit{c5} 17.g4 e6= and he has obtained two pawns for the knight. White’s king is still stranded in the centre and after the opening of the e-file, the lag in development of his pieces may hurt him.) 13...\textit{xc4} 14.\textit{bxc4}  \textit{c8} 15.f4  \textit{ed7} 16.d3  \textit{b7}. White has more space, but Black has no pawn-weaknesses in his camp. With his last move he has prepared the undermining of the d5-square with the move c7-c6. 17.0-0  c6 18.\textit{ce2}  \textit{c7} 19.\textit{a7}  \textit{bc8} 20.d4  \textit{h6∞} Bondars – Ciciotti, ICCF 2014.

\textbf{10...b5}

Black plays this move despite all! He is prepared against c4-c5.
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He bases his hopes on his lead in development and wishes to open the game on the queenside as quickly as possible.

11.c5

There arises a complicated, but approximately equal position after 11.b3, Khairullin – Levin, St Petersburg 2010, 11...bxc4!? 12. bxc4 e6 13.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)f2 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)b7\(\text{\text{\&}}\), followed by \(\text{\text{\&}}\)b8 and the preparation of the penetration of the rook to the b2-square.

It would not be good for White to trade his c-pawn for the enemy a-pawn: 11.cxb5 axb5 12.g3 e6 13.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)g2, Gupta – Gislasøn, Reykjavik 2010. Now, Black can squeeze his opponent's pieces with the protection of the a2-pawn: 13...\(\text{\text{\&}}\)a8!? 14.b3 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)a3 15.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)c2 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)a8\(\text{\text{\&}}\)

11...\(\text{\text{\&}}\)e8!?

This move is seldom played, but is possibly the best for Black. White has not developed his kingside pieces yet, so Black wishes to inflict a strike against his opponent's centre with f7-f5 and e7-e5.

12.d5

This is White’s most principled move. He wishes to occupy maximum space on the queenside and to cramp completely his opponent’s pieces.

After White’s alternatives, Black holds confidently his defence and may even begin a counter attack under favourable circumstances.

12.g4, Karthikeyan – Ovcina, Parramatta 2012, 12...dxc5!? 13. \(\text{\text{\&}}\)xc5 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)d6\(\text{\text{\&}}\)

12.h4 f5 13.exf5, Winkelmann – Bielicki, Germany 2011, 13...\(\text{\text{\&}}\)xf5!?\(\text{\text{\&}}\)

12.g3 dxc5 13.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)xc5 e5 14.d5 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)e7 15.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)f2 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)d6. This is one more plus of the move 11...\(\text{\text{\&}}\)e8. After the exchange of the pawn on d6 on c5, Black's knight may occupy the excellent blocking d6-square. 16. b3 Naturally, White cannot allow the move \(\text{\text{\&}}\)c4 and the subsequent trade of his powerful dark-squared bishop, so he will be forced to lose a tempo for the prophylactic move with his pawn. 16...\(\text{\text{\&}}\)b7 17.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)c1 c6 18.dxc6 \(\text{\text{\&}}\)xc6= – Black has got rid of his backward c-pawn and can be quite satisfied with the results of the opening.

12.\(\text{\text{\&}}\)f2 f5 13.d5 (It would be interesting for White, but still in-
sufficient to obtain an advantage, to try 13.exf5, Spassov – Bozovic, Belgrade 2007, 13...xf5!? 14. cxd6 £xd6 15.g4 £c8 16.f4 £b4 17.£e4 £e6 18.£c5 £c6. Black has lost too many tempi on moves with his queen, but has succeeded in depriving his opponent of the right to castle. 19.£g1 £d5 20.£g2 £d6∞ – White’s king is in the centre and the board is full of pieces, so he has no chances of maintaining an advantage, despite the presence of some weaknesses in Black’s pawn-structure.) 13...£e5 14.£d4 dxc5 15.£xc5 £d6 16.b3 £b6 17.£e2 fxe4 18.f4 £d3+ 19. £xd3 exd3 20.£xd3 £e8! Black’s knight frees a square for his rook. His plan is to attack the weak enemy d5-pawn. 21.£e4 £f6 22.£f3 £d6= Gilbert – Jacobi, ICCF 2012.

12...£e5 13.c6 £c8 14.£f4

14...£e6

Black must try by all means to undermine his opponent’s pawn-chain and to fight for space, which is essential for the harmonious action of his pieces.

15.£e2 £f6 16.dxe6 £xe6
17.b3 £e8 18.£c2 £b4

He seizes some space on the queenside.

19.0–0 a5 20.£f2 £a8

Black is preparing the development of his bishop to the a6-square under favourable circumstances. Later, in the game AlekseiNK – Demchenko, www.bestlogic.ru 2016, there followed: 21.£d4h3 £f7 22.£g5 £xg5 23. £xg5 h6 24.£e3 £h7 25.£fd1 £a6 26.£xa6 £xa6 27.£d3 e5. The majority of Black’s pawns are placed against the rules, i.e. on squares with the same colour as his bishop, but White can hardly find an active plan for actions, because he must be constantly on the alert about his opponent’s pawn-break in the centre – d6-d5. 28.£c4 £a8 29.£a1 g5. Black’s counterplay, connected with the preparation of g5-g4, is sufficient to maintain the equality. 30.£f2 £g6 31.h3 h5 32.£d3 £ae8 33.£ad1 £e7 34.£c1 £ef7. Draw. After 35.£h5, there would follow 35...g4 36.fxg4 hxg4 37.£g3
Black sacrifices a pawn, but solves the problem with his “bad” bishop. 

White has a choice between numerous possibilities here. Three of them are attacking: 

B5a) 10.d5, B5b) 10.h6, B5c) 10.0–0–0, while he can follow a positional route with B5d) 10.c1.

B5a) 10.d5

Black’s knight on f6 is an important defensive piece. It protects the h5-pawn and prevents the pawn-break g2–g4, therefore White’s desire to exchange it is understandable.

10...b5

Black must create counterplay on the queenside as quickly as possible.

11.xf6+

This is the logical conclusion of White’s plan.


The move 11.0–0–0 leads to a
sharp play. 11...bxc4 12.\(\texttt{xf6+ xf6}\)

The d4-square is weakened following 13.\(\texttt{c3 e5}\) 14.d5 \(\texttt{d4}\) 15.\(\texttt{xc4}\), Debiasi – Perruchoud, IECG 1999. Here, Black could have grabbed a pawn with 15... \(\texttt{xf6+}\) – and it would not be easy for White to continue his attack, because Black’s centralised knight eyes the f3-square and thus impedes the pawn-advance g2-g4.

13.g4 \(\texttt{b4}\). Black’s knight frees the way forward of his c5-pawn. 14.\(\texttt{c3 c5}\)

After 15.\(\texttt{gxf6}\) \(\texttt{a5}\) 16.\(\texttt{xc4 e6}\) 17.d5, Krasik – Naroditsky, ICC 2008, Black must exchange as quickly as possible one of the defenders of White’s king – the bishop on c4, or the knight on c3. 17...\(\texttt{d7!}\)? Black prepares the transfer of his bishop to the b5-square. 18.a3 \(\texttt{b5}\) 19.\(\texttt{xb5 xb5}\). This exchange-sacrifice is Black’s simplest road to equality. 20.\(\texttt{xb5 a2+}\) 21.\(\texttt{b1 xb5}\) 22.\(\texttt{xa2 b8}\). White has already an extra rook, but he fails to protect the b2-square and the game ends in a perpetual check. 23.\(\texttt{c2}\) (23.\(\texttt{b1}\)? \(\texttt{b3+}\) 24.\(\texttt{a1 xa3 #}\)) 23...\(\texttt{xb2+}\) 24.\(\texttt{xb2 xb2+}\) 25.\(\texttt{a1 b3=}\)

15.\(\texttt{xc4 cxd4}\) 16.\(\texttt{xd4 c7}\). Black’s major pieces exert powerful pressure on the b and c-files. 17.\(\texttt{b3 xd4}\) 18.\(\texttt{xd4 e6}\). Black wishes to trade the powerful enemy bishop on b3 even at the price of compromising his kingside pawn-structure. 19.\(\texttt{xex6}\) (19.\(\texttt{gxf5}\) \(\texttt{xb3}\) 20.\(\texttt{axb3 a5}\). Black is threatening to check on a1 and thus wins an important tempo, managing to capture on h5 with his queen. 21.\(\texttt{b1 xh5}\) 22.f4 \(\texttt{c6\#}\) De Zavalia – Diani, ICCF 2011) 19...\(\texttt{xe6}\) 20.\(\texttt{b1 c6}\) 21.\(\texttt{c4 b6}\). Black sacrifices a pawn and begins a counter attack. 22.\(\texttt{xe6+ g7}\) 23.\(\texttt{h2 d4}\) 24.\(\texttt{d5 xf3}\). He restores the material balance and after 25.\(\texttt{g2}\), Tochacek – Maliangkay, Switzerland 2002, could have even gobbled another pawn with 25...\(\texttt{hxg4!}\)!

11...\(\texttt{xf6}\) 12.\(\texttt{xb5}\)

White is reluctant to allow the opening of the b-file.

12.0–0–0 bxc4 – see 11.0–0–0.

12...\(\texttt{xb5}\) 13.\(\texttt{c1 d7}\)
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**14.g4**

White begins an attack and now, Black must react very precisely.

White would not achieve much if he abstains from the pawn-advance g2-g4. 14.g5 e6∞ Shorokhov - Gromov, ICCF 2008.

**14...hxg4 15.fxg4 e5**

Black acts in accordance with the classical principles and counters his opponent's flank attack with a strike in the centre.

16.d5 d4 17.xd4 exd4 18.g5 e8

Black reminds his opponent that he has pawn-weaknesses too.

**19.xf4 e5 20.f3 f6 21.d2,** Gunawan – Ye Jiangchuan, Singapore 1987, 21..c8 22.e2 e7 23.h5 g5∞ Black has succeeded in avoiding the opening of the h and g-files. Now, thanks to his powerful bishop on e5, which "cements" his pawn-structure, his prospects in the forthcoming battle are not worse.

**B5b) 10.h6**

White trades the powerful enemy bishop, but weakens his control over the strategically important d4-square.

10...xh6 11.xh6 e5 12.0–0–0

It is not good for White to play 12.d1, Christiansen – Reschke, Germany 1994, 12...b5!?∞ – His king is less safe in the centre than on the queenside.

**12...b5**

Black inflicts counter strikes in the centre and on the queenside trying to deflect his oppo-
nent’s pieces from the attack against his king.

13.d5

The move 13.dxe5 cannot be recommended, since following 13...\(\text{c}x\text{e}5\), Black’s knight will be very powerful at the centre of the board. 14.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{bxc}4\). Black has an extra pawn and good attacking prospects on the b-file. 15.\(\text{e}2\) (15.\(\text{d}5\), Manolache – Fedorov, Eforie Nord 2010, 15...\(\text{e}8?!\?) 15...c6. He covers the d5-square and prepares the development of his queen to the b6-square. 16.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{b}6\) 17.g4, Nachev – Frolov, Moscow 1996. White’s attack is obviously too slow. 17...\(\text{x}g4\)! Black sacrifices a piece and begins a decisive offensive. 18.\(\text{fxg}4\) \(\text{fxg}4\) 19.\(\text{x}g4\) \(\text{e}3?!\) 20.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}3+\) 21.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{b}4+\) 22.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{xd}2+\), followed by \(\text{d}3\) and eventually c4–c3. White is unlikely to hold the b2-square.

White’s attack will hardly succeed after 13.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{bxc}4\) 14.g4 \(\text{xd}5\) 15.exd5 \(\text{b}4\) 16.\(\text{c}3\) exd4 17.\(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{f}6\), with a double attack against the enemy rook and the f3-pawn. White is forced to exchange the queens. 18.\(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{xf}4+\) 19.\(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{hxg}4\) 20.\(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 21.\(\text{fxg}4\) cxd5 22.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{e}6=\) The position has been simplified considerably. 23.\(\text{d}1\), draw, Hansen – Jensen, Denmark 1984.

Following 13.g4, Black has an interesting piece – sacrifice. 13...\(\text{gx}4\) 14.dxe5 \(\text{xe}5\) 15.\(\text{fxg}4\) \(\text{fxg}4\) 16.\(\text{f}4\), Van Beers – Maes, Belgium 2000, 16...f5?! 17.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{b}4\) 18.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{fxe}4\) – He has three pawns for the piece and excellent squares for his knights.

13...\(\text{a}5\) 14.\(\text{g}3\)

White defends against \(\text{xc}4\), but now his knight stands in the way of his g2-pawn and his attack is slowed down.

14...\(\text{bxc}4\) 15.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{b}4\)

Black’s plan is quite simple. He is preparing the doubling (and eventually tripling...) of his major pieces on the b-file.

16.\(\text{f}1\)
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After 16...d7 17.e3, Neuman – Houska, Klatovy 2002, Black can change his plan a bit – to double his rooks on the b-file and to send his queen to protect his king. 17...e7!? 18.g4 e8 19.d3 f8 20.xf8+ x68. After the trade of the queens, Black’s king is completely safe. The arising endgame seems to be approximately equal. Black’s a6 and c4-pawns are weak indeed, but you should not forget that one of them is extra!

16...d7 17.e3 b8∞, followed by b6 and b8, Muir – Fedorov, Batumi 1999. The counterplay against the b2-pawn should provide Black with a very good game.

B5c) 10.0–0–0 b5

11.f4

The placement of White’s knight on f4 has some merits, but some drawbacks as well. It exerts pressure from there against the g6-square, weakened after the pawn-advance h7–h5, and also following g2–g4 h5xg4, will support h4–h5. On the other hand, Black will accomplish with tempo the thematic strike in the centre – e7–e5.

11.xd5 bxc4 – see variation B5a.

11.h6 xh6 12.xh6 e5 – bxc4 – see variation B5b.

11...bxc4 12.xc4

It would be premature for White to play here 12.g4?!, because after 12...e5! 13.dxe5 dxe5 14.gxh5, Black can sacrifice his knight, capturing the enemy pawns on f3 and e4 and his attack against the enemy king will be victorious. 14...xf3 15.xg2 dxe4 16.xf3 xc3 17.bxc3, Zoldan – Cazzaniga, Bratto 1994, 17...f6! The inclusion of Black’s queen into the attack is decisive. 18.d4 f5–+, White is helpless against the penetration of the enemy pieces on the b-file.

12.e5
3. \( \text{d}c3 \text{g7} \text{e}4 \text{d}6 \text{f}3 \text{0-0} \text{e}3 \text{c}6 \text{ge2} \text{a}6 \text{d}2 \text{b}8 \text{h}4 \text{h}5 \\
13. \text{dxe5} \\
It would not work for White to play here 13.\text{d}xg6?! , since following 13...\text{exd}4 14.\text{d}xd4, Van Dam – Klawitter, IECC 2001, Black would have the resource 14...\text{b}b4!? , emphasizing the unstable position of White’s bishops at the centre of the board. 15.\text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 16.\text{g}5 \text{xc}4 17.\text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 18.\text{xf}8 \text{xc}3 19.\text{bxc}3 \text{xf}8+ In the arising endgame Black’s two minor pieces are stronger than White’s rook and pawns. In addition, he will hardly manage to protect his weakened queenside pawns.

13...\text{dxe5} 14.\text{b}3 \text{a}5 \\
15.\text{d}d3 \\
This is an attempt by White to trade the powerful enemy knight.

He would lose after 15.\text{cd}5? \text{a}4! 16.\text{xa}4 \text{c}4++ I. Vorobiov – Karpasiuk, Lvov 2008.

15...\text{fd}7. Black brings his second knight as a replacement for the other one. 16.\text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 \\
17.\text{h}6 \text{e}6 18.\text{g}7 \text{g}7+ \\
White must play accurately in order to neutralise his opponent’s activity; otherwise, he may end up in a very bad position, Wiacek – Palsson, ICCF 2002.

B5d) 10.\text{c}1 \\
White prepares the development of his bishop on \text{e}2. Sometimes, this plan is tried without the inclusion of the moves \text{h}2-\text{h}4 – \text{h}7-\text{h}5 (variation B3).

10...\text{e}5 11.\text{d}5 \text{d}4 \\
White cannot put up for long with the centralised enemy knight. He has a choice from which square to attack it (\text{b}3 or \text{e}2).
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12.\(\text{\&}b3\)

After this move White must be ready to have his pawns doubled on the b-file.

The move 12.\(\text{\&}1e2\) has the drawback that the knight stands in the way of development of the bishop on f1. 12...c5 13.dxc6 \(\text{\&}xc6\)

After the removal of the knight from the d4-square, the weakness of the pawn on d6 becomes quite obvious, but Black hopes to exploit his lead in development, while the d6-pawn might be even sacrificed...

White would not achieve much with 14.0–0–0 \(\text{\&}e6\) 15.\(\text{\&}xd6\), Rogozenko – Guliev, Vejen 1993, 15...\(\text{\&}xd6!\)? 16.\(\text{\&}xd6\) \(\text{\&}xc4= –\) In this endgame, after the exchange of the weak d6-pawn for the c4-pawn, Black has nothing to be afraid of.

14.\(\text{\&}d1\) \(\text{\&}e6\) 15.b3 b5. He sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 16.\(\text{\&}xd6\) \(\text{\&}xd6\) 17.\(\text{\&}xd6\) \(\text{\&}b4\). The queens have been exchanged indeed, but White's defence is not easy at all. The lack of development of his kingside pieces hurts him horribly. 18.\(\text{\&}d5\) bxc4 19. bxc4, Vayser – Kristensen, Russia 2002. Here, Black could have exchanged his opponent's powerful bishop with the line: 19...c2+!? 20.\(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}xe3\) 21.\(\text{\&}xe3\) and activate his rook 21...\(\text{\&}b2\) 22.\(\text{\&}xa6\). White has two extra pawns, but lags considerably in development and the dark squares in his camp are vulnerable. 22...\(\text{\&}h6+\) 23.\(\text{\&}f2\) \(\text{\&}xd5\) 24.\(\text{\&}xd5\) \(\text{\&}c8\) 25.\(\text{\&}a3\) \(\text{\&}c2\) 26.\(\text{\&}c3\). White cannot protect simultaneously his pawns on a2 and c4. 26...\(\text{\&}xa2\) 27.\(\text{\&}g1\) \(\text{\&}b2\) 28. \(\text{\&}a3\) e4. Black sacrifices a pawn in order to open files. 29.fxe4 \(\text{\&}e8\+\) He not only attacks a pawn, but also prepares the transfer of his bishop to the c5-square. White has a considerable material advantage, but his position is difficult. His rook on h1 and the bishop are not developed yet and his pawns are weak. Black's pieces are active and very well coordinated. His initiative increases with every move.

14.\(\text{\&}c1\) b5!? It is important for Black to eliminate the enemy pawn on c4 in order to accomplish the centre pawn-break d6-d5. 15.\(\text{\&}xb5\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 16.\(\text{\&}g5\) axb5 17. \(\text{\&}g3\) b4 18.\(\text{\&}b5\) d5 19.\(\text{\&}xb4\) \(\text{\&}e6\). He has advanced d6-d5 at the price of a pawn. 20.a4 \(\text{\&}d7\) 21.\(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 22.\(\text{\&}d2\) d4. Black has obtained a protected passed pawn. 23.0–0 \(\text{\&}a8\) 24.\(\text{\&}d1\) \(\text{\&}fc8\) Fuzishawa – Gilbert, ICCF 2014. He has very good compensation for the minimal material deficit. His pieces are deployed much more
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harmoniously then their white counterparts. Black’s d4-pawn restricts considerably White’s possibilities.

**12...‡xb3 13.axb3 c5**

Before beginning active actions on the kingside (the pawn-advance f7-f5), it is useful for Black to apply some prophylactic on the opposite side of the board.

![Chess Diagram]

**14.‡e2**

After 14.b4, Black should better refrain from accepting the pawn-sacrifice and play instead the reliable move 14...b6. There might follow: 15.b5 axb5 16.cxb5 ‡e8 17.‡d3 f5 18.exf5. This is a typical approach by White in the King’s Indian Defence. At first he exchanges on f5 and then undermines the enemy pawn-centre with the move f3-f4 (18.‡c2, Portisch – Nunn, Szirak 1987, 18...f4!? 19.‡f2 ‡f6∞ – White's rook and bishop are squeezed with the protection of the weak pawn on h4.). 18...gxf5 19.‡g5 ‡f6 20.f4

[] 21.0–0 e4. With a black pawn on c7, this move is often wrong, because it presents White’s pieces with the excellent d4-square. Here, Black has nothing to worry about, since his pawn is on c5. 22.‡e2 ‡h7 23.‡d1 ‡d7 24.‡xh5. White has managed to win the h5-pawn, but has no advantage anyway. 24...‡d4+ 25.‡h2 ‡f6 26.‡e2 ‡h8 27.g3 ‡b7∞ Nyberg – Pallos Muico, ICCF 2014. The protected passed pawn and his powerful bishop on d4 as well as the counterplay against the weak enemy pawn on d5 are very good compensation for Black’s minimal material deficit.

**14...‡d7 15.‡d1**

The placement of the pawn on h4 precludes White from castling kingside. So, he should better keep his king in the centre. With his last move White prepares the transfer of his knight to the f2-square, from where it will support the pawn-advance g2-g4. He also prepares b3-b4.

**15...‡b6**

Black should not allow b3-b4.
16.\textit{f2}
This is an interesting pawn-sacrifice.

Following 16.b4 \textit{xb4} 17.\textit{xb4} cxb4 18.\textit{d2} b3 19.\textit{a3} \textit{fc8} 20.\textit{xb3} \textit{f8} 21.\textit{f2} \textit{e8} 22.\textit{c3} \textit{d7=}, there arises an endgame in which Black can hold his defence successfully, Emanuelli Simoncini - Santorelli, ICCF 2009.

16...\textit{xb3} 17.\textit{d3} a5!? Black wishes to open the a-file for his rooks with another pawn-sacrifice.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\caption{Position after 17.\textit{d3} a5}
\end{figure}

18.0-0 White declines the gift.

If 18.\textit{xa5}, then 18...\textit{b5=}

After 18.\textit{xa5} \textit{a8}, White will be forced to give the a-file to his opponent, because he has not castled yet. 19.\textit{d1} \textit{b6} 20.\textit{xa8} \textit{xa8} 21.b4 \textit{a6} 22.bxc5 \textit{xc4}

23.\textit{b2} \textit{a6} 24.cxd6 \textit{e8=} This is stronger for Black than capturing with the queen. It is well known that the queen is not a good blocking piece. Instead, the knight on d6 will occupy an excellent position. In addition, the queen on a6 will prevent White from castling.

18...\textit{a4} 19.\textit{a3} \textit{b6} 20.\textit{fa1}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board2.png}
\caption{Position after 19.\textit{a3} \textit{b6} 20.\textit{fa1}}
\end{figure}

20...\textit{d8}
The queen frees the way forward of the b-pawn and also eyes the weakness on h4.

21.\textit{d1} b5 22.cxb5 \textit{xb5} 23.\textit{xa4} \textit{xd3} 24.\textit{xd3} \textit{h7} 25.\textit{f2} \textit{f6} 26.g3 g5 27.hxg5 \textit{xg5} Sakhabeev – Krzyzanowski, ICCF 2014. White has managed to restore the material balance, but cannot rely on obtaining an advantage. It is Black who is fighting for an edge. He has the initiative on the kingside. White’s weak and isolated b2-pawn should be considered too.
This is White's most popular move in this position. He has built a powerful pawn-centre with his previous move and now he must think about the development of his kingside pieces and his castling.

5...0-0

White's basic moves in this position are 6.h3 – the Makogonov’s variation and the classical system 6.e2 and they will be analysed in the following chapters of our book (25 and 26-36), while here we will deal with the less popular moves:

A) 6.g5 and B) 6.e3.

We will pay some attention in short to White’s alternatives.

6.d5. This move is not convincing, because White weakens deliberately the dark-squared complex. 6...a6 7.d3, Cicak – Das, Barcelona 2015, 7...g4!? 8.0-0 d7

6.f4. This is not the best square for his bishop, because it would come under attack after e7-e5. Black’s plan for his further actions is quite simple. He must create pressure against the d4-square (g4, c6 and e7-e5). 6.g4 7.e2 c6 8.d5 e5!? 9.e3 xf3 10.xf3 d4 11.b5, I. Ivanov – Pushkedra, Guelph 2002. Black’s knight has occupied a powerful position in the centre and White’s desire to exchange it is understandable. 11...e8!? This is Black’s simplest road to equality. He is prepared in advance for the opening of the e-file. 12.0-0 a6 13.xd4 exd4 14.xd4 xe4=

6.d3. This move leads to the weakening of White’s control over the d4-square. 6...g4 7.e3 (7.h3 xf3 8.xf3 c6 9.e3 d7 – see 7.e3) 7...c6 8.h3 (8.e2 xf3 9.xf3 e5 10.d5 d4 – see 6.f4) 8...xf3 9.xf3 d7 10.d5 (10.
\( \text{Qe2? } \text{Qde5--+) 10... } \text{Qce5 } 11. \text{We2 c6 12.0–0 } \text{cxd5 13.cxd5 } \text{Cc8=, followed by } \text{Qxd3 and } \text{Wa5, } \text{Domonkos – Galyas, Balatonalmadi 2008. Black can create powerful pressure against the enemy queenside with the support of his strong bishop on g7.}

6.g3. If White wishes to fianchetto his bishop on fl, he should better not play so early e2–e4. 6... \text{Qg4. This is the point! After White has pushed g2–g3, he cannot play } \text{Qe2, therefore, Black's plan, connected with exerting pressure against the d4-square, becomes very unpleasant for White. 7.Qg2 (Following 7.h3 Qxf3 8.Qxf3, he obtains the two-bishop advantage, but lags in development. 8... Qc6 9.d5. White is incapable of holding the d4-square and is forced to allow the enemy knight to occupy a square at the centre of the board. 9...Qd4 10.Wd1 Qd7 11.Qe3 c5 12.f4 a6 13.Qg2 b5 – The dominant placement of the knight provides Black with a stable advantage, Becking – Jobava, Boeblingen 2000.) 7...Qc6 8.h3 Qxf3 9.Qxf3 e5 10.d5 Qd4 11.Qg2 c5 12.dxc6. White eliminates one of the bases of the enemy centralised knight (12.0–0 a6 13.a4 Wc5 14.Qa3 Qd7 15.h4 Qb6= Morihama – Dullemond, ICCF 2013). 12...bxc6 13.0–0 Qd7\infty – The powerful position of the knight on d4 compensates White’s two-bishop advantage, Moses – Gentil, Rio de Janeiro 1949.

A) 6.Qg5

This move was played by A. Alekhine, but gradually the popularity of 6.Qg5 diminished and it became a rare guest in the contemporary tournament practice. This is not surprising at all. There is a serious drawback in the placement of White’s bishop on g5 and the knight on f3, because he does not control the h5-square and Black can oust and trade the important enemy dark-squared bishop with h7–h6, g6–g6 and Qh5. If White insists on the development of his bishop on g5, he should better choose the Averbakh system, which does not have the above mentioned defect.

6...h6

Black wishes to clarify immediately the further plans of White’s bishop on g5.

(diagram)

7.Qh4

Black obtains a very good position after the other retreats of the enemy bishop.

7.Qe3 Qg4. His knight frees the way forward of his f-pawn
with tempo. 8.\textit{d}2 e5 9.d5 f5 10.\textit{h}3 \textit{f}6 11.\textit{exf}5. White must exchange, because he cannot hold the e4-square due to his lag in development. 11...\textit{gxf}5 12.\textit{e}2 \textit{a}6 13.0–0 \textit{c}5 14.\textit{c}1 a5\textsuperscript{+} – Black’s pawns on e5 and f5 control important central squares and White has problems to find an effective plan for his further actions, Aupi Royo – Ingersol, ICCF 2013.

7.\textit{d}2 e5 8.d5 \textit{a}6 9.\textit{d}3 \textit{h}5\textsuperscript{∞} Cicak – Das, Barcelona 2015. Black is perfectly prepared for the thematic King’s Indian pawn-advance f7-f5 and he can do it either immediately, or after the preliminary inclusion of \textit{f}4 and \textit{c}5.

7.\textit{f}4 \textit{c}6. Black wishes to exploit the misplacement of the enemy bishop on f4 and to advance e7-e5 with tempo. 8.d5 (After the simplifications there arises an approximately equal endgame following 8.\textit{h}3 e5 9.dxe5 \textit{dxe}5 10.\textit{xd}8 \textit{xd}8 11.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}4 12.\textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}3+ 13.bxc3 bxc6=) 8...e5 9.\textit{e}3 \textit{d}4. This temporary pawn-sacrifice is Black’s simplest road to equality. 10.\textit{xd}4 \textit{exd}4 11.\textit{xd}4

11...\textit{xe}4! This tactical strike is the key of Black’s strategy. After a few moves, exploiting the pin on the e-file, he will restore the material balance. 12.\textit{xe}4 (12.\textit{xe}7 \textit{e}8 13.\textit{e}2 \textit{g}7 14.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4= Khasin – Tal, Hastings 1963) 12...\textit{h}4 13.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}4+ 14.\textit{e}2 \textit{xe}2+ 15.\textit{xe}2 \textit{g}7= Lisitsin – Vasiu­kov, Riga 1954. The chances of both sides are approximately equal in the arising endgame. White has more space, but his pawns on c4 and d5 are placed against the rules, i.e. on squares with the same colour as his bishop.

7...\textit{g}5 8.\textit{g}3 \textit{h}5 9.\textit{e}2 9.d5 c6= Bronstein – Bole­slavsky, Parnu 1947.
9...e6
Black is not in a hurry to play \( \texttt{xg3} \). With his last move, he has prepared f7-f5 and in order to prevent the threat to have his bishop trapped after f5-f4, White will have to remove his knight from f3.

10.d5

After 10.0-0, Black has a very interesting possibility: 10...c5?! 11.d5 \( \texttt{xc3} \) 12.bxc3 e5∞ White’s queenside pawn-structure has been compromised and the position is closed, so he will hardly manage to exploit the power of his two bishops.

10...f5 11.\( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{xg3} \) 12.hxg3 fxe4 13.\( \texttt{xe6} \) \( \texttt{xe6} \) 14.dxe6

14...\( \texttt{xc3} + \). With this move Black not only doubles his opponent’s pawns on the c-file, but also deprives him of the possibility to win a pawn with the move \( \texttt{xe4} \). 15.bxc3 \( \texttt{f6} = \) – White must play very precisely in order not to lose his pawns, Uhlmann – Fischer, Havana 1966.

**B) 6.\( \texttt{e3} \)**

This move was played by Sultan Khan in his game against Salo Flohr back in the year 1931. Later, Bent Larsen used to play like this for a while.

6...e5
Black must react energetically.

After the careless approach 6...\( \texttt{bd7} \) 7.\( \texttt{d2} \) e5 8.d5, Black cannot attack the enemy bishop on e3 with the move \( \texttt{g4} \) and ends up in a difficult situation. 8...\( \texttt{e8} \) 9.\( \texttt{e2} \) f5 10.f3 f4 11.\( \texttt{f2} \) a5 12.a3. White is not in a hurry to castle kingside in order to avoid Black’s possible attack there. 12...\( \texttt{ef6} \) 13.b4 b6. This attempt by Black to prevent c4-c5 is doomed to failure. 14.\( \texttt{a4} \) \( \texttt{e8} \) 15.c5\( \pm \) Sultan Khan – Flohr, Prague 1931.

7.dxe5
White acts in the spirit of the exchange variation, which will be analysed in Chapter 17. There is a slight difference in the position (instead of \( \texttt{e2} \) White has played a move with his other bishop –
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\( \text{\textcopyright} \), but it does not change the evaluation of the position as approximately equal.

7.\( \text{\textcopyright} \) – see 6.\( \text{\textcopyright} \) e5 7.\( \text{\textcopyright} \).

7.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)\( \text{\textcopyright} \) 8.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)g5 f6 9.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)h4 h5 10.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)h3 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)h6 11.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d2∞ Florean – Reichel, Pardubice 2000.

7.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)\( \text{\textcopyright} \) 8.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)c6 8.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d5 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)d4! This pawn-sacrifice is Black’s simplest way of equalising. 9.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)x4 exd4 10.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xd4 (Following 10.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xd4 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)g4 11.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe3 12.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe3, the dark squares in White’s camp have been weakened, while Black’s bishops are very powerful. 12...c5 13.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d3 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)d7 14.0–0 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)h4 15.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)e2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)ae8∞ – He has sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn.)

10...\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe4! This is the point! Black regains his pawn with a tactical strike. 11.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe4 (11.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xg7 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)e8 12.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)e2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xg7 13.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d4+ \( \text{\textcopyright} \)f6 14.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xf6+ \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xf6= – His chances are not worse in this endgame, because White’s pawns on c4 and d5 are placed on squares with the same colour as his bishop on e2, Gallego Alcaraz – Blandon, Medellin 2015) 11...\( \text{\textcopyright} \)h4 12.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)g7 (White is incapable of preserving his material advantage 12.g4 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)e8 13.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)g2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)f5 14.0–0 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe4 15.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xg7 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xg7 16.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xg2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xg7 17.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d4+ \( \text{\textcopyright} \)f6 18.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xf6+ \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xf6= Borisenko – Sazhin, Cherepovets 2005.) 12...\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe4+ 13.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)e2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe2+ 14.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)g7 15.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d2 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)d7 16.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)he1 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)e8 17.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)ac1 f5 18.f4 c5 19.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)d3 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)f6 20.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe8 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe8 21.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)c3 b6= Jacobs – Pantazi, ICCF 2013.

7...dxe5 8.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xd8

About 8.h3 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)c6 – see Chapter 16, variation A.

White would not achieve much if he avoids the trade of the queens. 8.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)c2 c6!? Black does not need to be in a hurry to play the move \( \text{\textcopyright} \)bd7, which may lead to the delay of the development of the bishop on c8, because White would not achieve anything if he captures the e5-pawn. 9.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)c5 (Following 9.\( \text{\textcopyright} \)xe5 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)e8, White cannot preserve his material advantage. 10.f4 \( \text{\textcopyright} \)bd7. The knight on e5 should be better exchanged, because it impedes the possibility of
Black’s rook to exert pressure against White’s pawn on e4. 11.\(\text{cxd7 } \text{xd7} 12.0-0-0 \text{c7} 13. \text{g3 } \text{xe4}\). Black restores the material balance with this simple combination. 14.\(\text{xe4 } \text{f5} 15.\text{d3 } \text{xe4} 16.\text{xe4 } \text{e7} 17.\text{he1 } \text{xe4} 18.\text{xe4 } \text{xe4}= – The endgame is a draw.) 9...\(\text{e8} 10.\text{d1 } \text{bd7} 11. \text{e2}\). It may look like White has seized the initiative, but this is not true. Black gradually neutralises the pressure of his opponent’s pieces. 11...\(\text{f8} 12.\text{xf8 } \text{xf8} 13. 0-0 \text{e7} 14.\text{h3 } \text{h5} 15.\text{g3 } \text{c5} 16.\text{h2 } \text{a5}= – White has no compensation for the weakness of the d4-square and his “bad” bishop on e2, Korolcar – Laevich, www.bestlogic.ru 2013.

8...\(\text{xd8} 9.\text{d5}\)

About 9.\(\text{g5 } \text{e8} 10.\text{d5 } \text{xd5} 11.\text{cxd5 } \text{c6} 12.\text{c4 } \text{xd5} – see Chapter 17, variation B2.

9...\(\text{a6}\)

Black defends the c7-square. He plans to oust the enemy knight away from the centre with the move c7-c6.

10.0-0-0

It does not seem logical for White to opt here for 10.\(\text{xf6+}\). After the trade of the powerful knight on d5, he will have no compensation for the vulnerability of the d4-square. 11.a3 \(\text{b6} 12.\text{b4 } \text{c5} 13.\text{b5 } \text{c7=}, followed by a7-a6 and \(\text{e6}, \text{Lindgren – Hillarp Persson, Skelleftea 1999. White will have a difficult defence in this endgame.}

Black should not be afraid of the move 10.\(\text{g5}\), since he can cope reliably with it. 10...\(\text{d6} 11. \text{xf6 } \text{xf6} 12.\text{b4 } \text{c6}. This is a multi-purpose move. Black not only ousts the enemy knight from the centre, but plans also to centralise his own knight – \(\text{c7-e6-d4}\). 13. \(\text{dxf6}\) 14.a3 c5! Black prevents c4-c5 and fixes the enemy pawn on c4 on a square with the same colour as his bishop. 15.b5 \(\text{c7}, \text{Efimov – Matamoros Franco, Porto Man- nu 2007, 16.\text{xe5}. Black will regain easily his pawn, but White's position is already worse anyway. 16...\(\text{e6} 17.\text{g4 } \text{xe4+} 18.\text{e3 } \text{d4= – White is faced with a long and laborious defence of an inferior position in this endgame, without any chances of creating counterplay.}}

10.\(\text{d1 } \text{e8}. Black defends against the threat \(\text{e7} and removes his rook from a possible
pin on the h4-d8 diagonal. 11. \( \text{Qxf6}+ \) (11.\( \text{Qd3} \) c6 12.\( \text{Qxf6}+ \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) = Candela Perez – Taboas Rodriguez, Madrid 2014) 11...\( \text{Qxf6} \) 12. a3 b6= Mastrovasilis – Edouard, Eretria 2011.

10...\( \text{Qe6} \)

Black develops his pieces.

11.\( \text{Qxf6}+ \)

White's initiative decreases with the exchange of every piece and the vulnerability of the d4-square becomes more and more important.

Black should not be afraid of the pin of his knight 11.\( \text{Qg5} \), Van Wely – Efimenko, Moscow 2002, because in the tactical complications arising after 11...\( \text{Qxe4}?! \), his prospects would not be worse at all. 12.\( \text{Qxd8} \) \( \text{Qxf2} \) 13.\( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qxh1} \) 14.\( \text{Qe2} \) c6 15.\( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qh6}+ \) 16.\( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qf5}+ \) 17.\( \text{Qa1} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 18.\( \text{Qxh1} \) \( \text{Qc2}+ \) 19.\( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qe1}+ \) 20.\( \text{Qa1} \). Now, Black has a very pleasant choice. He can play 20...\( \text{Qxg2} \infty \), obtaining a third pawn for the piece, or can end the game in a perpetual check following 20...\( \text{Qc2} = 

11...\( \text{Qxf6} \) 12.\( \text{Qxd8}+ 

After 12.\( \text{Qe2} \), Black can transfer his knight from a6 to c6 obtaining a very good position. 12...\( \text{Qb4} \) 13.\( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qc6} = \) Dragomirescu – Spasov, Golden Sands 2013.

12...\( \text{Qxd8} \) 13.\( \text{Qa3} \)

White plans to occupy space on the queenside with b2-b4 and c4-c5 and to increase the scope of action of his bishop on f1. His plans will not be realised, though...

13...b6 14.b4 c5 15.b5 \( \text{Qc7} \)

16.h4

This position was reached in the game Larsen – Mortensen, Aaland 1989. Here, Black could have abandoned the plan with the transfer of his knight to d4 and send it on another route e8-d6. From the d6-square, it would exert powerful pressure against White’s pawns on c4 and e4 and will also support the pawn-advance f7-f5. 16...\( \text{Qe8}?! \) 17.h5 \( \text{Qd6} \) 18.\( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 19.\( \text{hxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 20.\( f3 \) f5= – The material is equal indeed, but White will be faced with an unpleasant defence of a slightly inferior position.
In Chapter 9 we have already analysed White’s move with the rook pawn, but only the variations in which he refrains from the natural development of his knight to the f3-square. Now, we will deal with the main positions of the variation with h2-h3, which was named in the chess theory after the Soviet grandmaster Vladimir Makogonov, who contributed greatly to its development.

We have to mention that the system became very popular lately. It is often played by strong grandmasters like Levon Aronian, Evgeny Tomashevsky, Dmitry Jakovenko...

The basic advantage of the move 6.h3 is that it has not been analysed so much as the main lines of the King’s Indian Defence. In the Makogonov variation there arise complicated positions with many pieces on the board and both sides have their trumps. The main idea behind the move 6.h3 is prophylactic. Now, White can develop his bishop to e3 without being afraid of Black’s knight-sortie g4 and what is even more important White wishes to impede Black’s thematic pawn-advance in the King’s Indian Defence f7-f5 with g2-g4.

6...e5

No doubt, the strongest and most logical move for White in this position is to occupy space with B) 7.d5, but before that we will analyse the not so ambitious move A) 7.dxe5.

About 7...e3 c6 – see Chapter 15, 6.e3 e5 7.h3 c6.

A) 7.dxe5

White treats this position in the spirit of the exchange variation (see Chapter 17). Still, in this way he cannot rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening, be-
cause the position is quickly simplified.

7...\textit{dxe5}
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\textbf{8.\textit{wx}d8}

8.\textit{g}5 \textit{a}6 9.\textit{w}xd8 \textit{a}xd8 – see 8.\textit{w}xd8.

White should better exchange queens immediately; otherwise, after 8.\textit{e}e3 \textit{c}6!? , Black’s prospects are not worse at all. White should watch carefully about the vulnerability of the d4-square. 9.\textit{e}2 \textit{b}6. Black prepares the development of his bishop to b7 and from there it will exert pressure against the e4-square. 10.0–0 \textit{b}7
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quickly the position with 11...\textit{d}d4 12.\textit{xd}4 \textit{exd}4 13.\textit{xd}4 \textit{xe}4 14. \textit{yg}7 \textit{yg}7 15.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 16.\textit{a}a4 \textit{e}8= Janev – Spasov, Blagoevgrad 2010.

He can also equalise easily following 11.a3 \textit{e}e8 12.\textit{e}e1 \textit{d}d4 13. \textit{xd}4 \textit{exd}4 14.\textit{xd}4 \textit{xe}4= Loiseau – Zhou, Paris 2012.

11.\textit{e}1 \textit{w}xd1 12.\textit{xd}1 \textit{b}4. Black’s knight is becoming very active. White’s e4-pawn is hanging and Black is threatening the rather unpleasant penetration of his knight to the d3-square. 13. \textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 14.\textit{h}4 \textit{d}d3 15.\textit{e}e3 \textit{f}4 \textit{S}ienkiewicz – Glukhovtsev, ICCF 2009. There has arisen a very complicated endgame on the board. Black has some initiative and White’s defence is not easy at all. For example, after the straightforward capturing of the pawn 16. \textit{xe}5?!, he ends up in a worse position following 16...\textit{g}5 17.\textit{g}3 \textit{ae}8 18.\textit{f}3 \textit{xe}4=. Black restores the material balance and his pieces are obviously more active and more harmoniously deployed.

\textbf{8...\textit{Ex}d}8
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After 11.c5, Black can simplify
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9.\textit{f}5
White is threatening to win material after $\text{xf}6$ and $\text{d}5$.

9.\textit{d}5 \textit{a}6 10.\textit{g}5 $\text{d}6$ – see 9.\textit{g}5.

9.\textit{e}3 \textit{c}6 10.\textit{d}1 \textit{xd}1+ 11.\textit{xd}1 \textit{g}6 12.\textit{d}3 $\text{d}8$= Eisenbeis – Rudolph, Germany 2001.

9.\textit{xe}5. White should better refrain from capturing the central pawn. 9...\textit{xe}4 10.\textit{xe}4 (10.\textit{xf}7?? \textit{xc}3–+) 10...\textit{xe}5 11.\textit{g}5, Campa – Ragoso, Milan 2013 (11.\textit{e}2 \textit{f}5=) 11...\textit{d}4!?? – Black’s pieces are very active.

9...\textit{a}6!?
He protects the c7-pawn and parries White’s threat.

10.\textit{d}5

Now, just like on the previous move, capturing the pawn does not promise White anything meaningful. 10.\textit{xe}5 $\text{e}8$= 11.\textit{d}3 (But not 11.f4, due to 11...\textit{h}5= and White cannot parry simultaneously his opponent’s two threats: f7-f6 and h7-h6, followed by $\text{xf}4$.) 11...\textit{xe}4+- Grivas – Ivanchuk, Heraklion 2004.

After 10.\textit{e}2, Andreikin – Grischuk, Astana 2012, the simplest road to equality for Black would be 10...\textit{c}5!= and again capturing the pawn would only bring negative emotions to White: 11.\textit{xe}5?! h6 12.\textit{f}4 $\text{e}8$ 13.\textit{h}2 $\text{fxe}4$+. Black restores the material balance and seizes firmly the initiative. White’s king is still stranded in the centre.

10...\textit{d}6 11.\textit{xf}6

11.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 12.\textit{xf}6 $\text{xf}6$ – see 11.\textit{xf}6.

11...\textit{xf}6

12.\textit{c}1
White wishes to exploit the misplacement of Black’s rook on d6 and to advance with tempo c4-c5.

After White’s alternatives he
cannot even equalise.

12.\textit{\texttt{xe}d1} \textit{\texttt{g}7} 13.\textit{\texttt{b}4} \textit{\texttt{d}7} 14.\textit{\texttt{a}3} \textit{\texttt{c}6}+ – After the removal of White’s knight from d5, Black will play \textit{\texttt{a}6-c7-e6} and \textit{\texttt{a}7-a5}, emphasizing the weakness of the d4-square and the vulnerability of White’s queenside pawns, Ramirez – Garre, Washington 2011.

12.\textit{\texttt{xf}6+}. This move at least deprives Black of his two-bishop advantage. 12...\textit{\texttt{xf}6} 13.0–0–0, Le – Grischuk, Astana 2012, 13...\textit{\texttt{c}5} 14.\textit{\texttt{d}3} b6 15.\textit{\texttt{d}2} \textit{\texttt{b}7} 16.\textit{\texttt{xe}5}. White cannot hold on to his extra pawn. 16...\textit{\texttt{e}6} 17.\textit{\texttt{g}4} \textit{\texttt{xd}3}+ 18.\textit{\texttt{xd}3} \textit{\texttt{xe}4}+ – In this endgame, with actions on both sides of the board, Black’s bishop will be more powerful than White’s knight.

12.0–0–0 \textit{\texttt{c}5}

13.\textit{\texttt{xf}6+} \textit{\texttt{xf}6} 14.\textit{\texttt{d}8+}. The penetration of White’s rook to the last rank seems dangerous for Black, but he manages to play \textit{\texttt{b}7-b6} and \textit{\texttt{b}b7}. 14...\textit{\texttt{g}7} 15.\textit{\texttt{xe}5} \textit{\texttt{xf}2} 16.\textit{\texttt{d}3} \textit{\texttt{xd}3}+ 17.\textit{\texttt{xd}3} \textit{\texttt{b}6}+, followed by \textit{\texttt{b}7}, getting rid of the pin of his bishop. Black will have an advantage in this endgame, since he has a superior pawn-structure and an active rook, while White’s bishop is restricted by his own pawns on c4 and e4.

13.\textit{\texttt{d}3}, V.Georgiev – Lesiege, Mermaid Beach 1998, 13...\textit{\texttt{d}8}!? Black avoids the exchange of his powerful bishop. 14.\textit{\texttt{b}4} (14.\textit{\texttt{xe}5} c6 15.\textit{\texttt{e}3} \textit{\texttt{c}7} 16.\textit{\texttt{c}2} \textit{\texttt{e}6} 17.\textit{\texttt{f}3} \textit{\texttt{xe}4}+ – He has succeeded in regaining his pawn and maintains a stable advantage thanks to his two powerful bishops.) 14...\textit{\texttt{xd}3}+ 15.\textit{\texttt{xd}3} f6. Finally, Black has managed to protect reliably his e5-pawn! 16.\textit{\texttt{hd}1} \textit{\texttt{f}7} 17.\textit{\texttt{c}5} \textit{\texttt{d}7}+. Now, he only needs to oust the enemy knight away from the centre with the move c7-c6 and to activate his queenside pieces and then Black can begin to realise his two bishops in this endgame. White is doomed to a long and laborious defence of this inferior endgame.

12.\textit{\texttt{b}4} c6 13.\textit{\texttt{xf}6+} \textit{\texttt{xf}6}. One of White’s pawns is hanging and he is forced to lose a tempo to protect it. 14.\textit{\texttt{a}3} c5! Black prevents the move c4-c5 and now White will have a “bad” bishop on f1. 15.\textit{\texttt{b}5} \textit{\texttt{c}7}. Black’s knight has abandoned the edge of the board. His plan includes undermining his opponent’s pawn-structure on the queenside with a7-a6. 16.\textit{\texttt{e}2} (16.\textit{\texttt{d}3} \textit{\texttt{d}6}+) 16...\textit{\texttt{e}6} 17.0–0–0 \textit{\texttt{g}7} 18.\textit{\texttt{a}4} a6+ Huebner – Ju.Polgar, Biel 1993. White’s defence will be difficult, because the majority of
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his pawns are placed against the rules, i.e. on squares with the same colour as his bishop, moreover that the d4-square would need permanent protection against the penetration of the enemy knight.

12...b6
Black prevents c4-c5.

13.b4
White is following his plan.

13...d8
Black not only removes his bishop under the attack, but also frees his knight on a6 from the protection of the c7-pawn.

14.c5
White is very consistent. Now, his bishop on f1 will become much more active.

It would be too slow for him to choose here 14.a3 c6 15.e3 f6 – Black has succeeded in protecting his e5-pawn and ousted the enemy knight on d5 from the centre, Grivas – Ivanchuk, Iraklion 2004.

14...bxc5 15.bxc5 e6 16.c6
White prevents the undermin-

16...b8
Black’s rook, which was completely idle on a8 for a long time, joins in the actions.

17.c4
White maintains the balance with this move.

He fails to do this with the line: 17.h4 d4 18.xb4 xb4 19.c4 e8 Can – Cheparinov, Albena 2014. Black has exchanged his knight, which was passive at the edge of the board. His prospects are preferable, since he has two powerful bishops, while White’s far-advanced c6-pawn may turn out to be weak in the future.

17...c5 18.c3 e8 19.0–0 g7 – Black will have some difficulties to develop his pieces and to preserve his two-bishop advantage, because White’s bishop on c4 controls the a6 and e6-squares, Kudr – Eldridge, ICCF 2012.

B) 7.d5
The position in the centre has been stabilised. Now, Black must prepare the pawn-advance f7-f5, which is typical for the King’s Indian Defence in order to create counterplay.

7...\( \text{\texttt{Nh5}} \)?

The knight not only frees the way forward of his f-pawn, but is also ready to go to f4, exerting unpleasant pressure against White’s kingside.

He should better play immediately \( \text{\texttt{Nh5}} \), because if he slows down, playing for example 7...a5, then White would have the resource \( 8.g4!? \), making his opponent’s knight-sortie at the edge of the board impossible. Then, Black will have to manoeuvre his knight to the queenside – \( \text{\texttt{Nh6-d7-c5(b6)}} \), but all this looks a bit clumsy, moreover that his king will be deprived of an important defender and White will have an easy task to organise an offensive on the kingside.

Following 7...\( \text{\texttt{Nh5}} \), White has a choice between three main lines: B1) \( 8.\text{\texttt{Ne3}}, \) B2) \( 8.\text{\texttt{Nh2}} \) and B3) \( 8.g3 \).

His alternatives are less popular and often lead to difficulties for him.

8.\( \text{\texttt{Ne2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f4}} \)

8.\( \text{\texttt{g1 a6}} \) 9.\( \text{\texttt{Ne3 e8}} \) – see 8.\( \text{\texttt{Ne3}} \).

8.\( \text{\texttt{g5 e8}} \). Black’s queen is very well placed on this square. After f7-f5 and the exchanges of pawns on f5, it will protect the knight on h5. 9.\( \text{\texttt{Nd2}} \). White prevents \( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) (Following 9.\( \text{\texttt{Ne2 f4}} \) 10.\( \text{\texttt{xf4 exf4}} \) 11.\( \text{\texttt{Nd2}} \), Kazhgaleyev – Barbero, Lisbon 2000, Black can simply capture a pawn 11...\( \text{\texttt{xc3?!}} \) 12.\( \text{\texttt{wxc3 xe4+}} \)). 9...\( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) 10.\( \text{\texttt{Ne2 f5}} \) 11.\( \text{\texttt{exf5}} \). White must give up the centre, because Black was threatening f5-f4 and h7-h6, trapping White’s bishop. 11...\( \text{\texttt{gx5}} \) 12. 0–0 \( \text{\texttt{Nd6}} \) 13.\( \text{\texttt{eae1}} \) 14.\( \text{\texttt{Ne3}} \) 15.\( \text{\texttt{xe4 xe4}} \) 16.\( \text{\texttt{c2 b6}} \). Black’s powerful pawns on e5 and f5 promise him an advantage, but he needs to prevent his opponent’s queenside counterplay. With his next few moves he impedes the pawn-advance c4-c5. 17.\( \text{\texttt{Nd2}} \) 18.\( \text{\texttt{xb3 g6}} \) 19.\( \text{\texttt{xe5}} \) 20.\( \text{\texttt{bxc5+}} \) Kireev – Demchenko, ICCF 2013.

It seems too slow for White to choose 8.\( \text{\texttt{d2}} \), moreover that he may have difficulties later with the development of his bishop on
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c1. 8...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}8}} 9.g3 f5. White has failed to prevent f7-f5. 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}2}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}6}} 11.g4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}6}}. Black’s knight is headed for c5 in order to increase the pressure against the e4-square. 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}1}} (It is preferable for White to opt for 12.f3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}7\text{∞}}} Sakaev – Radjabov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2009, although even then, Black would have no problems at all.) 12... \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}xe4}} 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe}4}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{fxe}4}} 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}3}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}5}} 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}3}} b6 16.b4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}3\text{+}}} 17.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}d}3} exd3 18.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}4}}. Black has the two-bishop advantage and must strive to open the position. 18...b5! – White has great problems to find a safe haven for his king, because both his flanks have been weakened by moves with his knight-pawns, Istratescu – Can, Graz 2014.

\textbf{B1) 8.\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}3}}

From this square White’s bishop will support the pawn-advance c4-c5.

\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{8...\textbf{a}6}}}

Black prevents this plan.

\textbf{9.a3}

This is White’s most principled move. He wishes to play b2-b4 and c4-c5, after which Black’s knight on a6 will be totally misplaced and he will need to lose plenty of time to bring it back into the actions (\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}8\text{-d}7}).

White’s plan has some drawbacks, however. His kingside pieces remain undeveloped and his king is stranded at the centre of the board. It is well known, this is not without risks...

About 9.g3 f5 – see variation \textbf{B3}.

After White’s alternatives there arise complicated double-edged positions.

\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{9.e}2}}. This is his worst decision. 9...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}4}} 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}4}}. After this exchange the dark squares in White’s camp are considerably weakened, while Black can even sacrifice his f4-pawn... In addition, if White really wanted to trade his bishop for the enemy knight, he did not need to lose a tempo for the move \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}3}}. 10...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}4}}. Black’s bishop on g7 has become considerably more active. 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}2}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}5}} 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}f}4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}8}} 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}2}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}5}}! Black increases his pressure against the e4-pawn and wishes to provoke f2-f3, which will weaken White’s position even more. 14.f3. He cannot capture the enemy bishop, because he would lose his queen after that. 14...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}5}} 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}6}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}6}}. The dark squares in White’s camp are horribly weak

9.g1. The retreat of White’s knight to g1, or h2 is encountered very often in similar positions. He wishes to impede the pawn-advance f7-f5 by exerting pressure against the knight on h5. The position is closed so Black is incapable of punishing his opponent for this obvious loss of time. He equalises effortlessly, though... 9...e8 10.e2 f5

Black should not be afraid of 11.xh5, because his two-bishop advantage would compensate the defects of his pawn-structure. 11... gxh5 12.f3 fxe4 13.g5 (following 13.d2 g6 14.e2 f5 15.0–0–0 b4+, White cannot even equalise, Anastasian – Neverov, Minsk 1990) 13...g6 14.gxe4 f5=

11.exf5 f4. Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative.

12.xf4 exf4 13.fxg6 xg6 14.f1 (14.g4, Vescovi – Kotronias, Bursa 2010, 14...c5! 14...c5 15.f3 d7 16.g1, Wegner – Cramling, Hamburg 1991 (16.d2 e8!?=) 16...e8!? Black has sufficient compensation for his minimal material deficit. He has the two-bishop advantage and actively deployed pieces, while White has not even completed the development of his queenside pieces.

9.h2 e8 10.e2 (following 10.g3, White does not prevent the pawn-advance 10...f5, for example: 11.exf5 gxf5 12.e2 f6 13.d2 c5 Ibragimov – Schaefer, Senden 2001) 10...f5. This is an energetic move. In his fight for the initiative Black is ready not only to weaken his pawn-structure, but even to sacrifice a pawn.

It seems too risky for White to play 11.0–0, Gheorghiu – Cooper, Novi Sad 1990. After 11...f4!?, White’s king will be unsafe, since his castling position has been considerably weakened by the move h2-h3.
11.\textit{\textbf{x}}h5. White weakens his opponent’s pawn-structure, but is deprived of his powerful light-squared bishop. 11...gxh5 12.g4 (12.\textit{\textbf{f}}3, Anastasian – Neverov, Minsk 1990, 12...f4!?∞) 12...f4 13.\textit{\textbf{d}}2 \textit{\textbf{b}}4. Suddenly White has problems with the protection of his d3-square. 14.\textit{\textbf{b}}5, Grunberg – Popescu, Calarasi 1995. Here, Black had an interesting pawn-sacrifice and eventually even a rook-sacrifice. 14...\textit{\textbf{d}}3+!? 15.\textit{\textbf{e}}1 \textit{\textbf{c}}5 16.\textit{\textbf{x}}c7 f3+! Black begins an attack against the enemy king. Now, White cannot restrict Black’s counterplay on the kingside with the move f2-f3. 17.\textit{\textbf{f}}1 \textit{\textbf{g}}6 White’s g4-pawn needs protection and the attempt to win a rook – 18.\textit{\textbf{a}}x8? would lead him to a rapid catastrophe, for example: 18...hxg4 19.hxg4 \textit{\textbf{x}}g4+ 20.\textit{\textbf{x}}g4 \textit{\textbf{w}}xg4 21.\textit{\textbf{g}}1 \textit{\textbf{h}}3+ 22.\textit{\textbf{e}}1 \textit{\textbf{d}}3# 11.exf5 \textit{\textbf{f}}4 12.\textit{\textbf{x}}f4 (White would not achieve much with 12.0–0 \textit{\textbf{x}}e2+ 13.\textit{\textbf{w}}xe2 gxf5∞ V.Georgiev – Moingt, Le Mans 1996.) 12...exf4 13.fxg6. He follows the well known chess wisdom – if you have to suffer, do it at least for a pawn! (The move 13.0–0 does not even equalise. 13...\textit{\textbf{x}}xf5 14.\textit{\textbf{f}}3, Flores – Vocaturo, San Cristobal 2012, 14...\textit{\textbf{x}}c3!? 15.bxc3 \textit{\textbf{c}}5 – White has no compensation for his weakened queenside pawn-structure.) 13.\textit{\textbf{w}}xg6 14.\textit{\textbf{f}}1 \textit{\textbf{c}}5 15.\textit{\textbf{e}}1 (15.\textit{\textbf{f}}3 \textit{\textbf{d}}7 – see 9.\textit{\textbf{g}}1) 15...a5∞ – White’s extra pawn and Black’s positional pluses approximately balance each other, Rodriguez – Peng, Kuala Lumpur 1993.

9.\textit{\textbf{d}}2. This retreat of the knight has the defect that White’s bishop on e3 has nowhere to retreat after f7–f5–f4. 9...\textit{\textbf{w}}e8

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

Or 10.a3 f5 11.\textit{\textbf{b}}3 b6 12.\textit{\textbf{w}}c2, Bachmann – Istratescu, Graz 2014, 12...c6!?∞ White weakens the f4-square after the careless move 10.g4 \textit{\textbf{f}}4+ 10.\textit{\textbf{b}}3 f5 11.c5. This pawn-sacrifice seems to be too optimistic. 11...f4 12.\textit{\textbf{d}}2 \textit{\textbf{x}}c5 13.\textit{\textbf{x}}c5 dxc5 14.b4, Wang – Ding Liren, China 2010, 14...\textit{\textbf{f}}7?! Black does not lose time to protect his c5-pawn. It is much more important for him to activate his bishop on g7, restricted by his own e5-pawn. 15.bxc5 \textit{\textbf{f}}8+ – The position has become sharper, while White has not developed his kingside pieces yet and his king is still stranded in the centre...

10.\textit{\textbf{e}}2 \textit{\textbf{f}}4 11.\textit{\textbf{x}}f4 exf4 12.0–0, Pogonina – Savina, Chita 2015, 12...\textit{\textbf{x}}c3!? 13.bxc3 \textit{\textbf{w}}e5 14.\textit{\textbf{w}}c2 \textit{\textbf{c}}5+ – White’s pawn-structure has been compromised and
Black’s knight has occupied an excellent blocking square.

10.g3. White restricts the enemy knight. 10...f5 11.exf5 gxf5 12.\( \text{e}2 \text{f}6 \).

13.f4 exf4. Black is evidently better prepared for the opening of the game. 14.\( \text{x}f4 \text{h}5 15.\text{f}3 \text{c}5+ \) Podzielny – Kummerow, Recklinghausen 2011.

13.\( \text{g}5 \text{g}6 14.h4 \text{h}6 15.\text{xf6} \text{xf6} \) – He has no compensation for Black’s bishop-pair, Umansky – Wolfsteiner, Bayern 2007.

13.\( \text{b}3 \text{d}7 \) Sethuraman – Shyam, New Delhi 2010.

13.\( \text{g}1 \text{h}8 14.\text{b}3 \text{g}6 \) Akesson – Hellers, Naestved 1988.

13.\( \text{f}3 \text{d}7 \) – Black’s play is much simpler in this complicated position, since his king is much more reliably placed, Lushenkov – Pervakov, Odessa 2008.

Following 13.\( \text{b}3 \), Black has a very promising pawn-sacrifice. 13...f4! 14.gxf4 exf4 15.\( \text{xf4 e}4 \). After the opening of the centre White will have problems with providing a safe haven for his king, while his attempt to sacrifice the exchange would not work, because after 16.\( \text{e}3 \text{xc}3 17.\text{bxc}3 \text{xc}3+ 18.\text{d}2 \), Cifuentes Parada – Ye, Tilburg 1994, Black can refuse the gift with 18...\( \text{e}5! \), preserving his control over the long diagonal.

9...f5 10.b4

10...\( \text{h}8 \)

This is useful prophylactic. Black removes his king away from the a2-g8 diagonal and frees the g8-square, which may be needed for his rook after White castles kingside.

11.\( \text{c}1 \text{c}5 \)

Black must not allow c4-c5.

Now, White must decide whether he will open the game in the centre.

12.\( \text{xc}6 \)

After this exchange, Black’s central pawns may become very dangerous.

White would not achieve much if he continues the game with a closed centre. 12.\( \text{b}1 \text{d}7 13.\text{c}1 \text{b}6 \). Black completes at first some prophylactic on the queenside and then begins active actions on the kingside. 14.\( \text{d}3 \text{e}7 15.0-0 \)
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f4 16.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 g5 17.\texttt{\textbackslash e}c2 g4 18.\texttt{\textbackslash h}xg4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}g4, followed by \texttt{\textbackslash f}g8, \texttt{\textbackslash f}6, preparing an attack on the g-file, Myers – Blanco Gramajo, ICCF 2013.

\textbf{12...bxc6 13.\texttt{\textbackslash e}xf5}

13.\texttt{\textbackslash e}e2 fxe4 14.\texttt{\textbackslash d}xe4 d5 15.\texttt{\textbackslash c}xd5 \texttt{\textbackslash c}xd5 – Black’s central pawns have been moved forward, Flear – Cvitan, Bern 1993.

\textbf{13...gx}f5 14.\texttt{\textbackslash e}2

White loses a piece after 14. \texttt{\textbackslash d}xe5? \texttt{\textbackslash e}e8 15.\texttt{\textbackslash x}c6 f4+ – Todrovic – Kr.Georgiev, Stara Pazova 2009.

\textbf{14...\texttt{\textbackslash f}6}

\textbf{15.\texttt{\textbackslash a}4}

This move was recommended by John Watson in his book “Strategic Chess Opening Repertoire for White”, Gambit 2012.

Following 15.0–0 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7 16.\texttt{\textbackslash c}2, Black succeeds in advancing quickly his e and f-pawns. 16... \texttt{\textbackslash f}e8 17.\texttt{\textbackslash e}cd1 e4 18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d4 f4 19. \texttt{\textbackslash x}c6. There begin interesting tactical complications. 19...\texttt{\textbackslash h}4 20.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c3 21.\texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash x}h3! Black cannot capture immediately the bishop on e3, because he would lose his queen. Therefore, he sacrifices a piece in order to open the g-file and to remove his queen from the h4-square with tempo. 22.\texttt{\textbackslash x}h3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5+ 23.\texttt{\textbackslash g}2 fxe3 24.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}7+ – White’s compensation for the piece is insufficient, Perez Fernandez – Benlloch Guirau, ICCF 2009.

\textbf{15...\texttt{\textbackslash e}8 16.0–0 f4 17.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7 18.\texttt{\textbackslash c}e1 a5 19.\texttt{\textbackslash c}2 axb4 20.axb4 \texttt{\textbackslash g}8→}

White’s defence against the attack of Black’s pieces on the g-file will be very difficult.

\textbf{21.\texttt{\textbackslash h}1 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5}

It has already become evident that White will fail to hold the g3 and h3-squares, since his pieces cannot come in time to help in the protection of his king.

\textbf{22.\texttt{\textbackslash d}4 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 23.\texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 24.\texttt{\textbackslash e}4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e4 25.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e4 \texttt{\textbackslash a}3 26.\texttt{\textbackslash x}c6}

218
White gobbles material in complete desperation.

26...$e6 27.$xd6

His win of two pawns is absolutely irrelevant, because White’s king is beyond salvation.

27...$f6 28.$g1 $g5

Black exchanges an important defender of the enemy king.

29.$xg5 $xg5 30.$xf4

White must already pay and he only prolongs his resistance for a while sacrificing a piece.

30...$xf4 31.$h5 $g8 32.$f3 $e3 0–1 Sage – Giannetto, ICCF 2014. 33.$xe3 $xe3 34.$g4 $xg4 35.$fxg4 $h4 36.$e6 $f2 37.$f5 $xf5 38.$xf5 $e2 39.$e1 $e8−+

B2) 8.$h2

White’s knight frees a square for his bishop. He plans to play $e2–f3. The bishop will protect reliably the g2-pawn on the f3-square and will increase his control over e4. What is even more important is that Black will have great difficulties to exchange it there.

8...$e8 9.$e2 $f4 10.$f3 $f5

11.g3

White sacrifices a pawn and ousts the enemy knight to the edge of the board.

After his alternatives he has no chances of obtaining an advantage in the opening.

11.$f1. White continues with the clumsy manoeuvre of his knight. Now, he wishes to transfer it to g3, but still, this loss of three tempi, to move the knight from f3 to g3, seems too lavish. 11...$a6 12.$g3 $c5 13.0–0. White has fortified reliably the strategically important e4-square, but has lost his control over the d3-square and Black exploits this immediately. 13...$cd3 14.$xf5 $xc1 15. $f6 $cd3 16.$fxg7 $xg7+ – His pieces are much more actively deployed, Bosch – Golubev, Dieren 1999.

11.$e3 $a6

(dia gram)

12.0–0 $c5 – see 11.0–0.
12.a3 \textit{We7} 13.b4, A.T.Kolev – Ermenkov, Sunny Beach 2012. White has restricted the enemy knight on a6, but has weakened his queenside and his king would be rather unsafe if he castles queenside. 13...\textit{b8!?} oo, followed by \textit{d7-f6}. Black’s knight has nothing to do on a6 and he transfers it to a more active position.

12.h4. White is planning to push g2-g3, avoiding sacrifices. 12...\textit{We7} 13.g3, Kavalek - Karpov, Bugojno 1982, 13...\textit{h3!?} oo – After the opening of the f-file, Black’s knight on h3 will support his attack against the f2-pawn.

11.0–0. White’s kingside has been weakened by the move h2-h3, so his castling kingside looks a bit risky. 11...\textit{a6}

Following 13.b4 \textit{xe4} 14.\textit{xe4 fxe4} 15.\textit{xe4} a5 16.a3, Kuzmin – Gufeld, Baku 1972, Black can begin active actions on the queenside with the move 16...\textit{b5!} oo

13.\textit{xc5}. White solves in a radical fashion the problem with the protection of the e4-square. 13...\textit{dxc5} 14.h4. He wishes to oust the enemy knight with the move g2-g3, but with his last move creates a target for Black to organise is not in a hurry to begin active actions on the kingside and brings prudently some reserves. 14.\textit{exf5 gxf5} 15.\textit{xf4} Now, Black’s fianchettoed bishop will become much more active, without an opponent, but White could not put up for long with the enemy knight on f4. 15...\textit{exf4} 16.\textit{c1 e5} 17.\textit{c2 g7} oo Straka – Bescos Anzano, ICCF 2012. Black’s prospects are not worse. He has the two-bishop advantage and good attacking prospects on the g-file. White can hardly exploit effectively the defects of his opponent’s pawn-structure and his knight is very passive at the edge of the board.

12.\textit{e3} \textit{c5}. Black increases his pressure against the e4-pawn.

12.\textit{e1} \textit{f7} 13.\textit{e3} \textit{d7}. Black
counterplay on the kingside. 14...g5! He sacrifices temporarily a pawn in order to activate considerably his queen. 15.hxg5 \( \text{wg6} \ 16.\text{wa4 wg5} \ 17.\text{ae1 a5}. \) Black prepares the transfer of his rook to the kingside with \( \text{fa6} \text{-g6(h6)} \). 18. exf5 \( \text{xf5} \) 19.\( \text{e4}. \) White ousts the enemy queen to the 6th rank and thus impedes the transfer of his queen’s rook into the attack. 19...\( \text{wg6} \) 20.\( \text{h1} \text{-h8} \) 21.\( \text{wa3} \) c6!? Black has the two-bishop advantage and should strive to open the position. 22.g4 \( \text{ac8} \) 23.dxc6 \( \text{xc6} \) 24.\( \text{xc5 we6} \) 25.d1 \( \text{e6} \) 26.\( \text{e3 d4} \) – White has succeeded in winning a pawn, but the dominating position of Black’s knight at the middle of the board and the vulnerability of White’s g4-pawn balance the prospects, Brewer – Nefedov, ICCF 2014.

11.h4. White wishes to play g2-g3 quite comfortably, without sacrificing material. Still, in a sharp position like this, every tempo counts and the time White has lost for the move h3-h4, which was hardly necessary, may tell later. 11...\( \text{a6} \) 12.g3 (It is preferable for White to opt here for 12.\( \text{e3 we7} \) – see 11.\( \text{e3}. \) ) 12...\( \text{h5} \) 13.0–0 (After 13.exf5, Black has at his disposal an energetic pawn-break in the centre – 13...e4! 14.\( \text{e2} \) e3. His pieces will develop a crushing attack against White’s monarch, stranded in the centre. 15.g4 \( \text{exf2+} \) 16.\( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 17.\( \text{g2 gx} \text{f5} \) 18.g5 \( \text{e4} \) – White has no compensation for the compromised shelter of his king, Vorobjov – Guilleux, Lille 2012.) 13.\( \text{f6} \) 14.exf5 e4 15.\( \text{g2 gx} \text{f5} \) 16.\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{wg6} \) 17.\( \text{d2} \text{c5} \) 18.\( \text{ad1} \text{d7} \) 19.\( \text{h1 d3} \) – In order to evaluate correctly this position, it would be enough to compare the placement of the knights on d3 and h2, Cannon – Limbert, ICCF 2013.

11...\( \text{xh3} \) 12.\( \text{g2 fxe4} \)

Black must present his opponent’s pieces with the wonderful e4-square to avoid the loss of a piece.

13.\( \text{e3} \)

White protects the f2-pawn.

The move 13.\( \text{xe4} \) does not seem so precise, because after 13...\( \text{f5} \) White will have difficulties with the defence of his f2-pawn.

(digram)

The natural move 14.\( \text{e3} \) does not work, because of 14...\( \text{f4} \) – Moynihan – Jones, Kilkenny 2012. Black centralises his knight
with the help of a tactical resource. White’s compensation for the pawn is insufficient.

14...\texttt{e}6 15.\texttt{e}2 (15.f3 h5= Riazantsev – Sjugirov, Olginka 2011) 15...\texttt{d}7= Black is better and White is forced to defend. For example, the natural move 16.\texttt{e}3?! leads immediately to a lost position for him following 16...\texttt{f}4! Black sacrifices a piece, opens the e-file and begins an attack against the enemy king. 17.\texttt{x}f4 \texttt{e}x\texttt{f}4 18.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{f}3! 19.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{e}8 20.0–0–0. White’s king will not be safe on the queenside, since after 20...\texttt{a}4, Black’s queen will win the a2-pawn. 21.\texttt{g}4 \texttt{x}e4 22.\texttt{x}e4 \texttt{a}2= Stoczek – Stellwagen, Porto Carras 2011.

14.\texttt{g}4 White wishes to exchange in a tactical way the enemy bishop on f5, which protects the knight on h3. 14...h5 15.\texttt{f}6+ \texttt{x}f6 16.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}7 17.\texttt{f}5+ \texttt{x}f5 18.\texttt{x}h3 \texttt{h}8 19.\texttt{f}3 h4= Semccsen – Hillarp Persson, Gothenburg 2011. The tactical complications are over. The two-bishop advantage is not so valuable in closed positions and White does not have full compensation for the pawn.

13...\texttt{a}6 14.\texttt{x}e4

White can postpone capturing of the pawn for a few moves. 14.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{c}5 15.\texttt{xc}5 \texttt{dxc}5 16.\texttt{xe}4 \texttt{f}5 17.\texttt{g}4, Vachier Lagrave – Habu, Villandry 2011. Here, Black’s simplest road to equality is 17...\texttt{e}7=!? 18.\texttt{x}h3 \texttt{x}g4 19.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}5= – The powerful placement of White’s knight at the centre compensates his sacrificed pawn, but not more than that.

14...\texttt{b}8=??

White has fortified reliably his centre and kingside, therefore Black wishes to open a second front. He is even ready to part with his a7-pawn in order to do that.

15.\texttt{e}2

White’s capturing of the pawn would lead to simplifications which would be rather difficult to evaluate. 15.\texttt{xa}7 \texttt{f}5 16.f3 (It would not work for White to choose here 16.\texttt{xb}8, because of 16...\texttt{xe}4 17.\texttt{xe}4 \texttt{xf}2=+) 16...
3...\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{g}7\) 4.e4 d6 5.\(\text{f}3\) 0-0 6.h3 e5 7.d5 \(\text{c}5\)

\(\text{e}8\) 17.\(\text{e}3\) h5 18.a3 b5 19.\(\text{w}2\) bxc4 20.\(\text{w}c4\) \(\text{c}5\). Black sacrifices another pawn in order to eliminate the blockade of the e4-square. 21.\(\text{xc}5\) dxc5 22.\(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{f}7=\) – White has an extra pawn, but his king at the centre of the board is an excellent target for Black’s pieces, Yalov – Robson, ICCF 2012.

Following 15.\(\text{w}d2\) b6 16.f3 \(\text{c}5\) 17.\(\text{xc}5\) bxc5 18.\(\text{f}1\), Black can try an excellent positional knight-sacrifice – 18...\(\text{f}4!\) 19.gxf4 exf4. He has obtained two pawns for the piece, two powerful bishops and a clear-cut plan, connected with a kingside pawn-offensive. White can hardly coordinate his pieces and find a safe haven for his king. 20.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 21.\(\text{e}2\) h5 22.\(\text{fd}2\) g5= von Wedel – Kuhne, BdF 2013.

15...\(\text{f}5\) 16.f3 h5 17.\(\text{f}1\)

17...\(\text{f}4!\) We have already discussed this piece-sacrifice in our previous notes. 18.gxf4 exf4 19.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{b}4\) 20.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{f}7\) 21.\(\text{h}3\)

\(\text{b}8\) 22.a3 \(\text{xe}4\) 23.fxe4 \(\text{f}3\)

24.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xe}4\)+. Black has managed to win a third pawn for the piece. 25.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}4\) 26.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}4\).

Black’s attack seems to be very powerful, but White still has some resources to maintain the balance. 27.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}2\)! This move is original indeed, but still insufficient for Black to obtain an advantage. 28.\(\text{d}7\). White wishes to transfer his bishop to \(\text{b}3\) in order to trap the enemy knight on \(\text{a}2\). 28...\(\text{h}7\) 29.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{xe}3\) 30.\(\text{xe}3\), Draw, Blanco Gramajo – Robson, ICCF 2013. After 30...f2

31.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}3\) 32.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{g}3\) 33.\(\text{exf}2\) \(\text{xf}2\)+ 34.\(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{xe}3\), Black regains his piece and preserves his two extra pawns, but his king is incapable of avoiding the perpetual check. 35.\(\text{f}7\)+ \(\text{h}6\) 36.\(\text{f}8\)+ \(\text{h}7\) 37.\(\text{f}7=

B3) 8.g3

White solves radically the problem with the penetration of the enemy knight to the f4-square.
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8...\( \text{a}6 \)

Before advancing f7-f5, Black brings into the actions his queen's knight. Later, it may go to c5, increasing the pressure against the e4-square.

9.\( \text{h}2 \)

This is prophylactic against f7-f5.

9.\( \text{d}2 \) f5 10.exf5 gxf5 11.\( \text{h}4 \), Lalith - Praneeth, New Delhi 2016, 11...\( \text{f}6 \)!?

After White's other responses Black advances f7-f5 obtaining a very good position. For example: 9.a3 f5 10.b4, Berkovich - Malisauskas, Budapest 1992, 10...c5!?∞

Or 9.\( \text{g}2 \) f5 10.0-0. This castling seems a bit risky, since White's kingside has been weakened. 10...f4 11.g4 \( \text{f}6 \) 12.g5 \( \text{h}5 \) 13.a3 h6 14.gxh6 \( \text{h}6 \) 15.b4 \( \text{f}6 \)∞, followed by g6-g5 and the transfer of Black's knight to g6(h5), Laliga - Fonteneau, ICCF 2015. His prospects are not worse. If Black manages to advance g5-g4, then White's king may come under a dangerous attack.

9.\( \text{e}2 \) f5 10.exf5 gxf5 11.\( \text{g}5 \) (11.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 12.g4?! \( \text{e}7 \) 13.g1 c6+= - The position is opened and White's king is still at the centre of the board, Nalbandian - Manik, Pardubice 1996; 12.\( \text{e}3 \), Grover - Ding, Athens 2012, 12...\( \text{e}7 \)!?∞) 11...\( \text{f}6 \)

12.\( \text{c}2 \), Bachmann - Lokander, Stockholm 2016, 12...c6!?∞ - After the opening of the c-file, White's queen on c2 may turn out to be misplaced.

12.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \). Black transfers his queen to g6 and White must already fight for equality. 13.\( \text{b}3 \) (It is possible that White's best move here is 13.\( \text{c}2 \), Van Kemende - Bennett, Liverpool 2008, 13...\( \text{g}6 \)∞ - Black has no problems at all, but at least White is not worse.) 13...\( \text{g}6 \) 14.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b}4 \)± - Black creates the threat f5-f4. 15.f4. White parries his opponent's threat, but weakens his pawn-structure. 15...h6 16.\( \text{h}4 \) exf4 17.gxf4, Bachmann - Giri, Tromso 2014. Here, Black could have tried a very promising piece-sacrifice: 17...\( \text{e}4 \)!± 18.\( \text{xe}4 \) fxe4± - He has good attacking prospects and if White accepts the gift, his position would immediately become hopeless. 19.\( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{xf}4 \) 20.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 21.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{xh}3 \)=, followed by \( \text{e}8 \), or e4-e3. White will be forced to castle here in order not to be checkmated at the middle of the board. He will lose however, his bishop on f2.
3. \( \text{Cc3} \) \( \text{Gg7} \) 4.e4 d6 5.\( \text{f3} \) 0-0 6.h3 e5 7.d5 \( \text{dh5} \)  

9.\( \text{fe3} \). White plans to castle queenside and his king will be safer there than at the centre of the board. 9...f5 10.exf5 gxf5 11.\( \text{dg5} \) (11.\( \text{Fd2} \) f4\( \infty \)) Heimann – Andersen, Biel 2015; 11.\( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 12.fxg3 \( \text{xe5} \) 13.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \infty \) Gibbs – Asenov, Crawley 2016) 11...\( \text{f6} \)  

12.\( \text{Cc2} \), Goganov – Belyakov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2015, 12...c6?!\( \infty \)  
12.\( \text{Fd2} \) \( \text{We7} \). Black covers the e6-square against the penetration of the enemy knight. 13.0-0-0 h6 14.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 15.\( \text{exc5} \). White exchanges the powerful enemy knight and weakens the e5-pawn, but presents his opponent with the two-bishop advantage (There arises a very complicated position after 15.\( \text{Fe1} \) \( \text{Fe4} \) 16.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \infty \) Del Rio de Angelis – Perpinya Rofes, Montcada 2015.) 15...dxc5 16.\( \text{Fe1} \) e4 17.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{Ff7} \) 18.\( \text{Fh2} \) \( \text{e8} \) 19.f3. White opens the f-file and wishes to create pressure against the weak enemy f5-pawn. 19...exf3 20.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d6} \). Black’s knight has occupied a very good position. It not only protects the weakness on f5, but can also support his queenside counterplay with a7-a6 and b7-b5. 21.\( \text{Fd3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 22.\( \text{hfl} \) a6\( \infty \), followed by b7-b5, Romm – Raijmaekers, ICCF 2015. Black’s powerful bishop on g7 compensates the weakness of his isolated f5-pawn.  

Following 9.\( \text{Fd2} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 10.b4 \( \text{d7} \), it will be a problem for White to find a safe haven for his king, because his pawn-structure has been compromised on both flanks and to leave his king in the centre with a board full of pieces will be too precarious. 11.\( \text{Fe2} \) a5 12.bxa5 f5. Black sacrifices material trying to open the position and to organise a crushing attack against the enemy king. 13.\( \text{Fxh5} \) \( \text{gxh5} \) 14.\( \text{Fh5} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 15.\( \text{Fb3} \) \( \text{d3} \) 16.\( \text{Fh2} \) \( \text{xc1} \) 17.\( \text{Fxc1} \) \( \text{d7} \infty \) – Black has good compensation for the sacrificed pawns, Bareev – Krnan, Kitchener 2015.  

9...\( \text{Cc5} \)  

10.b4  
White ousts the enemy knight from its active position, but makes castling queenside impossible.
After 11.h4, Black can create very good counterplay on the queenside with a5-a4, c7-c6 and \( a5 \). 11...a4 12.e2 \( f6 \) 13.c2 c6 14.g4 cxd5 15.cxd5 \( a5 \) 16.0-0 \( d7 \) Troia – Galliano, ICCF 2012.

11.e2 \( f6 \) 12.e3 \( e8 \) 13.g4. This only weakens White’s kingside pawn-structure, while he fails to prevent f7-f5 anyway. 13...f5 14.gxf5 gxf5 15.f1 \( h4 \) 16.\( x5 \) dxc5 17.e2, Morgan – Conlon, Telford 2005, 17...a6! Black’s rook joins into the attack. 18.g3 \( a6=+ \)

11.g2 b6 12.0-0 \( d7 \) 13.g4 \( e8 \) 14.f3 \( h8 \) 15.e1 a4 16.c1. Black has managed to fortify his position on the queenside and now he begins active actions on the opposite side of the board. 16.f5∞ O’Hare – Barria, ICCF 2010.

10...d7 11.b1

White plays this with the idea to counter a7-a5 with a2-a3.

Following 11.d2 a5 12.a3 f5 13.g2?! \( b6=+ \), White will have permanent difficulties with the protection of the c4-square, Pa- shikian – Nedev, Plovdiv 2012.

After 11.e2 a5 12.b5, White will be incapable of breaking on the queenside, because the c5-square is reliably controlled by Black. 12...f5?! This is an interesting pawn-sacrifice for the initiative. 13.xh5 g6 14.xf5 d6 15.e2 xe4 16.e4 fxe4 17.g4 \( e8=+ \) Jakovenko – Amin, Baku 2015.

11.a5 12.a3 axb4

It will be useful for Black to open the a-file for his rook.

13.axb4 f5∞

The position is very complicated, but Black’s game is much easier from the practical point of view. For example, White’s attempt to win a pawn 14.exf5?! (It is better for him to opt for 14.g2, Milanovic – Pavlovic, Kragujevac 2013, 14...\( d6=+ \)), would lead to a difficult position for him. 14...e4! Black opens the diagonal for his bishop and frees the e5-square for his knight.
15.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{e5}\) 16.\(\text{g4}\), Aronian – R. Mamedov, Berlin 2015.

Here, Black had a very powerful resource at his disposal 16... \(\text{w}e7!\) He sacrifices a piece and begins a decisive attack. 17.\(\text{gxh5}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 18.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xa2}\). This is where the opening of the a-file proved to be very useful. 19.\(\text{wb3}\) \(\text{xf2}\) Black sacrifices another rook on the altar of the attack. 20.\(\text{xf2}\) \(\text{d3+}\) 21.\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{xf2}\) 22.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{g5}\) 23.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{g2}\) 24.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{xc3–+}\), White is incapable of avoiding huge material losses. His dis coordinated forces are helpless against the crushing offensive of his opponent’s pieces.
After this move there arises on the board the Classical system, which is the most popular and principled set-up for White in the King's Indian Defence.

It was named like this, because White plays the opening according to the classical principles. At first he occupies the centre with his pawns and develops his knights to the most natural squares in the opening – f3 and c3 and then with his last move he prepares castling kingside, so that he can evacuate his king from the centre of the board as quickly as possible.

6...e5

Black finally begins to fight for the centre.

His further plans include the move c6, in order to exert pressure against the enemy pawn-centre and to provoke the move d4-d5, after which there will begin active actions on the flanks. Then, Black will begin to prepare the typical pawn-advance for the King's Indian Defence – f7-f5.

In Chapter 18 we will analyse the Gligoric variation (7.e3) and the move 7.d5 in Chapters 19 and 20. The chapters from 21 to 27 will be devoted to White's most popular move in this position – 7.0-0.

It seems very bad for him to opt for 7.h3, because after 7...exd4 8.cxd4, Black forces the
move f2-f3. 8...\texttt{e}8 9.f3. The combination of f2-f3 and h2-h3 leads to the weakening of the dark-squares on White's kingside. Black can exploit this immediately with 9...\texttt{h}5 10.0-0, Vark – Stein, Parnu 1971, 10...c5!? 11.\texttt{c}c2 \texttt{c}c6. 

7.\texttt{g}5. This bishop-sortie should better be done after the preliminary move d4-d5 – see the Petrosian system in Chapter 20. 7...h6. This is the simplest for Black. He ousts immediately the enemy bishop. 8.\texttt{h}4 (Following 8.\texttt{x}f6?! \texttt{x}f6, Black's two-bishop advantage provides him with a stable edge.) 8...g5  

(diagram)

9.\texttt{g}3 g4. Black ousts the enemy knight to the edge of the board. 10.\texttt{h}4 exd4 11.\texttt{x}d4 \texttt{e}8. White's e4-pawn is an excellent target for attack for Black's pieces. 12.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{a}6 13.f3, Hartikainen – Ehrnrooth, Finland 1990. This move is necessary; otherwise, White cannot hold on to his e4-pawn, but now, after 13...\texttt{h}5!?+, Black seizes the initiative, forcing his opponent to begin defending.

It is possibly best for White to continue with 9.dxe5 gxh4 10. exf6 \texttt{x}f6 11.\texttt{d}2, Korchnoi – Kavalek, Buenos Aires 1978, 11...\texttt{a}6\infty – Black's bishops are very powerful, but his kingside pawn-structure has been weakened.
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1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 g6 3.²c3 ²g7 4.e4 d6 5.²f3 0–0 6.²e2 e5 7.dxe5

The Exchange Variation

White cannot fight in this way for an advantage in the opening, but this line is still often played in the tournament practice and Black must be well prepared for it.

As a rule, White uses this exchange in three cases:

1. When the rating of the Black player is much higher and White plays for a draw.

2. When the draw is a quite suitable result for the White player according to his tournament situation.

3. When the White player considers that he plays endgames better than his opponent.

7...dxe5 8.²xd8

About 8.0–0 ²c6 – see Chapter 21.

Following 8.²g5, there arises an endgame again. 8...²xd1+ 9.²xd1 ²a6. Black protects his c7-pawn and prepares the transfer of his knight to the c5-square, from where it will exert pressure against the e4-square. 10.0–0 (Capturing of the pawn 10.²xe5, Mickevicius – Kotronias, Pardubice 2007, leads to simplifications: 10...²xe4!? 11.²xe4 ²xe5=) 10...²c5 11.²xf6 ²xf6. White parts with his powerful dark-squared bishop and prepares the penetration of his knight to the d5-square. 12.b4 ²e6 13.²d5, Vospernik – Tratar, Ljubljana 1993, 13...²g7 14.²e7+ ²h8 15.²xc8. This is a very sensible decision. White deprives immediately his opponent of the two-bishop advantage, which might tell in the future. 15...²fxc8!? 16.c5 a5= – The position has been considerably simplified and the draw is the most likely result.

8...²xd8

(diagram)

Now, White has a choice. He can play immediately A) 9.²d5,
or can develop at first his bishop to an active position B) 9.\textit{\textbackslash a}g5.

9.\textit{\textbackslash d}xe5. This move is played with the idea to end the game in a quick draw. 9...\textit{\textbackslash d}xe4. Black regains his pawn and the position is quickly simplified. 10.\textit{\textbackslash d}xe4 (10. \textit{\textbackslash d}xf7? \textit{\textbackslash d}xc3=+) 10...\textit{\textbackslash d}xe5 11.\textit{\textbackslash g}5. This is White’s most precise move. (After the too peaceful approach 11.0–0, White suddenly encounters difficulties. 11...\textit{\textbackslash c}6\textsuperscript{=} Black’s knight is quickly centralised. 12. \textit{\textbackslash e}e1 \textit{\textbackslash g}7. This is necessary prophylactic. Black covers the f6-square and deprives his opponent of the possibility to play \textit{\textbackslash g}5 and \textit{\textbackslash f}6. 13.a3 \textit{\textbackslash f}5 14.\textit{\textbackslash g}3, Sanchez – Geller, Saltsjobaden 1952, 14... \textit{\textbackslash c}2?!\textsuperscript{=} – Black’s bishop on e5 exerts powerful pressure against the b2-square and White can hardly complete the development of his queenside pieces without material losses.) 11...\textit{\textbackslash x}xb2 12.\textit{\textbackslash b}1. This is again the best move for White. (After the straightforward move 12.\textit{\textbackslash x}d8, Black may even try to fight for the advantage. 12...\textit{\textbackslash x}a1 13.\textit{\textbackslash x}c7 \textit{\textbackslash c}6. He has a superior pawn-structure and White’s temporary piece-activity is gradually neutralised. 14.0–0 \textit{\textbackslash g}7 15.\textit{\textbackslash d}d6 \textit{\textbackslash d}4 16.\textit{\textbackslash d}3 \textit{\textbackslash e}6 17.\textit{\textbackslash a}5 \textit{\textbackslash b}6 18.\textit{\textbackslash e}4 \textit{\textbackslash b}8 19.\textit{\textbackslash b}4, Pisacane – Scerbo, St Eufemia d’Aspromonte 2011, 19... \textit{\textbackslash d}4!?? 12...\textit{\textbackslash e}e8 13.\textit{\textbackslash x}b2 \textit{\textbackslash x}e4 14.0–0. The two-bishop advantage is an important factor for the evaluation of an open position and here, despite the absence of a pawn, White manages to maintain the balance. 14...\textit{\textbackslash c}6 15.\textit{\textbackslash c}5, Lunev – Gavritenkov, Tula 2000 (15.\textit{\textbackslash d}1 \textit{\textbackslash g}7=) 15...\textit{\textbackslash d}4!? 16.\textit{\textbackslash d}3 \textit{\textbackslash e}5 17.\textit{\textbackslash e}3 \textit{\textbackslash e}6=)

A) 9.\textit{\textbackslash d}d5

This move leads to numerous exchanges and quick simplifications. It is used by White when he wishes to draw as quickly as possible.

9...\textit{\textbackslash x}d5 10.\textit{\textbackslash x}d5 \textit{\textbackslash c}6

Black should better get rid immediately of his backward pawn.

11.\textit{\textbackslash c}4

White would not mind the exchange of the pawns, but wishes
to deploy his bishop to a powerful position at the middle of the board.

Following 11.\textit{g}5 f6 12.dxc6 \textit{xc}6 13.\textit{c}4+, Matjushin – Go
ganov, Samara 2014, the simplest way for Black to equalise is to play 13...\textit{f}8!?=, centralising his king.

\textbf{11...b5}

Black plans to exchange on d5 only after his bishop has been de
developed to the b7-square.

\textbf{12.\textit{b}3}

After 12.\textit{g}5?! f6 13.\textit{b}3 cxd5 14.\textit{c}1 \textit{e}6\textsuperscript{\texttt{f}}, White’s compensation for the pawn is insufficient, Haritakis – Kotr onias, Poros 1998.

\textbf{12...\textit{b}7 13.\textit{g}5 \textit{d}7}

\textbf{14.\textit{c}1}

After this move White is at least not worse. His alternatives should better be avoided.

For example: 14.dxc6 – this exchange only helps the development of Black’s pieces. 14...\textit{xc}6 15.\textit{d}5, Pham Chuong – Nguyen Duc Hoa, Ho Chi Minh City 2015. Here, Black has an interesting sacrifice: 15...\textit{xd}5!? 16.exd5 \textit{b}4 17.0–0 e4 18.\textit{d}2 \textit{xd}5\textsuperscript{\texttt{f}} – He has a pawn for the exchange and his minor pieces exert powerful pressure against White’s queenside. In fact, he must already fight for equality.

White ends up with a weak isolated pawn on d5 after the careless line: 14.0–0–0 cxd5 15.\textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 16.\textit{xd}5 (16.exd5? Herraiz Hidalgo – Illescas Cordoba, Ay
amonte 2002, 16...\textit{a}6\textsuperscript{\texttt{f}}+) 16...\textit{xd}5 17.exd5 \textit{d}7 18.\textit{d}1 \textit{c}8+ 19. \textit{b}1 f6 20.\textit{e}3 a6 21.\textit{d}2 f5\textsuperscript{\texttt{f}}, followed by the centralisation of the king and advancing the pawns in the centre and on the kingside, Bustamante – Castro, San Carlos 2012.

\textbf{14...a5}

\textbf{15.\textit{e}2}

White connects his rooks. This is better for him than castling, because the king is an important
battle unit in the endgame and should better remain in the centre than on the flank.

15.a3. This move seems less precise for White 15...a4 16.\texttt{\texttt{a}a2} b4?! Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 17.axb4 cxd5 18.\texttt{\texttt{x}d}5 \texttt{a}6 19.\texttt{\texttt{x}b}7 \texttt{xb}7= – He will restore the material balance on his next move and White will have to play very precisely in order to neutralise his opponent's pressure against the b2-pawn, Oli-lier – Feryn, Troyes 2010.

15...a4 16.dxc6 \texttt{\texttt{c}xc6} 17.\texttt{\texttt{d}d}5 \texttt{d}4+ 18.\texttt{\texttt{x}d}4 \texttt{exd}4 19.\texttt{\texttt{x}b}7

The character of the position remains more or less the same after 19.\texttt{\texttt{c}c}5 \texttt{h}6 20.\texttt{\texttt{d}d}2 d3+! – this is Black's simplest road to equality. He sacrifices temporarily a pawn and activates considerably his bishop on g7, as well as creates a pin against the enemy king. 21.\texttt{\texttt{x}d}3 \texttt{ad}8 22.\texttt{\texttt{c}c}2 \texttt{\texttt{x}d}5 23.exd5 \texttt{\texttt{x}d}5 24.\texttt{\texttt{x}d}5 \texttt{\texttt{x}d}5= and later, in the game Chabanon – Bacrot, Nimes 2014, Black succeeded in exploiting White’s imprecise play and even scored a victory.

(diagram)

19...d3+. This is an important intermediate check; otherwise, White would have played \texttt{\texttt{d}d}3, fixing the enemy pawn on a square with the same colour as his bishop. 20.\texttt{\texttt{f}f}3 \texttt{\texttt{x}b}7 21.b3 \texttt{h}6 22.\texttt{\texttt{e}e}3 \texttt{axb}3 23.axb3 \texttt{a}3

24.\texttt{\texttt{c}c}8+ \texttt{\texttt{h}h}7 25.b4 \texttt{\texttt{b}b}3 26.\texttt{\texttt{d}d}2 \texttt{h}5= Le Quang Liem – Ding Liren, Tabriz 2014. Black’s rook on b2 is an important defender (protecting his d3-pawn), as well as a good attacker (exerting pressure against the b4-pawn). White cannot exploit the vulnerability of the enemy pawns on b5 and d3, because his own pawn on b4 needs protection.

B) 9.\texttt{\texttt{g}g}5

Now, Black must consider the threats \texttt{\texttt{d}d}5 and \texttt{\texttt{f}f}6.

9...\texttt{\texttt{e}e}8

This is the simplest solution for him. He removes his rook.
from the pin and defends at the same time his e5-pawn.

We will analyse now B1) 10.0-0-0 and B2) 10.\textit{\text{d}5}.

White’s attempt to win a pawn would not work 10.\textit{x}xf6 \textit{x}xf6 11.\textit{\text{d}5}, because Black has the resource 11.\textit{\text{d}8+}, protecting his pawn and removing his bishop from the attack at the same time, S.Ivanov – Bakalarz, Myslowice 1985. White has no compensation for the vulnerability of his d4-square and Black’s two powerful bishops.

B1) 10.0-0-0

White wishes to exploit the lag of development of Black's queenside pieces. Still, the move 10.0-0-0 is connected with a certain strategical risk. If Black manages to mobilise his still undeveloped pieces and to trade the dark-squared bishops, White will have no compensation for the vulnerability of the d4-square and his “bad” bishop on e2.

10...\textit{\text{a}6}

From this square Black’s knight can join quickly in the fight for the important d4-square with \textit{\text{a}6-c5-e6}.

(diagram)

11.\textit{\text{e}1}

This is a multi-purpose move. White not only prepares the transfer of his knight to c2, from where it will control the important b4 and d4-squares, but also prepares f2-f3, after which he will be able to play \textit{\text{e}3}, without being afraid of the knight-sortie \textit{\text{g}4}.

It is not good for White to play here 11.\textit{\text{c}5}. He fails to preserve his extra pawn and this capturing only enhances the activation of the enemy pieces. 11...\textit{\text{c}5} 12.\textit{\text{x}xf6} \textit{\text{x}xf6} 13.f4 c6 14.b4 \textit{\text{x}e}5 15.\textit{\text{x}e}5 \textit{d}7 16.e6 \textit{\text{x}e}6. Black has a superior pawn-structure and if he manages to develop his queenside pieces without positional concessions, he will maintain the advantage. 17.\textit{\text{g}4} \textit{\text{e}7} 18.b5, Haik – Spassky, Montpellier 1991, 18...\textit{\text{b}6}! 19.\textit{\text{d}8+} \textit{\text{g}7} 20.\textit{\text{x}c}8 \textit{\text{x}c}8 21.\textit{\text{x}c}8 \textit{\text{x}c}8 – White’s isolated e4-pawn is weak, so Black maintains a slight but stable edge.

11.h3 \textit{\text{c}5} 12.\textit{\text{d}3}. White protects his e4-pawn, but presents his opponent with the two-bishop advantage. 12...\textit{\text{h}6} 13.\textit{\text{e}3} \textit{\text{x}d}3+ 14.\textit{\text{x}d}3, Nguyen – Rzayev, Vung Tau 2008, 14...\textit{\text{c}6}! 15.\textit{\text{h}d}1 \textit{\text{e}6} 16.b3 \textit{\text{b}5}=

11.\textit{\text{d}2}. This is a good alterna-
tive to the move \( \text{c}e1 \) – White prepares the transfer of his knight to b3, from where it will control the weak d4-square and will contribute to the occupation of additional space on the queenside (c4-c5).

11...c6 12.\( \text{c}b3 \) (12.f3 \( \text{c}c5 \) 13.\( \text{e}e3 \) \( \text{d}d7 \) 14.h4 a5 15.h5 \( \text{f}f8 \)) – If Black succeeds in trading the bishop on e3 (\( \text{e}e6 \), \( \text{f}f8 \), \( \text{c}c5 \)), he will manage to fight for the advantage, Osipov – Matyukhin, ICCF 2007.)

12...h6 13.\( \text{h}h4 \) (13.\( \text{e}e3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 14.\( \text{x}g4 \) \( \text{x}g4 \)) – Gerhards – Boger, ICCF 2003) 13...\( \text{c}c7 \). White has taken the c5-square under control, but Black’s knight can go to e6 via another route. 14.f3 \( \text{e}6 \) 15.\( \text{f}f2 \) \( \text{f}f8 \) 16.\( \text{b}b1 \) (following 16.\( \text{c}c5 \) \( \text{d}d7 \) 17.\( \text{a}a4 \), Black has the freeing pawn-advance 17...b5 18.\( \text{c}xb6 \) axb6 19.\( \text{c}xb6 \) \( \text{c}xb6 \) 20.\( \text{c}xb6 \) \( \text{x}a2 \) 21.\( \text{c}c1 \) \( \text{x}a8 \)) – Dudukin – Demin, Kaluga 2003)

16...\( \text{d}d7 \) 17.\( \text{d}d2 \) b6 18.\( \text{h}d1 \) – Black has succeeded in winning the fight for the c5-square and his prospects in the forthcoming fight are at least not worse, Mosquera – Contreras, Santa Rosa 2011.

\[ \text{11...c5 12.f3 e6 13.e3} \]

(diagram)

\[ \text{13...b6} \]

Black prepares the development of his bishop to b7.

\[ \text{14.d2} \]

The character of the position would not change after \[ 14.c2 \] \( \text{b7} \) 15.\( \text{d}d2 \), Toth – Kapengut, Kecskemet 1972, 15...\( \text{ed}8 \) 16.\( \text{hd}1 \)

\[ \text{xd2} \] 17.\( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \), followed by \[ c7-c5 \] and \( \text{d}4 \) and eventually f7-f5. The weaknesses of the d4 and d5-squares would approximately balance each other.

\[ \text{14...c7} \] 15.\( \text{d}d3 \) \( \text{ed}8 \) 16.\( \text{d}d1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 17.c5 \( \text{d}4 \) 18.\( \text{a}c2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) – Black’s perfectly centralised knight provides him with at least equal prospects, Oger – Nefedov, ICCF 2009.

\[ \text{B2) 10.d5 xd5 11.cxd5} \]

\[ \text{c6} \]

Black undermines his opponent’s powerful pawn and obtains a very good position.
12...\texttt{c4} 
This is the best for White and if he tries something else he may even fail to equalise.

12.0–0. This is a risky move and White ends up with an isolated pawn after it. 12...cxd5 13.exd5 \texttt{d7} 14.\texttt{xd1} h6 15.\texttt{e3} \texttt{d8} 16.d6 \texttt{b6} 17.\texttt{ac1} \texttt{e6}+ – His passed d6-pawn is much rather a liability than strength, Postl – Krause, ICCF 2008.

12.0–0–0. This move also leads to the formation of an isolated pawn for White on d5. 12...h6 13.e3 cxd5 14.b5 \texttt{d8} 15.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 16.exd5 \texttt{d7} 17.\texttt{xd7} \texttt{d7}. Black's plan is very simple now. He must activate his king (after the preliminary move f7–f5). 18.\texttt{b1} f5 19.\texttt{c1} b6 20.\texttt{c7} \texttt{f6} 21.\texttt{c6} \texttt{d5} 22.\texttt{c6} 23.\texttt{d6} \texttt{xe3} 24.\texttt{d7}+ \texttt{e6} 25.\texttt{g7} \texttt{g4} 26.\texttt{g6}+ \texttt{d5}+ – Black’s king and knight are much more active than their counterparts in this endgame, Michiels – Poljakov, ICCF 2014.

Following 12.d6, White's pawn is isolated from the rest of his forces and might perish later. 12...f6 13.e3 \texttt{e6}, Di Pasquale – Goldwaser, Villa Ballester 2006, 14.0–0–0 and here, Black can simply capture on a2: 14...\texttt{xa2}!? 15.\texttt{c2} \texttt{e6}. White’s compensation for the lost material is insufficient.

12.dxc6. This move only helps the development of Black’s pieces. 12...\texttt{xc6} 13.b5 \texttt{e6} 14.\texttt{xc6}. After this move Black’s two-bishop advantage is a much more important factor for the evaluation of the position than the isolated pawn on c6. 14...\texttt{eb8} 15.\texttt{b3} a5 17.\texttt{d2} a4 \texttt{Daebler – Huber, Bayern 2005.}

The position is simplified after 12.\texttt{d1} cxd5 13.b5 \texttt{d7} 14.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{xb5} 15.\texttt{xb5} b6 16.e2 \texttt{d7} 17.\texttt{c1} \texttt{ac8} 18.\texttt{xc8} \texttt{xc8} 19.\texttt{ac5} 20.e3 \texttt{xe4} 21.\texttt{xe5} f5= Gacnik – Cantelli, ICCF 2014.

12...cxd5 13.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{d7}

From this square Black’s knight may go to f6, from where it will exert pressure against the d5 and e4-squares, or may go to c5, in order to trade the powerful enemy bishop after \texttt{e6}.

14.\texttt{d2}
White protects his e4-pawn and prepares the retreat of his bishop from d5 after \texttt{f6}.

12.dxc6. This move only helps
choose here 14.0–0, because his king is removed away from the centre and this is not good in an endgame. In addition, after 14...h6 15.\&e3 \&f6, the e4-pawn is defenceless and the bishop cannot retreat from the d5-square, so Black obtains the two-bishop advantage. 16.\&fd1 \&xd5 17.\&xd5 b6 18.\&d2 \&e6 19.\&d3 \&ac8 20.a4 f5+ Kachar – Fedorov, Saratov 2006.

14.\&e2 h6 15.\&e3 (15.\&h4?! g5 16.\&g3. White’s bishop is very passive on this square. 16...\&f6 17.\&ad1 \&xd5 18.\&xd5 \&e6+ Hahn – Traut, BdF 2003) 15...\&f6 16.\&hd1 \&xd5 17.\&xd5 \&e6 18.\&e5 b6 19.\&cc1, Perez Mauricio – San Emeterio Cabanes, Oropesa del Mar 2001, 19...\&ac8!?? – Black’s bishops are very powerful and White is doomed to a long and laborious defence of an inferior endgame without any chances of obtaining an active counterplay.

There arises an equal position after 14.0–0–0 h6 15.\&h4 \&b6 16.\&b3, Ki.Georgiev – Uhlmann, Szirak 1985, 16...\&d7=

The move 14.\&c1 cannot be recommended, because following 14...h6 15.\&e3 \&f6 16.\&b3 \&xe4 17.\&c7 \&e6 18.\&xe6 \&xe6 19.\&xb7 \&a6, White regains his pawn indeed, but Black seizes firmly the initiative. 20.a3 \&d6. He ousts the enemy rook from its active placement and prepares e5–e4, after which his bishop will become much more active. 21.\&b4 \&c6 22.0–0 a5 23.\&a4 e4 24.\&d2 \&xb2 25.\&xh6 \&c3 26.\&xe4 \&xe4 27.\&xe4 a4 28.\&e2 \&xa3. The exchange of the h-pawn for the a-pawn is evidently in favour of Black. White will have difficulties to fight against Black’s outside passed pawn. 29.\&a2 \&b3 30.g3 \&b4 31.\&c1 a3 32.\&cc2 f6+ Rumyantsev – Tsygankov, ICCF 2012.

14...\&c5

15.0–0–0

About 15.\&e2 \&e6 16.\&e3 \&f4 – see 15.\&e3.

The move 15.0–0 leads to a complicated position. 15...\&e6 16.\&ac1 (16.\&xe6 \&xe6 17.\&e3 f5!?) 16...\&xd5 17.exd5 b6 18.d6 f6 19.\&e3 \&e6 20.\&fd1 \&ed8 21.\&c4 \&ac8 22.\&d5 \&f8 23.b3 \&f7\&f7\&f7 Just – Nieuwland, ICCF 2014. White can hardly obtain anything meaningful out of his passed d6-pawn. Meanwhile, Black may try to encircle and gobble it after some
time and this would provide him with a clear advantage.

15...c4. The threat of the penetration of this knight to the d6-square can be easily parried by Black. 15...f8 16.0-0 (16.f3 \(\text{xe}6=\)) 16...e6 17.fd1 xd5 18. exd5 b6 19.d6 \(\text{ac}8\) 20.ac1 \(\text{d}7\).

Black blocks reliably his opponent’s passed pawn. 21.a4 \(\text{c}6\) 22.e3 \(\text{ec}8\) 23.b3 f6. He does not forget to centralise his king. 24.f4 \(\text{f}7\) 25.fxe5 fxe5 26.d5 \(\text{e}6\) 27.cd1 a6= Rassler – Sikorsky, ICCF 2014.

Following 15.e3 \(\text{d}3+\) 16. \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}4+\) 17.fx e4 \(\text{f}4\), Black’s two-bishop advantage will compensate his undeveloped queen-side and the powerful placement of White’s bishop on d5.

18.e4 \(\text{e}6\) 19.f3 \(\text{xd}5\) – see 18.f3.

18.f3. White attacks immediately his opponent’s weak pawn. 18...e6 19.c4 \(\text{xd}5\) 20. exd5. Black loses his two-bishop advantage, but trades White’s powerful bishop. 20...ed8 21. ad1 \(\text{ac}8\) 22.b3 \(\text{c}5\) 23.d6 (Following 23.fx e4 \(\text{xd}5\) 24.xd5 \(\text{xd}5=\), White must still play very precisely, because Black’s bishop may turn out to be more powerful than White’s knight in actions on both sides of the board in this position, Schuster – Nieuwland, ICCF 2005.) 23...b5. White’s knight was too powerful on the c4-square. It protected the pawn on d6 and impeded the possibility for Black’s rook to occupy the c2-square. 24.a5 \(\text{c}3+\) 25.xf4 \(\text{h}6+\) 26. \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{c}2\). Black has activated considerably his forces by sacrificing a pawn. 27.b4 \(\text{d}7\) 28.a4 \(\text{g}7+\) 29.d5 \(\text{f}8\) 30.axb5 \(\text{xd}6+\). White’s king is seriously endangered. Black cannot checkmate immediately, but White will have to part with some material in order to avoid this. 31.e4 f5+ 32.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}3+\) 33.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}6\) 34.f3 \(\text{d}6+\) 35.g5 \(\text{e}2\) 36.\(\text{h}1\) h6+ 37.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{xh}2++\) Sindelar – Elbridge, ICCF 2013.

18.ac1. This is not a sacrifice, but an exchange of the b2 and b7-pawns. 18...xb2 19.c7 \(\text{e}6\) 20. \(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xe}6\) 21.xb7 (It seems less precise for White to choose here 21.b1 \(\text{e}5\) 22.cx b7 \(\text{a}6\) – He will have great difficulties to protect his a2-pawn, Yanin – Shchechachev, Nizhnij Novgorod 1998.) 21...c3 22.c1 \(\text{xd}2\) 23.xd2 \(\text{d}8+\) 24.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{xe}4+\). Black has managed to win a pawn, but he is unlikely to realise it in this endgame with four rooks. 25.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 26.\(\text{c}2\) g5 27.\(\text{g}4\) a6 28.\(\text{xc}7\) \(\text{f}8\) 29.\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{a}5\) 30.a4 \(\text{xa}4\) 31.e5 f3+
32.\texttt{xf3} h6 33.\texttt{g3} \texttt{g7}= Jankowiak – Krebs, ICCF 2010. Black’s material advantage is practically irrelevant, because his rook on f8 is too passive.

15.\texttt{xe6} 16.\texttt{xe6} \texttt{xe6} 17.\texttt{e3}

It would be too artificial for White to try to transfer his bishop to the b2-square: 19.\texttt{b3} \texttt{f8} 20.\texttt{c4} \texttt{d4} 21.\texttt{c1} f6 22.\texttt{b2} \texttt{e6} 23.\texttt{e3} \texttt{c5}= Kovacs – Piantedosi, ICCF 2014.

After 19.\texttt{xf3}, Black will gradually equalise: 19...\texttt{e7} 20.\texttt{c1} \texttt{xc1}+ 21.\texttt{xc1} f6 22.\texttt{c6}, Falatowicz – Tsygankov, ICCF 2014, 22...\texttt{f7}=, followed by \texttt{ec7}, trading the active enemy rook.

19...\texttt{f8} 20.\texttt{xc8} \texttt{xc8} 21.\texttt{d1} f6 22.\texttt{b3}

22...\texttt{e7}

Black defends against the possible penetration of White’s rook to the d7-square.

23.\texttt{c1} \texttt{c5}

Black has succeeded in transferring his bishop to c5 and after the exchange of the bishops he will have no problems whatsoever.

24.\texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 25.f3 \texttt{e6} 26.\texttt{e2} \texttt{f7} 27.\texttt{d2} \texttt{h5}= Rajmaekers – Papenin, ICCF 2011.
With this move there arises a variation, named after the Yugoslavian grandmaster Svetozar Gligoric, who contributed greatly to its development.

White postpones for a while his castling and makes a useful move, fortifying the d4-pawn and impedes the move c6, which is standard for Black in the Classical system.

7...g4
This is his most natural response. He exploits the main drawback of the Gligoric variation – the unstable placement of the bishop on e3 and begins an immediate chase after it.

Black is clearly worse after the straightforward approach 7...c6 8.d5 e7 9.d2 – White has deployed quite harmoniously his pieces. Now, Black cannot play f6-g4, while his active attempts on the kingside (e8 and f7-f5) would not be so effective, because White would not need to be in a hurry to castle kingside.

8.g5
It is useful for White to provoke the pawn-advance f7-f6, because the pawn will restrict Black's g7 on this square and his knight on g4 will not be able to go back to f6.

8...f6
Now, White must choose
where to retreat his bishop: A) 9.\textit{\texttt{c1}}, or B) 9.\textit{\texttt{h4}}.

9.\textit{\texttt{d2} exd4}. White weakens his control over the d4-square and Black exploits this immediately. 10.\textit{\texttt{xd4} f5} 11.\textit{\texttt{wg4} fxg4} 12.\textit{\texttt{e3} \texttt{c6} bxc6} 14.\textit{\texttt{d4} \texttt{h6} 15.0-0 \texttt{b8} 16.b3 c5 17.\textit{\texttt{e3} \texttt{g7}} 18.\textit{\texttt{c1} \texttt{h4}} 19.\textit{\texttt{a3} \texttt{b8}} 20.\textit{\texttt{e3} \texttt{xe4}} Jastrzebska – Coleby, ICCF 2012.

A) 9.\textit{\texttt{c1}}

The bishop goes back to its initial position. The moves Black has played “for free” – \textit{\texttt{g4} and \texttt{f7-f6}} are not so useful for him. In addition, there is some obvious disharmony in the deployment of his pieces.

9...\textit{\texttt{c6}}

Black exerts pressure against his opponent’s centre.

Once again White has a choice: he may close the centre A2) 10.\textit{\texttt{d5}}, or play A1) 10.0-0.

After White’s alternatives Black has no problems at all.

The move 10.dxe5 has the defect that Black does not need to worry about his knight on g4. 10...\textit{\texttt{gxe5} f5} 12.\textit{\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} 13.exf5 \texttt{xf5} 14.\textit{\texttt{d2} \texttt{g4}} – He has activated his knight on g4 and his bishop on g7, Tunik – Kant-sler, Israel 2002.

10.h3. This move is not so useful for White. 10...exd4. Naturally, Black should better retreat his knight in the centre and not at the edge of the board. 11.\textit{\texttt{xd4} (It seems rather artificial for White to play here 11.\texttt{b5}, Boensch – Kindermann, Munich 1992, 11...\texttt{ge5}! 12.\texttt{bxd4} f5+) 11...\texttt{ge5} 12.\textit{\texttt{xc6} (12.\texttt{e3} \texttt{d4} 13.\textit{\texttt{xd4} f5} 14.exf5 \texttt{xf5} 15.0-0 \texttt{e6} =, followed by \texttt{h4}, Parker – Buckley, Guildford 1991. Black’s pieces are very actively placed.) 12...\texttt{bxc6} 13.f4 \texttt{f7} 14.0-0 f5 15.exf5 \texttt{xf5} 16.\texttt{f3} \texttt{b8} = El Debs – Mecking, Caxias do Sul 2012. Black protects his c6-pawn in a tactical way and with his next move he will develop his queen to an active position with \texttt{b6} and his prospects in the forthcoming fight will not be worse at all.

A1) 10.0-0 \texttt{f5}

Now, you can see the main drawback of the move 9.\textit{\texttt{c1}}, in comparison to 9.\textit{\texttt{h4}}. White’s bishop does not pin the pawn on f6 and Black advances easily f6-f5.
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11.\textbf{g5}

White attacks the enemy queen and wins a tempo for development. He has no chances of obtaining an advantage after his alternatives.

Or 11.exf5 exd4 12.\textbf{b5} (12.\textbf{g5} \textbf{d7} – see 11.\textbf{g5}) 12...\textbf{xf5} 13.\textbf{fxd4} \textbf{xd4} 14.\textbf{xd4}, Perez Lopez – Fernandez Gonzalez, Gijon 2000. Now, Black counterattacks the h2-pawn and forces the enemy knight to abandon the centre of the board: 14...\textbf{h4}!? 15.\textbf{f3} and later, he increases his pressure on the long diagonal 15...\textbf{f6}=, impeding the development of White's queenside pieces.

It would be too straightforward for him to opt for 11.dxe5 \textbf{gxe5} 12.\textbf{xf5} \textbf{xf5}. He has reduced the pawn-tension in the centre, while Black's pieces have been considerably activated. 13.\textbf{xe5} (13.\textbf{e3} \textbf{g4} 14.\textbf{g5} \textbf{d7} 15.\textbf{d2} \textbf{ae8}= Portisch – Z.Polgar, Prague 1995) 13...dxe5. Black will hardly manage to exploit effectively the vulnerability of White's isolated pawn, but his knight will occupy a powerful position at the centre of the board with the support of his e5-pawn. 14.\textbf{f3}, Cebalo – Nunn, Debrecen 1992, 14...\textbf{xd1}!? 15.\textbf{xd1} \textbf{d4}. This pawn-sacrifice is Black's simplest road to equality. 16.\textbf{xb7} \textbf{ab8} 17.\textbf{d5+} \textbf{h8} 18.\textbf{e4} \textbf{xe4} 19.\textbf{xe4} \textbf{ec2} 20.\textbf{b1} \textbf{a3}= – White can avoid the repetition of moves only at the price of material losses.

It is not good for White to play 11.d5 \textbf{e7}. Black obtains a position, which will be analysed, beginning with Chapter 22, but with two extra moves – \textbf{g4} and \textbf{f7-f5}. 12.\textbf{g5} (12.\textbf{fxf5} \textbf{gf5} 13.\textbf{g5} \textbf{f6} 14.\textbf{f4} e4 15.\textbf{e3} \textbf{h6} 16.\textbf{h3}. White's knight has been ousted to the edge of the board and Black can begin active actions in the centre. 16...c6∞ Rossiter – Howell, Oakham 1994) 12...\textbf{f6} 13.\textbf{f3} (13.\textbf{xf5} \textbf{gf5} – see 12.\textbf{xf5}) 13...\textbf{f4} 14.\textbf{c5} (14.\textbf{b4} \textbf{e8∞} – He retreats his knight to this square, analogously to Chapters 24-25, 9.b4) 14...\textbf{h6}. This is the simplest move for him. Black refrains from capturing the pawn in order to impede the development of his opponent's initiative on the queenside. 15.\textbf{e6} \textbf{xe6} 16.dxe6. White has succeeded in trading his opponent's important light-squared bishop, but after 16...\textbf{xc5}, his compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient. 17.\textbf{b3} \textbf{d4+} 18.\textbf{h1} \textbf{b4} 19.\textbf{c2} \textbf{c6}. Black
prepares the transfer of his knight to the centre of the board. 20.e7 \textit{f7} 21.b5 d4 22.xd4 cxd4 23.c4 xe7 24.d2 e8 – He has two pawns for the exchange, while White will hardly manage to activate his rooks, since there are no open files on the board, Kunze – Hohlbein, freechess.de 2012.
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\end{center}

11...\textit{d7}

Black's queen will impede the development of his bishop on c8 on this square, but the queen will go soon to f7 and he will coordinate advantageously his pieces.
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12.dxe5

12.exf5 exd4 13.f6. After the exchange of the f-pawn for the d-pawn, the position will become approximately equal (13.b5 xf5= Saric – B.Smith, Zagreb 2012). 13...xf6 14.xd4 e4 15.xe4 xd4 16.d3 e6= Le Quang Liem – Gharamian, Bel
dfort 2012.

After 12.d5. Black should better retreat his knight not to e7, where it will not have any good prospects, but to d8, followed by \textit{f7}. 12...\textit{d8} 13.exf5 (There arise interesting complications after 13.d2 \textit{f7} 14.h4, Andersen – Kristiansen, Helsingor 2013, 14...g5!? 15.exf5 xh2 16.xh2 gxh4 17.g4 hxg3+ 18.fxg3 g5 – White’s king is rather unsafe and that might tell in the future.) 13...gxf5 14.d2 (14.e1 f7=) 14...\textit{f7} 15.h4 h6 16.c2 h8! Black continues to improve the placement of his knight. It is headed now for the g6-square! 17.h3 \textit{f6} 18.g5 xg5 19.xg5 g7 20.f3 g6 – White will have great difficulties to parry his opponent’s attack on the g-file, Dimitrov – Vasilev, ICCF 2013.

12...fxe4

There arise simplifications after the pawn exchanges in the centre.

13.xe4 gxe5 14.xe5 \textit{xe5}
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15.\textit{c1}

White prepares the trade of the enemy bishop on g7.
Chapter 18

He could have played the move 15.\textit{d}2 with the same purpose, but after that Black would equalise immediately by a double attack against the knight on e4 and the pawn on c4. 15...\textit{c}6!? 16.\textit{c}3 \textit{x}c4 17.\textit{x}c4+ \textit{x}c4 18.\textit{d}5 \textit{c}6 19.\textit{e}7+ \textit{h}8 20.\textit{x}d6 \textit{b}5= – White’s pieces are active, but Black has the two-bishop advantage, moreover that White’s b2-pawn is hanging...

15...\textit{f}7 16.\textit{h}6 \textit{x}h6 17. \textit{h}6 \textit{f}5= It would be useful for Black to oust the enemy knight away from the centre of the board. Following 18.\textit{g}5 \textit{g}7 19.\textit{x}g7+ \textit{x}g7+= Portisch – Hineise, Zurich 2009, there arises an advantageous exchange of the queens for Black. (White’s king was safer, because it was protected by three pawns, while Black’s king was defended only by two pawns. This circumstance is irrelevant in the endgame, though...). Black has a slight edge in this position, because of his more active minor pieces.

A2) 10.\textit{d}5 \textit{d}4

This retreat of the knight in the centre seems more active than \textit{e}7.

(digram)

11.\textit{x}d4

White creates a pawn-weakness for his opponent on d4, but Black has sufficient compensation for it.

Following 11.h3 \textit{xe}2 12.\textit{xe}2 \textit{h}6, the focus of the fight is moved to the flanks. Black will prepare a pawn-offensive on the kingside and White will do that on the queenside.

13.\textit{d}2 c5 14.g4 \textit{f}7 15.0–0–0 \textit{a}6= Rychagov – Khotenashvili, Rethymnon 2010.

The move 13.a4 leads to a complicated position. 13...\textit{d}f7 14. 0–0 f5 15.a5 f4. Black’s attack on the kingside may turn out to be very powerful, because White’s king shelter has been weakened by the move h2-h3. 16.\textit{d}2 \textit{g}5 17.\textit{xc}1 \textit{xf}3+ 18.\textit{xf}3 \textit{h}4 19.c5 \textit{g}5 20.\textit{b}5 \textit{f}6. Black’s achievements seem to be much more real. This is because his target is the enemy king! 21.g3 \textit{x}h3 22.\textit{xc}7
White’s defence is not easy at all. His attempt to gobble some material with the move 23...\(\text{xa8}\) would lead immediately to a hopeless position for him: 23...
\(\text{g4}\) 24.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{h5}\) 25.f3 \(\text{f3}\) 26.g4
\(\text{xg4}\) 27.\(\text{xa3}\) dxc5 28.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{f8}\)!
29.\(\text{e1}\) c4!++

The move 13.g4 prevents Black’s counterplay, connected with f7-f5. 13...c5. After this move
White is deprived of the possibility to develop his queenside initiative with the move c4-c5, moreover that Black may try to prepare a pawn-sacrifice in the spirit of the Benko Gambit – a7-a6 and b7-b5. 14.\(\text{g1}\) \(\text{d7}\) 15.g5 \(\text{f7}\) 16.h4
\(\text{fxg5}\) 17.\(\text{hxg5}\) a6 18.a4 b5. After the opening of the game on the
queenside, it has become clear why White’s king will have to remain at the centre of the
board. 19.axb5 axb5 20.\(\text{xa8}\) \(\text{xa8}\) 21.\(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{b8}\) 22.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{f8}\)
23.\(\text{db1}\) \(\text{a1}\) 24.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{e7}\) Kolcak – Hefka, ICCF 2010. White’s extra pawn is absolutely irrelevant. Black’s play is much easier from the practical point of view, because White must be constantly on the alert about his weak
pawns on b5 and g5, as well as about his opponent’s active pieces.

11...\(\text{exd4}\)
(diagram)

12.\(\text{b5}\)
White wishes to gobble quite comfortably the enemy pawn.

White’s attempt to win only a
pawn will lead to great problems
for him. 14.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{e7}\) 15.f3 \(\text{f5}\)
16.h3, Luukkonen – Virtanen,
Finland 2009, 16...\(\text{f6}\)!? 17.\(\text{g3}\)
\(\text{ae8}\). Black is preparing the penetration of his pieces on the e-file.
18.0−0 \(\text{h5}\). He exchanges the important enemy defender of the e2-square. 19.\(\text{hxh5}\) gxh5 20. \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{xd3}\) 21.\(\text{xd3}\) \(\text{e2}\) 22.\(\text{xe2}\) \(\text{xe2}\)++ The activity of Black’s pieces compensates with an interest his minimal material deficit.

14.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{h4}=\) Here, White
should better give back the piece
and be happy with an equal position, because his attempt to pre-
serve his material advantage would end in a catastrophe for him. 15.\textit{xe}2? \textit{xc}3+ 16.\textit{xc}3 \textit{xf}2+ 17.\textit{d}2 \textit{g}4 18.\textit{c}5 \textit{f}5 19.\textit{e}1 \textit{xd}5+ 20.\textit{c}2 \textit{yg}2 21.\textit{g}1 \textit{exe}2+ 22.\textit{xe}2 \textit{xe}2 23.\textit{cxd}6 \textit{d}3+ 0–1 \textit{L'Ami} – \textit{Nisipeanu}, Budva 2009.

12...f5

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

13.0–0

After 13.exf5?, Black has a well concealed tactical strike: 13...\textit{xf}2! 14.\textit{xf}2 \textit{xf}5. White has an extra piece, but is incapable of defending this position. The activity of Black's pieces increases with every move. 15.\textit{f}3 a6. It would be useful to oust the enemy knight to the edge of the board. 16.\textit{a}3 d3 17.\textit{e}1, \textit{Kragelj} – \textit{Callier}, Forni di Sopra 2012, 17...\textit{h}4+!? 18.\textit{g}1 \textit{ae}8 19.\textit{d}2 \textit{xb}2–+

13.\textit{yg}4 fxg4. Black's bishops are very powerful. 14.0–0 \textit{we}7 15.\textit{d}3, \textit{Tabernig} – \textit{Lehner}, Austria 2015, 15...\textit{d}7!? He is trying to mobilise his pieces as quickly as possible. 16.\textit{xd}4 \textit{ae}8 17.\textit{e}1 c5!? 18.\textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6-- Black's pieces are very actively and harmoniously deployed and he has full compensation for the minimal material deficit.

13...\textit{e}5 14.\textit{xf}5

After this move White at least will have an extra pawn.

14.\textit{xd}4?! fxe4 15.\textit{e}3 \textit{wh}4. Black has restored the material balance and has preserved excellent attacking prospects. 16.\textit{c}1 \textit{yg}4 17.\textit{yg}4 \textit{yg}4 18.\textit{d}2 \textit{e}5. He forces a weakening of the shelter of White's king and maintains a stable positional advantage. 19.f4 exf3 20.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 21.\textit{gxf}3 \textit{ae}8= \textit{Rychagov} – \textit{Vachier Lagrave}, Dagomys 2009.

14...\textit{d}3!

This is Black's most precise move! Now, he obtains the two-bishop advantage, while saving the pawn would have been an impossible task anyway.

15.\textit{xd}3 \textit{xd}3 16.\textit{xd}3 \textit{xf}5 17.\textit{d}1
Black would have obtained powerful initiative even after the other possible retreats of White’s queen and it would have compensated fully his sacrificed pawn.

For example: 17...\texttt{\$e2} a6 18.\texttt{\$c3} \texttt{\$h4} 19.\texttt{\$e3} \texttt{\$ae8} 20.\texttt{\$ad1} (20.\texttt{\$ac1} g5!?\texttt{\$\texttt{\$e8}}) 20...\texttt{\$e5} 21.g3 \texttt{\$h3} Fish – Rudolf, Germany 2011 or 17.\texttt{\$g3} a6 18.\texttt{\$c3} \texttt{\$e5} 19.\texttt{\$f4}. On this square, White’s pawn restricts his bishop on \texttt{c1} and the defence of his king has been weakened too. 19...\texttt{\$g7} El Debs – Flores, Campinas 2010.

\texttt{\$f6}

Black increases the pressure against the enemy \texttt{b2}-pawn. White has problems to complete the development of his queenside.

18.\texttt{\$xc7}

18.a4 \texttt{\$f7}

18...\texttt{\$ac8} 19.\texttt{\$e6}

White wishes to decrease the pressure of the enemy pieces against his position by exchanges.

19...\texttt{\$xe6} 20.\texttt{\$xe6} \texttt{\$xe6} 21.\texttt{\$e3}

White completes the development of his pieces.

21...\texttt{\$b6} 22.\texttt{\$d4} \texttt{\$xd4} 23.\texttt{\$xd4} \texttt{\$xc4}

Black has restored the material balance and his pieces are more active. All this compensates the vulnerability of his isolated \texttt{d6}-pawn and the not so safe shelter of his king.

24.\texttt{\$d3}

The character of the fight remains more or less the same after 24.\texttt{\$d2} \texttt{\$e4} 25.\texttt{\$fe1} \texttt{\$xe1}+ 26.\texttt{\$xe1} \texttt{\$xa2} 27.\texttt{\$f3} d5 28.\texttt{\$e7} \texttt{\$f7}= Black has managed to win a pawn, but he cannot put up with the enemy rook on the penultimate rank. He cannot avoid the repetition of moves. 29.\texttt{\$e8}+ \texttt{\$f8} 30.\texttt{\$e7}, Draw. Gavrilov – Zontakh, Lipetsk 2009.

24...\texttt{\$e4} 25.a3 \texttt{\$e2} 26.b4 \texttt{\$fxf2}. Once again Black wins a pawn, but after 27.\texttt{\$xf2} \texttt{\$xf2} 28.\texttt{\$xf2} \texttt{\$f6}+ 29.\texttt{\$e2} \texttt{\$xa1} 30.\texttt{\$xd6} \texttt{\$xa3} 31.\texttt{\$e6}+, his king is incapable of avoiding the perpetual check. 31...\texttt{\$g7} 32.\texttt{\$e7}+
\( \text{Rusev - Spasov, Pleven 2015.} \)

\[
\text{B) 9.} \text{h}4
\]

This is a more natural retreat of White’s bishop and from this square it prevents Black’s pawn-advance \( f6-f5 \).

9...\text{c6}

Now, just like in variation A, Black exerts immediate pressure against White’s centre.

\[ \text{10.d5} \]

White occupies space. The pawn-structure in the centre has been stabilised and the focus of the fight is moved to the flanks.

About 10.0–0 g5 – see Chapter 21, variation B.

10.h3 \text{h}6 11.dxe5 (11.d5 \text{e}7 – see 10.d5) 11...dxe5 12.d5, Williams – Hebden, Aberystwyth 2014. White’s pieces are more actively placed, but his d4-square is so weak that Black has very good possibilities to organise active counterplay. (12.b3, Azmaiparashvili – Reyes Larena, Toledo 1991, 12...\text{d}4!? 13.xd4 exd4∞)

12...f7?! Black improves the position of his knight. 13.b3 \text{g}5 14.xg5. White presents the two-bishop advantage to his opponent, but preserves the important defender of the d4-square – his knight on f3. 14...fxg5 15.c5 \text{h}8 16.0–0 \text{d}4 17.xd4 exd4∞ – Black’s powerful bishop-pair compensates fully the slight defects of his pawn-structure.

10.dxe5. This move only improves the position of the enemy knight on g4. 10...\text{g}xe5 11.0–0 \text{e}6 12.d5 \text{d}7. Black removes his queen away from the h4-d8 diagonal and prepares the pawn-advance \( f6-f5 \). 13.d2 \text{e}8 14. \text{ae}1 f5 15.xe5 dxe5. The pawn will control an important square at the centre of the board from here.

16.exf5 xf5 17.g5 d4∞ Zmokly – Mannermaa, ICCF 2008. Black’s powerful centralised knight provides him with a stable advantage. White’s knight is also in the centre, but Black can always oust it from there with the move c7-c6.

10...\text{e}7
White wishes to force the enemy knight away from the centre, but this is not a part of Black's plans.

11. \( \text{Qd2} \)

There arises a complicated positional battle after 11.h3 \( \text{Qh6} \).

It would be too straightforward for White to play the prophylactic move 12.g4. He weakens his kingside, but shows his opponent that he plans to castle queenside, therefore, Black can begin the preparation of \( b7-b5 \) immediately. 12...\( \text{Qf7} \) 13.\( \text{Cc2} \) (13.\( \text{Qd2 Qd7=} \); 13.\( \text{Qd2 c5} \) – see 12.\( \text{Qd2} \)) 13...\( \text{Qd7} \) 14.0-0-0 \( \text{a6} \) 15.\( \text{Qb1 b8} \) 16.\( \text{Qd2 b5} \) F. Gheorghiu - Forster, Bern 1994.

12.\( \text{Qd2} \). This is hardly the best square for White's queen. Later, Black can win a tempo by attacking it with his bishop: \( \text{Qf7} \) and \( \text{Qh6}. \) 12...\( \text{Qf7} \) 13.g4 \( \text{c5} \). This is a typical pawn-advance for similar positions. Black prepares counterplay on the queenside with \( a6, \text{Qd7} \) and \( \text{b5}. \) 14.\( \text{h2 \text{Qh6}} \) 15.\( \text{Cc2 g7} \) 16.\( \text{Qf1 Qd7} \) 17.\( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{a6= Savon - Doroshkievich, Riga 1970.} \)

White wishes to provoke an exchange on \( g4 \) and after \( \text{hxg4}, \) there will arise a position in which Black will be incapable of advancing \( f6-f5 \) and his bishop on \( g7 \), restricted by his own pawns, will be completely static to the end of the game. Naturally, developments of this type are completely against Black's intentions. (It seems less active for White to continue with 14.f3 \( f5 \) 15.\( \text{Cc2 Qf4} \) 16.\( \text{Qf1} \), Dorfman – Relange, Aubervilliers 2001, 16...\( \text{c5?=} \) 14...\( f5 \) 15.e\( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \). White's knights have gained access to the e4-square, but Black's cavalry can also occupy active positions on d4 and f4. 16.\( \text{Qde4 Qf4} \) 17.0-0 (17.\( \text{Qg1?!} \) Goormachtigh – A. L'Ami, Vlissingen 2013, 17...\( \text{Qe7} \) 18.\( \text{Qd2 a6=} \) – Following \( \text{Qg1}, \) White cannot castle kingside any more. With his last move Black prepares the pawn-sacrifice \( b7-b5 \), if the enemy monarch seeks its shelter on the queenside.) 17...\( \text{h6=} \) Saravanan – David, Cappelle la Grande 2008.

12.\( \text{Cc2} \). White prepares castling queenside and increases his control over the e4-square. 12...\( g5 \) 13.\( \text{Qg3 Qg6} \) 14.0-0-0 \( f5 \) 15.e\( \text{xf5} \) (15.\( \text{Qd2 fxe4} \) 16.\( \text{Qxe4 Qf5} \). White must be constantly on the alert about the possible enemy penetration to the d4-square, therefore, he makes a practical decision – to exchange the enemy knight on \( f5. \) 17.\( \text{Qg4 Qf4} \) 18.\( \text{Qxf5 \text{xf5}} \)
The powerful placement of White’s centralised knight compensates Black’s two-bishop advantage, Matveeva – L’Ami, Istanbul 2003.)

15...\(\texttt{xf5}\) 16.\(\texttt{d3}\), Groszpeter – Cvitan, Zenica 1986, 16...\(\texttt{h6}!\) =, Black removes his pawn away from the dangerous diagonal. White’s task to organise an attack on the Kingside will not be easy at all. Black’s plan is quite simple: this is the preparation of b7-b5 with c7-c5, a7-a6, \(\texttt{d7}\), as well as the penetration of his knight to the f4 and d4-squares.

12.0-0. White’s Kingside has been weakened by the move h2-h3 and Black obtains effortlessly excellent counterplay. 12...g5 13.\(\texttt{g3}\) \(\texttt{g6}\)

14.\(\texttt{b3}\)?! White’s queen goes away from his Kingside. 14...\(\texttt{f4}\).

Black’s knight exerts powerful pressure against the enemy position on this square and its exchange 15.\(\texttt{xf4}\) would lead to the opening of the g-file. 15...gx\(\texttt{f4}\) 16. a4. White’s Queenside activity seems a bit too late. On the other hand, Black’s attack on the g-file looks much more dangerous.

11...f5!?

This is not the most popular move for Black, but is not bad at all...
3. \text{c}3 \text{g}7 4.\text{e}4 \text{d}6 5.\text{f}3 0-0 6.\text{e}2 \text{e}5 7.\text{e}3 \text{g}4 8.\text{g}5 \text{f}6

all. He is not afraid of the possible exchange on g4.

\textbf{12.\text{x}g4}

White does not allow \text{f}6, but trades his powerful light-squared bishop.

After his alternatives, Black plays \text{f}6 and avoids capturing on g4.

For example: 12.0-0 \text{f}6 13.f3 b6 14.\text{d}3 \text{h}6?, or 12.c5 \text{f}6 13.cxd6 cxd6 14.f3, Nickoloff – Koliada, Hamilton 1994 and here Black obtains a very good position after activating his bishop on g7 with 14...\text{h}6!=

Following 12.h3 \text{f}6 13.g4, Black ends up with a good game after a plan, connected with a pawn-sacrifice: c7-c6 and b7-b5. 13...\text{h}8 14.f3 c6 15.\text{f}b3 b5!? 16.\text{cxb5 cxd5 17.exd5 h}6 – White’s d5-pawn is weak and his king will be very unsafe both in the centre as well as on the queenside, Biyiasas – Browne, Manila 1976.

It would be interesting for White, but still insufficient to obtain an advantage, to try 12.exf5. He wishes to capture on g4 only after the preliminary exchange of the pawns. He will thus obtain an important square for his knight in the centre of the board: 12...\text{gx}f5 13.\text{x}g4 \text{fxg}4 14.\text{d}e4. Still, after 14...\text{we}8 (with the idea \text{g}6-f4) 15.\text{xe}7 \text{xe}7, Black’s two-bishop advantage would be sufficient to maintain the equality. 16.\text{we}2,
15.a3 g5. Black is preparing the transfer of his knight to f4. 16.b4 b6 17.Qf1 (17.Qb1?! Qg6 18. bxc5 bxc5 19.Qa4 Qf4= Akesson – Cvitan, Bela Crkva 1986) 17... Qg6 18.Qg3 Qf4 19.0–0 h5 20. bxc5 bxc5 21.Qb1 Qf6=, followed by h5–h4, Skrondal – Torgersen, ICCF 2008. After this, White will have to sacrifice a pawn (Qf5) and later he will have to prove that his compensation for it is sufficient.

15...b1. This move looks more precise than 15.a3, because White can try to advance b2–b4 saving a tempo for this not so necessary move. 15...g5 16.b4 b6 17.bxc5 bxc5 18.0–0 18.a4 Qd7 19.Qa6 Qc8 20.Qa3 Qg6 21.0–0 Qf4= Gefenas – McNab, Algeria 1993) 18...Qg6 19.Qa4 (19.Qb3 Qf4 20. Qc2 h5 21.Qfb1 h4∞ – Black’s prospects are not worse in the forthcoming complicated fight, Grabner – Krebs, ICCF 2008) 19...Qf4 20.Qb3 Qd7 21.Qa3 Qf7= – His kingside activity balances the possible penetration of White’s rooks on the b-file, Williams – Mamonovas, ICCF 2009.

15...bxc6 16.b4

16...Qe6

The preparation of the central pawn-break d6–d5 is Black’s simplest road to equality.

17.0–0 d5 18.exd5

18.cxd5?! cxd5 19.Qc5 d4 20. Qb5 Qd7= – Black’s protected passed pawn in the centre provides him with better chances, Tan – Zhang, Xinghua Jiangsu 2011.

18...cxd5

The position is being opened. Black’s two powerful bishops compensate fully the defects of his pawn-structure.

19.Qc5 dxc4 20.Qe4 Qf7 21.Qd6 Qf4 22.Qe1 Qd7 23.Qc2 a5 24.a3 Qh7 25.Qe2 Qd5!

This exchange-sacrifice is Black’s simplest road to equality.

26.Qxf4 Qxf4 27.Qa1 Qc6


There could have still followed: 28...Qd5. Black’s pressure on the long diagonal forces White to part with his material advantage. 29.Qxd5 Qxd5 30. Qxd5 Qxd5 31.Qxc4 axb4 32. axb4. In this endgame Black should prevent by a precise play the advance of the enemy b4-pawn. 32...Qa4 33.Qb1 Qc3 34. Qb6 Ra2 35.Qe1 Qe4. After this “little” tactical strike, Black exploits the lack of a leeway for the enemy king and trades the important enemy bishop. 36.h3 Qxc5 37.bxc5 Qc2 38.Qxg4 Qf8 39.Qd7 Qxc5 40.Qxc5 Qxc5=
7.d5
White clarifies immediately the pawn-structure in the centre and the actions are focused on the flanks. Here, contrary to the variations after 7.0–0 ćc6 8.d5 ćc7, which will be analysed in Chapters 22-27, the move 7.d5 seems a bit premature, because Black’s knight will be very useful in the fight for the c5-square and this will complicate White’s task to develop his initiative on the queenside.

7...a5
This move prevents the pawn-advance b2-b4 and was analysed by the Ukrainian grandmasters Efim Geller and Leonid Stein.

We will deal in details with: A) 8.ćd2, B) 8.će3, C) 8.h3 and D) 8.0–0.

The Petrosian system 8.ćg5, will be analysed in the following chapter.

About 8.h4 ća6 9.ćd2 ćc5 – see 8.ćd2.

8.g3. This is a good move when Black’s knight is on h5, but here, it is not to be recommended. 8... ća6 9.ćh4 ćc5 10.f3, I.Ivanov – Gelfand, New York 1989, 10... ćh3!?∞ – The weaknesses on White’s kingside have become quite obvious.

It would be too slow for White.
to choose here 8.a3  \( \text{d}h5 \) 9.\( \text{d}g1 \) \( \text{d}f4 \) 10.\( \text{d}f3 \), Zvjaginsev – Morozevich, Pamplona 1994. Black obtains a good position after 10... \( \text{d}a6 \)!?

A) 8.\( \text{d}d2 \)

This is the beginning of a straightforward plan. White will leave his king in the centre for a long time and impedes the development of his queenside, but begins a pawn-offensive with h4-h5 and g4.

8...\( \text{d}a6 \)

Black must try to organise quickly counterplay. His further plan includes \( \text{c}c5 \), c7-c6 and the preparation of the occupation of space on the queenside with b5-b4.

9.h4

9.0-0 \( \text{c}c5 \) – see variation D.

9.g4 \( \text{c}c5 \) 10.h4 a4 – see 9.h4.

White loses two tempi after 9.\( \text{d}b3 \) a4 10.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{c}c5 \) 11.\( \text{g}b1 \), Palacios Perez – Zanoletty, Logroño 2002, 11...\( \text{h}5 \)!? Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 12.hx5 \( \text{d}3+ \). This intermediate check deprives White of his castling rights. 13.\( \text{f}f1 \) \( \text{h}4 \). Black is not in a hurry to capture on h5 and continues to create additional threats. 14.\( \text{f}f3 \) \( \text{f}4 \)! 15.\( \text{x}g6 \) fxg6→ – White is faced with a difficult defence.

9...\( \text{d}c5 \)

10.h5

White cannot continue the game without this move; otherwise, Black will counter the pawn-advance g2-g4 with the move h7-h5. For example: 10.g4 a4 11.\( \text{f}3 \) (11.h5, Kouatly – Kasparov, Evry 1989, 11...\( \text{h}6 \)!?) 11...h5. White’s attack has backfired. 12.g5 (His situation would be even worse after 12.\( \text{f}f1 \) hxg4 13.\( \text{g}3 \) gxg3 14.\( \text{x}f3 \) \( \text{h}7 \!阳性, followed by f7-f5, Lyberg – Olsson, Sweden 2004. Black has an extra pawn and a very good position.) 12...\( \text{h}7 \). He is preparing to undermine the enemy g5-pawn with the move f7-f6.
3. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 4. \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5. \( \text{f3} \) 0-0 6. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 7. \( \text{d5} \) a5

13. \( \text{f1} \) f6 14. \( \text{g1} \) fxg5 15. hxg5 \( \text{f4}! \) This exchange-sacrifice is typical for similar positions. 16. \( \text{xf4} \) exf4\( ^{+} \) Sunye Neto – Hernandez, Linares 1992. The dark squares in White’s camp have been weakened and his g5-pawn is doomed. Black’s bishop on g7 is not weaker than any of White’s rooks.

10...c6 11. g4

After 11. \( \text{c2} \), Dunnington – Lanka, Paris 1990, the simplest for Black would be to capture the pawn 11... \( \text{d5} \)? 12. \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{gx5} \)\( ^{=} \), followed by \( \text{f7-f5} \), creating excellent counterplay.

It would be worse for White to play here 11.h6, because after this move he will have no chances of attacking on the h-file and Black’s defence would be facilitated considerably. 11... \( \text{h8} \) 12. f3, Bykovsky – Caspi, Herzliya 2006, 12... \( \text{cxd5} \)?? 13. \( \text{xd5} \) a4\( ^{+} \)

11... \( \text{cxd5} \)

The move 12.exd5 is obviously weaker. White breaks the classical principle that flank attacks are effective only in positions with a secure centre. 12... \( \text{e4} \) 13. g5 \( \text{hxh5} \) 14. \( \text{gxh5} \) g6 15. \( \text{cxe4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 16. \( \text{wh5} \) \( \text{f5} \). Black’s bishop protects reliably the h7-square and White has no other targets to attack. 17. f3, Shchukin – Inarkiev, St Petersburg 2001, 17... \( \text{w6}^{=} \) – White’s attack has reached its dead end. He lags considerably in development and his king is an excellent target for Black’s well mobilised and perfectly coordinated pieces.

12...b5

He exploits the insufficient protection of the e4-pawn and accomplishes this thematic pawn-advance immediately.

13. f3

White fortifies his e4-pawn and defends against the threat b5-b4.

11. \( \text{cxd5} \)

13. f3

White fortifies his e4-pawn and defends against the threat b5-b4.

It is bad for White to play here 13.g5?? – his attack is evidently not well prepared. 13... \( \text{h5} \) 14.
\( \text{xh5 \text{b4}} \) This is a powerful intermediate move. Black worsens the placement of the enemy knight and ousts it to the edge of the board. 15.\( \text{a4 d3+} \) 16.\( \text{b7f1 f4} \). This is the point. Black refrains from capturing the bishop and begins a direct attack. 17.\( \text{f3 a6+} \) 18.\( \text{g1 xg5=} \) Kozlov – Gnsarev, Astana 2007.

13.h6 \( \text{h8}\infty \)

13.a3 \( \text{b6} \) 14.f3 \( \text{d7} \) 15.\( \text{b3 b4} \) 16.\( \text{xc5} \), Tsesarsky – Tseitin, Givataim 2000, 16...\( \text{xc5?!} \) 17.\( \text{a4 a7} \) 18.h6 \( \text{h8} \) 19.\( \text{g5 ffb8=} \)

13...b4 14.\( \text{a4 fbd7} \) 15.\( \text{xc5 xc5} \) 16.\( \text{b3 xb3} \) 17.\( \text{xb3 d7}\infty \) – Black’s queenside counterplay (\( \text{e7, ab8, fcc8, a5-a4} \)) is sufficient to maintain the balance, Wukits – Fasser, ICCF 2012.

B) 8.\( \text{e3 g4} \)

Black plays in the spirit of the Gligoric variation. He attacks the enemy bishop and frees the way of his f-pawn.

He must play \( \text{g4} \) immediately; otherwise, White will take the g4-square under control and will obtain an advantage: 8...\( \text{a6} \) 9.\( \text{d2!=} \)

9.\( \text{g5 f6} \)

10.\( \text{h4} \)

This is the best for White. The bishop will pin the pawn from this square and will impede the pawn-advance f6-f5.

After the other retreats of White’s bishop, Black not only equalises, but can also fight for an advantage.

10.\( \text{c1 f5} \) 11.\( \text{g5 a6} \) 12.exf5 gxf5
13. \xc3\x86xg4 fxg4 14. \xc3\x85e4 \xe8 15.0-0 \x85g6 16. \xe2 b6\+ – Black’s two powerful bishops and good prospects for active play on the kingside (h7-h5-h4 and eventually h4-h3) are a much more important factor for the evaluation of the position than White’s dominance over the e4-square, Kljucharev – Shomoev, Kemerovo 2007.

13.h3 \xf6f6 14.f4, Kovalenko – Shimanov, Dubai 2015, 14...h6!? 15.\xe6 (It is bad for White to play here 15.\xe3, in view of 15...\xe4. Black’s knight is in a hurry to occupy the weakened g3-square. 16.0-0 \x93\x95\x83\x83) 15...\x8e6 16.dxe6 \xe7 17.0-0 \x93\x95\x83\x83 – White’s two bishops are insufficient to compensate fully the sacrificed pawn.

10.\xd2 f5 11.\x85g5 (11.exf5 gxf5 12.h3 \xf6f6 13.0-0 \x8d714.\xc1 \xc5= – Black’s prospects are not worse thanks to his powerful pawns on f5 and e5, Zlotnik – Vilar Lopez, Palma de Mallorca 1992) 11...\xf6 12.exf5 (12.c5, Stocek – Pavlidis, Kalamaria 2008, 12...h6!? 13.\xe6 \x8e6 14.dxe6 \xc6 (13...gxf5 13.\xe4. This pawn-advance is standard for similar positions. White wishes to provoke e5-e4, in order to use later the d4-square for his pieces. (13.\x95\xc2 \xe3 14.0-0 \xc5 15.f4 e4= Murshed – Konguvel, Sakthi 1996) 13...e4 14.\xe3 \xe7 15.\xd2 \xa6 16.\x83h3 \x94\x83 Simeonidis – Solak, Athens 2004.

10...h5

Black is threatening to trap the enemy bishop.

11.\xd2 \xa6

Black does not need to be in a hurry to remove his knight from g4.

12.a3

White will try to exploit the defencelessness of the enemy rook on a8 and to advance b2-b4.

12.0-0 \xe8 13.a3 \xd7 – see 12.a3.

White would not achieve much if he tries to advance g2-g4. 12.\xd1 \x83h6 13.h3 \xc5 14.g4 \x83g4 15.hxg4 \x8f7=, followed by \x83h6, Bandza – Schultz, Germany 1994, or 12.h3 \x83h6 13.g4 (13.a3 \x93d7 – see 12.a3) 13...hxg4 14.hxg4 \xf7. Now again, the plan with the activation of the bishop on g7 promises Black at least an equal position. 15.a3 \xd7 16.f3 \x83h6\+, emphasizing the vulnerability of the c1-h6 diagonal, Barbero – Belotti, Switzerland 1999.

12...\xd7
Black parries his opponent’s threat.

13.\textit{h3}

White ousts immediately the enemy knight from its active position.

13.\textit{\texttt{xf}1} \textit{\texttt{c5}} 14.\textit{b3} \textit{g5}. Black is preparing \textit{f6-f5}. 15.\textit{g2} \textit{f5} 16.\textit{\texttt{h3}} \textit{\texttt{xf6}} 17.\textit{f3}?! (It is preferable for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice: 17.\textit{\texttt{xh}5} \textit{\texttt{xf}5} 18.\textit{\texttt{wh}5} \textit{\texttt{f6}} – Black has more than sufficient compensation for the minimal material deficit.) 17...\textit{\texttt{e8}} – White’s king is forced to remain in the middle of the board, since castling kingside seems to be too precarious, Loginov – Fedorov, St Petersburg 1997.

Or 13.0–0 \textit{\texttt{e8}} 14.\textit{b3} (14.\textit{\texttt{h3}} \textit{\texttt{h6}} – see 13.\textit{h3}) 14...\textit{f5} 15.\textit{\texttt{b1}} (diagram)

15...\textit{\texttt{c5}}! This is an important moment. Black must take care about the future of his knight on a6: otherwise, after White plays b3-b4, it will not have any good prospects. 16.\textit{b4} \textit{axb4} 17.\textit{\texttt{a4}} 18.\textit{\texttt{xa}4}. The trade of a couple of minor pieces is in favour of Black, since he has less space. 18...\textit{\texttt{xa}4} 19.\textit{\texttt{e}1} \textit{\texttt{h6}}= Speelman – Strikovic, Oviedo 1992.

13...\textit{\texttt{h}6} 14.\textit{\texttt{b}1}

Or 14.0–0 \textit{\texttt{e}8} 15.\textit{b3}, Petrov- \textit{\texttt{g}eller}, Sochi 1977, 15...\textit{\texttt{f}7}?! =, followed by \textit{\texttt{e}7} and \textit{\texttt{h}6} with a good position for Black.

14...\textit{\texttt{c}5} 15.\textit{b4} \textit{axb4} 16.\textit{axb4} \textit{\texttt{a}4}

17.\textit{\texttt{xa}4}

The move 17.\textit{\texttt{c}2} leads to an inferior position for White. 17...\textit{g5} 18.\textit{\texttt{g}3} \textit{\texttt{xc}3} 19.\textit{\texttt{xc}3} \textit{h4} 20.
h2 f5. Black begins active actions on the kingside. 21.c5 (21.f3 g4$; 21..a1 xa1+ 22.wxa1 g4$ Rogers – Piket, Groningen 1990) 21...g4 22.c6 c8$ – White can hardly find a safe haven for his king, because his kingside has been weakened by the move h2-h3, Bareev – Kasparov, Tilburg 1991.

17..xa4 18.wc1 g5 19.hg3 h4 20..h2 d7

Black’s bishop returns to the h3-c8 diagonal from where it will support his pawn-offensive (f6-f5 and g5-g4).

21.c5

21.f3 f5 22..g1 g4$ Morovic Fernandez – Kamsky, Las Palmas 1994.

21...f5$ It is far from clear what White should do with his king. It would be risky to leave it in the centre and castling would be playing with fire. Black will have excellent attacking prospects after g5-g4.

C) 8.h3 h5!?

This is the simplest move for Black. Now, White cannot restrict the enemy knight on f6 with the move g2-g4.

9.g3

White prevents the penetration of the knight to f4.

He has another plan, which is less reliable. At first he allows h4 and then, he ousts it from its active position with g2-g3. For this purpose he has tried in practice the moves 9..h2, 9..g1 and 9..d2.

9..h2 f4 10..f3. Now, the pawn-advance g2-g3 will be connected with the sacrifice of the pawn on h3. (It is better for White to choose 10..f1 a6 11.g3 h5 12..e2 f6 – see 9..g3 a6 10..h2 f6.) 10...a6 11.e3 b6!? Black increases his control over the c5-square. His plan is quite simple: c5 and f7-f5, while White will have problems to utilise his knight placed at the edge of the board. 12.0–0 c5 13.wc2
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f5† Odeeva – Magerramova, Russia 1991.

9.\( \text{g1} \) \( \text{f4} \) 10.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 11.g3 \( \text{fxe}4 \) 12.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{h5} \) 13.\( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{gxh}5 \) 14.\( \text{w}xh5 \). Black has lost a pawn indeed, but his prospects are not worse at all. His play is in fact much easier. 14...\( \text{f5} \) 15.\( \text{fe}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 16.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6}† \) – White is not well prepared for the opening of the game in the centre, because his pieces are not developed and his king is unsafe, Andonov – Suaibi, Struga 2002.

9.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 10.\( \text{f1} \) \( \text{a6} \) 11.g3 \( \text{h}5 \)

12.\( \text{b3} \) b6. At first Black uses some prophylactic against c4-c5 and then will out the enemy knight from the b3-square with \( \text{d}7 \) and a5-a4, obtaining an edge. 13.\( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14.\( \text{e}2 \) a4 15.\( \text{c}1 \) a3 16.b3, Cramling – Estrella Vidiella, Malgrat del Mar 1991, 16...\( \text{f5}† \). He sacrifices a pawn and seizes completely the initiative.

12.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f6} \) (diagram)

Following 13.a3 \( \text{c}5 \) 14.b3 \( \text{d}7 \) 15.\( \text{b1} \) \( \text{h}6 \), White will have problems with the protection of his e4-pawn. The point is that after 16.\( \text{w}c2 \), Black can exploit the fact that the enemy queen and rook are deployed on the same diagonal and win a pawn by a tactical strike. 16...\( \text{xd}2+ \) 17.\( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{fxe}4! \) 18.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 19.\( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 20.h4 \( \text{c}5† \) Morozevich – Jones, Dresden 2008.

13.g4 \( \text{d}7 \). Black’s knight frees the way forward of his f-pawn. 14.\( \text{b}3 \), Damljanovic – Dragomirescu, Rijeka 2010, 14...\( \text{f5}† \)

9...\( \text{a}6 \)

10.\( \text{h}2 \)

White continues the process of ousting the enemy knight.

About 10.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f6} \) – see 9.\( \text{d}2 \)
3. \( \text{d} \text{c} 3 \text{ g} 7 \) 4. \( \text{e} 4 \text{ d} 6 \) 5. \( \text{f} 3 \text{ 0-0} \) 6. \( \text{e} 2 \text{ e} 5 \) 7. \( \text{d} 5 \text{ a} 5 \)

\( \text{b} 4 \text{f} 4 \text{ 10. } \text{f} 1 \text{ a} 6 \text{ 11. } \text{g} 3 \text{ h} 5 \text{ 12. } \text{e} 2 \text{ h} 5 \).

10. \( \text{g} 5 \text{ f} 6 \text{ 11. } \text{e} 3 \text{ f} 5 \) – see 10. \( \text{e} 3 \).

10. \( \text{e} 3 \text{ f} 5 \text{ 11. } \text{e} 5 \text{ g} 5 \text{ 12. } \text{g} 5 \text{ f} 6 \text{ 13. } \text{d} 2 \text{ c} 5 \infty \) – Black’s powerful \( \text{e} 5 \) and \( \text{f} 5 \)-pawns enable him not only to equalise, but also to fight for the advantage in the middle game, De Souza – Cella, Praia da Pipa 2014.

10. \( \text{e} 1 \text{ f} 1 \text{ 11. } \text{g} 4 \text{ c} 6 = \text{ Martinovic – Spasov, Kastel Kambelovac 2014.} \)

10. \( \text{a} 3 \text{ c} 5 \text{ 11. } \text{e} 3 \text{ f} 5 \text{ 12. } \text{e} 5 \text{ g} 5 \text{ c} 6 \infty \text{ Zvjaginsev – Pavlovic, Yugoslavia 1995.} \)

10... \( \text{f} 6 \)

11. \( \text{g} 4 \)

White’s knight does not need to remain at the edge of the board.

11. \( \text{g} 4 \text{ f} 6 \text{ 12. } \text{e} 3 \text{ d} 5 \text{ 13. } \text{g} 1 \text{ h} 8 \text{ 14. } \text{d} 2 \text{ f} 5 = \text{ Janda – Belyakov, Pardubice 2013.} \)

11. \( \text{h} 4 \text{ c} 5 \text{ 12. } \text{f} 3 \) (12. \( \text{g} 5 \text{?! h} 6 \text{ 13. } \text{xf} 6 \text{ xf} 6 \+)

– Black’s two-bishop advantage may become a telling factor in the future, Granda Zuniga – Matamoros Franco, Montevideo 2015) 12...c6\( \infty \), followed by \( \text{b} 6 \), Aronian – Van Wely, Wijk aan Zee 2013. Black has created good counterplay on the queenside, while White must still lose time to transfer his knight on \( \text{h} 2 \) to a more active position.

11... \( \text{d} 7 \text{ 12. } \text{h} 6 + \)

This move seems more precise than the immediate 12.\( \text{h} 4 \), because Black can play 12...\( \text{h} 5 \), preventing the pawn-advance \( \text{h} 4 \)-\( \text{h} 5 \).

12. \( \text{h} 8 \text{ 13. } \text{h} 4 \text{ d} 5 \)

12... \( \text{h} 8 \text{ 13. } \text{h} 4 \text{ d} 5 \)

13. \( \text{e} 3 \text{ f} 6 \text{ 14. } \text{d} 2 \text{ c} 6 = \text{ Khairullin – Shomoev, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013.} \)

14. \( \text{g} 4 \)

White continues with his pawn-offensive on the kingside.

The move 14.\( \text{h} 5 \) looks a bit premature, since following 14...
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14...f5

Black sacrifices a pawn and exchanges his opponent’s active pieces neutralising completely his initiative on the kingside. 16.hxg6 hxh6 17.Bxh6 Bh7 18.Bxh7+ Bxg6 19.Bh5 Bh8 20.Bd2. It is not good for White to exchange on h8, because Black’s pieces will occupy the h-file. 20...Bxh5 21.gxh5+ Bh7 22.Bg1 Bf6 23.Bb3 Bd7 24.Bg6+. White gives back the pawn, but succeeds in trading the queens. (He can also continue the game with a material advantage: 24.Ba3 Bg8 25.Bh1 Bb4 26.Bf3 Bg5=, followed by c7-c6. Black’s pieces are obviously more actively placed and White’s extra pawn is not important at all.) 24...Bxg6 25.hxg6+ Bxg6 26.Ba3 Bh8 27.Bg1+ Bf6 28.Bxc5 Bxc5= Ipatov – Bacrot, Jerusalem 2015.

D) 8.0-0

This is a quiet move. White does not clarify his plans yet.

8...Ba6

This move is played with the idea to follow with Bc5, increas-
ing the pressure against the e4-pawn.

Now, White must decide how to parry his opponent’s threats.

9.\textit{\textgammag}g5

9.ee1. He fortifies reliably the e4-pawn with the help of his rook, but this plan takes too much time and Black succeeds in fortifying his queenside. 9...\textit{\textdeltad}c5 10.\textit{\textfifth} b6 11.h3, Balashov – Khalifman, Kiev 1986, 11...\textit{\textdeltad}d7!?=

9.\textit{\textdelta}d2. This move has the obvious drawback that Black can activate his bishop by playing \textit{\texth}h6. 9...\textit{\textdeltad}c5

10.\textit{\textgammab}1 \textit{\texte}8 11.b3 f5 12.a3 \textit{\textf}6 – see 10.b3.

The move 10.\textit{\textw}c2 may lead to an inferior position for White. 10...\textit{\textd}h6!? 11.\textit{\texte}b3 \textit{\textxc}1 12.\textit{\textxc}1 \textit{\textxb}3 13.\textit{\textxb}3 (It is preferable for him to choose 13.axb3 b6 14.\textit{\textg}a1 \textit{\textd}7 15.\textit{\textw}d2 \textit{\texte}8 16.\textit{\textd}3, May – Krause, Germany 1993, 16...\textit{\textg}7!?=, followed by f7-f5.) 13...\textit{\textd}d7. White has a “bad” bishop and Black only needs to prevent the pawn-break c4-c5. 14.\textit{\textw}c2 \textit{\textc}5 15.\textit{\textec}d1 (15.\textit{\textc}4 b6 16.\textit{\textxc}5 bxc5 17.\textit{\textd}2 f5† Richardson – Cloodt, ICCF 2008) 15...f5 16.\textit{\textexf}5 \textit{\textxf}5 17.\textit{\textw}d2 (17.\textit{\textc}1 g5 18.\textit{\texte}3 \textit{\textf}6† Flohr – Petrosian, Moscow 1950) 17...\textit{\textd}7 18.\textit{\textw}e3 \textit{\texte}7 19.f3 b6 20.\textit{\texte}4 \textit{\textf}5 21.b3 \textit{\textxe}4 22.\textit{\textf}xe4, Gelfer – Liberzon, Israel 1974, 22...\textit{\texth}4!?† – White’s bishop is severely restricted by his own pawns.

10.b3. This move is necessary if White wishes to advance a2-a3 and b2-b4, because after the immediate move a2-a3, Black has the rather unpleasant resource a5-a4. 10...\textit{\texte}8. He is preparing f7-f5. Black does not need to be in a hurry to play \textit{\texth}6. 11.a3 f5 12.\textit{\textf}b1 \textit{\textf}6 13.b4. White sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. (13. \textit{\textf}3 \textit{\textd}7 14.b4 axb4 15.axb4 \textit{\texta}4 16.\textit{\textw}c2 \textit{\textxc}3 17.\textit{\textxc}3 \textit{\texth}6 18.c5, Ruetten – Forgach, Bad Zwesten 2001, 18...\textit{\textf}4!??†, followed by \textit{\texth}5 and \textit{\textw}h4 with excellent attacking prospects for Black.) 13...axb4 14.axb4 \textit{\textc}xe4 15.\textit{\textdx}4 \textit{\textxe}4 16.\textit{\textxe}4 fxe4 17.\textit{\texte}3 (17.c5 \textit{\textw}h4= Karagiannis – Bologan, Xanthi 1991) 17...\textit{\texth}4 18.\textit{\textd}2 \textit{\textg}4
19.\textbf{xg}4 \textbf{w}xg4= – White’s bishop is obviously more active than its counterpart, but he is still a pawn down, Bacrot – Kritz, Mainz 2004.

9.\textbf{w}e2 \textbf{dh}5. Black plans to play \textbf{df}4.

White can solve radically the problem with the enemy knight on f4, by exchanging it with his bishop on c1, but this would weaken horribly his dark squares. He not only would not obtain an advantage in the opening, but might even fail to equalise. For example: 10.a3 \textbf{df}4 11.\textbf{x}xf4 \textbf{exf}4 12.\textbf{de}2 \textbf{gf}5\textsuperscript{+} Ilkin – Semenova, Sukhumi 2007, or 10.\textbf{g}5 \textbf{w}e8 11.\textbf{fe}1 \textbf{df}4 12.\textbf{x}xf4 \textbf{exf}4 = Kem-pinski – Bacrot, Trzcianka 2015.

10.\textbf{de}1. White wishes to place his bishop on f3. 10...\textbf{df}4 11.\textbf{xf}3 (11.\textbf{x}xf4 \textbf{exf}4 12.\textbf{wd}2 \textbf{g}5 13.\textbf{dd}3, Koneru – Sareen, Calicut 2003, 13...f5!?\textsuperscript{+}) 11...\textbf{dc}5 12.\textbf{xe}3 \textbf{bd}6\textsuperscript{∞}, followed by f7-f5, Danner – Wiedermann, Linz 2011.

9.\textbf{de}3. There has arisen a position like in the main variation, but without the move h7-h6. 9...\textbf{dh}5 (following 9...\textbf{dg}4, Black must consider the possibility 10.\textbf{g}5)

9.\textbf{de}1. White is preparing \textbf{dd}3 and f2-f3. 9...\textbf{dd}7!? Black’s second knight joins in the fight for the c5-square.

After 10.\textbf{wd}2 \textbf{dc}5 11.\textbf{de}1, Black
has an interesting pawn-sacrifice: 11...£f4, Belchev – S. Vasilev, ICCF 2010, 12.£xf4 exf4 13.£xf4 a4 14.£c1 f5∞ – He has two powerful bishops and harmoniously deployed pieces as compensation for his minimal material deficit. It is in fact White who must think about equality.

10.g3. White prevents the appearance of the enemy knight on the f4-square. 10...£f6. Black has provoked a weakening of his opponent's kingside and now, his knight can go back, since it has nothing to do on the h5-square any more. 11.£d2, Kuryshev – Chechetko, St Petersburg 2015, 11...h5!? 12.£f3 £c5 13.£c2 b6∞, followed by £e8, £d7, £h7 and f7-f5. The weakening of White's king shelter (g2-g3) may hurt him in the future if Black organizes a kingside attack.

9...£h6

10.£e3

White's more logical move 10.£h4 (preserving the pin of the knight) 10...£e8, would lead to positions analysed in the next chapter.

After 10.£d2 £c5 11.£c2 £h5 12.£e1 £f4 13.£xf4 exf4, the dark squares in White's camp are seriously weakened. 14.£d3 £xd3 15.£xd3, Tribuiani – Rago, Naretto 1999. Here, Black could have begun a dangerous attack with the move 15...f3!±.

10...£g4

Black's knight frees the way forward of his f7-pawn with tempo.

11.£d2

It does not seem any better if White retreats his bishop to its initial position. 11.£c1 f5.
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After 12.\( \text{\textcircled{d}}e1 \text{\textcircled{f}6} \) 13.\( \text{\textcircled{f}3} \text{\textcircled{f}4} \) 14.\( \text{\textcircled{d}}d3 \), Black may refrain from the standard pawn-offensive on the kingside and try instead to transfer his knight to g3. 14...h5!? 15.\( \text{\textcircled{d}}d2 \) h4 16.a3 \( \text{\textcircled{h}5} \) 17.\( \text{\textcircled{f}2} \text{\textcircled{g}3\rightarrow} \) Davidov – Vinchev, ICCF 2014. Accepting the knight-sacrifice would lead to a quick checkmate for White. Later, Black may combine his kingside attack g6-g5-g4, \( \text{\textcircled{g}5} \) with some prophylactic on the opposite side of the board – c7-c5.

12.exf5 gxf5 13.g3 (13.\( \text{\textcircled{e}1} \text{\textcircled{e}8} \) 14.f3 \( \text{\textcircled{f}6=} \) Ovcharenko – Kazoks, ICCF 2012) 13...\( \text{\textcircled{c}5} \) 14.\( \text{\textcircled{h}4} \). White is threatening \( \text{\textcircled{x}f5} \) and \( \text{\textcircled{x}g4} \). 14...e4.

15.f4 exf3 16.\( \text{\textcircled{xf}3} \text{\textcircled{a}4\infty} \) – Black’s actively placed pieces compensate the vulnerability of his f5-pawn, Volzhin – Nataf, Koszalin 1999.

15.\( \text{\textcircled{x}xf5} \). White fails to win a pawn, because Black has an intermediate move. 15...\( \text{\textcircled{xf}2} \) 16.\( \text{\textcircled{xf}2} \) (White's attempt to remain with extra material 16.\( \text{\textcircled{x}h6+} \text{\textcircled{x}h6} \) 17.\( \text{\textcircled{xf}2} \), Volzhin – Balcerak, Senden 1999, would lead to a very difficult position for him after 17...e3!? – this pawn would impede the development of White's queen-side pieces. 18.\( \text{\textcircled{xf}8+} \text{\textcircled{xf}8} \) 19.\( \text{\textcircled{f}1} \text{\textcircled{xf}1+} \) 20.\( \text{\textcircled{xf}1} \text{\textcircled{xf}5\rightarrow} \) – White cannot develop his bishop on c1 and his rook on a1 without material losses.) 16...\( \text{\textcircled{xf}5} \) 17.\( \text{\textcircled{e}3} \text{\textcircled{d}3} \) 18.\( \text{\textcircled{x}d3} \text{\textcircled{ex}d3=} \) – Black’s two powerful bishops compensate fully the weakness of his d3-pawn, Nielsen – Mortensen, Taastrup 1998.

15.\( \text{\textcircled{x}g4} \). This move leads to the weakening of the light squares. 15...\( \text{\textcircled{fx}g4} \) 16.\( \text{\textcircled{e}3} \text{\textcircled{xc}3!?} \) Black exchanges his powerful bishop, but removes the threat against his e4-pawn. 17.\( \text{\textcircled{b}xc3} \text{\textcircled{d}d3} \). Black’s knight is headed for the f3-square. 18.\( \text{\textcircled{x}h6} \). White wins a pawn, but this is not important at all. 18...\( \text{\textcircled{f}7} \) 19.\( \text{\textcircled{e}2} \text{\textcircled{e}7} \) 20.\( \text{\textcircled{e}3} \text{\textcircled{h}7\rightarrow} \) Voveris – Amico, ICCF 2013.

11...\( \text{\textcircled{f}5} \) 12.\( \text{\textcircled{ex}f5} \)

Following 12.g3, the simplest for Black would be to play 12...f4, obtaining good attacking chances. 13.\( \text{\textcircled{h}4} \text{\textcircled{g}5} \) 14.\( \text{\textcircled{h}1} \text{\textcircled{f}7} \). He prepares the doubling of his rooks on the f-file. 15.\( \text{\textcircled{f}3} \text{\textcircled{d}7} \) 16.\( \text{\textcircled{e}2} \text{\textcircled{af}8\infty} \) Savchenko – Kokarev, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013.

12...\( \text{\textcircled{gx}f5} \)
The move 13.g3 does not create problems for Black. 13...f4 14.\textit{\textbf{h}4} \textit{\textbf{d}7}. He prepares the sacrifice of his knight on h2. 15.\textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{x}h}2! 16.\textit{\textbf{x}h}2 \textit{\textbf{h}3+} 17.\textit{\textbf{g}1} \textit{\textbf{f}xg}3 18.\textit{\textbf{x}g}3 \textit{\textbf{x}g}3+ 19.\textit{\textbf{g}2} e4. The bishop on g7 joins into the actions. Black has a very powerful attack for the piece. 20.\textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{g}6} 21.\textit{\textbf{e}f}4 \textit{\textbf{xf}4} 22.\textit{\textbf{x}f}4 e\textit{\textbf{x}f}4 23.\textit{\textbf{xf}3} \textit{\textbf{c}5}. He has regained a part of the sacrificed material. He has a pawn for the exchange and the two-bishop advantage. 24.\textit{\textbf{a}e}1 \textit{\textbf{d}3}. The activity of Black's pieces increases with every move and this circumstance forces White to part with the extra material. 25.\textit{\textbf{e}7} \textit{\textbf{f}6} 26.\textit{\textbf{xd}6} \textit{\textbf{xe}7} 27.\textit{\textbf{xe}7} \textit{\textbf{d}7=}. Both kings are relatively unsafe and this approximately balances the chances, Zlatariu – Terreaux, ICCF 2012.

13...f6 14.f3

Black has no problems at all after 14.b3 \textit{\textbf{c}5} 15.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{ce}4} 16.\textit{\textbf{xe}4} \textit{\textbf{xe}4=} Guzy – Staf, ICCF 2006, as well as following 14.g3 \textit{\textbf{c}5} 15.f4 16.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{f}5} 17.\textit{\textbf{xc}5} dxc5 18.\textit{\textbf{e}1} e4 19.\textit{\textbf{fxe}4} \textit{\textbf{xe}4} 20.\textit{\textbf{xf}4} \textit{\textbf{g}5} 21.\textit{\textbf{g}4} \textit{\textbf{h}3+} 22.\textit{\textbf{x}h}3 \textit{\textbf{x}h}3 23.\textit{\textbf{xf}8+}, Draw, Voiculescu – Dorner, ICCF 2014. White’s extra pawn is irrelevant, because after 23.\textit{\textbf{xf}8\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}3}, his king is vulnerable and Black’s bishops are very active.

14...f4

Black prepares the development of his bishop to f5.

15.\textit{\textbf{d}3}

White should possibly transfer here his bishop to the b1-h7 diagonal and later try to simplify the position by exchanging pieces. He will not manage to obtain an edge, but at least will not be checkmated on the g-file. 15.\textit{\textbf{c}1} \textit{\textbf{f}7} 16.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{f}8} 17.\textit{\textbf{b}1} \textit{\textbf{c}5} 18.\textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{g}7} 19.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{xd}3} 20.\textit{\textbf{xd}3} \textit{\textbf{h}5} 21.\textit{\textbf{f}2} \textit{\textbf{h}3} 22.\textit{\textbf{e}4} \textit{\textbf{h}8} 23.\textit{\textbf{e}2} b6 24.\textit{\textbf{h}1} \textit{\textbf{f}5=} Voiculescu – Pasko, ICCF 2014.

15...\textit{\textbf{f}5} 16.\textit{\textbf{e}1} (16.\textit{\textbf{c}1} \textit{\textbf{e}8} 17.\textit{\textbf{e}1} \textit{\textbf{g}6\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}} Ortiz de Latier – Canamas Soler, ICCF 2010) 16...\textit{\textbf{h}8\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}} Black is preparing \textit{\textbf{g}8}. He has very good attacking prospects. 17.\textit{\textbf{f}2} \textit{\textbf{e}8} 18.\textit{\textbf{a}3} \textit{\textbf{g}8} 19.\textit{\textbf{h}1} \textit{\textbf{g}6} 20.\textit{\textbf{e}1} \textit{\textbf{h}5} 21.\textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{g}3++} 22.\textit{\textbf{e}xg}3. It would be too risky for White to accept the sacrifice of the knight, but now, the vulnerability of the dark squares in his camp would hurt him horribly. 22...\textit{\textbf{xf}3} 23.\textit{\textbf{h}3}. White has managed to neutralise the first wave of the enemy attack. He has no counterplay at all however, so Black can bring his reserves patiently. With his next moves he will prepare the transfer of his knight from the edge of the board to the f4-square. 23...\textit{\textbf{f}6} 24.\textit{\textbf{g}1} \textit{\textbf{b}8} 25.\textit{\textbf{c}1} \textit{\textbf{h}5} 26.\textit{\textbf{b}3} \textit{\textbf{d}7} 27.\textit{\textbf{d}2} \textit{\textbf{h}4} 28.\textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{f}8} 29.c5 \textit{\textbf{g}6} 30.\textit{\textbf{d}e}4 \textit{\textbf{f}4=} Ermakov – Zemlyanov, ICCF 2011.
Chapter 20

1. d4 \( \triangle f6 \) 2. c4 \( \triangle g6 \) 3. \( \triangle c3 \) \( \triangle g7 \) 4. e4 \( d6 \)
5. \( \triangle f3 \) 0–0 6. \( \triangle e2 \) e5 7. d5 a5 8. \( \triangle g5 \)

The Petrosian System

With this move there arises an interesting system of development named after World Champion number 9 – Tigran Petrosian.

White pins the enemy knight and thus impedes his thematic pawn-advance f7-f5.

8...h6

Black should better clarify immediately the intentions of the enemy bishop, because if he slows down with this, White will play \( \underline{\triangle}d2 \) and his bishop will manage to retreat to e3 without being afraid of the move \( \underline{\triangle}g4 \).

9. \( \underline{\triangle}h4 \)

9. \( \underline{\triangle}e3 \). This move is not in the spirit of the Petrosian system.

White refrains voluntarily from the pin of the knight. Black exploits this immediately. 9...\( \underline{\triangle}g4 \) 10. \( \underline{\triangle}d2 \) (10. \( \underline{\triangle}c1 \) f5 11. exf5 gxf5 12. g3 \( \underline{\triangle}a6 \) 13. \( \underline{\triangle}h4 \) \( \underline{\triangle}c5 \) 14. 0-0 e4 – see Chapter 19, variation D) 10...f5 11. h3 (11. exf5 gxf5 12. h3 \( \underline{\triangle}f6 \) – see 11.h3) 11...\( \underline{\triangle}f6 \). White fails to hold the important e4-square. 12. exf5 gxf5 13. \( \underline{\mathbf{w}}c1 \) f4. Black prepares the development of his bishop to f5. 14. g3 e4 15. \( \underline{\mathbf{h}}4 \) e3. Black begins an attack. 16. fxe3 fxg3 17. \( \underline{\triangle}g6 \) \( \underline{\mathbf{e}}8 \)

Now, White must defend very precisely.

It is obviously bad for him to play 18. \( \underline{\mathbf{w}}c2 \)?! – his queen will be attacked in the future by the enemy knight on this square. 18... \( \underline{\triangle}a6 \) 19. 0-0–0 (19. \( \underline{\mathbf{g}}1 ? \) \( \underline{\triangle}b4 \) 20.
\[ 3. \text{c3} \text{g7} 4. \text{e4} \text{d6} 5. \text{f3} 0-0 6. \text{e2} \text{e5} 7. \text{d5} \text{a5} 8. \text{g5} \text{h6} 9. \text{h4} \text{a6} \]

\[ \text{wb1} \text{e4} 21. \text{xe4} \text{f5} 22. \text{xb4} \text{xe4} 23. \text{d3}, \text{T.Hansen – Forcen Esteban, Sitges 2015, 23...\text{g5} 24. \text{f4} \text{xf4}! 25. \text{exf4} \text{xd3} –+) 19... \text{b4} \text{Levin – Ozolin, Samara 2015.} \]

It seems more reliable for White to choose 18.\text{g1}, Flores – Morovic Fernandez, San Salvador 2016, 18...\text{f5} 19.\text{xg3} \text{bd7} 20. \text{f4} \text{c5} – Black has sufficient compensation for his minimal material deficit. His pieces are very active, while White's king is stranded in the centre.

9...\text{a6}

Black increases his control over the b4 and c5-squares and thus impedes the development of White's queenside initiative. Meanwhile, now Black can play \text{we8}, without being afraid of the knight-sortie \text{b5}.

10.\text{d2}

This is a thematic move. Now White's bishop on e2 controls the h5-square and he should not be afraid of the transfer of the enemy knight from f6 to f4.

The other route of White's knight \text{e1-d3} has the drawback that in comparison to \text{d2} he does not control sufficiently the strategically important e4-square.

10.0–0 \text{we8} 11.\text{e1} (11.\text{d2} \text{d7} – see variation B) 11...\text{d7} 12.\text{d3} \text{xe4}!? This temporary piece-sacrifice is Black's simplest road to equality. 13.\text{xe4} \text{f5} 14.\text{c3} \text{g5} 15.\text{g3} \text{e4} 16.\text{f4} \text{xf4} 17.\text{xf4} \text{g6} 18.\text{d2} \text{c5} = Zakharov – Gromov, ICCF 2009. Black has restored the material balance. His pieces are very actively deployed. Later, he can organise an attack against White's king on the semi-open g-file.

10...\text{we8}

White has two basic plans for action in this position.

He can evacuate his king away from the centre B) 11.0–0, or can, without losing a tempo for castling kingside, begin immediate active actions on the queenside with A) 11.a3. This way of saving a tempo seems very dubious, though...
11.b3 \( \&d7 \) 12.0–0 (12.a3 \( \&h7 \) – see variation A) 12...\( \&h7 \) – see variation B.

11.\( \&b1 \) \( \&d7 \) 12.b3 (12.0–0 \( \&h7 \) – see variation B) 12...\( \&h7 \) 13.f3 (13.a3 h5 – see variation A) 13...h5 14.0–0 (14.a3 \( \&h6 \) – see variation A) 14...\( \&h6 \) 15.\( \&f2 \) (15.a3 \( \&e3 \) – see variation B) 15...\( \&e7 \) 16.\( \&h1 \) h4 17.a3 \( \&f4 \) – see variation B1, 16.\( \&h1 \).

11.h3. This is hardly the most useful move for White. 11...\( \&h7 \) 12.a3 \( \&d7 \) 13.b3 f5∞ Semcsen – Radovanovic, Pardubice 2011.

It looks too risky for White to choose 11.g4, because he fails the prevent the enemy pawn-advance f7-f5 anyway. The weakening of the f4-square however, may hurt him in the future. 11...\( \&h7 \)

12.\( \&g3 \) f5\( \&^\circ \)

12.\( \&g1 \) \( \&d7 \) 13.\( \&f1 \) \( \&g5 \) 14.\( \&xg5 \) hxg5. The dark squares in White’s position are weakened and his h2-pawn is vulnerable. 15.\( \&d2 \) \( \&f6 \) 16.\( \&g3 \) \( \&g7 \) 17.\( \&f1 \) \( \&h8\&^\circ \) Anastasian – Mariano, Dubai 2004.

12.f3 f5 13.a3 fxg4 14.fxg4, Spassky – Arakhamia Grant, Copenhagen 1997. Here, Black could have obtained an advantage with the line: 14...\( \&xf6 \)? 15.\( \&xf6 \) \( \&xf6\&^\circ \) – White has no compensation for the weakness of the f4-square.

11.\( \&xf6 \). He exchanges the defender of the g4-square and after 11...\( \&xf6 \) 12.\( \&g4 \) (12.h4 \( \&g7 \) 13.h5, Cazzaniga – Roberts, Milan 2013, 13...\( \&g5! ? \) ) manages to trade his opponent’s lightsquared bishop, which is absolutely essential for Black in the King’s Indian Defence. Still, White’s plan seems to be too slow and Black organises good counterplay. 12...\( \&xg4 \) 13.\( \&w \times g4 \) \( \&b4 \). This is the point. White is incapable of taking simultaneously control over the c2 and d3-squares. So, he must comply with the transfer of the enemy knight into the centre of the board. 14.0–0 \( \&c2 \) 15.\( \&ad1 \) \( \&d4 \) 16.\( \&f3 \) h5 17.\( \&g3 \), Timman – Avrukh, Amsterdam 2001, 17...c6!?\&^= – Black has a very good position.

A) 11.a3 \( \&d7 \)
12.b3
because he would be incapable of
castling after this move. 15.b4
axb4 16.axb4 e3 17.f2 xf2+ 18.xf2 e7= – Naturally, White
will accomplish an artificial cas­
tling and will evacuate his king to
a safe square, but of course it
would be Black who will fight for
the opening advantage, Laketic –

12...h7 13.f3
13.0–0 h5 – see variation B.
13...b1 h5 14.f3 h6 – see 13.f3

13...h5
Black prepares the develop­
ment of his bishop to h6.

14.b1
14.0–0 h6 – see variation B.

Following 14.f2 h6 15.a2
(15.b1 e7 – see 14.b1), Black
obtains good counterplay after a
transfer of his queen to the g5­
square. 15...e7 16.b1 g5 17.
g1, Bischoff – Clara, Baden­
Baden 1990, 17...h4!∞

14...h6 15.f2
15.0–0 e3 – see 11.0–0.

White should not allow e3,
18.b4 axb4 19.axb4 \textit{a}4 20.\textit{d}1.
He is preparing the transfer of his knight to the e3-square (20.\textit{b}5
\textit{xb}5 21.cxb5 \textit{f}6 22.\textit{a}1 \textit{b}6 23.\textit{xa}8 \textit{xa}8= Patrici – De Souza, ICCF 2008. After White’s c4-
pawn has gone to b5, he would not have the possibility c4-c5.\nWithout this move, he cannot break Black’s defence on the
queenside.) 20...\textit{xb}5 21.\textit{e}3, Rossiter – Ledger, Dundee 1993 (21.
\textit{d}3 c6∞) 21...b6!?! This is the simplest for Black. Now, it would
be dangerous for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice: 22.exf5?! gxf5
23.\textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 24.\textit{xf}5, because after 24...\textit{c}3 25.\textit{b}2 \textit{g}7 26.\textit{c}2
\textit{xe}2 27.\textit{xe}2 \textit{e}4+, White’s king, stranded in the centre, will come
under a crushing attack by Black’s pieces.

16...\textit{xb}4 17.axb4 \textit{h}4
This is a very useful pawn-advance. Now, White will not be
able to play h2-h4.

18.\textit{c}2
The pawn-sacrifice 18.c5 dxc5

19.b5 would not promise White
more than equality. 19...\textit{b}4 20.
\textit{c}4 h3 21.g3, Danner – Stanec, Austria 1993, 21...b6?!∞

18...\textit{g}5 19.\textit{g}4
White at least preserves his castling rights with this move.

19.\textit{g}1?! c5?! Indjic – Brankovic, Vrnjacka Banja 2012.

19...\textit{e}7
Black’s queen has provoked a
weakening of his opponent’s king-
side and now can go back to the
e7-square. His knight will be best
placed on g5.

20.c5 \textit{dxc}5 21.bxc5 \textit{xc}5
22.\textit{c}4 \textit{fb}8∞ White has sacri-
ficed a pawn and has seized com-
pletely the initiative on the queen-
side. His king however is not safe
at all, so Black’s prospects are not
worse. 23.d6 cxd6 24.\textit{d}5 \textit{d}8
25.\textit{xd}6 \textit{e}6 26.\textit{c}4 \textit{c}6 27.
\textit{b}6. White’s pieces are very ac-
tive, but the dark squares in his
camp are horribly compromised.
27...\textit{d}4 28.\textit{b}2 \textit{f}8 29.0–0
\textit{g}7 30.\textit{d}1 \textit{g}5 31.\textit{c}7 \textit{e}7.
3. \(c3\) \(g7\) 4.\(e4\) d6 5.\(f3\) 0-0 6.\(e2\) e5 7.d5 a5 8.\(g5\) h6 9.\(h4\) \(c6\)

Black sacrifices the exchange and seizes the initiative. 32.\(dxa8\)
\(dxa8\) Martynov – Tsygankov, ICCF 2014. Black has a pawn for the exchange and powerful initiative. The position of White’s king is weakened and the dark squares in his camp are hopelessly weak.

B) 11.0–0 \(d7\)

12.b3

White is preparing a2-a3. Now, he should not be afraid of the pawn-advance a5-a4.

12.\(b5\) \(h7\) 13.a3 \(f6\) – see 12.a3.

12.\(b1\) \(h7\) 13.\(h1\) (13.a3 a4 – see 12.a3) 13...h5 – see 12.\(h1\).

12.\(xf6\). After this move the position is simplified considerably and the position is balanced. 12...\(xf6\) 13.\(g4\) \(xg4\) 14.\(xg4\), Barata – Supi, Registro 2013, 14... \(c5\) 15.\(e2\) a4=

12.f3. This move is premature before the removal of Black’s knight from f6. White loses his control over the h5-square. Black transfers his knight to the f4-square and obtains an excellent position. 12...\(h5\) 13.b3, C.Hansen – Jensen, Aarhus 1994 (13. \(e1\) \(f4\)\(∞\)) 13...\(f4\)!\(∞\)

12.a3 \(h7\)

13.b3 h5 – see 12.b3.

13.\(h1\) h5 – see 12.\(h1\).

Black has no problems after 13.\(b5\) \(f6\) 14.\(xf6\) \(xf6\) 15.b4 \(e7\) 16.\(b3\)= Piskov – Stefansson, Copenhagen 1991.

13.\(b1\) a4. Now, the pawn-advance b2-b4 would lead to the formation of an isolated pawn in White’s position on the a-file. 14. \(b5\) h5 Black not only prepares \(h6\), but also threatens to trap the enemy bishop after g6-g5 and h5-h4. 15.f3 \(h6\) 16.\(f2\) (16.b4 axb3 17.\(xb3\) \(e3\)+ 18.\(f2\) \(xf2\)+ 19.\(xf2\), Agdamus – Tukmakov, Buenos Aires 1970, 19...\(e7\)!\(∞\)=) 16...\(e7\) 17.b4 axb3 18.\(xb3\) h4\(∞\) – Black’s counterplay on the kingside seems at least as dangerous as White’s initiative on the opposite side of the board, Ostojic – Markovic, Cetinje 1990.
White often plays here the prophylactic move 12.\( \text{h}1 \), taking his king away from the g1-a7 diagonal. 12...\( \text{h}7 \\

13.b3 h5 – see 12.b3.
13.\( \text{b}1 \) h5 14.f3 \( \text{h}6 \) 15.b3 \( \text{e}3 \)
16.a3 \( \text{c}5 \) – see variation B2.
13.\( \text{c}1 \), Limeres Guiance – Prieto Aranguren, Mondragon 2007, 13...\( \text{f}6! \)? 14.\( \text{x}f6 \) \( \text{x}f6= \\
13.a3 h5 14.f3 \( \text{f}6 \) 15.\( \text{x}f6 \)
(White should better refrain from the exchange of the dark-squared bishops. 15.\( \text{f}2 \) h4 16.b3 \( \text{g}5 \) – see 12.b3) 15...\( \text{x}f6 \) 16.b3 \( \text{e}7 \) –
The dark squares in White’s camp are weak, Gulko – Kasparov, Novgorod 1995.
13.f3 h5

14.a3 \( \text{f}6 \) – see 13.a3.
14.b3 \( \text{f}6 \) – see 12.b3.
14.\( \text{e}1 \), Granda Zuniga – Mi-

12...\( \text{h}7 \\

14.\( \text{b}3 \) b6. It is not clear what White’s knight is doing on b3, since he cannot advance c4-c5 without the support of his b-pawn, so sooner or later his knight will have to abandon the b3-square, freeing the way forward of his b-pawn. 15.\( \text{c}1 \), Petrosian – Hort, Lugano 1968, 15...\( \text{f}6! \)? 16.\( \text{x}f6 \) \( \text{x}f6= – White has lost too much time on manoeuvres with his knight and Black’s prospects are not worse at all.

12...\( \text{h}7 \\

13.a3

13.f3 h5 14.a3 (14.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) – see 13.\( \text{h}1 \)) 14...\( \text{h}6 \) – see 13.a3.

White would not achieve much with the line: 13.\( \text{h}1 \) h5 14.f3 \( \text{f}6 \). Now, he must either exchange the bishops, which is doubtlessly in favour of Black, or just retreat his bishop from its active position. 15.\( \text{f}2 \) h4 16.a3 \( \text{g}5 \) 17.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
18.b4 axb4 19.axb4 \( \text{f}6 \). Black is
preparing the transfer of his knight to the h5-square. 20.c5. White sacrifices a pawn in an attempt to deflect his opponent from his kingside attack. (20.\(d3 \ h5^\uparrow\) Polak - Alekseev, Pardubice 1999) 20...h3 21.g3 dxc5 22. bxc5 \(dxc5\) 23.c4 \(bxc5\) = White has sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, but not more than that, Vaassen - Borisovs, LSS 2007.

13...h5

Here, contrary to the other variations in the King’s Indian defence, in the Petrosian system Black, as a rule, cannot advance f7-f5 easily and is forced to prepare for a long time this pawn-break.

The point is that the straightforward attempt 13...f5 will be countered by White with 14.exf5 gxf5 15.h5, followed by \(e7\) and the chase of Black’s rooks by White’s bishops would be very unpleasant for Black.

14.f3 \(h6\)

Now, White can either prevent \(\text{xe3}\) with B1) 15.\(f2\), or play B2) 15.\(h1\).

15.\(a2\) \(e3+\) 16.\(h1\) \(b8\), or 15.\(c2\) \(e3+\) 16.\(h1\) \(f5\) - see 15.\(h1\).

There arises a complicated double-edged fight after 15.\(e1\) \(c5\) 16.\(b1\) \(f5\)∞ Auzins – Pomonev, ICCF 2010.

The move 15.\(b1\) leads to an approximately equal position. 15... \(\text{xe3+}\) 16.\(f2\) (16.\(h1\) \(c5\) – see 15.\(h1\)) 16...\(xf2+\) 17.\(xf2\) \(e7\). Black has exchanged his bishop on g7, which was severely restricted by his own pawn on e5 and now, he can be very optimistic about the future. 18.b4 axb4 19.axb4 c5. He prevents the pawn-advance c4-c5.

20.dxc6 (Following 20.bxc5 \(dxc5\), the powerful placement of the knight on c5 compensates for Black the slight weakness of his isolated b7-pawn. 21.\(d2\) b6 22.\(d2\) \(b8\) 23.\(c2\) \(g7\)∞ Khenkin – Bokan, Moscow 1989) 20...bxc6 21.\(a4\) \(b8\) 22.\(c5\), Zlotnik – A. Kuzmin, Budapest 1989. White has managed to advance c4-c5, but Black was well prepared against that. 22...\(e6!\)? 23.\(xa6\) \(xa6\) 24.cxd6 \(xd6\) 25.\(c5\) \(ab6=\) – The weaknesses of the pawns on b4 and c6 balance each other.

B1) 15.\(f2\) \(e7\)

Black is threatening \(g5\) and \(h3\) at an opportune moment.
16. \textbf{\textit{c2}}

White parries this threat. Now, after \textit{\textbf{\textit{g5}}}, he will have the resource \textit{\textbf{\textit{fd1}}} and after \textit{\textbf{\textit{h3}}} he will simply play \textit{\textbf{\textit{f1}}}.

16. \textit{\textbf{h1}}. This move is too passive. 16...h4 17.\textit{\textbf{b1}} \textit{\textbf{f4}} 18. \textit{\textbf{g1}}, Jimenez Villena – Danailov, Seville 1992 (18.\textit{\textbf{e1}} \textit{\textbf{g5}}\textit{\textbf{∞}} Najdorf – R.Garcia, Mar del Plata 1968) 18...\textit{\textbf{g7}}?\textit{∞}, followed by \textit{\textbf{h8}}, \textit{\textbf{f6-h5-g3}}. Black’s attack may turn out to be very dangerous.

Black obtains a very good position in the variation 16.\textit{\textbf{a2}} h4 17.\textit{\textbf{b2}} h3?\textit{∞}, or 16.\textit{\textbf{b1}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} 17. \textit{\textbf{b2}} \textit{\textbf{h3}} 18.\textit{\textbf{g3}} h4 19.f4, Grinev – Yukhno, Dnipropetrovsk 2003, 19...\textit{\textbf{f6}}?\textit{∞}

16...h4

17.\textit{\textbf{fd1}}

17.\textit{\textbf{ab1}} \textit{\textbf{f4}} 18.\textit{\textbf{fd1}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} – see 17.\textit{\textbf{fd1}}.

17...\textit{\textbf{f4}} 18.\textit{\textbf{ab1}}

18.\textit{\textbf{f1}}? \textit{\textbf{g5}}\textit{\textbf{∞}} Vickery – Ozanne, Guernsey 2008.

The position is equal following 18.\textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} 19.\textit{\textbf{d3}}, Malich – Schmidt, Decin 1976, 19...\textit{\textbf{c5}}?=

18...\textit{\textbf{g5}} 19.\textit{\textbf{h1}}

19.\textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{f6}} 20.\textit{\textbf{e2}} \textit{\textbf{e3}}\textit{\textbf{∞}} – After the trade of the bishops, the vulnerability of the dark squares in White’s camp may hurt him in the future, Tukmakov – Magerramov, Moscow 1983.

19...\textit{\textbf{e3}} 20.\textit{\textbf{xe3}} \textit{\textbf{xe3}}= – White must defend accurately; otherwise, he might get checkmated following \textit{\textbf{g7}}, \textit{\textbf{h8}}, \textit{\textbf{f6-h5-g3}}, Meier – Miles, Hamburg 1995.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Diagram}
\end{figure}

B2) 15.\textbf{\textit{h1}} \textbf{\textit{e3}}

16.\textbf{\textit{c2}}

White’s plan includes \textit{\textbf{d3}}, increasing the control over the \textit{\textbf{b1-h7}} diagonal.

16.\textit{\textbf{a2}}. He protects his knight and prepares \textit{\textbf{b1}}. Still, all this
3. c3 g7 4.e4 d6 5.d3 0-0 6.e2 e5 7.d5 a5 8.g5 h6 9.h4 \nseems too slow. 16...\textit{b}8. Black wishes to play \textit{a}7 at an opportune moment. A similar manouevre (in another opening, indeed...) has been encountered in the games of Akiba Rubinstein. 17. \textit{b}1 g5. This is a defensive and not attacking move. Black increases his control over the f4-square. 18.e1 c5. From here the bishop will prevent the pawn-advance b3-b4. 19.d1 h4 20.f2. White must comply with the exchange of the bishops, because this is the only way for him to break on the queenside. Later however, the advantage of having a “good” bishop against White’s “bad” bishop may become an important factor. 20...\textit{x}f2 21.e1, Bezold – Enders, Binz 1994, 21...\textit{c}6!?\infty

16.\textit{b}1. One of the defects of this natural move is the fact that White’s a3-pawn remains defenceless and Black can transfer his bishop to c5 with tempo. 16...c5 17.c1 f5 18.exf5. Naturally, White should not allow his opponent’s pawn-offensive on the kingside (f5-f4, g6-g5-g4). 18...\textit{xf}5

The move 19.f4 leads to a complicated positional battle. 19...e4 20.e1 e3 21.g3 f2 22.d1 f6 23.b4 axb4 24.axb4 g4 25.g2 \textit{b}6 Walczak – Habermehl, ICCF 2013.

On the contrary, the move 19.f2 leads to simplifications 19...g6 20.xc5 xc5 21.b4 axb4 22.axb4 a4 23.a1 xc3 24.xc3 f6 25.f4 xa1 26.xa1 e8= Sharden – Cavajda, ICCF 2000.

19.\textit{a}2 g6. Black’s plans include the doubling (and eventually even tripling) of his major pieces on the g-file. 20.b4 axb4 21.axb4 e3 22.\textit{c}3 (He has no problems after 22.f2 xf2 23.xf2 f6 24.\textit{c}3 h4=, followed by \textit{h}5-f4(g3), Douziech – Balabaev, Canada 2001) 22...\textit{h}6. Black must remove his knight from the g-file in order to protect his bishop. 23.b3 \textit{f}6 24.a1 f4 25.d3 \textit{h}8 26.\textit{ac}1 \textit{g}8=, followed by \textit{a}8-f8-f7-g7, Vinot – Muneret, ICCF 2004.

16...f5 17.exf5 gxf5

18.eae1

Or 18.b5 \textit{g}6 19.f1 \textit{f}6 20.d3 \textit{g}5 21.xg5 \textit{xg}5= and
then $\text{h8}$, $\text{g8}$, forcing White to begin defending, De Blois Figueredo – Lakatos, ICCF 2013.

He would not achieve much by exchanging the bishops $18.\text{xf2}$ $\text{xf2}$ $19.\text{xf6}$ $\text{g1}$ $\text{h8}$. Black's king frees a square for his rook. $21.\text{b2}$ $\text{c5}$. Without this move, after b3-b4, Black's knight will be misplaced at the edge of the board. $22.\text{b4}$ axb4 $23.\text{xb4}$ $\text{c4}$ $24.\text{xa4}$ $\text{xa4}$ $25.\text{d1}$ $\text{a8}$ $26.f4$ $e4$ (It is worse for Black to opt here for $26...\text{exf4}$, Kramnik – Gelfand, Linares 1994, $27.\text{f3}$?! – His weak kingside pawns may turn into an easy prey for White's pieces.) $27.\text{f1}$. White prepares the transfer of his knight to the blocking e3-square. $27...\text{g6}$ $28.\text{e3}$ $\text{g7}$ $29.\text{c5}$ $\text{g4}$ $30.\text{xg4}$ $\text{hxg4}$ $31.\text{c1}$ $\text{xb2}$ $32.\text{xb2}$ $\text{a3}$ – Black has at least an equal position thanks to his dominance over the a-file and his protected passed e4-pawn, Kalinin – Nitsche, ICCF 2007.

$19.\text{d3}$

$19.\text{d1}$ $\text{h6}=\text{Babula – Scholz, Germany 2008.}$

$19.\text{d1}$ $\text{c5}$


$20.\text{b1}$, Sundararajan – Dalo, Barbera del Valles 2015, $20...\text{f6}!\text{?}$. White is unlikely to manage to advance b3-b4, while Black's plan on the kingside is quite simple – $\text{h8}$, $\text{g8}$...

$18...\text{g6}$

$19...\text{h6}$ $20.\text{e2}$

$20.\text{db1}$ $\text{f7}=\text{Van Hoolandt – Cazzaniga, Milan 2012.}$

$20...\text{f7}$ $21.\text{f2}$ $\text{xf2}$ $22.\text{exe2}$ $\text{c5}$ $23.b4$ axb4 $24.$ axb4 $\text{xd3}$ – Black's prospects are not worse thanks to his powerful pawn-tandem e5 and f5, Rossetti – Tingander, Lechenicher SchachServer 2010.
Chapter 21

1.d4 ½f6 2.c4 g6 3.½c3 ½g7 4.e4 d6 5.½f3 0–0 6.½e2 e5 7.0–0

This is White’s strongest and most logical move. He does not determine the pawn-structure in the centre yet and just castles.

7...½c6

Black cannot begin his pawn-offensive on the kingside before White has castled, since that would contradict the well known principle that flanks attacks are effective only in positions with a secure centre.

With his last move Black increases his pressure against the d4-square and wishes to provoke d4–d5. He is not afraid of the fact that he will have to lose a tempo for the retreat of his knight if White really plays like this.

We will analyse now A) 8.dxe5 and B) ½e3.

The move 8.d5 will be dealt with in Chapters 22-27.

White ends up in an inferior position after 8.½e1?! exd4 9.½xd4 ½xe4†, as well as following 8.½g5?! ½xd4 9.½xd4 exd4 10.½xd4 ½xe4! Black seizes the initiative after this tactical strike. 11.½xd8 ½xd4 12.½xc7 ½xc3 13. bxc3 ½e6 14.½d3, Lys – Orzechowski, Czech Republic 2006, 14...½fc8!? 15.½a5 ½c5 16.½e2 ½a4† – White’s two-bishop advantage does not compensate the weakness of his doubled c-pawns.

A) 8.dxe5

White plays in the spirit of the exchange variation.

8...dxe5
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9.\( \text{\$g5} \)

The move 9.h3 does not create any problems for Black. 9...\( \text{\$d4} \)\( = \) His prospects are not worse. White's attempt to trade the central pawns with 10.\( \text{\$xe5} \), Schatz - Saathoff, Ansbach 2000, 10...\( \text{\$xe4} \!) 11.\( \text{\$xe4} \)\( \text{\$xe5} \), would lead to a worse position for him, because Black's minor pieces are placed much more actively.

9.\( \text{\$e3} \). White is trying to cover the d4-square against the penetration of the enemy knight. 9...\( \text{\$g4} \) 10.h3 \( \text{\$xf3} \). Black exchanges an important defender of the central squares. White's two-bishop advantage will not be so important here, because the position is of a closed type. 11.\( \text{\$xf3} \) \( \text{\$d4} \) 12.\( \text{\$b5} \) \( \text{\$e6} \) 13.\( \text{\$b3} \) c6 14.\( \text{\$fd1} \) \( \text{\$e7} \) 15.\( \text{\$c3} \), Hajek - Skuja, Pardubice 2001. Here, Black has an interesting plan for actions: 15...\( \text{\$h5} \)!, followed by \( \text{\$h7} \) and \( \text{\$h6} \), exchanging the dark-squared bishops, followed by the penetration of his knight to the d4-outpost. White must react very precisely not to end up in a strategically hopeless position with a "bad" bishop on f3.

9.\( \text{\$xd8} \). This move often leads to transposition of moves. 9...\( \text{\$xd8} \) 10.\( \text{\$g5} \) \( \text{\$f8} \) 11.h3. This move is too slow. White defends against \( \text{\$g4} \), but does not prevent the penetration of the enemy knight to d4 (it would be better for him to opt here for 11.\( \text{\$fd1} \) \( \text{\$g4} \), or

11.\( \text{\$ad1} \) \( \text{\$g4} \) - see 9.\( \text{\$g5} \). 11...\( \text{\$d4} \) 12.\( \text{\$xd4} \) exd4 13.\( \text{\$xf6} \) \( \text{\$xf6} \) 14.\( \text{\$b5} \) c6 15.\( \text{\$d6} \), Inkiov - Cossin, Rosny sous Bois 2004, 15...\( \text{\$e6} \)!!? - Black can continue to play for a win without any risk thanks to his two-bishop advantage.

9...\( \text{\$xd1} \)

This is the simplest move. Black trades the queens and gets rid of the pin of his knight.

10.\( \text{\$fxd1} \)

White would not achieve much if he captures with his other rook. 10.\( \text{\$xd1} \) \( \text{\$g4} \) 11.\( \text{\$d2} \) (11.\( \text{fe1} \) \( \text{h6} \) 12.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{fd8} \) = Bu - Dyachkov, Rishon Le Ziyyon 2006, 11...\( \text{\$xf3} \) 12.\( \text{\$xf3} \) \( \text{\$d4} \). He must play very precisely in order to neutralise the pressure of Black's centralised knight. 13.\( \text{fd1} \) (13.\( \text{\$b5} \), Bacrot - Radjabov, Rishon Le Ziyyon 2006, 13...\( \text{\$e6} \)?) 13...\( \text{\$h5} \) 14.\( \text{\$e2} \) c6 15.\( \text{\$d7} \) 16.\( \text{\$g3} \) \( \text{\$b6} \) 17.\( \text{\$b3} \) \( \text{\$fe8} \) 18.\( \text{\$f2} \) \( \text{\$f8} \) 19.\( \text{\$f1} \) \( \text{\$b4} \) 20.\( \text{\$d3} \) a5= - Black's task is much simpler in this endgame, Goncharov - Tsygankov, ICCF 2011.
10...\textbf{g4}

He is fighting for the d4-square.

11.h3

11.\textit{a}c1 h6 12.\textit{e}e3 \textit{f}d8 13.h3 \textit{xf}3 14.\textit{xf}3 \textit{d}4 15.\textit{b}b5 \textit{e}6 16.\textit{xd}8+ \textit{xd}8, Hladecek – Valak, ICCF 2009, 17.\textit{xa}7 \textit{ea}8 18.\textit{b}b5 \textit{xa}2= Black has succeeded in activating his rook.

Following 11.\textit{d}d2 \textit{xf}3 12.\textit{xf}3 \textit{d}4, the chances of both sides are approximately equal. 13.\textit{d}d5 (13.\textit{ad}1 h5 – see 10.\textit{ad}1) 13...\textit{xd}5 14.\textit{xd}5 f5 15.\textit{e}3 \textit{ad}8 16.\textit{f}f1 \textit{f}f7 17.\textit{xd}4 \textit{exd}4= Siikaluoma – Ponomarev, ICCF 2008.

11.\textit{d}d3. White is preparing the doubling of his rooks on the d-file. Still, the placement of his rook on d3 enables Black to simplify the position with a tactical strike. 11...h6 12.\textit{e}e3 \textit{xe}4! 13.\textit{xe}4 f5 14.\textit{c}c5 (14.\textit{c}c3?! e4 15.\textit{d}d2 exf3 16.gxf3 f4 17.\textit{c}5 \textit{xc}3 18.bxc3 \textit{f}5, Perun – Pavlov, Kiev 2004, 19.fxg4 \textit{xc}5= – White’s pawn-weaknesses are the cause for Black’s advantage.) 14.e4 15.\textit{b}b3 exf3 16.gxf3 f4 17.\textit{xf}4 \textit{fxe}3 18.fxe3, Itkis – Golubev, So­vata 2000. White has an extra pawn, but his pawn-structure has been compromised and his pieces are not so harmoniously deployed. 18...\textit{a}5! 19.\textit{b}b5 \textit{ae}8. This temporary piece-sacrifice is the simplest road to equality for Black. 20.\textit{xa}5 \textit{xe}3 21.\textit{f}f1 b6 22.\textit{xa}7 \textit{bx}c5 23.\textit{xc}7 \textit{xb}2 24.\textit{b}b1 \textit{d}4 25.\textit{h}1 \textit{a}3= – He regains the pawn on a2 and there arises complete equality on the board.

11...\textit{xf}3 12.\textit{xf}3 \textit{d}4

13.\textit{d}d5

13.\textit{d}d2 c6 14.\textit{e}e2, Grochowski – Falatowicz, ICCF 2006, 14...\textit{e}6!= White’s knight on e2 covers the d4-square, but is placed a bit passively.

13.\textit{b}b5 \textit{e}6 14.\textit{e}e3, Sokolovs – Roca, Yerevan 1996, 14...\textit{a}6 15.\textit{c}3 \textit{fd}8 16.\textit{xd}8+ \textit{xd}8= If
Black manages to accomplish the manoeuvre $\text{f}8\text{c}5$, he may even obtain an edge in this endgame.

13...$\text{Qxd5}$ 14.$\text{cxd5}$

Now, White will be able to exert pressure against the $\text{c}7$-pawn, but this would be insufficient for an advantage.

14...$\text{f5}$

15.$\text{Bac1}$

15.$\text{Bf1}$ $\text{f7}$ 16.$\text{d2}$, Gustafsson – Golubev, playchess.com 2004 (16.$\text{Bac1}$ $\text{Qxf3}$ – see 15.$\text{Bac1}$) 16...$\text{Qaf8}!$? 17.$\text{Bb4}$ $\text{Qd8}$ 18.$\text{Bac1}$ $\text{Qf6}$ 19.$\text{Ba5}$ $\text{Qdd7}=$ – The $\text{c}7$-pawn has been reliably protected. Black holds solidly his defence thanks to his powerful centralised knight.

15.$\text{e3}$ $\text{ae8}$ (His position is quite acceptable after 15...$\text{Qf7}$ 16. $\text{Qxd4}$ $\text{Qxd4}$ 17.$\text{exf5}$ $\text{gxf5}$ 18.$\text{e1}$ $\text{Qf8}=$ Li Chao – Ding Liren, Zaozhuang 2015.) 16.$\text{Qab1}$ $\text{Qf7}$ 17. $\text{e1}$ $\text{Qxf3}+$ 18.$\text{gxf3}$ $\text{Qf8}$. Black prepares the transfer of his bishop to $\text{d6}$ from where it will protect reliably his $\text{c}7$-pawn. 19.$\text{Bc1}$ $\text{Qd8}$

20.$\text{Qf1}$ $\text{Qg7}$ 21.$\text{e2}$ $\text{a6}$ 22.$\text{g1}$ $\text{Qd6}=$ White has more space, but his kingside pawn-structure has been weakened, Roether – Trofimov, IECC 2011.

15...$\text{Qf7}$

16.$\text{Qf1}$

16.$\text{e3}$ $\text{fxe4}$ 17.$\text{g4}$ $\text{Qf5}=$ Krush – Melekhina, Saint Louis 2009.

Black has no reasons to be afraid of 16.$\text{exf5}$ $\text{Qxf3}+$ 17.$\text{gx3}$ $\text{gxf5}$ 18.$\text{d6}$ $\text{cxd6}$ 19.$\text{Qxd6}$ $\text{Qe8}=$ White’s pieces are more actively placed, but his kingside pawn-structure has been compromised, Martinovic – Jovanovic, Sarajevo 2016.

16...$\text{Qxf3}$ 17.$\text{gx3}$ $\text{ed7}$ 18. $\text{e3}$ $\text{f4}$ 19.$\text{d2}$ $\text{Qf8}$ 20.$\text{c4}$ $\text{Qf7}$ 21.$\text{e2}$ $\text{d6}$ 22.$\text{a3}$ $\text{Qf6}!?$ Black’s king is headed for the $\text{h}4$-square in order to force White’s pieces to protect the $\text{h}3$-pawn. 23.$\text{Bb4}$ $\text{Qg5}$ 24.$\text{Qg1+}$ $\text{Qh4}$ 25.$\text{Qg4+}$ $\text{Qh5}=$ White cannot play for a
win, because of the vulnerability of his h3-pawn.

**B) 8.\( \text{e}3 \)**

There has arisen a position similar to the Gligoric variation. The difference is the inclusion of the moves 0–0 and \( \text{c}6 \).

8...\( \text{g}4 \) 9.\( \text{g}5 \) f6 10.\( \text{h}4 \)

About 10.\( \text{c}1 \) f5 – see the Gligoric variation (Chapter 18, variation A1).

10...\( \text{g}5 \) 11.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}6 \)

Black’s main task in this variation is to activate his knight on h6. In order to do this, as a rule, he advances f6-f5, so that after an exchange on f5 to follow with \( \text{d}5 \).

12.dxe5

White’s alternatives do not provide him with anything meaningful.

12.h3. This is hardly the most useful move for him. 12...f5 13.d5 \( \text{d}4 \)= Marin – Ye, Thessaloniki 1988.

12.d5 \( \text{e}7 \). The position in the centre has been stabilised and the actions are focused on the flanks. 13.\( \text{d}2 \) (13.\( \text{e}1 \). The transfer of the knight to \( \text{d}3 \) seems to be a bit too slow. 13...\( \text{g}6 \) 14.f3 \( \text{f}4 \) 15.\( \text{d}3 \) f5 16.exf5 \( \text{xf}5 \)= Banikas – Smirin, Athens 2008; 13.\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 14.\( \text{f}1 \) f5 15. exf5 \( \text{xf}5 \). One of Black’s knights is headed for d4 and the other for the f4-square. This should compensate for him the fact that White dominates over the strategically important e4-square. 16.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 17.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \)= Kuzubov – Mutschnik, Neuhausen 2007.) 13...\( \text{g}6 \)

In this complicated position
White has numerous alternatives, but neither of them promises him any advantage.

14.b4 $\text{d}f4$ 15.c5 $\text{f}5$ 16.$\text{exf}5$ $\text{g}xf5$ 17.$\text{e}d4$ $\text{d}4\text{=}$. Rodriguez – Ye, Greenhills 1989.

14.$\text{c}e1$. White is preparing $\text{d}2$-$\text{f}$1-$\text{e}$3. 14...$\text{f}4$ 15.$\text{f}1$ (15.$\text{f}$1 $\text{f}$5 16.$\text{exf}5$ $\text{g}xf5$ 17.$\text{de}4$ $\text{b}$6=, followed by $\text{d}4$, Gutman – Kornev, Evpatoria 2007) 15...$\text{f}$5 16.$\text{exf}5$ $\text{g}xe2$+ 17.$\text{w}xe2$ $\text{g}xf5$= Zak – Portisch, Budapest 1993.

14.$\text{c}c1$ $\text{f}$5 15.$\text{exf}5$ $\text{g}xf5$ 16.$\text{de}4$ $\text{f}4$ 17.c5 $\text{d}4$= Vescovi – De Carvalho, Belo Horizonte 2010. The dominating position of Black’s knights on d4 and f4 compensates White’s powerful knight at the centre of the board.

12...$\text{fxe}5$

Now, Black will not have the possibility to play $\text{f}6$-$\text{f}$5, but he has gained access to the semi-open file for his rook and the trade of the flank f-pawn for the central d-pawn may also turn out to be in his favour.

13.$\text{h}$3

It is bad for White to choose 14.$\text{h}$4 $\text{dxc}5$ 15.$\text{d}5+$ $\text{xd}5$ 16.$\text{xd}5$ $\text{d}4$= Acs – Ganguly, Paks 2009, or 14.$\text{c}4+$ $\text{h}$8 15.$\text{h}$4 $\text{f}$6 16.$\text{xf}6+$ $\text{xf}6$ 17.$\text{e}1$ $\text{dxc}5$ Chekhov – Glek, Tashkent 1987 and in both variations White’s compensation for the material deficit is insufficient.

14.$\text{d}2$ $\text{dxc}5$ 15.$\text{b}3$ $\text{b}$6 16.$\text{d}5+$ $\text{xd}5$ 17.$\text{xd}5$ $\text{f}7$= – The vulnerability of the a2-g8 diagonal precludes Black from fighting

13...\(\text{\#f7}\)
Black improves the position of his knight.

14.c5
White activates his bishop on e2 with a pawn-sacrifice. After his alternatives, Black plays \(\text{\#d4}\) and c7–c6 obtaining a very good position.

14.\(\text{\#h2}\) \(\text{\#d4}\) 15.\(\text{\#g4}\) c6!?=

14.\(\text{\#d5}\) \(\text{\#d4}\) 15.\(\text{\#e3}\) c6 16.b4 \(\text{\#e6}\) = Portych – Borges, ICCF 2011.

14.\(\text{\#d2}\) \(\text{\#d4}\) 15.\(\text{\#g4}\) c6 16.\(\text{\#xc8}\) \(\text{\#xc8}\) = Aalderink – Orsolic, IECG 2004.

14...dxc5 15.\(\text{\#c4}\) h6 16.\(\text{\#c1}\)

It is obviously bad for White to choose here 16.\(\text{\#xf7+}\) \(\text{\#xf7}\) 17.\(\text{\#d5+}\) \(\text{\#g6}\)! 18.\(\text{\#xc5}\) \(\text{\#xf3}\)! 19.gxf3 \(\text{\#xh3}\)\(^+\), followed by \(\text{\#d4}\), \(\text{\#f6}\), with a very strong attack for Black, Vera Gonzalez Quevedo – Paneque, Holguin 1989.

White would not achieve much with a transfer into an endgame: 16.\(\text{\#xd8}\) \(\text{\#xd8}\) 17.\(\text{\#b5}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 18.\(\text{\#fd1}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) = Dumitrache – Paunovic, Istanbul 1988.

16...\(\text{\#h7}\) 17.\(\text{\#d5}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 18.\(\text{\#b5}\) \(\text{\#e7}\) 19.\(\text{\#xc6}\) bxc6

Black’s tripled pawns are weak, but one of them is extra after all...

20.\(\text{\#a3}\) \(\text{\#d6}\)
Black prepares a transfer of his knight into the centre of the board.

21.\(\text{\#d2}\) \(\text{\#b8}\) 22.\(\text{\#b3}\) \(\text{\#b5}\) 23.\(\text{\#ac4}\) \(\text{\#d4}\) = Savegren – Amico, ICCF 2009. There has arisen a position with dynamic balance. Black’s queenside pawn-structure has been weakened, but he has an extra pawn, the two-bishop advantage and his knight has occupied a dominating position at the centre of the board.
Chapter 22

1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 g6 3.♘c3 ♘g7 4.e4 d6 5.♘f3 0–0 6.♗e2 e5 7.0–0 ♘c6 8.d5 ♗e7

There has arisen the basic position not only of the classical system, but of the entire King's Indian Defence in general.

The pawn-structure has been defined. Later, Black will try to organise an attack on the kingside and he will have to prepare f7-f5 for this purpose. White, as a rule, will try to advance c4-c5 and to open the c-file.

It should be noted that Black's knight on e7 is misplaced at the moment and has no moves. He will need to lose several tempi to activate it.

Now, we will analyse: A) 9.♗h1, B) ♗e3, C) 9.♗d2, D) 9.a4, E) 9.♗g5.

White's basic lines will be dealt with in Chapters 23-27.

About 9.♗e1 ♘h5 10.b4 f5 – see Chapter 25.


9.h3. This plan is not impressive at all. Instead of organising an offensive on the queenside, White simply centralises his pieces – ♗e1, ♗d3. Black advances effortlessly f7-f5 and obtains at least an equal position. 9... ♘h5 10.♗e1 f5 11.♗d3 ♘f6 12.exf5 gxf5 13.♗c2 ♘g6 14.♗g5 ♘f7 15.♗c1 a6∞

It is not good for White to play 9.♗h4, because he would be incapable of preventing f7-f5 anyway. 9... ♘e8 10.g3 f5 11.exf5 ♘xf5 12.♗xf5 (12.♗f3 ♘f6= Bauer – Libiszewski, Montpellier 2004) 12... ♘xf5 13.♗e3 ♘e7 14.♗c1 b6 15.♗g4 ♘f6 16.♗xf5 gxf5 17.f3 ♘a8= – Black can even fight for the advantage later thanks to his powerful pawn-tandem f5 and e5, Jacobs – Ulasevich, ICCF 2012.
3. \( \text{c}3 \text{g}7 \text{4.e}4 \text{d}6 \text{5.f}3 \text{0-0} \text{6.e}2 \text{e}5 \text{7.0-0} \text{c}6 \text{8.d}5 \text{e}7 \)

9. \( \text{b}1 \). This move may turn out to be a loss of a tempo later. If White wishes to play b2-b4, he should better do this immediately (see Chapters 24-25). 9...\( \text{h}5 \text{10.e}1 \) (After 10.\( \text{e}1 \), Black obtains a very good position by playing 10...\( \text{h}6 \)\( \land \)). Now, the move \( \text{g}5 \) has become impossible and Black can play f7-f5 quite comfortably without being afraid of the exchange of his light-squared bishop after \( \text{g}5-e6 \).) 10...\( \text{f}4 \text{11.d}3 \text{xe}2+ \text{12.e}2 \text{f}5 - \text{Black has two powerful bishops and good attacking prospects on the kingside, Lobron - Brunner, Germany 1990.} \)

9.\( \text{c}2 \). White increases his control over the f5-square and his further plans include the moves g3 and \( \text{h}4 \). 9...\( \text{h}5 \text{10.d}1 \) (10.\( \text{b}4 \text{a}5 - \text{see Chapter} \text{24};10.\text{g}3, \text{Eljanov - Al Sayed, Khanty-Mansiysk 2009, 10...\text{h}6!?=} 10...\text{h}6 \text{11.\text{g}3 \text{f}5 12.\text{h}4 \text{f}6 13.\text{ex}f5, Koumtzis - Dimic, Belgrade 2013. Here, Black could have obtained an excellent counterplay after the non-standard move 13...\text{xf}5!? \text{As a rule, he should avoid the trade of his light-squared bishop in a similar pawn-structure, but here, it would be more important for him to preserve his knight, which may occupy later the d4-square.} \text{14.}\text{xf}5 \text{xf}5\text{2} \)

A) 9.\( \text{h}1 \)
White frees the g1-square for his knight, which may be neces-sary if Black plays \( \text{h}5 \). This plan seems too slow, though...

9...\( \text{e}8 \)
Black is preparing f7-f5.

It is less precise for him to choose instead 9...\( \text{h}5 \), because of 10.\( \text{g}1 \text{f}4 \text{11.f}3 \text{=} \)

10.\( \text{e}1 \)
There has arisen a position like in Chapters 26-27, but with the inclusion of the moves \( \text{h}1 \) and \( \text{e}8 \). This is in favour of Black, since White's move \( \text{h}1 \) may turn out to be not so useful in numerous variations.

There arises a double-edged fight if White tries to advance g2-g4. 10.\( \text{g}1 \text{f}5 \text{11.exf}5, \text{Sulava - Ponomariov, Ohrid 2001, 11...}\text{xf}5!? 12.g4 \text{d}4\text{=} \)

10.a4 a5. The inclusion of the moves with the rook pawns would not provide White with much. 11.\( \text{e}1 \text{f}5 12.d3, \text{Cvitan - B.Socko, Biel 2007, 12...fxe}4!? \text{This is Black's simplest road to equality - his knight is headed for the d4-square.} \text{13.}\text{xe}4 \text{f}5 \text{14.f}3 \text{c}6 \text{15.} \)

287
\(\text{Chapter 22}\)

\(\Delta g_5 \, \text{c7} \infty\) — Black’s knight are very powerful at the centre of the board and this balances the prospects.

10...f5 11.exf5 \(\Delta xf5\) 12.\(\Delta d3\)

There arises a repetition of moves after 12.\(\Delta f3\) \(\Delta f6\) 13.\(\Delta d3\) \(\Delta d4\), or 13.\(\Delta g5\) \(\Delta d4\) 14.\(\Delta d3\) \(\text{w}e7\) — see 12.\(\Delta d3\).

12...\(\Delta f6\) 13.\(\Delta f3\)

It would not be so active for White to continue here with 13. \(\Delta c2\) \(\Delta d7\) \(\text{Nakamura} - \text{Radjabov, Beijing} 2012\).

13...\(\Delta d4\)

![Diagram](image)

14.\(\Delta g5\)

The trade of the knights 14.\(\Delta xd4\) exd4 enables Black to seize the initiative 15.\(\Delta e4\) \(\Delta xe4\) 16.\(\Delta xe4\), Miles – Beliaevsky, Nova Gorica 1999, 16...\(\text{w}f6?!\)

14...\(\text{w}e7\) 15.\(\Delta ge4\), Melkumyan – Zhou, London 2012, 15...

\(\text{h}5?!\) 16.\(\Delta g5\) \(\text{w}d7\) 17.\(\Delta e3\) \(\Delta f4\) — Black’s prospects are not worse at all. He has two excellent squares for his knights – d4 and f4, while White has only one – e4.

B) 9.\(\Delta e3\) \(\Delta g4\)

Black cannot slow down with this move; otherwise, White will play \(\Delta d2\) and it will become impossible for Black to remove the enemy bishop from the e3-square.

10.\(\Delta d2\)

It would not be so precise for White to choose here 10.\(\Delta g5\), because then Black can win a tempo by attacking the enemy bishop with the move \(\text{h}6-f7\). 10...f5 11. exf5 \(\text{gxf5}\) 12.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{h}6\) 13.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{f}7\) 14.\(\text{h}4\) a6 15.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}8\) 16.cxd6 cxd6 17.a4 \(\Delta g6\). White’s bishop continues to come under attack with tempi. 18.\(\Delta g3\) \(\Delta d7\) 19.\(\Delta d2\) b5. Black prevents \(\Delta c4\). 20.axb5 axb5 21.\(\text{w}b3\) e4 22.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{d}4\) Urban – Ergenekon, ICCF 2014.

10...f5 11.\(\Delta g5\)
There arises an approximately equal position following 11.exf5 \(\text{x}f5\) 12.\(\text{d}e4\) \(\text{f}6\) 13.\(\text{g}5\), Lomineishvili – Topel, Kusadasi 2006, 13...\(\text{h}6\) 14.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 15.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{b}6\) 16.\(\text{f}e1\) \(\text{g}7\) – Black has a bishop-pair and a solid position.

11...\(\text{f}6\) 12.\(\text{f}3\)

White fortifies the e4-square, but allows \(\text{h}5\).

12.exf5 \(\text{x}f5\) 13.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}6\) 14.\(\text{c}e4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 15.\(\text{xe}4\), Sanikidze – Fedorov, Dubai 2010, 15...\(\text{d}4\)!?

16.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{c}7\) – The dominance over the d4 and e4-squares balances the chances.

12...

\(\text{h}5\)

13.c5

White sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative, but this is still insufficient for an advantage.

13...\(\text{dxc}5\) 14.\(\text{b}3\)

14.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{h}8\) 15.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{b}6\) 16.\(\text{e}6\) \(\text{xe}6\) 17.\(\text{dx}e6\). Black has not only an extra pawn, but also a powerful outpost at the centre of the board.

He sends there immediately his knight: \(\text{e}7\)-\(\text{c}6\). 17...\(\text{f}6\) 18.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{c}6\) 19.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}4\) 20.\(\text{x}d4\). White could not put up with the enemy knight for long. 20...\(\text{ex}d4\) 21.\(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{c}6\), followed by \(\text{b}6\)-\(\text{b}5\), \(\text{c}5\)-\(\text{c}4\), \(\text{d}4\)-\(\text{d}3\), Galanov – Cavajda, ICCF 2010. Black advances his pawns in the centre and on the queenside and obtains at least an equal position.

14...\(\text{h}8\) 15.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{b}6\) 16.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{f}4\)

17.d6. White wins the exchange, but Black will have two pawns for it. It is also very important that there are no open files on the board and White will hardly manage to activate his rooks. 17...\(\text{cxd}6\) 18.\(\text{f}7\) \(\text{xf}7\) 19.\(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{f}6\) 20.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 21.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{d}5\). Black sacrifices a pawn, but obtains the f5-square for his knight and it will soon go to d4 from there. 22.\(\text{ex}d5\) \(\text{f}5\) 23.\(\text{d}6\) \(\text{d}7\) 24.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{xf}7\) 25.\(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{d}7\) 26.\(\text{f}e1\) \(\text{d}8\) 27.\(\text{xe}8\) \(\text{xe}8\) 28.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{f}7\) 29.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{cxb}4\) 30.\(\text{xa}7\) \(\text{d}4\). Now, White will fail to hold
on to his d6-pawn. 31.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}2 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}d6
32.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}c}1 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}8 33.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}c}8+ \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}8 34. \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}e5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}3. Black prepares the transfer of his knight to c5, after which White will lose his only pawn on the queenside. 35.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}1 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}c}5 36.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}6 37.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}e6 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}e6
38.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}8 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}xa}4 39.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}7= – Black’s powerful passed b4-pawn is quite sufficient to compensate the sacrificed exchange, Galanov – Pugh, ICCF 2013.

C) 9.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}d}2

White is not in a hurry to organise his pawn-offensive on the queenside. He simply completes the development of his pieces and waits for his opponent to advance f7-f5. After this he will play \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}5-e6 and will begin actions on the light squares.

9...\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}8

\begin{center}
\textbf{10.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}c}1}
\end{center}

About 10.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}1 f5 11.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}d}3 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}6, or 11.f3 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}6 – see Chapter 26, 9.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}1 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}d}7 10.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}d}2 f5 11.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}d}3 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}6, or 11.f3 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}6.

10.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}3 b6?!\textsuperscript{2} Ftačnik – Meinsohn, Groningen 1974.

10.a4. White’s pawn-offensive on the queenside would not bring him much. 10...f5 11.a5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}6 12. \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}h}8 13.b4 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}g8 14.c5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}h}6 15. \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}f6 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}f6 – Black has the two-bishop advantage and what is even more important – his knight on e7 has been activated, Berkes – Lewis, Southend 2015.

10.b4 f5 11.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}3 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}f}6. Now, after an exchange on f5, Black will manage to attack the enemy queen with \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}7xf5-d4. 12.exf5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}f5 13.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}h}6 14.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}f6 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}f6 15. \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}4 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}7= Wotulo – Kavalek, Manila 1973.

10...f5

\begin{center}
\textbf{11.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}5}
\end{center}

This is the logical continuation of White’s plan.

Giving up the centre with 11.exf5 seems too risky for White. 11...gxf5 12.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}5 (12.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}3 b6 13. \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}g}5 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}h}6 – see 11.\textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}b}3) 12...h6 13. \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}6 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}x}e6 14.dxe6 \textit{\textbf{\textdaggerdbl}e}8. White’s e6-pawn has been isolated from the rest of his forces and will be-
come an easy prey for Black’s pieces. 15.\textit{b}3 \textit{c}6 16.\textit{h}5 \textit{xe}6 17.\textit{x}b7 \textit{f}6 18.\textit{e}2 \textit{fb}8 19.\textit{a}6 \textit{xb}2\texttt{+} – White’s compensation for the lost material is insufficient, Taimanov – Fischer, Vancouver (m/1) 1971.

11.\textit{b}3 \textit{b}6. Black prevents \textit{c}4-\textit{c}5. 12.\textit{ex}f5 \textit{gf}5 13.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 14.\textit{e}6 \textit{xe}6 15.\textit{dx}e6 \textit{c}8 16.\textit{d}5 \textit{xe}6 17.\textit{xe}7\texttt{+} \textit{xe}7 18.\textit{c}5+. The position is opened and White’s bishops become very active, but he is still a pawn down and has no more than equality. 18...\textit{h}8 19.\textit{cx}d6, Taimanov – Tseitlin, USSR 1973, 19...\textit{cx}d6 20.\textit{fd}1 \textit{d}8\texttt{∞}

11...\textit{h}6 12.\textit{e}6 \textit{xe}6 13.\textit{dx}e6 \textit{c}6

Black prevents the appearance of the enemy knight to the d5-square.

14.\textit{c}5 \textit{d}5

The position is becoming complicated. Now, Black will have a powerful pawn-centre, but White succeeds in capturing the enemy a and b-pawns. 15.\textit{ex}d5 \textit{cx}d5

16.\textit{wb}3 \textit{dc}7 17.\textit{xb}7 \textit{db}8 18.\textit{xa}7 \textit{xb}2 19.\textit{fd}1 \textit{dc}6 20.\textit{a}3 \textit{eb}8 21.\textit{b}1 \textit{e}7\texttt{∞} – White loses one of his pawns, Starace – Chorfi, LSS 2007.

D) 9.a4 \textit{a}5

10.\textit{e}1

There has arisen a position, which will be analysed in Chapters 26-27, but with the inclusion of the moves \textit{a}4 – \textit{a}5. This is much rather in favour of Black. After he plays \textit{b}7-\textit{b}6, White will have great difficulties to break his opponent’s defence on the queenside.

10.\textit{b}3. White is preparing \textit{a}3 and \textit{b}3-\textit{b}4. This plan seems a bit slow, though... 10...\textit{h}5 11.\textit{a}3 (11.\textit{g}3 \textit{f}5 12.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}6 13.\textit{f}3 \textit{fx}e4 14.\textit{c}xe4, Vorobiov – Lubbe, Lueneburg 2016, 14...\textit{f}5\texttt{!?}=) 11...\textit{b}6 12.\textit{g}3. White prevents \textit{f}4 (following 12.\textit{b}4 \textit{ax}b4 13.\textit{xb}4 \textit{f}4= Iturrizaga Bonelli – Bachmann, Linares 2008, or 12.\textit{e}1 \textit{f}4 13.\textit{d}3 \textit{f}5= Stern – Stets, Guben 2011, Black has a very good game).
12...h6! He takes the g5-square under control. Now, Black is perfectly prepared for the thematic pawn-advance f7-f5. 13.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{\textsf{2}}}c2 f5 14.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{\textsf{h}}\textsuperscript{4}} f4 15.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{\textsf{g}}}xg6 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{\textsf{g}}}xg6 16.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}}hx5 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{\textsf{g}}}g5 – He has a powerful attack for the sacrificed pawn. His bishop is ready to go to h3 and after the preliminary exchange on g3, Black’s knight will go to f4, Vetter – Ojeda, ICCF 2013.

10...

Black not only frees the way forward of his f7-pawn, but also increases his control over the c5-square.

\textbf{11.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}}d3}

Or 11.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}}e3 f5 12.f3 b6 13.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}}d3 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}}c5 14.b4 (It is not so active for White to choose here 14.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{a}}a3, Evdokimov – Jakovenko, Dagomys 2010, 14...f4!?∞, followed by g6-g5, h7-h5, \textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}}e7-g6 and Black’s kingside attack may become very powerful.) 14...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}}xd3 15.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}}xd3 axb4 16.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{b}}b5. White has seized the initiative on the queenside with a temporary pawn-sacrifice.

16...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}}h8 17.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{b}}b3 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}}g8 18.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}}xb4, Korchnoi – Kasparov, Barcelona 1989. White has restored the material balance, but has lost two tempi for that. 18...fxe4!? This is the simplest for Black. 19.fxe4 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}}h6! He exchanges his “bad” bishop and obtains a quite acceptable position. 20.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}}hx6 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{xf}}1+ 21.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{xf}}1 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{hxh}}6=

\textbf{11...f5 12.f3}

After White’s alternatives, Black’s knight on e7 will go to the d4-square: 12.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}}d2, A.Gavrilov – Duncker, Schwaebisch Gmunden 2016, 12...fxe4!? 13.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}}xe4 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{f}}f5=, or 12.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{exf}}5 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{xf}}5 13.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}}e4 (13.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{a}}a3, Ftacnik – Nijboer, Hamburg 2005, 13...c6!?∞) 13...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{f}}6 14.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}}g5 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}}d4= Grosso – Humer, ICCF 2001.

\textbf{12...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}}h8}

This is a very useful move. The g8-square may be necessary for Black’s rook (after a pawn-offensive on the kingside), as well as for his knight \textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}}g8, preparing the trade of the dark-squared bishops with \textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}}h6.
3. \texttt{c3 g7 4.e4 d6 5.f3 0-0 6.e2 e5 7.0-0 c6 8.d5 e7}

13.\texttt{d2}

Following 13.\texttt{b5 g8 14.\texttt{a3}, Kozul – Can, Jerusalem 2015, Black must at first stabilise the situation in the centre 14...\texttt{fxe4}! 15.fxe4, and then trade the dark-squared bishops under favourable circumstances 15...\texttt{xf1+ 16.\texttt{xfl b6 17.g3 \texttt{h6 18.\texttt{hxh6 \texttt{xh6}=}}}}

After 13.\texttt{e3}, Black must prevent the enemy pawn-break c4-c5 with the move 13...\texttt{b6}, for example: 14.\texttt{b1, Ziegler – Matthias, Germany 1994 (14.b4 axb4 15. \texttt{xb4, Sekulovska – Velikhanli, Moscow 1994, 15...\texttt{c5?!=} 14... \texttt{f4!} 15.\texttt{f2 g5oo. There has arisen a very complicated position. It is worth mentioning here that White’s straightforward actions on the queenside may be punished by Black with a concealed tactical strike: 16.b4 axb4 17.\texttt{xb4 \texttt{f6 18.a5 bxa5 19.\texttt{xa5? c5!+}}}}}

13...\texttt{b6 14.b3 \texttt{c5 15.\texttt{c2}}}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\texttt{15...\texttt{b7}? Black’s bishop is only seldom removed away from the c8-h3 in similar positions, be-}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

15...\texttt{b7}? Black’s bishop is only seldom removed away from the c8-h3 in similar positions, because it supports his pawn-offensive. Here however, the move \texttt{b7}

E) 9.\texttt{g5}

This move does not create any problems for Black. The placement of White’s bishop on g5 is not so good, because Black may win a tempo (h7-h6) for the organisation of his pawn-offensive on the kingside.

9...\texttt{h5}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\texttt{15...\texttt{h5}}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

His knight is headed for the f4-square.
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10.\(\text{\&}e1\)

Following 10.\(\text{\&}e1\) h6 11.\(\text{\&}d2\) f4 12.\(\text{\&}xh4\) f4 12.\(\text{\&}f4\) it becomes unclear why White has lost two tempi for moves with his bishop, since it could have captured on f4 from the c1-square as well... 12...exf4 13.d2 g5 14.h3 g6 Gonzalez Zamora – Bologan, Turin 2006.

10.g3. White prevents the appearance of the enemy knight on the f4-square, but weakens the shelter of his king. 10...h6 11.\(\text{\&}d2\) h3 12.\(\text{\&}e1\) f5 13.\(\text{\&}h4\) 13.exf5. Nikcevic – Brustman, Koszalin 1998) 13...\(\text{\&}f6\) 14.exf5 g5 15.\(\text{\&}g6\) xg6 16.fxg6 f5 17.\(\text{\&}e3\) (After 17.\(\text{\&}f3\), Oll – Piesina, Vilnius 1993, Black can prepare capturing on g6 with his queen, increasing his control over the e4-square in the process. 17...\(\text{\&}e8\)?) 18.\(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}xg6\) 17...\(\text{\&}xg6\) 18.f3, Nikcevic – Berthelot, Gonfreville 1999, 18...\(\text{\&}d7\)?) – White’s king shelter has been weakened.

10...\(\text{\&}f4\) 11.\(\text{\&}d3\) \(\text{\&}xe2+\) 12.\(\text{\&}xe2\)

Black has the two-bishop advantage. He only needs to solve the problem with his knight on e7, which has no moves at the moment, in order to obtain an excellent position.

12...h6 13.\(\text{\&}d2\)

13.\(\text{\&}e3\). This retreat of the bishop seems less precise, since now Black can win a tempo for the organisation of his pawn-onslaughter on the kingside (f5-f4). 13...f5 14.f3 g5 15.c5 \(\text{\&}g6\) 16.\(\text{\&}c2\) (16.\(\text{\&}c1\), Pelletier – Fedorov, Plovdiv 2003, 16...\(\text{\&}f4!\)) 16...f4 17.\(\text{\&}f2\) g4 Dhanish – Sadowski, ICCF 2008.

13.\(\text{\&}xe7\). White is reluctant to lose time for the retreat of his bishop, but its exchange for the misplaced black knight does not seem reasonable. 13...\(\text{\&}xe7\) 14.b4 f5 15.c5 h5 16.a4 \(\text{\&}h6\) Sedlak – Popovic, Vrnjacka Banja 2013.

13...g5

Black weakens his control over the f5-square, but activates considerably his knight.
14.g4
This seems to be the most reliable move for White.

After his alternatives, his king may come under a dangerous attack.
14.f3 f5 15.b4 Qg6 16.g3 f4↑ Smith – Gatto, ICCF 2003.
14.c5 f5 15.f3, Prohaszka – Huschenbeth, Pardubice 2009, 15...Qg6!?∞, followed by Qf4, or f5-f4, h6-h5, g5-g4.
14.h4. White’s attempt to open the position on the kingside seems anti-positional. 14...g4 15.f4 gxf3 16.Qxf3 f5 17.Wh5, Oll – Shirov, Tilburg 1992, 17...f4 18.c5 Qf6 19. Wd1 Qg6=.

14...Qg6 15.f3 Qf4 16.Qxf4 exf4

White has more space, but Black has the two-bishop advantage.
17.Qd1
White prepares the trade of his opponent’s powerful fianchettoed bishop.

After the careless move 17. Qfd1, Pelletier – Radjabov, Biel 2006, 17...Qe5!?=, Black obtains an edge.

17...c6 18.Qc3 cxd5
He opens the c-file for his major pieces.
19.cxd5

19...Qd7 20.Wf2

20...Qb6
Black forces the exchange of the queens after which there arises an approximately equal endgame on the board.
21.Wxb6 axb6 22.a3


22...Qfc8 23.Qg2 Qc4 24. Qxg7 Qxg7 25.Qc3 h5 26.h3 h4 27.Qa2 Qac8= Moise – Jonckheere, ICCF 2014.
This move was popular at the beginning of the 90ies of the past century. White’s knight can go to the c4-square, from d2 (after b2-b4 and c4-c5) and from there it will exert pressure against the d6-square.

Before the beginning of his pawn-offensive on the queenside White prevents the activation of Black’s knight (\( \text{h5-f4} \)). Later however, the players with White came to the conclusion that the knight manoeuvre is not so dangerous for Black and began playing immediately b2-b4 (see Chapters 24-25).

9...\( \text{a5} \)

It is usually recommended to avoid pushing pawns on the side the opponent will attack, but this is an exceptional case. The point is that Black loses one tempo for the move a7-a5, while White will need two preparatory moves a2-a3 and \( \text{b1} \) in order to advance b2-b4.

10.\( \text{a3} \)

The move 10.\( \text{b1} \) usually leads to transposition of moves. 10...\( \text{d7} \) 11.b3 (11.a3 a4 – see 10.a3) 11...c6 12.a3 (12.a3 b5 – see variation B1; 12.b2 \( \text{h6} \) 13.a3 \( \text{c8} \) – see variation B2) 12...c5. Now, in order to push b3-b4, White must lose time to retreat his bishop. 13.a1 \( \text{h6} \). Black’s bishop is much more active here than on the g7-square. 14.a3 \( \text{e8} \). Black is preparing f7-f5. 15.b4 b6 16.b3 axb4 17.axb4 f5 18.bxc5 bxc5= Ftacnik – Aramil, Philadelphia 2007. After the exchange of the a and b-pawns, White will have problems to finds targets for attack. Black’s only weakness has been protected reliably by his knight on e8.
10.b3. This plan seems too slow. In general, in order to provoke the move b2-b3, in this variation Black loses a tempo for d7. Now, he can continue without this move. 10...d7 11.a3 f5 12.b4 axb4 13.axb4 fx e4!? This is his simplest road to equality. Black presents his opponent with the e4-square, but obtains the d4-outpost for his knight. 14.dxe4 dxe4 15.a4 d4 16.b5 f6 17. axf6+ xf6 18.xd4 exd4 19.d3 f5 20.a5 d7= Nitz – Vasile, ICCF 2012.

**10...d7**
Black is preparing a5-a4.

![Diagram 1](image1.png)

Now, White can prevent his opponent’s positional threat **B)** 11.b3, or can ignore it – **A)** 11.b1.

He plays sometimes 11.a2 a4 12.b4 axb3 13.axb3 a4. Black is ready to part with his powerful light-squared bishop in order to impede his opponent’s pawn-advance a3-a4. 14.e3 b6 15.d3

**A) 11.b1 a4 12.b4**

White must comply with the appearance of an isolated pawn; otherwise, he cannot continue with his offensive on the queenside.

12.b3 axb3 – see 12.b4.

**12...axb3**

![Diagram 2](image2.png)

**13.axb3**
White’s knight will support the pawn-advances c4-c5 and a3-a4-a5 from this square.
13...b6

Now, the move c4-c5 has become impossible and White must advance his a-pawn in order to break his opponent’s defence on the queenside.

14...e8 15.a4

About 15.d2 f5 16.f3 d6 17.a4 h5, or 15.e3 f5 16.f3 d6 17.a4 h5 – see 15.a4.

15...f5

The move 16.a5 leads to a complicated position. 16...xa5 17.xa5 (After 17.xa5, Black has no problems at all. 17...xa5 18.xa5 a8 19.b3 d6 20.d3 b= Brunner – Nunn, Nuremberg 1990) 17...d6.

18...e4 19...e4 fxe4 20.b7. This position was reached in the game Ulibin – Smirin, Vienna 1998 and the opponents agreed to a draw. White can try here an interesting plan, connected with a piece-sacrifice, but Black can hold the defence with a precise play: 20...e8 21.xa8 e8 22.cxd6 a4 23.d2 f5 24.dxc7 b7 25.d6. White has only two pawns for the piece, but his passed pawns are very powerful. 25.d7
26...\texttt{a3} \texttt{f6} 27...\texttt{b4} \texttt{xb4} 28. \texttt{xb4} \texttt{g5} 29...\texttt{c5} \texttt{d4} 30...\texttt{a6} \texttt{e3} 31...\texttt{b1} \texttt{g7} 32...\texttt{xe3} \texttt{xe3+} 33...\texttt{h1} \texttt{a8} 34...\texttt{b7} \texttt{f8=} – White can hardly improve his position.

16...\texttt{f6}

After White has played f2-f3 and his bishop does not control the h5-square any more, Black can go back to the plan with the transfer of his knight to the f4-square.

17...\texttt{e3}

17...\texttt{d2} \texttt{h5} 18...\texttt{a5} \texttt{bxa5} 19. \texttt{xa5} \texttt{f4} 20...\texttt{h1}, Pekarek – Voller, Pribram 1996, 20...\texttt{fxe4}! 21...\texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe2} 22...\texttt{xe2} \texttt{xf1+} 23...\texttt{xf1} \texttt{c6} 24...\texttt{xc6} \texttt{xc6} 25...\texttt{xc6} \texttt{xa1} 26...\texttt{xa1} \texttt{xc6}= The position has been simplified considerably. The pawns on c4 and d6 are equally vulnerable.

17...\texttt{h5} 18...\texttt{a5} \texttt{f4} 19...\texttt{xb6} \texttt{xa1} 20...\texttt{xa1} \texttt{cxb6}

Black has a weakness on b6, but the powerful position of the knight on f4 compensates the slight defect of his pawn-structure.

21...\texttt{c2} \texttt{h6}

22...\texttt{f2}

The move 22...\texttt{e1} leads to a calmer position. 22...\texttt{xe2+} 23...\texttt{xe2} \texttt{xe3+} 24...\texttt{xe3} \texttt{c7} 25...\texttt{a3} \texttt{a8} 26...\texttt{ab5} \texttt{xc4}. After the trade of the pawns on b6 and c4, Black has equalised completely. 27...\texttt{xb6} \texttt{fxe4} 28...\texttt{xe4} \texttt{e8} 29...\texttt{b1} \texttt{c8} 30...\texttt{e3} \texttt{g7} 31...\texttt{a3} \texttt{a6} 32. \texttt{a2} \texttt{e7}= Lambert – Jordan, LSS 2009.

22...\texttt{a8}

Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative.

23...\texttt{xb6} \texttt{b8} 24...\texttt{e3} \texttt{b3}, Draw, Vodicka – Herzog, Lechenicher SchachServer 2013. After 25...\texttt{xf4} \texttt{xf4}, Black’s pieces are very active, while the dark squares in White’s camp are very weak. All this is sufficient to compensate Black’s minimal material deficit.
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B) 11.b3 c6

We will analyse now: B1) 12...b1 and B2) 12...b2.


12...c2 c8 13.dxc6. Giving up the centre seems strategically risky. 13...bxc6 14.b4 d5 15.c3 b3 xe4 16.xe4 dxe4 17.g4. White prevents f5-d4, but weakens the position of his king. 17...c5 18. xxa5 cxb4 19.axb4 d5=, followed by f4, Brunsteins – Hadet, LSS 2008.

12.a2 e8!? With a white rook on a2, Black’s plan, connected with b7-b5-b4, would not be so effective, because he would be incapable of seizing the a-file. 13. e1 (It is too artificial for White to choose 13.db1, L.Portisch – Nijboer, Istanbul 2000, 13...f5?!∞; 13.b4 axb4 14.axb4 xa2 15.xa2 cxd5 16.cxd5 f5 = M.Gurevich – Babula, Germany 2000.) 13...f5 14.dxc6 bxc6 15.c5 d5 16.exd5 cxd5. Black has occupied the centre with his pawns, but will hardly manage to hold it. 17.c4! This is a surprising tactical strike. 17...e6 (It would be too risky for Black to accept the piece-sacrifice: 17...dxc4 18.xc4+ h8 19. g5±, followed by d2.) 18.b6 b8 19.cxd5 d5 20.d2 ec7 21.c4 xb6 22.cxb6 d5 23.b7, Draw, Terekhov – Terreaux, ICCF 2014. After 23...c7 24.c5 d5 25. xxd5 xb7 26.b2 xb3=, the position looks like a dead draw.

B1) 12...b1

White is preparing b3-b4, but Black can inflict a pawn-strike before his opponent.

12...b5!

He sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative.

13.dxc6

It is bad for White to opt for 13.xb5 cxd5= – the exchange of a central pawn for a flank pawn is obviously in favour of Black.

After 13.b4, there arises a
complicated positional battle. 13...axb4 14.axb4 bxc4 15.\(\text{c}\)xc4 cxd5 16.exd5 \(\text{f}\)f5 17.\(\text{b}\)b3 \(\text{e}\)e4 18.\(\text{b}\)b5 (18.\(\text{a}\)a5, Chuchelov – Jens, Netherlands 2000, 18...\(\text{w}\)b6!?) 18...\(\text{c}\)xc3 19.\(\text{c}\)x\(\text{c}\)3 \(\text{c}\)c8!? Black transfers his bishop to b7 and from there it will not only exert pressure against the d5-pawn, but will also block the enemy passed pawn. 20.\(\text{a}\)a3 \(\text{b}\)b7\(\text{c}\)

13...b4

14.cxd7

White should better refrain from opening the a-file, because he may even fail to equalise. 14. axb4 axb4 15.\(\text{d}\)d5 (It is preferable for White to opt here for 15.\(\text{a}\)a5 \(\text{c}\)c7 16.\(\text{d}\)d5 \(\text{e}\)exd5 17.\(\text{c}\)xd5 \(\text{e}\)a2 18.\(\text{d}\)d3, Gokhale – Mahmoud, Kolkata 1996, 18...\(\text{h}\)h5!?) 15...\(\text{c}\)xc6 16.\(\text{b}\)b2 (16.\(\text{e}\)xf6+ \(\text{e}\)xf6= Volzhin – Hillarp Persson, Budapest 1996) 16...\(\text{a}\)a2? – The active placement of Black’s rook provides him with better prospects, Gomez Esteban – Porras Campo, Erandio 2014.

14.\(\text{b}\)b5 \(\text{c}\)xc6 15.\(\text{f}\)f3, Grigore – Baron Rodriguez, Benasque 1999, 15...\(\text{d}\)d7!? It would be too precarious for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice 16.\(\text{c}\)xd6, because after 16...\(\text{c}\)c5 17.\(\text{b}\)b5 \(\text{b}\)b7\(\text{c}\) (followed by \(\text{c}\)c6), Black would have more than sufficient compensation for the minimal material deficit.

After 14.\(\text{c}\)c7 \(\text{w}\)xc7 15.\(\text{d}\)d5 \(\text{e}\)exd5 16.\(\text{c}\)xd5 \(\text{a}\)a4\(\text{c}\) White must play very precisely not to end up in an inferior position, Grigore – Nevedichey, Calarasi 1995.

The move 14.\(\text{d}\)d5 leads to an approximately equal position. 14...\(\text{c}\)xc6 15.\(\text{f}\)f6+ (15.\(\text{b}\)b2 \(\text{e}\)e6 16.\(\text{a}\)a1 \(\text{d}\)d7= Ftacnik – Gadjily, Moscow 1994) 15...\(\text{w}\)xf6 16.\(\text{f}\)f3 \(\text{e}\)e7= – White is incapable of exploiting the weakness of the d5-square, because the transfer of his knight there would take too much time, Fordan – Tancsa, Hungary 2003.

14...\(\text{b}\)xc3 15.\(\text{f}\)f3 \(\text{e}\)xe4 16.\(\text{w}\)d3 \(\text{c}\)c5 17.\(\text{w}\)xd6 \(\text{xd}\)7
Black's seemingly weak c3-pawn may become the cause of great worries for White. This would be particularly true if Black succeeds in protecting it with his bishop by playing e5-e4.

18.\texttt{\text{\textit{g5}} e8 19.bdb1 h6 20.\texttt{\textit{xe7}} xe7 21.c5 e4 22.\texttt{\textit{e1}} f8}

Black removes his queen from the pin.

23.b4 axb4 24.axb4 \texttt{\textit{e5}} 25.\texttt{\textit{d5}} h7 26.\texttt{\textit{c2}} f5+ - White will have problems to advance his passed pawns, while Black has good prospects of attacking on the kingside, Goncharov – Tyutyunnik, ICCF 2011.

B2) 12.\texttt{\textit{b2}}

White develops his pieces and prepares b2-b4.

12...\texttt{\textit{h6}}

13.dxc6

13.c5. This pawn-sacrifice, for the sake of activating the pieces, seems premature and cannot provide White even with equality.

13...dxc5 14.\texttt{\textit{d4}} cxd5 15.exd5 e4 16.\texttt{\textit{d6}}, Atakisi – Remmel, Switzerland 2003 (16.\texttt{\textit{a4?!}} exd5 17.\texttt{\textit{xc5 c6f}} Janssen – Nijboer, Rotterdam 1999) 16...\texttt{\textit{f5?!}}

It is too early for White to play 13.b4, because of 13...axb4 14. axb4, Arlandi – Gelfand, Leon 2001, 14...\texttt{\textit{b6?!}}= and he will have problems to protect his b4-pawn. Advancing b4-b5 would weaken the a5 and c5-squares.

The move 13.\texttt{\textit{b1}} leads to a complicated manoeuvring battle. 13...\texttt{\textit{c8}}. Black prepares the transfer of his knight to b6. 14.\texttt{\textit{d2}} (After 14.dxc6 \texttt{\textit{xc6}}, White can hardly exploit the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn. For example: 15.\texttt{\textit{d3}} \texttt{\textit{b6}} 16.b4 axb4 17.axb4 \texttt{\textit{h5}} 18.g3, Ftcnk – Topalov, Polanica Zdroj 1995, 18...\texttt{\textit{a4}}= – Black's piece-activity compensates the slight weakness of Black's d6-pawn.) 14...\texttt{\textit{b6}} 15. dxc6 \texttt{\textit{xc6}} 16.\texttt{\textit{fd1}} \texttt{\textit{e7}} 17.\texttt{\textit{f1}} \texttt{\textit{fd7}} 18.\texttt{\textit{d3}}. White attacks the d6-pawn, but Black can simply sacrifice it. 18...\texttt{\textit{c5}} 19.\texttt{\textit{xd6}} \texttt{\textit{xd6}} 20.\texttt{\textit{xd6 g5}} 21.\texttt{\textit{dd1 xb3}}. He restores the material balance. 22.\texttt{\textit{d5}} \texttt{\textit{d7}} 23.\texttt{\textit{fe3 xe3}} 24. \texttt{\textit{exe3 bc5}} 25.\texttt{\textit{f3 g7}}= – White has the two-bishop advantage, but his pawn-structure has been weakened, Klemettinen – Ould Ahmed, ICCF 2011.

13.\texttt{\textit{h1}}. White adheres to a waiting tactic. The removal of his
king away from the g1-a7 diagonal would be useful for him if he advances f2-f4. 13...c5. Black closes the game on the queenside. His later plans are connected with the preparation of the pawn-advance f7-f5.

14.\(\text{wc2}\)  f8 15.\(\text{b5}\)  f5 16.\(\text{d3}\)  fxe4= Sakaev – Amonatov, Dagomys 2009.
14.\(\text{f3}\)  f8 15.\(\text{c1}\), Beliavsky – Erdogdu, Budva 2009. Black should better refrain from trading the bishops – 15...\(\text{g7}\)!∞, followed by f7-f5.

14.\(\text{d3}\)  h5 15.g3. White prevents the appearance of the enemy knight on f4, but weakens the shelter of his king. 15...\(\text{h3}\) 16.\(\text{e1}\)  f5 17.exf5  xf5= – Both sides have excellent outposts for their knights. White has the e4-square and Black has d4, Kramnik – Van Wely, Nice 2008.

13...\(\text{xc6}\) 14.\(\text{d3}\)  \(\text{wb6}\)
(diagram)

Black’s bishop was restricted by his e4-pawn and it would have better prospects on the c8-h3 diagonal.

18.\(\text{ad1}\)  \(\text{e6}\) 19.\(\text{b5}\)  \(\text{g4}\)∞

His counterplay is sufficient to maintain the equality. 20.\(\text{c1}\)  \(\text{xf3}\) 21.\(\text{gxf3}\)  \(\text{xc1}\) 22.\(\text{xc1}\)  d5!
Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 23.\(\text{exd5}\)  \(\text{fxd5}\) 24.\(\text{xe5}\)  f6 25.\(\text{e4}\)  c7 26.\(\text{xc7}\)  \(\text{xc7}\) 27.\(\text{c2}\)  \(\text{c6}\) 28.\(\text{xd8+}\)  \(\text{xd8}\) 29.\(\text{d2}\)  \(\text{e6}\) 30.\(\text{xa5}\)  \(\text{c5}\) 31.\(\text{d2}\)  \(\text{xf3}\)= – White’s king shelter has been weakened and Black’s attack should be sufficient at least for a draw by a perpetual check, Carbajal – Souza, ICCF 2008.
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1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 g6 3.²c3 ²g7 4.e4 d6 5.²f3 0–0 6.²e2 e5 7.0–0 ²c6 8.d5 ²e7 9.b4
The Bayonet Attack

White does not lose time to prevent ²h5–f4 and begins immediate active actions on the queenside. The system, beginning with the move 9.b4, is named “The Bayonet Attack” in the English speaking chess literature.

9...²h5

Black exploits immediately the possibility to deploy his knight on h5, presented so gallantly by his opponent.

We will analyse now: A) 10.²d2, B) 10.c5 and C) 10.g3.

The basic move for White 10.²e1 will be dealt with in the next chapter.

10.a4 ²f4 11.a5 (11.c5 c6 – see variation B) 11...f5 12.²d3, Volkov – Afonin, ICCF 2009, 12...²xd3!? 13.²xd3 h6∞

Following 10.²b3, Black should better not be in a hurry to advance f7–f5 and should play at first 10...h6, preventing ²g5–e6. 11.c5 (11.a4 ²f4∞) 11...f5 12.a4 (after 12.²d2, Black can obtain a very good position with 12...fxe4 13.²xe4 ²f4∞) 12...fxe4 13.²xe4 ²f5 14.²d3, Skembris – Kotronias, Wijk aan Zee 1995, 14...²h7?= Black protects prudently in advance the g6-square, which may become weak after the move ²h4, and obtains a quite acceptable game. White must be constantly on the alert about Black’s active possibilities ²f4, or ²g4.

10.²c2. This is a quiet move. 10...a5. After the exchange of the b-pawn, White will have difficulties to advance c4–c5. 11.bxa5 ²xa5 12.²e1 (12.²d1 ²f4 13.²xf4 exf4∞ – The vulnerability of the dark squares in White’s camp may hurt him in the future, Gyi-mesi – Sikula, Hungary 2008) 12...f5.
5. 0f3 0-0 6. 0e2 e5 7. 0-0 0c6 8. d5 0e7 9. b4 0h5

5. 0f3 0-0 6. 0e2 e5 7. 0-0 0c6 8. d5 0e7 9. b4 0h5

13. 0d2 0f4=
13. a4 0f4 14. 0xf4 exf4 15. 0ab1 b6 16. 0d3 fxe4 17. 0xe4 0g4= - Black has two powerful bishops, Hoffmann - Nogga, ICCF 2008.
13. exf5 0xf5 14. 0d2 (14. 0g5 0d7 15. 0ad1, Epishin - Shchekachev, Amsterdam 2000, 15... 0f7? =, followed by h7-h6, g6-g5, 0f4) 14... 0h6. Black exchanges his passive bishop and obtains at least an equal position. 15. 0e4 0xd2 16. 0xd2 b6 17. c5 0f4= - He has very good chances of organising a dangerous attack against the enemy king thanks to his powerful knight on f4, Mraz - Cavajda, ICCF 2007.

A) 10. 0d2
This is not White's most reliable move. His knight frees a square for his bishop, but it will not be stable on f3, because Black may attack it later with g6-g5-g4.
10... 0f4 11. 0f3

11.a4 f5 12. 0f3 g5 - see 11. 0f3.

It would be premature for White to opt here for 11.c5, since following 11...c6! †, Black will be much better prepared for the opening of the game in the centre, Tsakhaev - Szapunov, Briansk 1995.

11. 0b3 f5 12. a4, Tosic - Antic, Belgrade 1999, 12... c6! ?=

11... f5

12.a4

12.c5 g5 13. exf5. Naturally, White should not allow g5-g4. 13... 0xf5 14. g3 - He ousts the enemy knight from its active position, but weakens the shelter of his king (14. 0e4 0f6 15. a4 0d4 = - Black's prospects are not worse thanks to his control over the d4 and f4-squares.) 14... 0h3+ 15. 0g2, Manion - Sherzer, New York 1994, 15... 0d7! †

12... g5 13. exf5 0xf5 14. g3 0h3+ 15. 0g2 0d7 16. 0b3

White cannot solve all his defensive problems with 16. 0e4 g4 17. 0b3, Zagorskis - Gross, Pardubice 1995, 17... 0f7! †
16...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d4}}} 17.\text{\textit{\textbf{xd4}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{exd4}}} 18.\text{\textit{\textbf{b5}}} \\

Here, in the game Keene – Kavalek, Teeside 1975, Black could have tried an interesting exchange-sacrifice: 18...\text{\textit{\textbf{xf4}}}! 19.\text{\textit{\textbf{xf3}}} a6 20.\text{\textit{\textbf{a3}}} g4 21.\text{\textit{\textbf{d1}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{f7}}} 22.\text{\textit{\textbf{a2}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{f5}}} 23.f3. White will fail to avoid the catastrophe on the light squares, despite his tenacious resistance. 23...\text{\textit{\textbf{g6}}} 24.\text{\textit{\textbf{e2}}} h5 25.c5 \text{\textit{\textbf{f8}}}--

B) 10.c5 \text{\textit{\textbf{f4}}} \\

11.\text{\textit{\textbf{xf4}}} \\

White exchanges the powerful enemy knight, but weakens the dark squares and activates considerably the bishop on g7.

After 11.a4, Black’s simplest road to equality would be 11...c6!? , after which there follow quick simplifications. 12.dxc6 \text{\textit{\textbf{xe2}}}+ 13.\text{\textit{\textbf{xe2}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{xc6}}} 14.\text{\textit{\textbf{g5}}} f6 15.\text{\textit{\textbf{e3}}} dxc5 16.\text{\textit{\textbf{xc5}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{f7}}} 17.\text{\textit{\textbf{fd1}}}. White has some slight initiative, but it is harmless, because Black’s position has no pawn-weaknesses and he can gradually neutralise the activity of his opponent’s pieces with an accurate play. 17...\text{\textit{\textbf{e8}}} 18.a5 \text{\textit{\textbf{f8}}} 19.\text{\textit{\textbf{xf8}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{xf8}}} 20.b5 \text{\textit{\textbf{xa5}}}! 21.\text{\textit{\textbf{xa5}}}, Draw, Blank – Holroyd, ICCF 2015. After 21...\text{\textit{\textbf{b4}}} 22.\text{\textit{\textbf{d8}}}+ \text{\textit{\textbf{g7}}} 23.\text{\textit{\textbf{xa7}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{xa7}}} 24.\text{\textit{\textbf{xc8}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{a1+}}} 25.\text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{f8}}} 26.\text{\textit{\textbf{c7+}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{f7}}}=, the vulnerability of the first rank would not allow White to play for a win and he must comply with the repetition of moves.

The move 11.\text{\textit{\textbf{c4}}} leads to the weakening of the d1-h5 diagonal. 11...\text{\textit{\textbf{g4}}}. White will have great problems to get rid of this pin. 12.h3 (12.\text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}}, Nepomniachtchi – Nakamura, playchess.com 2007, 12...f5!? =) 12...\text{\textit{\textbf{h5}}} 13.\text{\textit{\textbf{e1}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{h8}}} 14.\text{\textit{\textbf{f1}}} f5 15.\text{\textit{\textbf{xf4}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{xf4}}} 16.\text{\textit{\textbf{c1}}} a5= Bykhovsky – Avrukh, Beersheba 1996.

11...\text{\textit{\textbf{exf4}}} \\

Now, the outcome of the opening battle will depend on whether Black will manage to activate his knight on e7, which has no moves at the moment. If he succeeds in
doing this, his prospects will be at least equal. If he fails, he may face difficulties.

12.\textit{\textbf{Bc1}}

This is White’s most logical move. He not only protects his knight, but also removes his rook from the dangerous diagonal.

White would not achieve much with 12.\textit{\textbf{Wd2}}, since he would fail to capture the pawn on f4, because of the insufficient protection of his knight on c3. 12...\textit{\textbf{h6}}

13.\textit{\textbf{Ad1}} (13.\textit{\textbf{Ac1}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} – see 12.\textit{\textbf{Cc1}})

13...\textit{\textbf{d7}} 14.\textit{\textbf{Cd4}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Ff1}} \textit{\textbf{Gg6}}

16.\textit{\textbf{C6}}, Welin – Mortensen, Winterthur 1986. Now, Black can simply capture the pawn 16...\textit{\textbf{Xd4}}?! 17.\textit{\textbf{Wxd4}} bxc6 18.\textit{\textbf{Dxc6}} \textit{\textbf{Xc6}}∞ and White must still prove that the activity of his pieces is sufficient to compensate the lost material.

12.\textit{\textbf{Wb3}} \textit{\textbf{h6}} 13.\textit{\textbf{Ad1}} (The move 13.\textit{\textbf{h4}} looks anti-positional. White prevents g6-g5 indeed, but weakens considerably his kingside. 13...\textit{\textbf{Gg4}} 14.\textit{\textbf{Ff1}} \textit{\textbf{xf3}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Xf3}} \textit{\textbf{H5}}\) – He has no compensation for the vulnerability of his dark squares, Baldomero Garcia – Muneret, ICCF 2003) 13...\textit{\textbf{g5}}. White has an interesting pawn-sacrifice here – 14.\textit{\textbf{e5}}, but he cannot rely on obtaining an advantage at all. 14...\textit{\textbf{dxe5}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Dd6}} cxd6 16.\textit{\textbf{Xxd6}} \textit{\textbf{Ye8}}=, followed by \textit{\textbf{Ff5(c6)}} – d4 and Black has a very good position, Najer – Kotsur, Elista 2000.

12...\textit{\textbf{h6}}

This is a standard plan for Black in similar positions. It is essential for him to play g6-g5, in order not only to protect reliably his f4-pawn, but also to free the g6-square for his knight.

13.\textit{\textbf{Dd4}}

White centralises his knight.

13.a4 \textit{\textbf{g5}} 14.\textit{\textbf{h3}} – see 13.\textit{\textbf{h3}}.

It seems less reliable for him to transfer to the d4-square his other knight 13.\textit{\textbf{Db5}} a6 14.\textit{\textbf{Dd4}}, Dubov – Fedoseev, Berlin 2015, since following 14...\textit{\textbf{g5}}, the threat g5-g4 would force White to weaken his kingside. 15.\textit{\textbf{h3}} \textit{\textbf{Gg6}}∞
13.\textit{d}2 g5 14.\textit{cx}d6 \textit{cx}d6 15. \textit{\&}b5 \textit{\&}g6 16.\textit{\&}fd4 \textit{\&}f6 17.\textit{\&}fd1, Cheparinov – Fier, Dubai 2014, 17...g4!?

The move 13.\textit{\&}e1 is too slow. 13...g5 14.\textit{\&}d4 \textit{\&}g6 15.\textit{\&}f5 (Black has very good attacking prospects after 15.\textit{\&}cb5 a6 16.\textit{\&}a3, Megaranto – Nguyen, Tagaytay City 2013, 16...g4?!?) 15...\textit{\&}xf5 16.\textit{ex}f5 \textit{\&}xc3!? This is the simplest solution for Black. He wins a pawn in a tactical fashion. 17.\textit{\&}xc3 \textit{\&}f6 18.\textit{\&}c2 \textit{\&}e7 – White is incapable of protecting simultaneously his pawns on f5 and d5, Teske – Ragger, St Veit 2002.

13.\textit{\&}d2. White prepares the transfer of his knight to c4 from where it will exert pressure against the d6-square. 13...g5 14. \textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}g6 15.\textit{cx}d6 (15.a5 \textit{\&}e8 16.\textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}d7?!) 15...\textit{cx}d6 16.\textit{\&}b5 White would not achieve much after the penetration to the c7-square. 16...a6 17. \textit{\&}c7 \textit{\&}b8 18.\textit{\&}b3 \textit{\&}e7 Veingold – Reyes Larena, Zaragoza 1991.

13.h3. This is prophylactic against g6-g5-g4. 13...g5 14.a4 \textit{\&}g6 15.\textit{cx}d6 (15.a5 \textit{\&}e8 16.\textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}d7?!) 15...\textit{cx}d6 16.\textit{\&}b5 White would not achieve much after the penetration to the c7-square. 16...a6 17. \textit{\&}c7 \textit{\&}b8 18.\textit{\&}b3 \textit{\&}e7 Veingold – Reyes Larena, Zaragoza 1991.

13.\textit{\&}d2. White prepares the transfer of his knight to c4 from where it will exert pressure against the d6-square. 13...g5 14. \textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}g6 15.\textit{cx}d6 (15.a5 \textit{\&}e8 16.\textit{\&}d2 \textit{\&}d7?!) 15...\textit{cx}d6 16.\textit{\&}b5 (After 16.a4, Black can simply play 16...\textit{\&}d7?= and the d6-pawn is untouchable. 17. \textit{\&}xd6? \textit{\&}xc3! 18.\textit{\&}xc3 \textit{\&}f6–+) 16...a6. Black ousts the enemy knight from its active position. 17.\textit{\&}d4 (17.\textit{\&}bxd6? b5 18.\textit{\&}xc8 \textit{\&}xc4+ and White loses his knight.) 17...\textit{\&}e8 18.\textit{\&}f5 \textit{\&}xf5 19.\textit{ex}f5 \textit{\&}e5 – Black’s bishop is more active, while White’s f5-pawn would need permanent protection, Czerwonski – Siwiec, Guben 2008.

13...c6!?

Black refrains from the standard plan with the transfer of his knight to the g6-square. Instead, he wishes to open the game in order to exploit the power of his bishops.

It would be less precise for Black to opt for 13...a6 14.h3 \textit{\&}h8 15.\textit{\&}d2± Ivanchuk – Grischuk, Nalchik 2009.

14.\textit{\&}b3 \textit{\&}xc5 15.\textit{\&}xc5

It is worse for White to continue with 15.d6 \textit{\&}xb4= – Black will have three pawns for the piece and the two-bishop advantage. In addition, his pawn-mass on the queenside will be very powerful.

15...\textit{\&}xd5 16.\textit{\&}xd5 \textit{\&}e5 17.
Black has an excellent position. 19.\(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qd4}\) 20.\(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{b6}\) 21.\(\text{c6}\). White bases his hopes on his passed pawn. 21...\(\text{Ec8}\) 22.\(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{g7}\) 23.\(\text{Wa3}\) \(\text{Qxf3}+\) 24.\(\text{gxh3}\) \(\text{Wh4}\). Black’s attack would be sufficient at least for a perpetual check. 25.\(\text{We7}\) \(\text{Wh5}\) 26.\(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{g5}\) 27.\(\text{Wxa7}\) \(\text{Qd4}\) 28.\(\text{Wxh7}\) \(\text{Qxf2}\+\). Black sacrifices his bishop and ends the game in a draw. 29.\(\text{Qxf2}\) \(\text{Wh2}+\) 30.\(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 31.\(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Qce8}\) 32.\(\text{Qxe4}\) \(\text{Wh1}\+\), Draw, Auzins – Colin, ICCF 2013.

C) 10.\(\text{g3}\)

White solves radically the problem with the penetration of the enemy knight to the f4-square, but weakens the shelter of his king.

10...\(\text{f5}\)

11.\(\text{Qg5}\)

This knight is headed for the e6-square in order to force the exchange of the powerful enemy light-squared bishop.

11.\(\text{Qf2}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 12.\(\text{f3}\) (12.\(\text{c5}\) a5!=) 12...\(\text{c6}\) 13.\(\text{Qg2}\), Altinok – Lindenmair, Katerini 2014, 13...\(\text{Qd7}\)?\(\ldots\) - White has more space, but his king is not so safe as its counterpart.

11...\(\text{Qf6}\)

After White has played \(\text{g2-g3}\), Black’s knight has nothing to do on \(\text{h5}\) and must come back urgently.

12.\(\text{f3}\)

White protects reliably the e4-square.

After his alternatives both sides gain access to the d4 and e4-squares and deploy there comfortably their knights.

12.\(\text{exf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) 13.\(\text{Qxe4}\) a5 14.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 15.\(\text{Qxe4}\) \(\text{Qd4}\) 16.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{f5}\)= G. Kuzmin – Taimanov, Kharkov 1967.

12.\(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 13.\(\text{Qcxe4}\) (13.\(\text{Qgxh3}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 14.\(\text{Qxf6}\+) \(\text{Wh6}\) 15.\(\text{Qe4}\) \(\text{We7}\) 16.\(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qd4}\)= Drugda – Pospisil, ICCF 2012) 13...\(\text{Qf5}\) 14.\(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qd4}\) 15.\(\text{b2}\) (There arise simplifications after 15.\(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 16.\(\text{Qxe4}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 17.\(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qxg5}\) 18.\(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Wh6}\) 19.\(\text{f3}\) a5 20.\(\text{Qxh3}\) \(\text{Qxa5}\) 21.a4 \(\text{b6}\)= - Black’s position is super solid, Linna – Hefka, ICCF 2012) 15...\(\text{Qxe4}\) 16.\(\text{Qxe4}\) g5 17.\(\text{f3}\). White prevents g5-g4. (17.\(\text{Qd2}\), Girya – Ju Wenjun, St Petersburg 2012, 17...\(\text{g4}\)?)= 17...\(\text{Qf5}\) 18.\(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 19.\(\text{fxe4}\) \(\text{Wh7}\)= - The powerful placement of Black’s knight at the centre of the board compensates
his “bad” bishop on g7, Salgado Allaria - Los, ICCF 2014.

12...c6
This is the most reliable move for Black. He takes in advance the d5-square under control.

13...\text{xe3}

13.g2 cxd5 14.cxd5 h6 15.\text{xe6 }\text{xe6} 16.dxe6. This position is typical for variation C. White has the two-bishop advantage, but his pawn on e6 is too far away from the rest of his forces and is very likely to perish later. 16...c8 17.b3, Murugan - Saunders, London 1993, 17...fxe4 18.fxe4 d5. This central pawn-break is Black’s simplest road to equality. He not only gets rid of his backward d6-pawn, but may win the enemy e6-pawn in some lines: \text{b6xe6}. 19.exd5 \text{fxd5=}

13.b5 cxd5 14.cxd5 h6 15.\text{e6 }\text{xe6} 16.dxe6 \text{c8}
(diagram)

Following 17.d3 d5!, Black seizes the initiative. 18.a3 \text{b6+}

19.h1 dxe4 20.fxe4 \text{fd8}. Black removes his rook with tempo from the X-ray juxtaposition with the enemy bishop on a3. 21.f3 \text{xe6} 22.d1 \text{h8} – White must still prove that his bishop-pair is sufficient to compensate the missing pawn, Zlatilov - Kir. Georgiev, Sofia 1988.

17.b3 \text{b6+} 18.g2 fxe4 19.\text{xe4 }\text{d4} 20.b2 \text{d8} – White’s compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient, Blees - Kr. Georgiev, Athens 1992.

17.b2 h5 Podzielny - Sutkus, Germany 1996. Black not only prepares the development of his bishop to an active position (\text{h6}), but also counterplay on the kingside with h5-h4, \text{f6-h5}. He must also have in mind the standard plan with the move d6-d5.

13...h6 14.e6 \text{xe6} 15.\text{dxe6 }\text{c7}

Black wishes to play \text{c8} in some lines, but right now this move is impossible due to the defencelessness of the d6-pawn.

16.b5

16...\textit{\texttt{F}}fd8

17.bxc6

The move 17.\textit{\texttt{d}}d2 leads to a complicated double-edged fight. 17...\textit{\texttt{h}}h7 18.\textit{\texttt{f}}c1 fx4 19.fxe4 \textit{\texttt{c}}c8 20.bxc6 bxc6 21.\textit{\texttt{d}}d5, Garcia Palermo – Gallagher, Aosta 1990, 21...\textit{\texttt{e}}xe6!? This is an interesting exchange-sacrifice. 22.\textit{\texttt{c}}c7 \textit{\texttt{d}}d7 23.\textit{\texttt{xa}}8 \textit{\texttt{xe}}4 24.\textit{\texttt{c}}c2 \textit{\texttt{f}}6 25.\textit{\texttt{b}}b6 axb6 26.\textit{\texttt{x}}xb6 \textit{\texttt{e}}e8 27.a4. White's passed pawn looks dangerous, but after 27...c5, his bishop cannot come back to assist in the defense of his king. 28.a5 \textit{\texttt{f}}f5

17...bxc6 18.\textit{\texttt{a}}a4 \textit{\texttt{c}}c8 19.\textit{\texttt{ab}}1 \textit{\texttt{xe}}6 20.\textit{\texttt{b}}b7

White's pieces are active, but Black is still a pawn up and his prospects are not worse. 20...a5 21.\textit{\texttt{fb}}1 \textit{\texttt{f}}f8 22.\textit{\texttt{c}}c5 \textit{\texttt{d}}d5 23.exd5 \textit{\texttt{exd}}5 24.\textit{\texttt{c}}c4 \textit{\texttt{h}}h8 25.\textit{\texttt{xd}}d5 \textit{\texttt{xd}}d5 26.\textit{\texttt{f}}f2 \textit{\texttt{ac}}8 27.\textit{\texttt{a}}a7 \textit{\texttt{b}}b8 28.\textit{\texttt{d}}d1 \textit{\texttt{fd}}8 29.\textit{\texttt{b}}b3 \textit{\texttt{h}}5 30.\textit{\texttt{xa}}5 e4 31.fxe4 fxe4= – White has succeeded in regaining the sacrificed pawn, but in the meantime Black has created a passed pawn in the centre and activated considerably his bishop on g7, Hertel – Hefka, ICCF 2012.
Chapter 25

1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 g6 3.♘c3 ♘g7 4.e4 d6 5.♘f3 0–0 6.♗e2 e5 7.0–0 ♘c6 8.d5 ♘e7 9.b4 ♜h5 10.♗e1

The Bayonet Attack

This is a prophylactic move. Now, White is not afraid of the enemy knight-sortie to the f4-square, since he will simply remove his bishop to f1.

10...f5 11.♗g5

This is a thematic move for him in this variation.

11.♗d3. White’s queen is not so reliably placed on this square. It can come under attack by the enemy knight after ♘f4, moreover that the pin of the knight after fxe4 and ♘f5 would be rather unpleasant for White. 11...h6. Now, he cannot play ♘g5. 12.c5, Ehvest – Amonatov, Moscow 2010, 12...fxe4!? 13.♗xe4 ♘f5∞

11.♗b1. This is a very prudent move. White defends against a7-a5, because he can simply counter it with a2-a3, but in general the move ♗b1 is not so useful for him. 11...♗f6 12.♗d3. White increases his control over the strategically important e4-square. (12.exf5 ♘xf5 13.♗g5, Ehvest – Shomoev, Moscow 2010, 13...h6!? 14.♗xf6 ♘xf6 15.♗e4 ♘f7∞ and Black’s two-bishop advantage compensates the powerful placement of White’s knight at the middle of the board.).

12...a6!? This is a non-standard plan for similar positions. White usually attacks on the queenside with a pawn-structure of this type, but here, we have an exception to the rules. Black wish-
es to advance b7-b5, followed by bxc4, in order to deflect his opponent's bishop from the protection of his e4-pawn. 13.\textit{h}c2 b5 14.\textit{g}5. White prepares the exchange on f6 so that he can reduce the pressure against the e4-square, but presents Black with the two-bishop advantage. 14...h6 15.\textit{x}xf6 bxc4 16.\textit{x}c4 \textit{xf}6 17.a4 \textit{fxe}4 18.\textit{xe}4 \textit{g}7 19.\textit{d}3 \textit{e}8. This move is played with the idea to transfer the queen to f7, from where it will not only exert pressure on the semi-open f-file, but will also eye the weak enemy d5-pawn. 20.\textit{b}3 \textit{h}8 21.\textit{bc}1 \textit{e}7\textit{oo} Molzahn – Peterc, ICCF 2014.

11.a4 \textit{f}6 12.\textit{d}3, Zhou Jianchao – Ding Liren, Xinghua 2014 (12.\textit{d}2 a5 – see 11.\textit{d}2; 12.a5, Zhou Jianchao – Wang Jue, Shenzhen 2016, 12...\textit{c}6\textit{oo} 12...\textit{fxe}4 13.\textit{xe}4 \textit{g}4=)

11.c5 \textit{fxe}4. Black frees the f5-square for his knight.

12.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}4 13.\textit{c}4 \textit{f}5 14.\textit{e}6 \textit{xe}6 15.dxe6. Black will gradually neutralise his opponent's initiative with an accurate play. 15...

\textit{h}8 16.\textit{xe}4 \textit{d}5. Now, in order to avoid material losses, White must comply with simplifications and a transfer into an endgame. 17.\textit{xf}4 \textit{dxc}4 18.\textit{g}5 \textit{xd}1 19.\textit{axd}1 \textit{h}6 20.\textit{e}3 \textit{d}4 21.e7 \textit{fe}8 22.\textit{c}1 \textit{b}5 23.\textit{cb}6 \textit{axb}6 24.\textit{xc}4 \textit{xe}7= – The powerful placement of Black's knight at the middle of the board compensates the weakness of his isolated e5-pawn, as well as his "bad" bishop on g7, Raijmaekers – Sirotkin, ICCF 2009.

12.\textit{xe}4 \textit{f}4 13.\textit{xf}4. White exchanges the powerful enemy knight, but presents Black with the two-bishop advantage. 13...\textit{xf}4

14.cxd6 cxd6 15.\textit{fd}2, P.Nielsen – Brustman, Koszalin 1997. Here, Black could have obtained a very good position with the move 15...\textit{ff}7\textit{oo}, followed by a transfer of the knight to the centre of the board \textit{f}5-d4.

14.\textit{c}2 \textit{f}5 15.\textit{fd}2 \textit{xe}4 16.\textit{xe}4 \textit{f}5 17.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}4= – Both sides have powerful knights at the middle of the board, Berti – Enricci, ICCF 2010.

After 14.\textit{fd}2, Black can try to exploit the insufficient protection
of the enemy d5-pawn. 14...dxc5 15.a4 b5!? (It seems less reliable for Black to choose here 15...cxd5 16.a3 c6 17.bxc5 h8 18.b5 f8 19.b1∞ Kramnik – Gelfand, Novgorod 1996. The position is objectively equal, but White's play is much easier from the practical point of view. He has very powerful pressure for the pawn.) 16. axb5 cxb4 17.b3 h8 18.c4 h6 19.c5 xdx5 20.e4 e6 21. a7 f8 22.a1 b4= – White was busy regaining his material and in the meantime Black managed to activate his passive bishop on g7 and to equalise, Gataullin – Tarrio Ocana, ICCF 2009.

11.d2. Now, just like after 11.g5, White will oust the enemy knight, but his own knight on d2 is deployed a bit more passively. 11...f6.

11.d2. Now, just like after 11.g5, White will oust the enemy knight, but his own knight on d2 is deployed a bit more passively. 11...f6.


12.c5 h8. Black's knight on e7 has no moves, therefore, his desire to activate it is easily understandable. 13.f3 g8 14.e4 h6 15.a4 fxe4 16.fxe4 f4 17.xe6. This move is necessary; otherwise, Black's attack against the enemy king might become very dangerous. 17...xh6 18.d3 (18.c1, Smirin – Ye Jiangchuan, Yerevan 1996, 18...e7!?) 18...f7 19.c6 bxc6 20.dxc6 c5 21.b4∞, followed by e6-f4(d4), g5(h4), h6 with good attacking possibilities, Zhu Chen – Xie Jun, Beijing 1997.

11...f6

Now, White may protect his e4-pawn with the bishop A) 12.f3, or with his pawn B) 12.f3.

A) 12.f3 c6

This is a useful move. Black takes immediately the control over an important square at the middle of the board. After White's pawn is removed from the d5-square (following e6 and xe6), Black can advance d6-d5 (after
the preliminary exchange on e4).

We will analyse now: A1) 13.dxc6, A2) 13.b3, A3) 13.b5, A4) 13.b2 and A5) 13.e3.

13.b1. This is not the most active plan for White. 13...cxd5 14. cxd5 h6 15.e6 xe6 16.dxe6 fxe4 17.xe4 xe4 18.xe4 d5 19.c2 b6 = Evdoki mov – Kuznetsov, Alushta 2004. Black has realised a typical plan for this position. Now, White cannot protect his e6-pawn. His bishops are very powerful, but his activity is only sufficient to maintain the equality.

13.a3. On this diagonal (after White plays b4-b5) his bishop will be very well placed. 13...cxd5

14.exd5 e4 15.e2 h6 16.e6 xe6 17.dxe6 d5 18.cxd5 fxd5 19. xd5 xd5 20.xd5 xd5 22. b3 xd5 23.b5 xe6 24.xe7. White has restored the material balance, but cannot fight for the advantage, because after 24...h7 25.h4 e4=, Black succeeds in activating his bishop on g7, which is not restricted any more by his pawn on e5, Bailey – Lindsalu, ICCF 2005.

A1) 13.dxc6

This move seems to be too straightforward. White opens the position for his pieces, but Black’s centre may become very powerful.
13...bxc6 14.exf5 gxf5 15. b5 h6
It would be useful for Black to oust the enemy knight to the edge of the board.
16.h3 d5

17.cxd5

17...a3 e4 18.cxd5 cxd5 – see 17.cxd5.

The move 17.bxc6 leads to very complicated game. 17...e4 18.a3 d4 19.c7 wxc7 20.b5 wxe4 21. xe7 xb5 22.xf8 xf8 23. xd4. White must part with his bishop; otherwise Black’s central pawns may become very dangerous. (23.f4 exf3∞) 23...d5 24.wd1 exf3 25.b1 we6 26.xf3 d7 27.bd1 ef6 28.xc6 xc6. White must be very careful in the arising complicated endgame, because Black’s two bishops may turn out to be stronger than White’s rook and pawns. 29.f4 g8 30.e6 h8 31.de6 a4= Ciciotti – Panitovsky, ICCF 2014.

17...cxd5 18.a3 e4 19.f4

20.a2 d4 21.wb3+ h7 22.ad1 g6. Black trades the powerful enemy knight. 23.xg6 xg6 24.c4 h7 25.cf7 d3. Black sacrifices the exchange and relies on his far-advanced central pawns. 26.h3 d7 27.c5 (White should better refrain from accepting the gift, because after 27.xe8 xe8 28.b2 d7, his pieces would be restricted considerably by Black’s e and d-pawns, Aykent – Arounopoulos, ICCF 2013) 27...c8 28.xa7. Now, White will also create a powerful passed pawn. 28..f8 29.b6 we7 30.b7 xf7 31.bxc8 xc8 32.e3. The position might seem very complicated and non-balanced, but the prospects of both sides remain approximately equal. There might follow: 32... e6 33.b5 e8 34.c1 d6 35.c6 e5. Black’s pieces are perfectly coordinated. 36.c5 f6 37.d5 h4 38.e7 f4. Both Black’s bishops are hanging, but his attack seems very powerful. 39.xe6 xe3 40.xe3 e7 41.f4 b2 42.cd1 c3, Draw, Neubauer – Sanner, ICCF 2012. After 43.xd3 xe1 44.xd6 xd6 45.xe4+ h8 46.a8+ h7 47.e4= Black’s king cannot avoid the perpetual check.

A2) 13.wb3
White’s queen will be very active on the a2-g8 diagonal, moreover that he frees the d1-square for his rook and from there it can
exert pressure against the enemy d6-pawn if the d-file is opened.

13...h6 14.a6 a6 15. dxe6 a6 16. dxe6 a6

Now, White must play very precisely; otherwise, he may simply lose his e6-pawn without obtaining sufficient compensation for it.

16.d1

16.a3 a6 17.a1, Eljanov - Radjabov, Moscow 2005, 17... a6! = White’s pieces are harmoniously deployed and he has the two-bishop advantage. All this compensates his missing pawn, but not more than that.

16.b5 a6 17.a3 a5 18.a4 (White should better not regain the pawn 18.exf5 axf5 19.a4xb7, because after 19...a8 20.a4 d5 a5xd5 21.exd5 a6f7+, Black seizes completely the initiative, Korobov - Yevseev, Sochi 2008. Later, he may prepare an attack on the g-file: e5-e4, a6e5, a6h7, a6g8, forcing White to begin defending.) 18...f4∞ Nezetic - Djokic, Pozarevac 2012.

16.c5. If both sides play correctly, the position would be considerably simplified. 16...fxe4 17.cxd6 axf3 18.dxe6 a8 19.a4 (19.a4b2 a7 a8 20.a4xe5 a6f7 21. a6e1 fxg2 22.a6h3 a6f8+, followed by a6f4-h4, a6h5-f4, Pelletier - Inarkiev, Istanbul 2003. Black’s king position has been considerably weakened and Black’s attack is very powerful.) 19...a6 20. a4c5 a7 a6 21.a6e6 21.a6d5 a6d5 22.a6xd5 cxd5 23.a6xe6 a6xe6 24.a6d1 a6, draw, Kopta - Maximov, Pardubice 2010. The agreement to a draw might seem a bit premature, because after 25.a6e3 a6d8 26.gxf3 a6f5+, the position might still be approximately equal, but Black’s play would be much simpler from the practical point of view. His king is much more reliably protected than its counterpart.

16...a6

Of course not 16...a6, due to 17.a6d6.

17.b5
It would be less precise for White to opt for 17.c5 fxe4 18. cxd6 exf3 19.dxe7 \textit{Ex}d1+ 20.\textit{Ex}d1 \textit{Ex}xe6! Black sacrifices a rook, having in mind quite justifiably so, that after accepting the sacrifice White would come under a crushing attack. 21.\textit{Ex}d8+ \textit{Kh}7 22.gxf3. White complies with an inferior position, but at least he would not lose immediately (22.\textit{Ex}xa8?? \textit{E}g4 23.\textit{Ex}f1 \textit{Ex}xg2+ 24.\textit{Ex}e1 \textit{Ex}g1+ 25. \textit{Ex}d2 \textit{Ex}xg2+ 26.\textit{Ex}d3 e4+ 27.\textit{Ex}c4 \textit{E}c2--+) 22...\textit{Ex}g8+ Kallio – Kotronias, Batumi 2002.

17...\textit{Ex}xe6

White's plan includes the development of his bishop to a3, therefore he opens the a3-f8 diagonal in advance.

13...cxd5 14.cxd5 h6 15. \textit{Ed}e6 \textit{Ex}xe6 16.dxe6 fxe4

17.\textit{Ex}xe4

17.\textit{Ex}e4 \textit{Ec}8 18.\textit{Ed}d5 \textit{Ex}xd5 19. \textit{Ex}d5 \textit{Eb}6 20.\textit{Ex}f3 d5 21.\textit{Ex}a3 \textit{Ec}e8 22.\textit{Ex}xe7 \textit{Ex}xe7 23.\textit{Ex}xd5. White has succeeded in protecting reliably
his pawn on e6, but this is insufficient to provide him with an advantage, because after 23...\textit{xf2} 24.\textit{h1}, Black will advance his pawn up to the e3-square. 24...e4 25.\textit{c1} e3 26.\textit{d3} \textit{d2} 27.\textit{e4} \textit{h7} 28.\textit{b3} \textit{d4} 29.\textit{f1} \textit{f2} 30.a4 \textit{c5} 31.c2 \textit{g5} – Both sides have powerful pawns on e6 and e3 and this balances the chances, Novoa – Kolehmainen, ICCF 2006.

17...\textit{xe4} 18.\textit{xe4} d5 19. \textit{a3}

Now, there arises an approximately equal endgame.

19...\textit{dxe4} 20.\textit{xd8} \textit{fxd8} 21.\textit{xe7} \textit{e8}

22.\textit{c5}

22.\textit{b4} \textit{xe6} 23.\textit{xe4}. There is just a few material left on the board and White cannot exploit the slight weakness of the isolated enemy e-pawn. 23...\textit{c8} 24.a4 a6. The trade of another couple of pawns is Black’s simplest road to equality. 25.bxa6 bxa6 26.f4 \textit{b6} 27.fxe5 \textit{e8} 28.\textit{c3}, Draw, Morley – Burger, ICCF 2011. In fact, after 28.\textit{b3} 29.\textit{d4} \textit{b4}, White will be incapable of holding on to his extra pawn: 30.\textit{f2} \textit{xd4} 31.\textit{xd4} \textit{xe5} 32.\textit{ad1} \textit{xd4}+ 33.\textit{xd4} \textit{e6}=

22.\textit{xe6} 23.\textit{e3}

The immediate capturing on e4 would not promise much to White: 23.\textit{xe4} a6 24.bxa6 (24.b6 \textit{c8} 25.\textit{e3} \textit{d6} 26.g3 h5 27.\textit{b1} \textit{c2} 28.\textit{a4} \textit{f7} 29.\textit{g2} \textit{e6} – Brodsky – Shimanov, St Petersburg 2008) 24...\textit{exa6} 25.a3 \textit{f8} 26. \textit{xf8} \textit{xf8} 27.\textit{e3} b5 28.\textit{b3} b4 29.\textit{xb4} \textit{xa3} 30.\textit{xa3} \textit{xa3}– Shen Yang – Ju Wenjun, China 2015.

23...a6

24.b6

White prevents further simplifications, but his b6-pawn, which is placed against the rules, (on a square with the same colour as his bishop), might become weak later. (24.\textit{eb1} axb5 25.\textit{xb5} \textit{ea6} 26.\textit{xb7} \textit{xa2}– Gordon – Bacrot, Germany 2013; 24.a4 axb5 25. axb5 \textit{xa1} 26.\textit{xa1} \textit{ed6} 27.h4 h5 28.\textit{a8}+ \textit{f7} 29.\textit{h2} \textit{f6}– Pelle-
tier – Gallagher, Germany 2002.)

24...â6 25.g3 (25.a4, Malakhatko – Moradiabadi, Paris 2008, 25...c6=) 25...d8. Black forces his opponent’s pieces to protect the b6-pawn. 26.ab1 f7 27.h4 c8 28.a4 h5 29.ed1 e8= Mozharov – Matinian, Kazan 2014. It is not easy to see how White can improve his position, moreover that it should not be forgotten that Black still has an extra pawn.

A4) 13.b2

This is a good square for White’s bishop. It will exert pressure against the e5-square from this position.

13...h6 14.e6 xe6 15.dxe6 fxe4 16.xe4

16.xe4 d5 17.cxd5 (17.d3 e4 18.f1 wb6 19.b1 h5 – White will have problems with the protection of the f2-square, Bareev – Radjabov, Enghien les Bains 2003) 17...cxd5 18.c2 c8 19.b3 wb6 20.d2 xb4 21.ad1


16...xe4

17.xe4

White is preparing to sacrifice the exchange on e5.

The move 17.xe4 would lead to a position, which would not be so interesting. 17...d5 18.cxd5 cxd5 19.f3 e4 20.xg7 xg7 21.g4 wb6 22.d2 h5 23.h3 xf6 24.a3 af8= Krutous – L.Hansen, ICCF 2015. White has succeeded in protecting his e6-pawn, but the placement of his bishop is not so adequate. Black’s major pieces exert powerful pressure against the f2-square.

17...d5 18.cxd5 cxd5 19.xe5!? xe5 20.xe5

White has a pawn for the exchange, two powerful bishops and good attacking prospects on the a1-h8 diagonal. Still, after a precise play Black will hold convincingly the defence.
20...\textbf{b6}

His queen attacks simultaneously the pawns on e6 and b4.

\textbf{21.d2}

Following 21.d2, Black can give back the exchange and destroy the shelter of his opponent's monarch. 21...\textbf{xf3}! 22.gxf3 \textbf{xe6} 23.e1 \textbf{f5} 24.g3 (24.f4 \textbf{f7} 25.d1 g5 26.g3, Tari - Djurhuus, Oslo 2014, 26...d4=) 24...\textbf{f7} 25.c1 d4 26.c7 \textbf{d5} = Nyback - Matthiesen, Copenhagen 2003.

\textbf{21...\textbf{ad8}}

Black plans to play d5-d4 at some moment, covering the diagonal of the bishop on b2.

\textbf{22.d2}

22.a3 \textbf{xe6} 23.\textbf{d4}. The queen+bishop tandem seems really threatening; nevertheless, White does not have anything concrete. 23..\textbf{f5} 24.\textbf{h8+} \textbf{f7} Black's monarch is leaving the kingside. 25.\textbf{h7+} \textbf{e8} 26.xb7 \textbf{f7} 27.b5+. After White's queen has been deflected away from the attack, Black's king may go back to g8. 28.d1 (28.d3 \textbf{h4} 29.e2 d4 30.d1 \textbf{g8} 31.g3 \textbf{f5} 32.a6 \textbf{xa6} 33.a6 \textbf{c7} 34.d3 \textbf{f7} 35.h4 \textbf{f6}= Norrelykke - Manzo, ICCF 2014. White cannot improve his position in this endgame. Naturally, he can exchange on d4 and capture the d4-pawn, but will lose his two-bishop advantage and Black's rook will easily make a draw against White's bishop and two pawns.) 28...d4 29.d3 \textbf{e7} 30.g3 \textbf{g8} 31.d2 (31.b5 \textbf{h7}=) 31...\textbf{e8} 32.g2 \textbf{h7} 33.b5 \textbf{f7} 34.\textbf{c6} \textbf{f8} 35.xd4 \textbf{d8} 36.c3 \textbf{xd4} 37.xd4 \textbf{g7} 38.d3 \textbf{xc3} 39.xc3 \textbf{e2} 40.f3 \textbf{b2} 41.a4 \textbf{g7} 42.c6 h5 43.a6 \textbf{f7}= Akdag - Dorner, ICCF 2010.

22.e1. White protects his attacked pawns, but his offensive is slowed down. 22...d4 23.d1. White prepares the transfer of his bishop to b3 from where it will protect reliably the e6-pawn. (23.d1 h5=) 23...a5 24.a3 \textbf{f5} 25.b3 \textbf{h7} 26.d2 axb4 27.axb4 \textbf{d6} 28.d1 (28.c1 \textbf{g8}!?=) 28...\textbf{c6} 29.c1 \textbf{h5} 30.h3 \textbf{xb4} 31.xb4 \textbf{xh4}. There has arisen an endgame. This is in favour of Black, because he does not need to be afraid any more of the possible checkmating attacks against his king. 32.e7 \textbf{c8} 33.g4 \textbf{e5} 34.f4 \textbf{xe7} 35.d6. White regains the exchange and the position becomes absolutely equal. 35...\textbf{c6}
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36.\texttt{\texttt{exe7 \texttt{exe7}} \texttt{37.\texttt{xd4 \texttt{c7= Micic - Colucci, ICCF 2007.}}}}

\textbf{22...\texttt{exe6}}

\textbf{23.\texttt{e1}}

23.\texttt{xh6? d4↑ Rey - Watson, Email 2008.}

23.\texttt{d4 f5} 24.\texttt{h8+ f7} 25.\texttt{h7+ e8} 26.\texttt{xb7 f7} 27.\texttt{b5+ f8} 28.\texttt{d3 (28.f1. It would be still too early for White's king to go to the centre, because there are still too many pieces on the board. 28...d4↑ Pileckis - Kenneskog, Vaxjo 2013.) 28...g8 29.b5 h7 30.h3 c7= - White's two powerful bishops and a pawn compensate the sacrificed exchange, but not more than that, Balabaev - Lutzenberger, Chessfriend.com 2004.}}

23...\texttt{f7} 24.\texttt{xh6}

Now, White will have two pawns for the exchange, but Black succeeds in activating considerably his pieces by playing d5-d4 and f5.

\textbf{24...d4 25.\texttt{d2}}

The game will end in a perpetual check after 25.\texttt{exe7 exe7} 26.\texttt{xg6+ g7} 27.\texttt{e6+ f7} 28.\texttt{g4+ Gilbert - Jensen, ICCF 2012.}

\textbf{25...\texttt{f5}}

26.\texttt{e4}

White should not give up his a2-pawn: 26.\texttt{d1 xa2↑ Fier - Sai, Bhubaneswar 2010.}

26.a4 \texttt{fe8= Malakhatko - Stokke, Tromsoe 2010.}

\textbf{26...\texttt{e8} 27.a3}

27.a4 \texttt{e5} 28.f3 \texttt{b3} 29.c1 d3. Black's pieces are very active, but his king is vulnerable, so he cannot play for a win. 30.b2 \texttt{e6} 31.e1 \texttt{d6} 32.xd3 \texttt{e4} 33.fxe4 \texttt{xd3} 34.c8+ \texttt{e8} 35.xe8+ \texttt{f7} 36.f4+ \texttt{xe8} 37.e5+ \texttt{d7} 38.\texttt{b5= - Black's king cannot avoid the perpetual check, Wuerzbesse- ser - Petrillo, ICCF 2010.}
The move 19.\textit{c}c5 leads to an equal endgame. 19.dxe4 20.\textit{w}xd8 \textit{fxd8} 21.\textit{xe}7 \textit{e}8 22.\textit{c}c5. There has arisen the same position as in variation A3, but only with a pawn on b4 and not on b5. This would not have any effect on the evaluation of the position. 22.b6 23.\textit{e}e3 \textit{f}f8 24.b5 \textit{g}g7 25.\textit{e}ac1 (25.\textit{c}c1 \textit{c}c5). Black has transferred his bishop on g7 to a more active position and has created counterplay against the enemy f2-pawn. 26.\textit{b}b2 \textit{e}xe6 27.\textit{xe}4 \textit{f}f8= Satici – Civitillo, ICCF 2010) 25.\textit{e}ac8 26.\textit{xc}8 \textit{xc}8 27.\textit{d}d1 \textit{f}f6 28.\textit{d}d7 \textit{xe}6 29.\textit{xa}7 \textit{c}c5 30.\textit{x}xh6 \textit{d}d8. Black’s pieces are so active that White cannot hold on to his extra pawn. 31.g4 \textit{d}d1+ 32.\textit{g}g2 \textit{fb}1 33.\textit{e}e3 \textit{xb}5 34.\textit{g}g3 \textit{fb}2 35.\textit{g}g7 \textit{f}f6 36.\textit{b}b7 \textit{xa}2= Lloyd – Cumming, ICCF 2015.

19..\textit{b}6
Black defends against \textit{c}c5.
20.\textit{w}g4

White cannot achieve much with a transfer of his bishop to d7, since this would take too much time. 20.\textit{a}a4 \textit{d}d6 21.\textit{d}d7 e4 22.\textit{c}c1 \textit{xb}4 23.h3 \textit{d}d6∞ Gardarsson – Tarrio Ocana, ICCF 2010.

20..\textit{e}4 21.\textit{ad}1 \textit{c}c7 22.\textit{xb}3
White is trying to squeeze his opponent’s pieces with the protection of the d5-pawn.

22.\textit{a}4 \textit{f}5 23.\textit{d}d7 h5 24.\textit{e}e2,
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Martinez – James, FICGS 2011, 
24...\texttt{haf8!}\texttt{?}\infty

\textbf{22...\texttt{haf5}}

\textbf{23.e2}

23.\texttt{x}d4 \texttt{x}d4 24.\texttt{x}d4, Iskusnyh – Motylev, Moscow 1999, 
24...\texttt{haf8!}\texttt{?}\infty – Black’s pressure against the f2-pawn provides him with an edge.

23.\texttt{d}d2 h5 24.\texttt{h}e2 \texttt{c}c3 25.\texttt{e}c2 \texttt{w}e5 26.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{d}d4. Black has exploited his opponent’s imprecise play and has transferred his bishop to a powerful position at the middle of the board. 27.\texttt{e}e3. White neutralises the pressure against the f2-pawn, but loses his two-bishop advantage. 27...\texttt{haf8} 28.\texttt{d}d1 \texttt{x}e3 29.\texttt{x}e3 \texttt{g}g7 30.h3 \texttt{h}8f6\texttt{?} – White will fail to preserve his e6-pawn, Ruggieri – Borroni, ICCF 2009.

23.\texttt{h}e2, Radjabov – Moreno Carnero, Pamplona 2002, 23...\texttt{c}c3=

23.b5 h5 24.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}6 25.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}5= O’Hare – Morozov, ICCF 2007.

23.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{d}d6 24.\texttt{ed}1 \texttt{d}8 25. \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{b}8 26.\texttt{c}2 h5 27.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}6. Black begins a permanent chase after White’s queen. 28.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}5 29.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}6= Braziulis – Sudnitsyn, ICCF 2008.

23.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{af}8 24.g4. Now, Black will not be able to play \texttt{h}5 and White will manage to capture on h6, but the shelter of his king is compromised. 24...\texttt{e}5 25.\texttt{x}h6 \texttt{x}h6 26.\texttt{x}h6 \texttt{d}6 27.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{x}e6 28.h3 \texttt{f}3 29.\texttt{e}3 \texttt{f}4= Starke – Larsson, Lechenicher Schach-Server 2009.

23...\texttt{h}5 24.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}6

25.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}5 26.\texttt{h}4

26...\texttt{f}6 27.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}5 28.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}6= Xu Jun – Ponomariov, Shenyang 2000
B) 12.f3

This move leads to a more complicated game than 12...†h8, because Black will have greater problems to simplify the position.

12...†h8

Black removes prudently his king away from the dangerous diagonal and frees the g8-square for his knight.

We will analyse now: B1) 13. †e6, B2) 13...†e3, B3) 13...†b1.

13.b5. This is an important decision, but it weakens even more the dark squares in White’s camp. 13...†h5 14...†e6 (14...†f1, Abbasov – N.Mamedov, Baku 2009, 14... †xf4!? 15...dxe6 16. †xf4 exf4 17...c1, Ricardi – Lemos, Berazategui 2007, 17...fxe4 18. fxe4 ♦e5 19...d3 ♦g8!? 20...h3 c6 21...ed1 ♦f6† – Black’s initiative increases with every move. In addition, White is likely to lose his e6-pawn, which is too far away from the rest of his forces.

13.c5. White begins immediate active actions on the queenside, but weakens his control over the d5-square. 13...h6 14...e6 ♦xe6 15. dxe6 d5. After this pawn-break the position is simplified considerably. 16.exd5 ♦fxd5 17...xd5 ♦xd5

Now, White is faced with a choice. He can trade the queens himself, or can offer his opponent to do that.

18...xd5 ♦xd5 19...c4 ♦xb4 20. ♦b1 ♦c6 21...e3. The activity of White’s pieces compensate his material losses, but not more than that. (21...d5 ♦ab8 22...xb7 ♦xb7 23...xc6 ♦bb8 24...d7 ♦h7 25...f6= Korzans – Gerhards, ICCF 2010) 21...ab8 22...bd1 ♦fd8 23. ♦d7 ♦xd7 24...xd7 ♦f8= Korobov – Huschenbeth, Pardubice 2008.

18...b3 ♦xb3 19.axb3 ♦c6. Black prepares the transfer of his knight to the centre of the board. 20...a4 ♦fe8 21...c4 (Following 21...e3 ♦xe6 22.b5 ♦d4 23...d3 ♦ee8, White can regain his pawn, but will be deprived of his two-bishop advantage. 24...xd4 exd4 25...xe8+ ♦xe8 26...xa7 ♦e3 27. ♦c4 ♦f8 28...a8 ♦g7= Zubov – Lyukmanov, ICCF 2010) 21...a6 22.b5. This move leads to additional simplifications. 22...axb5 23.
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E xa8 E xa8 24. ∆xb5 E e8 25. ∆d1
E xe6 26. ∆d7 ∆f8 27. ∆xc7 ∆xc5+

B1) 13. ∆e6

This is a straightforward move. White’s knight penetrates immediately to the e6-square, without waiting for the move h7-h6.

13... E xe6 14. dxe6 ∆h5

Black wishes to deploy his knight on f4. In addition, the knight may change its route and after ∆f6, ∆g7, may attack the weak enemy e6-pawn.

15.g3

White parries his opponent’s threat.

15.c5 ∆f4. Now, White must play precisely in order to maintain the balance. 16. ∆c4 fxe4
(diagram)


– H. Ivanov, IECG 2001) 19... ∆fxe6 20. ∆xe6 E xe6 21. cxd6 cxd6 22. ∆b5 a6 23. ∆xd6 E d4† – The shelter of White’s king has been weakened, while Black’s knight is very powerful at the middle of the board, Nakamura – Al Modiahki, Southampton 2003.

17. E xe4!? This is an interesting exchange-sacrifice. 17... d5 18. ∆xf4 dxe4 19. ∆g5 ∆f6 20. ∆xf6+ E xf6 21.fxe4 E g7 22. ∆d5 E f8 23. W e2 c6 24. E d1. Now, in addition, White sacrifices a knight! 24... cxd5 25. exd5 E f5 26. d6 W f6= – His far-advanced passed pawns are very powerful, but this would be sufficient only to maintain the equality, Primakov – Malashenkov, ICCF 2014.

15... ∆f6

(diagram)
16.\textit{exf5}

16.\textit{h6} 16.\textit{e8} 17.\textit{d5} 17.\textit{g8}. White is incapable of preserving his e6-pawn, but after 18.\textit{e3} 18.\textit{g7} 19.c5 19.ex6 20.\textit{xf6} 20.\textit{xf6} 21.cxd6 21.cxd6=, his two powerful bishops and the vulnerability of Black's d6-pawn compensate White's missing pawn, Cottegne – Tiemann, ICCF 2012.

16.c5. He is preparing \textit{c4}. 16...f4 17.\textit{g2} (17.g4?! 17.g7 18.\textit{c4} 17.c6 19.exd6 cxd6= Van Wely – Radjabov, Wijk aan Zee 2007) 17.c6 18.exd6 (There arises a complicated double-edged position after 18.\textit{c4} 19.g7 19.exd6 cxd6 20.\textit{b}5 20.\textit{b}5 21.\textit{b}2 a6 22.\textit{a}3 22.\textit{x}b4 Keuter – Chocenka, ICCF 2007.) 18...xd6 19.\textit{d}5

19...\textit{g7} (It is also possible for Black to continue here with 19...\textit{d}4 20.\textit{b}2 \textit{xe}6 21.g4 \textit{h}7 22.\textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} 23.\textit{d}5= – White has two very strong bishops and exerts pressure against the weak enemy d6-pawn, so this compensates his minimal material deficit, Shirov – Radjabov, Wijk aan Zee 2007) 20.e7 \textit{xe}7 21.gxf4 \textit{e}6 22.\textit{h}1 \textit{cd}4 23.\textit{g}1. White has managed to open the g-file, but Black neutralises his opponent's initiative on the kingside with a precise play. 23...\textit{f}6. He fortifies the e5-square. 24.f5 (24.b1 25.f5 25.gxf5 26.d3 27.exf5 28.\textit{e}4 27= Van Unen – Ollmann, ICCF 2007) 24...gxf5 25.exf5 25.\textit{xf5} 26.\textit{d}3 27.\textit{e}4, Van Unen – Poli, ICCF 2008, 27...\textit{e}8!?= – White's pieces are very actively deployed, but Black has an extra pawn and a solid position.

16...\textit{gxf5}

17.f4

White is trying to oust the enemy knight from its active position, but Black does not intend to retreat it at all!

Following 17.\textit{h}1 f4, the g3-square would need permanent protection. 18.\textit{e}4 19.hxg3 20.g4 21.xg3 21.xg3+ 22.\textit{g}2 \textit{h}4 23.\textit{d}3 \textit{f}6 with excellent counterplay on the dark squares, Unen – Samerdokas, ICCF 2013.
17...\texttt{\textdollar}xg3?! 
This is an interesting piece-sacrifice. Black begins an attack and White must defend very accurately.

18.hxg3 \texttt{\textdollar}g8 19.g4 exf4 20.\texttt{\textdollar}b2

About 20.\texttt{\textdollar}d2 fxg4 21.\texttt{\textdollar}b2 \texttt{\textdollar}g7 – see 20.\texttt{\textdollar}b2.

20...fxg4

White has avoided the attack on the g-file, but Black has already three pawns for the piece. 21.\texttt{\textdollar}d2 \texttt{\textdollar}g7 22.\texttt{\textdollar}ad1 (The move 22.\texttt{\textdollar}f1 would lead to a very complicated position. 22...f3 23.\texttt{\textdollar}e4 \texttt{\textdollar}e5 24.\texttt{\textdollar}d5 \texttt{\textdollar}xb2 25.\texttt{\textdollar}xb2 \texttt{\textdollar}xd5 26.\texttt{\textdollar}xd5 \texttt{\textdollar}h4 27.\texttt{\textdollar}f2 \texttt{\textdollar}f5 28.\texttt{\textdollar}g3. White has managed to block his opponent’s passed pawns, but loses additionally his d5-pawn. 28...\texttt{\textdollar}xd5 29.\texttt{\textdollar}ae1 \texttt{\textdollar}e8 30.\texttt{\textdollar}f4 \texttt{\textdollar}g5 31.\texttt{\textdollar}d3 c6= Garnica – Hablizel, ICCF 2013.) 22...\texttt{\textdollar}g6. Black’s knight joins into the attack. 23. \texttt{\textdollar}f1 \texttt{\textdollar}f3 24.\texttt{\textdollar}e4 \texttt{\textdollar}e5. The shelter of White’s monarch is already seriously endangered. 25.\texttt{\textdollar}xe5! He sacrifices the exchange in an attempt to seize the initiative. 25...\texttt{\textdollar}xe5 26.\texttt{\textdollar}e4 \texttt{\textdollar}h4 27.\texttt{\textdollar}f4 \texttt{\textdollar}g8. Black removes his king away from the dangerous a1-h8 diagonal. 28.\texttt{\textdollar}f6+, Draw, Ciciotti – V.Kuzmin, ICCF 2013.

B2) 13.\texttt{\textdollar}e3

This is a seemingly active move, but has the drawback that Black may exploit the defencelessness of the bishop on e3.

13...\texttt{\textdollar}h6

14.\texttt{\textdollar}f7+

White gets rid of the unpleasant pin of his knight.

Following 14.h4, the weakened shelter of his king may hurt White in the future. 14...\texttt{\textdollar}h5 15.c5 \texttt{\textdollar}f4 16. \texttt{\textdollar}f2 \texttt{\textdollar}xg5 17.hxg5 \texttt{\textdollar}g8 18.\texttt{\textdollar}xd6 \texttt{\textdollar}xd6 – He will fail to hold on to his g5-pawn, after which Black will not only have an extra pawn, but also excellent attacking prospects,
Fier – Al Sayed, Caleta 2014.

**14...fxe7 15...xf6 f4**

**16.c5**

16...g5 eg8 17.g4 (17.c5 h6 – see 16.c5) 17...h6 18.h4 g5 19.\(f2\) h5 20.h3 \(h7\) 21.c5 \(e7\) 22.\(g2\) \(g6\) Gelfand – Radjabov, Sochi 2008.

Black obtains a very good position after 16.g4 a5 17.bxa5 \(eg8\) 18.g5 h6 19.h4 \(xa5\) 20.f2 g5 21.b5 h5 22.h3 b6= Knoll – Boger, ICCF 2006. White will hardly manage to break on the queenside, while on the opposite side of the board Black has very good counterplay, connected with the doubling of his rooks on the h-file, as well as with the transfer of his knight to the h4-square (\(e7\)-g6-h4).

**16...eg8 17.g5 h6 18.\(h4\) g5 19.f2 \(g7\)**

(diagram)

**20.g4.** This is a prophylactic move. White must not allow g5-
the dangerous diagonal on the process.

13...h6 14.\(\text{\textalpha}e6\) \(\text{\textalpha}xe6\) 15.\(\text{dxe6 fxe4}\)

Before transferring his knight to d4, Black stabilises the pawn-structure in the centre.

16.fxe4 \(\text{\textalpha}c6\) 17.\(\text{\textalpha}d5\) \(\text{\textalpha}g8\)

Black must play like this in order to follow that with \(\text{\textalpha}d4\); otherwise, White will have the move e6-e7.

18.\(\text{\textalpha}d3\)

He is preparing the queen-sortie \(\text{\textalpha}g4\).

18.\(\text{\textalpha}g4\) \(\text{\textalpha}d4\) 19.b5 c6 — see 18.b5.

Following 18.\(\text{\textomega}d3\) \(\text{\textalpha}d4\) 19.\(\text{\textomega}h3\) \(\text{\textomega}e8\), White will have difficulties with the protection of his e6-pawn. 20.\(\text{\textomega}g4\) c6 21.\(\text{\textalpha}c3\) \(\text{\textomega}e7\) 22.\(\text{\textalpha}b5\) \(\text{\textalpha}h7\) 23.bxc6 bxc6 24.\(\text{\textalpha}e2\) \(\text{\textalpha}xe6\) 25.\(\text{\textomega}xe6\) \(\text{\textomega}xe6\) 26.\(\text{\textomega}xe6\) \(\text{\textomega}xe6\) — Riedener – Rogetzer, ICCF 2009.

18.b5 \(\text{\textalpha}d4\) 19.\(\text{\textomega}g4\) c6. Black ousts the enemy knight from the centre of the board. 20.\(\text{\textalpha}b4\) \(\text{\textomega}b8\) 21.\(\text{\textalpha}e3\) a5 22.bxa6 bxa6 23.\(\text{\textomega}d2\) \(\text{\textomega}a5=\) Even – Moll, ICCF 2012.

18...\(\text{\textalpha}d4\) 19.\(\text{\textomega}g4\) g5

20.h4

White is trying to organise an attack against the enemy king.

20.c5 c6 21.e7 \(\text{\textalpha}xe7\) 22.\(\text{\textalpha}xg5\).

He sacrifices a piece and begins an attack on the light squares.

22...\(\text{\textomega}cxd5\)? 23.\(\text{\textomega}xd5\) \(\text{\textomega}c8\) 24.\(\text{\textomega}e4\) \(\text{\textalpha}e5\) 25.\(\text{\textalpha}e7\) — White has seized completely the initiative and Black will be faced with a difficult defence, Gelfand – Giri, London 2012.

22...hxg5 23.\(\text{\textomega}h3+\) \(\text{\textalpha}g8\) 24.\(\text{\textomega}xe7+\) \(\text{\textomega}xe7\) 25.\(\text{\textomega}c4+\) \(\text{\textomega}f7\) 26.cxd6
The pin on the a2-g8 diagonal seems quite threatening, but Black can hold the balance with a precise play. 27...\texttt{xf6} 28. \texttt{xf7} \texttt{xf7} 29. \texttt{c8+} \texttt{xf8} 30. \texttt{e8} \texttt{f6} 31. \texttt{f1} \texttt{e2+!} Black deflects the enemy bishop and gets rid of the pin. He forces a transition into a drawish endgame with bishops of opposite colours. 32. \texttt{xe2} \texttt{e7} 33. \texttt{xe7} \texttt{xf1+} 34. \texttt{xf1} \texttt{xe7}= Dothan – Jorgensen, ICCF 2009.

White fails to develop his attack after 20. \texttt{h3} c6 21. \texttt{e3} \texttt{f6} 22. \texttt{g4}, Ponomariov – Radjabov, Wijk aan Zee 2003, 22... \texttt{xe6}!? 23. \texttt{xg5} \texttt{g6=} Black has fortified reliably his h6-square and thanks to the powerful position of his knight at the centre of the board his prospects in the forthcoming battle are at least not worse.

The move 20. \texttt{e3} leads to great complications. 20...c6. Black attacks the enemy knight, but White does not even think about retreating it! 21. \texttt{f1} (He can also sacrifice his knight with the line: 21.h4 \texttt{cxd5} 22. \texttt{exd5} \texttt{f4} 23. \texttt{xf4} \texttt{gxf4} 24. \texttt{g6} \texttt{f6} 25.c5 \texttt{e7} 26. \texttt{bc1} \texttt{g8=} Ray – Dunlop, ICCF 2010.) 21... \texttt{cxd5} 22. \texttt{exd5} \texttt{f4}. Black sacrifices the exchange and prevents \texttt{e4}. 23. \texttt{xf4} \texttt{gxf4} 24. \texttt{g6} \texttt{f6=} Shpakovsky – Gullotto, ICCF 2009. Black has parried the checkmating threats against his king. In the middle game his knights may even prove to be stronger than White’s rook and pawns.

20... \texttt{f6}
With a knight on d5 and a queen on g4, White’s e6-pawn may turn out to be very powerful. With his last move Black wishes to oust the enemy queen from the g4-square and play later \texttt{xe6}.

21. \texttt{g3}
White would not object to the trade of the e6-pawn for the g5-pawn.

21... \texttt{xe6} 22. \texttt{hxg5} \texttt{h5}

23. \texttt{h2}
White’s target is the h6-square.

He would not obtain much with 23. \texttt{g4}, because after 23... \texttt{hf4}, he would have to lose a tempo for the retreat of his bishop. 24. \texttt{xf4} \texttt{xf4} 25. \texttt{e2} \texttt{g5=} – Black has an extra pawn indeed, but his bishop on g7 is so “bad” that his material advantage is practically irrelevant, Florea – Bancevich, ICCF 2011.

23... \texttt{hf4} 24. \texttt{gxh6} \texttt{f6}
White has an extra pawn, but Black’s prospects are at least
equal. He plans to play $g5$, developing powerful initiative on the dark squares. White’s material advantage is not felt at all, moreover that the pawn on h6 impedes his attack against the enemy king.

25...exf4 26.e5
White sacrifices a pawn and opens the diagonal for his bishop.

25...$x$e5 26.$w$h5 $d$g5 28. $g$6 $g$8 29.$f$5 $f$8

After the exchange of the queens, Black’s king will be safe.

30.$w$xf8 $a$xf8 31.$d$e7
White sacrifices the exchange and wishes to simplify the position, neutralising his opponent’s initiative.

31...$f$3+ 32.$f$2 $x$e1 33. $x$e1 $f$6 34.$e$6 $h$4+ 35.$f$1 $x$e7 36.$x$e7 $g$3 37.$e$4 $f$6 38.$h$7+ $g$8 39.$x$c7 $x$h6 40.$x$b7 $a$3 41.$g$1 $f$8 42. $d$7 $x$a2+ Zlotkowski – Merilo, ICCF 2012. White has a pawn for the exchange and his pieces are very active. Still, he would need to find numerous accurate moves in order to save the draw.

25.$x$xf4

After White’s alternatives Black ends up with an even more pleasant game.

25.$f$1 $g$5 26.$b$3 $c$6= Stephan – Baiocchi, ICCF 2009.

Or 25.$e$3 $d$4 26.$x$xf4 exf4 27.$h$3 $e$5= and Black dominates on the dark squares, Gromark – Sikorsky, ICCF 2010.

25.$d$1 $g$8 26.$f$1 $g$5= – White will hardly activate his “bad” bishop on f1, Jacobs – Lux, Email 2008.
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The Traditional Line

With this move, just like after 9.d2, White does not allow h5. From the e1-square his knight may go to d3 and from there it will support his queenside offensive (c4-c5) and also may help in an eventual strike against the enemy centre with f2-f4.

9...d7

Black prepares immediately the thematic pawn-advance f7-f5. This retreat of the knight to d7 seems more precise than e8, because from d7 the knight controls the c5-square and prevents the development of White’s initiative on the queenside.

We will analyse now A) 10.f3 and B) 10.d3.

10.g4 f5 11.f3 h8 – see 10.f3.

A) 10.f3 f5

The move 10.e3 will be dealt with in the next chapter.

10.g5 f5 11.exf5 (11.f3 – see 10.f3 f5 11.g5) 11...gxf5 12.f4, Cvetkovic – Nikolaidis, Korinthos 1997, 12...h6!? 13.h4 f6 14.fxe5

10.h1 f5 11.exf5 xf5 12.c2, Miles – Ziegler, Malmo 1996, 12...h4!?

10.d2 f5 11.c1 (11.d3 f6, or 11.f3 f6 12.d3 f4 – see variation B) 11...f6 12.f3 f4 13.c5, Miles – Lind, Gausdal 1980. Without the preliminary move d3 this pawn-break seems a bit premature (it is preferable for White to opt for 13.d3 g5 – see variation B) 13...c6!? This is the simplest. Black should not accept the pawn-sacrifice. 14.cxd6 xd6 15.dxc6 xc6= – He has turned out to be very well prepared for the opening of the game in the centre.
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11.g4
White wishes to build a formidable fortress on the kingside.

11.d3 f4 – see variation B.

11.e3 f4 – see Chapter 36.

11.g5 h6 12.e3 g5 13.a4 a5 Agdestein – I. Sokolov, Novi Sad 1990.

11...h8
This is a very flexible move. At first Black wishes to improve the placement of his knight on e7 and only then to determine the pawn-structure on the kingside.

This move has some merits, but also some drawbacks too. On the one hand the bishop will be very active on the g1-a7 diagonal, but on the other hand the bishop will be attacked with tempo after f5-f4.

The move 12.g5 looks premature. 12...f4. White’s g5-pawn has been isolated from the rest of his main forces and may cause plenty of troubles for him. 13.h4 h6 14. f2, V.Belov – Ulko, Moscow 2010 (14.f2 g8 Levin – Shomoev, St. Petersburg 2009) 14...f7!?, followed by g8, f8, h7, e7.

The move 12.h1 would lead to a complicated positional fight. 12...f4 13.d2, Jpsingle – Pineapple, playchess.com 2006. Here, Black could have transferred his rook to the h-file obtaining very good counterplay: 13...g5!? 14. d3 f6 15.c2 h5 16.g1 h6+

Following 12.g2, the knight will cement reliably White’s kingside, but Black will manage to create a barrier on the opposite side of the board, which would be very difficult for White to break: a7-a5, b7-b6, c5. 12...a5

12.e3
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13.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash c}5 14.h3 (14.h4 b6 – see 13.h4) 14...b6 15.b3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d7= Miladinovic – Istratescu, Elista 1998.

13.h4 \texttt{\textbackslash c}5 14.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3 b6 15.\texttt{\textbackslash h}2, Petkov – Hebden, La Pobla de Lillet 2005, 15...h5?! 16.g5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7\texttt{\textbackslash e}8 – and in both cases Black holds quite confidently his defence on the queenside and counter attacks on the kingside.

After 12.h4, Black can open a second front. 12...c6 13.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3 (White would not achieve much with 13.\texttt{\textbackslash g}2 f4 14.\texttt{\textbackslash h}2 a5 15.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2 \texttt{\textbackslash c}5=, while following 13.\texttt{\textbackslash g}2 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 14.\texttt{\textbackslash d}3 b5 15.b3 \texttt{\textbackslash a}5!, Black would seize the initiative: 16.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2 fxg4 17.fxg4 b4= Volkov – Chumanov, Lechenicher Schach-Server 2014.) 13...\texttt{\textbackslash f}6 14.\texttt{\textbackslash d}3 b5?! With this energetic strike Black liquidates the base under the central enemy d5-pawn. 15.c5 (There arises a calmer position after 15.\texttt{\textbackslash b}4 cxd5 16.cxd5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7= Rumiancevav – Winkler, ICCF 2009.) 15...cxd5 16.cxd6 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d6 17.\texttt{\textbackslash c}5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}8 18.g5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 19.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e7 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e7 20.\texttt{\textbackslash x}d5. White's knight is very powerful, but Black has the two-bishop advantage, moreover that White's king is not safe. His h and g-pawns have been advanced too early too far. 20...\texttt{\textbackslash e}6 21.\texttt{\textbackslash f}2 \texttt{\textbackslash b}8 22.\texttt{\textbackslash c}7 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 23.\texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash c}5 24.\texttt{\textbackslash d}5, Petigin – Panov, ICCF 2013, 24...\texttt{\textbackslash d}6 25.\texttt{\textbackslash f}6 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 26.\texttt{\textbackslash d}5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}6= – White would risk much if he avoids the repetition of moves.

12.\texttt{\textbackslash d}3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}8 13.\texttt{\textbackslash h}1 (13.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 – see 12.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3; 13.\texttt{\textbackslash g}2 a6 14.\texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6= Pinter – Uhlmann, Szirak 1985) 13...f4 14.\texttt{\textbackslash g}1 g5. Black's plan is very simple: h7-h5, \texttt{\textbackslash f}6-h6. 15.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2 h5 16.h3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 17.\texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 18.\texttt{\textbackslash g}2, Cheparinov – Fedorov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2005, 18...\texttt{\textbackslash e}7\texttt{\textbackslash e}8, preparing the transfer of the knight to the h4-square.

12...\texttt{\textbackslash g}8

13.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2

Following 13.\texttt{\textbackslash g}2 f4 14.\texttt{\textbackslash f}2, Black should not be in a hurry to advance h7-h5. 14...\texttt{\textbackslash h}6 (after 14...h5, White has an interesting pawn-sacrifice: 15.g5! \texttt{\textbackslash x}g5 16.\texttt{\textbackslash h}4 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 17.\texttt{\textbackslash b}5=) 15.b4 a5= Pavlov – Shianovsky, Bucharest 1962.

13.\texttt{\textbackslash d}3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 14.\texttt{\textbackslash f}2. White avoids prudently the trade of the bishops (14.\texttt{\textbackslash d}2?! \texttt{\textbackslash x}e3+ 15.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e3 f4 16.\texttt{\textbackslash f}2 g5 17.c5, K.Petrosian – Lomineishvili, Schwaebisch Gmuend 1994, 17...\texttt{\textbackslash f}7?! 18.h3 h5= – The vulnerability of the dark squares in White's camp may hurt
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him in the future.) 14...fxg4 15.fxg4, Enchev – Michelakos, Kavala 2016, 15...b6 16...b1 a5= – White has more space, but the shelter of his king has been weakened by the move g2-g4.

13...f4 14...f2 h5 15.h3 ...f6

16...d3 (It would not be so precise for White to play 16...g2, Passerotti – Gianfelici, Porto San Giorgio 2009, 16...f7+., followed by the transfer of Black's rook to the h-file.) 16...h4. Black succeeds in trading advantageous the bishops. 17...e1 xf2+ 18...xf2, Bordas – Pirisi, Budapest 1989, 18...f7 19...h2 ...h7= White has more space, but his bishop is restricted by his own pawns.

B) 10...d3 f5
(diagram)

11...d2
White's bishop frees the square for his rook.

The move 11.a4, Larsen – P.H.Nielsen, Valby 1991, does not seem so useful for White. 11...fxe4!? 12...xe4 ...f6 13.f3 ...f5 14...f2 ...d4 15...d3 ...f5= – The dominance over the e4 and d4-squares balances the prospects of both sides.

11.exf5. White has no chances of obtaining an advantage after the reduction of the pawn-tension in the centre. 11...xf5 This knight is headed for the d4-square. 12.f3. White is preparing ...f2-e4 (12...e4 ...f6 13.f3, L.Schmid – Gligorvic, Hamburg 1965, 13...xe4!? 14...xe4 ...d4=) 12...f6 13...f2 c6 14...e4 ...d4 15...e3, Traut – Gundrum, Germany 2001, 15...f5!? 16...d3 ...h5± (followed ...f4) – Black's cavalry is very active.

11.f4. This strike in the centre is not good for White. It would have been justified if Black's knight had been on e8 and not on d7. Here, he controls reliably the e5-square and it would be only White who might have problems. 11...exf4 12...xf4 (Following 12...xf4, Black can simply capture
his opponent's central pawn: 12...\texttt{\textbackslash}dxc3!? 13.bxc3 fxe4 14.\texttt{\textbackslash}b4 \texttt{\textbackslash}f5∞ – White must still prove that he has sufficient compensation for the material deficit, Jovanovic – Dimic, Belgrade 2016.) 12...\texttt{\textbackslash}c5= Black’s prospects are not worse at all. In addition, White must play very carefully. For example, after the straightforward move 13. exf5?! , Black seizes the initiative 13...\texttt{\textbackslash}xf5\texttt{\textbackslash}+ Rellstab – Castagna, Hoogovens 1962.

11.f3 f4

12.\texttt{\textbackslash}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash}f6 – see 11.\texttt{\textbackslash}d2.

The prophylactic move 12.g4 does not seem appropriate. 12...\texttt{\textbackslash}f6 13.\texttt{\textbackslash}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash}g7. Black prepares the transfer of his rook to the h-file. 14.\texttt{\textbackslash}e1 \texttt{\textbackslash}h8 15.\texttt{\textbackslash}g2 h5 16.h3 \texttt{\textbackslash}g8 17.\texttt{\textbackslash}h1 \texttt{\textbackslash}h6 18.b4 a5 19.a3 \texttt{\textbackslash}f7 20.c5 \texttt{\textbackslash}h4 21.\texttt{\textbackslash}xh4 \texttt{\textbackslash}xh4\texttt{\textbackslash}+ – The dark squares in White’s camp have been weakened, Tombette – De Bari, ICCF 2014.

12.b4. White occupies space on the queenside and prepares c4-c5. 12...g5. This is the beginning of Black’s standard kingside pawn-offensive. 13.c5 \texttt{\textbackslash}f6 14.a4 h5 15.\texttt{\textbackslash}f2 \texttt{\textbackslash}g6 16.a5 16...\texttt{\textbackslash}f7. This is a multi-purpose move and we will encounter it numerous more times. The rook is not only ready to go to g7 (after the preliminary move \texttt{\textbackslash}f8) in order to support the pawn-break g5-g4, but will also protect the c7-square against the possible penetration of the enemy pieces. Meanwhile, the bishop on f8 will protect the d6-pawn. 17.a6 (There arises a complicated position with mutual chances after 17.c6 \texttt{\textbackslash}f8 18.cx \texttt{\textbackslash}b7 \texttt{\textbackslash}xb7 19.\texttt{\textbackslash}a3 \texttt{\textbackslash}g7 20.h3 \texttt{\textbackslash}c8\texttt{\textbackslash}∞ – Black’s queenside pawn-structure has been weakened, but his kingside attack may become very powerful, Vescovi – Krylov, Moscow 2010.) 17...\texttt{\textbackslash}xa6 18.\texttt{\textbackslash}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash}f8 19.c6 \texttt{\textbackslash}b8. Black must bring into the actions his rook on a8 as quickly as possible. The point is that after White has played c5-c6, Black’s bishop on c8 has no moves and this isolates the rook on a8, which may hurt very much Black later. 20.\texttt{\textbackslash}xa6 \texttt{\textbackslash}xb4 21.\texttt{\textbackslash}e2 a6 22.\texttt{\textbackslash}xa6 \texttt{\textbackslash}b8 23.\texttt{\textbackslash}h3 \texttt{\textbackslash}xh3 24.gxh3. White has prevented for a while the enemy pawn-advance g5-g4, but has weakened the shelter of his king. 24...\texttt{\textbackslash}g7 25.\texttt{\textbackslash}h1 \texttt{\textbackslash}h8. Black is perfectly prepared for the
pawn-break g5-g4. 26. \( \text{b}5 \) g4 27. \( \text{w}e2 \) g3 28. \( \text{g}1 \) h4 29. \( \text{b}7 \) e8 30. \( \text{a}3 \) f7. He is preparing \( \text{g}5 \). Black's knight will exert powerful pressure from this square against the enemy pawns on f3 and h3. 31. \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 32. \( \text{w}g2 \) \( \text{w}f6 \) 33. \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{w}g6 \) \( \infty \) Saglione - Dorner, ICCF 2013.

11... \( \text{f}6 \) 12. \( \text{f}3 \) f4

Now, White must make a choice about his further plans in this position. He may try the prophylactic move B1) 13. \( \text{g}4 \), in order to prevent his opponent's possible attack on the kingside. He can also choose the more ambitious move B2) 13. \( \text{c}5 \).

13. \( \text{c}1 \) g5 14. \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \) – see variation B2b.

13.b4 g5 14.c5 c6 15.cxd6 \( \text{w}xd6 \) 16.dxc6 \( \text{xc}6= \) Tologontegi n - Yurtaev, Bishkek 2009.

B1) 13. \( \text{g}4 \)

Now, Black cannot continue with his usual plan, connected with the advance of his g-pawn and must prepare the opening of the h-file. Naturally, the h-file would not be sufficient to checkmate the opponent, but it would be good enough to deflect White's pieces from the massive offensive on the queenside.

13... \( \text{g}5 \)

14. \( \text{e}1 \)

White prepares the transfer of his bishop to the f2-square.

About 14.b4 h5 15.h3 \( \text{g}6 \) 16. \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{f}7 \), or 14.c5 h5 15.h3 \( \text{g}6 \) 16. \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{f}7 \) – see 14. \( \text{e}1 \).

14... \( \text{h}5 \) 15. \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

Black's knight is trying to occupy the weakened h4-square.

16. \( \text{g}2 \)

16.b4 \( \text{f}7 \) 17. \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}8 \) or 16. \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 17. \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}8 \) – see 16. \( \text{g}2 \).

16.c5 \( \text{f}7 \)

(diagram)

17. \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}8 \) – see 16. \( \text{g}2 \).
It seems imprecise for White to choose 17.b4, since following 17...\(e8\) 18.f2, Gyimesi – Szuk, Budapest 1994 (18.g2, Gyimesi – Cvitan, Ticino 1994, 18...a5?!\(\equiv\)), Black may deflect his opponent’s queen from the protection of the g4-pawn: 18...a5?! 19.a3 axb4 20.axb4 \(e\text{x}a1\) 21..\(e\text{x}a1\) hxg4 22.hxg4 \(\text{gx}g4\)! He sacrifices a piece and develops a powerful attack 23.fxg4 f3 24.d1? \(\text{w}d7!−+

17.cxd6 cxd6 18.c1 \(f8\) Black’s position is very solid, despite his opponent’s space advantage, while the vulnerability of White’s kingside may hurt him in the future. 19.b3 (19.f2 \(h7\) 20..\(b\)b3 hxg4 21.hxg4 \(\text{hx}g4\) 22..\(xh)4 \(\text{hx}H4\) 23.d2 a6 24.a4, Khalifman – Spasov, Manila 1990, 24...\(b8!\)∞ – Black is quite safe in this position thanks to his pair of bishops.) 19..\(h7\) 20.g2 a6 21.a4 \(d7\) 22..\(f2\), Lobron – Renet, Novi Sad 1990, 22...\(h4+!\) 23..\(xh4\) \(g\text{x}h4\) – The dark squares in White’s camp have been weakened.

17..\(f2\)

This logical move is the natural continuation of the plan, connected with the transfer of the bishop to the g1-a7 diagonal from where it will exert powerful pressure against Black’s queenside.

17.b4 \(f8\) 18..\(h1\) \(h7\) – see 17..\(h1\).

17..\(h1\) \(f8\) 18.b4 (18.f2 \(h4\) – see 17..\(f2\); 18.c1, Storm Herseth – Sharavdorj, Duisburg 1992, 18...a5?! 19..\(f2\) c5=) 18..\(h7\) 19..\(f2\) \(e7\) 20..\(b\)3 \(g7\) Lukacs – Grivas, Budapest 1993.

It is also possible for White to play immediately 17.c5 \(f8\) 18.cxd6 (18..\(f2\) \(h4\) – see 17..\(f2\)) 18...\(cxd6\) 19.a4 \(h7\) 20..\(h1\) \(d7\)∞, although even then Black’s prospects should not be worse, Baumegger – Anagnostopoulos, Oberwart 1997.

17...\(f8\) 18.b4

18..\(h1\) \(h4+\) 19..\(xh4\) \(g\text{x}h4\) 20..\(f2\) (20.b4 \(h7\) – see 18.b4)
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20...\texttt{g7} 21.\texttt{\check{f}f1 \check{d}7=\texttt{Milanovic} – Runic, Zupanja 2008.

18.c5 \texttt{\check{h}4+} 19.\texttt{\check{x}h4 gxh4} 20.\texttt{\check{c}1} (20.\texttt{\check{h}1 \check{g}7\texttt{?\texttt{?}}} 20...\texttt{\check{g}7=\texttt{Hagstroem} – Kristinsson, Denmark 1997).

18...\texttt{\check{h}4+}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\end{center}

19.\texttt{\check{x}h4}. White cannot put up with Black’s knight on \texttt{h4}, so he must part with his powerful bishop, reluctantly though... 19...\texttt{gxh4} 20.\texttt{\check{h}1 \check{h}7} 21.\texttt{\check{f}2 \check{g}5} 22.\texttt{a4}, L.Hansen – S.Hansen, Lyngby 1989, (22.\texttt{\check{c}1 \check{h}7\texttt{\infty Moy – Lin, Los Angeles 2013}) 22...\texttt{a5?!=} Black has the initiative. The position is closed indeed, so White is likely to manage to hold the balance, because Black can hardly break on either side of the board.

B2) 13.c5 \texttt{g5}

Positions of this type are very difficult to play for both sides. Even small imprecision by White may lead to a crushing attack against his king. Black’s play is not easy either, because in the majority of the cases White will prevent the immediate attack on the kingside and Black will have to combine his attacking moves on the kingside with accurate defence against the penetration of White’s pieces on the \texttt{c}-file.

It seems his most natural move here is – \texttt{B2b) 14.\texttt{\check{c}1}}, but at first we will have a look at a plan for White in which he refrains from this on move 14, as well as later: \texttt{B2a) 14.\texttt{\textit{cxd6}}.}

\texttt{B2a) 14.\textit{cxd6} \textit{cxd6} 15.\textit{\check{f}2} \texttt{h5} 16.\texttt{h3}}

16.a4 \texttt{\check{g}6} 17.h3 \texttt{\check{f}7} – see 16. \texttt{h3}.

The careless move 16.\texttt{\check{c}2}?! weakens the control over the \texttt{g4}-square and enables Black to begin an immediate attack. 16...\texttt{g4} 17.\texttt{\check{f}c1 \check{g}6=\texttt{Romanov – Lohmann, ICCF 2010.}}
16...\texttt{\textit{Bg6}}

From this square Black's knight may go later to h4.

17.\texttt{\textit{Bc2}}

Following 17.a4 \texttt{\textit{Bf7}} 18.\texttt{\textit{Bb5}} \texttt{\textit{Bf8}} 19.\texttt{\textit{Bc2}}, Black obtains excellent attacking possibilities after the pawn-sacrifice: 19...g4! 20.\texttt{\textit{Bxg4}} h\texttt{\textit{xg4}} 21.\texttt{\textit{Bxg4}} \texttt{\textit{Bg7}} 22.\texttt{\textit{Bac1}} \texttt{\textit{Bh4}} 23.\texttt{\textit{Bd1}} a6 24.\texttt{\textit{Ba3}}, Luehrig – Noack, DESC 2004, 24...\texttt{\textit{Bh5}}! –→

17...\texttt{\textit{Bf7}}

Black covers the c7-square and prepares the transfer of his rook to g7 in order to support the pawn-break g5-g4.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\end{center}

18.\texttt{\textit{Bfc1}}

This is the essence of White's plan. In fact, it is not clear which of his rooks is better placed on c1. Now, his king may try to abandon the kingside via the f1-square, but on the other hand the rook on f1 may be necessary for the defence.

The line: 18.a4 \texttt{\textit{Bh4}} 19.\texttt{\textit{Bb5}} leads to an interesting position.

19...\texttt{\textit{g4}}. Black sacrifices a pawn and begins an attack against the enemy king. 20.\texttt{\textit{Bxg4}} h\texttt{\textit{xg4}} 21.\texttt{\textit{Bxg4}} \texttt{\textit{Bf8}} 22.\texttt{\textit{Bfc1}} \texttt{\textit{Bg7}} 23.\texttt{\textit{Bd1}} a6 24.\texttt{\textit{Bc3}}. White’s pawn on g4 is presently untouchable, but Black can transfer his knight to g3 in a tactical fashion and the position of White’s king becomes seriously endangered. 24...\texttt{\textit{Bh5}}! 25.\texttt{\textit{Bc4}} (25.gxh5? Accepting the knight-sacrifice would lead to an immediate loss for White: 25...\texttt{\textit{Bxg2}}+ and he cannot play 26.\texttt{\textit{Bf1}}, because of 26...\texttt{\textit{Bxf2}}+! 27.\texttt{\textit{Bxf2}} \texttt{\textit{Bb6}}+ with a checkmate in four moves.) 25...\texttt{\textit{Bxg3}} 26.\texttt{\textit{Ba3}} \texttt{\textit{Bh7}} 27.\texttt{\textit{Bb5}} \texttt{\textit{Bf6}} 28.\texttt{\textit{Bf1}} \texttt{\textit{Bh6}} 29.\texttt{\textit{Bh3}}. White has managed to cover the h-file just in time. 29...\texttt{\textit{Bg7}} 30.\texttt{\textit{Bf2}} \texttt{\textit{Bh6}}= Learte Pastor – Olano Aizpurua, ICCF 2010.

18...\texttt{\textit{g4}} 19.\texttt{\textit{fxg4}}

19.\texttt{\textit{h4}} h\texttt{\textit{xg4}} 20.\texttt{\textit{fxg4}} \texttt{\textit{Bh4}} – see 19.\texttt{\textit{fxg4}}.

19...\texttt{\textit{hxg4}} 20.\texttt{\textit{hxg4}} \texttt{\textit{Bh4}}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chessboard2.png}
\end{center}

21.\texttt{\textit{Bb5}}
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It would be too passive for White to opt here for 21.$d1 – he abandons the plan, connected with the penetration of the knight to the c7-square and begins to defend passively. 21...$f8 22.$c2 $g7+ Soltau – Maeder, Germany 1975.

White has no time for 21.a4, Kozul – Jovanovic, Otocac 2010, because then Black will have an interesting piece-sacrifice: 21...$xg4!? 22.$xg4 f3 23.$h6+. White must give back the piece. 23...$xh6 24.$xh6 $b6+ 25.$h2 fxe2 26.$xe2 $f2 27.$e3 $xg2+ 28.$h1 $h7?!+, followed by the exchange of the queens. It is an endgame indeed, but White must play very accurately in order to neutralise the pressure of Black’s pieces.

21...$xg4!

Black cannot wait any more, because White was threatening to play $c7, followed by $e6, covering the diagonal of the bishop on c8. After this Black’s kingside attack would reach its dead end.

22.$xg4

22...$f3! 23.$h6+ $xh6 24. $xh6 $g4. He continues to increase the pressure. 25.$d2 $xg2 26.$g5+. White forces a transfer into an endgame. 26...$xg5 27.$xg5 fxe2 28.$xg2 $g7. He cannot preserve his extra piece, because after a retreat of his bishop, Black can play $d7 and $xb5. 29.$xd6 $xg5 30.$f2 $f8+ 31.$f5 $xf5 32.exf5 $xf5= – The tactical complications are over and the position has been simplified considerably, Oortwijn – Volkov, Lechenicher SchachServer 2012.

B2b) 14.$c1 $g6

We will deal now with B2b1) 15.$b5 and B2b2) 15.cxd6.

B2b1) 15.$b5

White is not in a hurry to exchange on d6, because he plans to provoke a weakening on his opponent’s queenside with the move $a5. This manoeuvre seems a bit slow, though...
15...\textit{\texttt{xf7}} 16.\textit{\texttt{a5}}

16.cxd6 cxd6 – see 15.cxd6.

16...b6 17.cxd6

17.cxb6 cxb6 – see 17.cxd6.

17...cxd6

Black should not accept the bishop-sacrifice 17...bxa5?! 18.\textit{\texttt{xc7±}} – White’s passed pawns are very dangerous.

18.\textit{\texttt{e1}}

18.\textit{\texttt{b4}}. He would not obtain much if he tries to create pressure against Black’s d6-pawn. 18...\textit{\texttt{f8}} 9.\textit{\texttt{c6 e8}} 20.a4 a6 21.\textit{\texttt{a3 d7}} 2.\textit{\texttt{c1 a5}} 23.\textit{\texttt{e1 f6}} 24.\textit{\texttt{f2 h5}} 5.\textit{\texttt{c4 g7∞}} – Dorner – Arancibia Guzman, ICCF 2011.

18...\textit{\texttt{g4}}

Black exploits the insufficient protection of the enemy pawn on e4 and accomplishes the pawn-break g5-g4 without preparation.

19.\textit{\texttt{fxg4}}


19.\textit{\texttt{b4}}. The transfer of White’s knight to the c6-square is not effective at all. 19...a6 20.\textit{\texttt{c6 f8}} 21.\textit{\texttt{a4 xe4?!}} Black sacrifices a piece and begins decisive actions. 22.fxe4 f3 23.\textit{\texttt{d1 d7}} 24.\textit{\texttt{xd6}} White must give back the piece (24.\textit{\texttt{c3? h6–+}}) 24...\textit{\texttt{xd6}} 25.\textit{\texttt{b4 f6∞}} Denisov – Verst, ICCF 2014.

19...\textit{\texttt{xe4}}

19...\textit{\texttt{xe4}}

The exchange of a flank pawn for a central pawn is a certain achievement for Black.

20.\textit{\texttt{b4}}

20.\textit{\texttt{f3 g5∞}} – Ragger – Joshua, New Delhi 2011.

20...a6 21.\textit{\texttt{f3 g3!}} 22.\textit{\texttt{xd6 xd6}} 23.\textit{\texttt{c6 f8}} 24.\textit{\texttt{hxg3 fxg3}} 25.d6 e4
Black exploits the circumstance that capturing on e4 is impossible and enlarges the scope of action of his fianchettoed bishop.

26.\( \text{e2} \text{x}f1+ \) 27.\( \text{xf1} \text{xg4} \) 28.\( \text{d5}+ \text{h}8 \)

\[ 29.\text{c7} \]
White’s passed pawn seems very dangerous, but his king is too vulnerable.

29.\( \text{xg3} \). He has managed to capture the g3-pawn, but now Black’s e-pawn goes forward. 29...e3 30.\( \text{xa6} \text{xa6} \). This exchange-sacrifice is Black’s simplest road to equality. 31.\( \text{xa6} \text{f4} \) 32.\( \text{e4} \text{e2}+ \) 33.\( \text{h2} \text{g3} \) 34.\( \text{yg3} \text{d7} \). White’s king is too bare and he cannot avoid the perpetual check without material losses. 35.\( \text{xb6} \text{f2}+ \) 36.\( \text{h2} \text{f6} \) 37.\( \text{c5} \text{f5} \) 38.\( \text{e6} \text{xe6} \) 39.\( \text{xe6} \text{h4}+ \) 40.\( \text{wh3} \) e2. White will have to give up a rook for this pawn. 41.\( \text{b8}+ \text{g7} \) 42.\( \text{wh4} \text{h4} \) 43.\( \text{e8a1} \text{a1} \) 44.\( \text{xe1} \text{xe1} \). The tactical complications are over. In the arising endgame Black’s bishop copes succ-

cessfully with White’s three pawns. 45.\( \text{d7} \text{a5} \) 46.\( \text{b4} \text{c7}+ \) 47.\( \text{h3} \text{f6} \) 48.\( \text{g4} \text{e7} \) White will lose his d7-pawn, Knoll – Palsson, ICCF 2014.

29...\( \text{e6} \) 30.\( \text{xe4} \text{f5} \) 31.\( \text{d5} \text{e4} \) 32.\( \text{d2} \text{e5} \)

Black’s pieces will gradually encircle and gobble White’s passed pawn. 33.\( \text{c4} \text{b7} \) 34.\( \text{d7} \text{d8} \) 35.\( \text{c6} \text{xc6} \) 36.\( \text{xc6} \text{f5} \) 37.\( \text{c8} \text{xc8} \) 38.\( \text{d3} \text{f8} \) 39.\( \text{dxc8a1} \text{xc8} \) = – There is almost no material left on the board, Draw, Ragger – Nakamura, Gibraltar 2016.

B2b2) 15.\( \text{cxd6} \text{cxd6} \)
16.\textbf{b}5

This is White’s most logical move. White is threatening to penetrate to the c7-square. Black’s knight is forced to retreat to e8, so his pawn-break g5-g4 is impeded.

As a rule, slowing down with the move \textbf{b}b5, would not promise White anything.

16.\textbf{f}2 \textbf{f}7

17.\textbf{b}5 h5 – see 16.\textbf{b}5.

17.a4 \textbf{f}8 18.\textbf{b}5 h5 19.h3 (19.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{e}8 – see 16.\textbf{b}5) 19...\textbf{g}7 20.\textbf{c}2 (It is better for White to opt here for 20.\textbf{a}3 a6 21.\textbf{a}3 \textbf{h}4∞ Maksimovic – Solak, Nis 1995.) 20...g4?!† This is the point. Black does not need to waste time for the retreat of his knight. 21.\textbf{c}7 gxf3† His attack is very powerful and White would lose immediately if he captures the rook: 22.\textbf{c}xa8? Gasik – M. Socko, Warsaw 2012, 22...fxe2! 23.\textbf{e}f1 \textbf{h}4 24.\textbf{c}xc8 \textbf{g}xg2+ 25.\textbf{h}1 \textbf{c}xc8 26.\textbf{c}xc8 \textbf{xf}2 27.\textbf{c}3 \textbf{xe}4++

17.\textbf{b}3 h5 18.h3 a6?! Black prevents \textbf{b}b5. 19.\textbf{b}1. This plan seems too slow for White. 19...\textbf{f}8 20.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{g}7 21.\textbf{a}3 \textbf{h}4 22.\textbf{a}5 b6 23.\textbf{e}1 \textbf{d}7 24.\textbf{d}2 b5. Black restricts again the enemy knight. 25.\textbf{h}1 \textbf{e}7 26.\textbf{c}3 a5. Before advancing g5-g4, Black wishes to oust White’s rook from the third rank. 27.\textbf{b}3 b4 28.\textbf{c}1 g4! This is the beginning of the attack. 29.\textbf{f}xg4 h\times g4 30.\textbf{x}g4 \textbf{x}g4 31.\textbf{x}g4 \textbf{x}g4 32.h\times g4 \textbf{d}7 33.\textbf{h}3 \textbf{h}7 34.\textbf{g}1 \textbf{f}8†, followed by f4-f3, or \textbf{g}7, \textbf{f}h8, \textbf{g}6, with an attack on the h-file, Popov – Panitevsky, ICCF 2014.

16...\textbf{f}7 17.\textbf{c}2

17.\textbf{f}2 h5 18.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{e}8 19.a4 \textbf{f}8 – see 17.\textbf{c}2.

17...\textbf{e}8 18.a4

18.\textbf{f}2 h5 19.a4 \textbf{f}8 – see 18.a4.

18...h5 19.\textbf{f}2 \textbf{f}8

20.h3

White has fortified his position on the kingside, but Black has his resources to improve his position.
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20...\texttt{g}b3 \texttt{g}g7 21.h3 \texttt{g}h4 – see 20.h3.

Following 20.\texttt{d}xa7, there arises a transfer into an endgame. 20...\texttt{c}c7 21.\texttt{a}a5 \texttt{xc}2 22.\texttt{xd}8 \texttt{exe}2 23.\texttt{xc}8 \texttt{xa}4 24.\texttt{xg}5 (24.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{g}4 25.\texttt{f}f2 \texttt{e}e3 26.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{b}b3. Black’s rooks are active and this compensates the passivity of his minor pieces. 27.\texttt{fc}2 \texttt{ea}2 28.\texttt{b}b1 \texttt{f}f7= Soltan – Mahler, Germany 1977) 24...\texttt{xb}2 25.\texttt{b}b1 \texttt{ab}4 26.\texttt{xb}2 \texttt{xb}2. The position has been simplified considerably. White can hardly find any squares to penetrate into the enemy camp. 27.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{f}f7 28.\texttt{d}d1 \texttt{b}5 29.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{b}3 30.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{b}5= Jurado Perez – Maldonado Pacheco, ICCF 2007.

21...\texttt{g}g7

Black’s plan is quite simple. At first he will play \texttt{h}h4 and then he will weaken his queenside with the move a7-a6, but will oust the enemy knight from its active position, followed by \texttt{f}f6 and g5-g4.

This is the best square for White’s queen. From here it can help in the defence of his king against the enemy pawn-break g5-g4 and also after a7-a6 will support the transfer of his knight to the b6-square (\texttt{a}3-c4-b6).

Now, just like on the previous move, 21.\texttt{d}xa7 transfers into an approximately equal endgame. 21...\texttt{c}c7 22.\texttt{a}a5 \texttt{xc}2 23.\texttt{xd}8 \texttt{exe}2 24.\texttt{xc}8 \texttt{xa}4 25.\texttt{d}d3 (25.\texttt{xg}5 \texttt{xb}2 26.\texttt{b}b1 \texttt{ec}2 27.\texttt{b}b6 \texttt{aa}2 28.\texttt{d}d7 \texttt{ab}2 29.\texttt{xb}2 \texttt{xb}2 30.\texttt{a}a1 \texttt{f}f7 31.\texttt{d}d8 \texttt{e}e7 32.\texttt{a}a5 \texttt{b}3 33.\texttt{f}f1 \texttt{h}4 34.\texttt{d}d1 \texttt{g}5=) 25...g4 26.\texttt{f}f2 \texttt{e}e3 27.\texttt{e}e1 g3 28.\texttt{fc}2 \texttt{b}3= – Black’s prospects are not worse thanks to his space advantage on the kingside and his active rooks, Averkin – Kasparov, Moscow 1979.

The move 21.a5 leads to a complicated double-edged position. 21...\texttt{d}d7 22.\texttt{b}b3 \texttt{h}h4 23.\texttt{e}e1 a6 24.\texttt{a}a3 \texttt{f}f6 25.\texttt{b}b6 \texttt{e}e8!? Black must avoid the trade of the queens; otherwise, his kingside attack would become senseless. 26.\texttt{c}c7, Gatot – Petrillo, corr. 1990. Here, Black could have played 26...\texttt{e}e7!??, threatening \texttt{d}d8. White cannot counter this with 27.\texttt{xb}7??, because of 27...g4++ with a decisive attack for Black.

21...\texttt{h}h4 22.\texttt{e}c2 a6 23.\texttt{a}a3 \texttt{f}f6
9. $\text{d}1 \text{e}7 10. $\text{d}3 \text{f}5 11. $\text{d}2 \text{f}6 12. $\text{f}3 \text{f}4 13. $\text{c}5 \text{g}5 14. $\text{c}1 \text{g}6

Here, he can try an interesting trap – 23...g4!? and now White must decide how to capture on g4. 24.hxg4?! This move is imprecise. (White should better choose 24.fxg4 $\text{f}6 25. $\text{e}1 \text{hxg}4 – see 23...$\text{f}6.). 24...$\text{f}6 25. $\text{e}1 $\text{d}7 – see 23...$\text{f}6 24. $\text{e}1 g4 25.hxg4 $\text{d}7.

24. $\text{e}1!

This is the most accurate move for White. He can exchange later the enemy knight on h4 with his bishop.

The routine move 24.$\text{fc}1 would lead to difficulties for White. 24...g4 25.fxg4 $\text{hxg}4 26. $\text{hxg}4 $\text{x}g4 27. $\text{x}g4 $\text{x}g4 28. $\text{x}g4 $\text{hxg}4 29.$\text{e}1 $\text{g}5 30.$\text{xh}4 $\text{wxh}4. Here, contrary to the main variation, White has failed to play $\text{h}3. 31.$\text{f}2 $\text{h}7+ and he cannot defend simultaneously against the two threats $\text{xe}4 and $\text{h}4, Radzikowska Holuj – Belavenets, ICCF 1987.

24...g4 25.fxg4

25.hxg4 $\text{d}7 26.$\text{a}5 $\text{c}8 27. $\text{c}4 $\text{e}8 28.$\text{c}3 $\text{xc}4 29.$\text{xc}4

29...$\text{xf}3+!! This knight-sacrifice is very powerful and is not obvious at all. 30.gxf3 $\text{g}6 31.$\text{b}6 $\text{hxg}4. The g-file is opened and White’s king is seriously endangered. 32.fxg4 $\text{xg}4 33.$\text{xg}4 $\text{xg}4 34.$\text{f}2 $\text{f}3 35.$\text{d}1 $\text{xe}4. Black has already two pawns for the piece and his attack continues. 36.$\text{g}1 $\text{f}5 37. $\text{d}2 e4 38.$\text{e}3 $\text{g}6 39.$\text{e}1 $\text{e}7. His dark-squared bishop joins into the attack with a great effect. 40.$\text{f}2 $\text{h}5+ Nitsche – Papenin, ICCF 2010.

25...hxg4

26. $\text{xg}4
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26.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4} 27.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4} 28.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4}, or 26.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4} 27.\texttt{hxg4} (27.\texttt{exe8? \texttt{xf2}}+ Talla – Szelag, Ustron 2008) 27...\texttt{hxg4} 28.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4} – see 26.\texttt{hxg4}.

26...\texttt{hxg4} 27.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4} 28.\texttt{hxg4} \texttt{hxg4} 29.\texttt{whe6+} 30.\texttt{wh4} \texttt{hxh4} 31.\texttt{wh6+}

Now, it turns out that Black’s king is not safe either.

31...\texttt{wh8}

32.\texttt{wxf3}

It would be too optimistic for White to opt for 32.\texttt{d4}, Ftacnik – Lechtynsky, Sumperk 1984,

32...\texttt{wxe7} 33.\texttt{wh3} \texttt{gg8} 34.\texttt{wh4+} \texttt{wxe4} 35.\texttt{wec3} \texttt{we1+} 36.\texttt{wef2}

36...\texttt{wxe2+}. This rook-sacrifice leads to a draw by force. 37.\texttt{wxe2+}. White’s king is incapable of avoiding the perpetual check, Draw, Gilbert – Kiselev, ICCF 2011.
This is a double-edged move. The bishop is very active on the g1-a7 diagonal, because it will support White's pawn-offensive on the queenside (c4-c5) and the attack against the a7-pawn (\(\text{\textbullet}b5\)).

On the other hand it will be attacked with tempi. At first White will have to lose a tempo for the retreat of his bishop after f7-f5-f4 and after that Black will manage to exploit the placement of the bishop on f2 in order to open files on the kingside (g5-g4-g3).

10...f5 11.f3 f4 12.\(\text{\textbullet}f2\) g5 13.\(\text{\textbullet}b5\). White forces b7-b6, but loses too much time for manoeuvres of his knight. 13...b6 14.b4 a6 15.\(\text{\textbullet}c3\) h5 16.\(\text{\textbullet}h1\) (Following 16.c5, Black can accept the pawn-sacrifice: 16...bxc5 17.bxc5, D.Gurevich – Jones, Las Vegas 1994, 17...\(\text{\textbullet}xc5\)!! 18.\(\text{\textbullet}xc5\) dxc5 and later, the vulnerability of the dark squares in White's camp may hurt him badly.) 16...\(\text{\textbullet}f6\) 17. c5 g4 18.cxb6 cxb6 Korchnoi – Ye, Novi Sad 1990.

13.g4. This is a solid move. At first White wishes to prevent his opponent's attack against his king. 13...h5. Now, the move g5-g4 is impossible, so Black plans to transfer his rook to h6. Later, his
queen may come to help it and he will prepare penetration into the enemy camp on the h-file. 14.h3 
\[ \text{f6} \] 15.\text{d3} \text{h6} 

16.c5 (The position will be approximately equal after 16.\text{g2} \text{g6} 17.\text{h1} \text{f8} 18.b4 \text{f6} 19.c5 \text{d7}=- – White holds reliably his defence on the h-file, but will hardly manage to break on the queenside, because Black has no weaknesses in his position, Doet- tling – Uhlmann, Schwerin 1999.) 16...\text{xc5} 17.\text{xc5} \text{dxc5} 18.\text{xc5} \text{g6} 19.\text{c1} \text{f8}. Black wishes either to trade his passive bishop, or to transfer it to the d6-square, from where it will protect the weak c7-pawn. 20.\text{b5} \text{d6} 21. \text{b3} \text{hxg4} 22.\text{fxg4} \text{e7}. He prepares a transfer of his queen to h7. 23.\text{xd6} \text{cxd6} 24.\text{xa7} (The penetration to c7 is harmless for Black. 24.\text{c7} \text{d7} 25.\text{xb7} \text{h7} 26.\text{h2} \text{f8} 27.\text{f3} \text{f6} 28.\text{xa7} \text{xa7} 29.\text{xa7} \text{g4} 30.\text{xa7}. White has an extra pawn, but his king has been considerably weakened. 31.\text{g2} \text{xa2}. Black regains his pawn and obtains a very good position. 32.\text{g4} \text{f7} 33.\text{h1} \text{g7} 34.\text{f5} \text{b3} – White has a passed b-pawn, but his king’s shelter has been compromised. There is just a few material left on the board, though... Gilbert – Kazoks, ICCF 2014.) 24...\text{h7} 25. \text{c3}, So – Van Wely, Wijk aan Zee 2014, 25...\text{xa7?!} 26.\text{xc8}+ \text{f8} 27.\text{b6} \text{hxh3}. Black’s attack on the h-file forces White to sacrifice the exchange and be happy with a perpetual check. 28.\text{xf8}+ \text{xf8} 29.\text{xd6}+ \text{g8} 30.\text{b8}+ \text{f7} 31.\text{c7}+ \text{g8}= 

A) 13.b4 

White occupies space on the queenside and prepares c4-c5. 

13...\text{f6} 

In the variation with 10.\text{e3}, as a rule, Black is not in a hurry to play this move, because his knight on d7 impedes White’s pawn-advance c4-c5. Still, after he has played b2-b4, Black’s knight has nothing to do on d7 any more. 14.\text{c5} \text{g6} 

(diagram) 

15.\text{xd6} 

White opens immediately the c-file.
15.a4 h5 16.c6 bxc6 17.dxc6 g4 18.\textit{c}d5 \textit{xd}5∞ Black has good attacking prospects on the kingside. For example, after the imprecise move 19.exd5?! Branch – Steinmeyer, corr. 1961, he can develop immediately his queen to an active position: 19...\textit{g}5→ and White will have no satisfactory defence against \textit{g}4-g3.

15.\textit{c}c1. He refrains from the exchange on \textit{d}6 for the moment. 15...\textit{f}7 16.a4 (16.cxd6 cxd6 – see 15.cxd6) 16...\textit{f}8

17.cxd6 cxd6 – see 15.cxd6.

17.a5?! h5 18.cxd6 \textit{xd}6. Black has managed to activate his bishop on \textit{g}7. 19.\textit{d}d3 g4 20.\textit{b}b5 \textit{d}7 21.\textit{xd}6 cxd6 22.\textit{b}2. White’s manoeuvres seem too slow. 22...\textit{g}3! This is the beginning of Black’s attack. We will encounter this pawn-sacrifice numerous more times in this chapter. 23.hxg3 \textit{fxg}3 24.\textit{gx}g3 \textit{h}4 25.\textit{h}2 \textit{h}5 26.\textit{d}d3 \textit{g}3→ Pospelov – Degtiarev, Internet 2011.

17.\textit{d}d3 h5 18.c6. This is an interesting idea. White refrains from opening of the c-file and exploits the pawn on \textit{c}5 as a wedge against his opponent’s queenside. 18...bxc6 19.dxc6 \textit{e}6

20.\textit{b}2. White prepares the trade of the light-squared bishops. 20...\textit{g}4 21.\textit{c}c4 \textit{e}8 22.b5 \textit{g}3 23.\textit{e}1 \textit{h}8. Black removes his king from the dangerous diagonal. 24.\textit{b}3 \textit{xc}4 25.\textit{xc}4 \textit{g}7 26.\textit{d}d3 \textit{h}4 27.h3. It may look like White has succeeded in closing the position on the kingside and has deprived his opponent of his attacking possibilities. Still, after the transfer of the knight to \textit{g}5, followed by the sacrifice on \textit{h}3, Black will break his opponent’s defensive fortress. His attack however, will be only sufficient to maintain the equality. 27...\textit{f}7 28.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}7 29.\textit{b}2 \textit{h}7 30.\textit{a}2 \textit{g}5 31.\textit{ab}4 \textit{e}6 32.\textit{c}2 \textit{hx}3+! 33.gxh3 \textit{hx}3 34.\textit{a}6 \textit{f}5! Black
sacrifices another knight on the altar of the attack. 35.\textit{\textcopyright}xf4 exf4 36.exf5 \textit{\textcopyright}xf5 37.\textit{\textcopyright}c3 h3 38.\textit{\textcopyright}e2 g2. After this move White will be forced to part with his extra material and the position becomes equal. 39.\textit{\textcopyright}xg2 hxg2 40.\textit{\textcopyright}f2 \textit{\textcopyright}e8 41.\textit{\textcopyright}xg2 \textit{\textcopyright}e5 42.\textit{\textcopyright}xg7 \textit{\textcopyright}xg7 43. \textit{\textcopyright}xe5 \textit{\textcopyright}xe5 44.\textit{\textcopyright}g2 d5 45.\textit{\textcopyright}g4 \textit{\textcopyright}b1+ 46.\textit{\textcopyright}g2 \textit{\textcopyright}c2+, Draw, Primakov – Tsygankov, ICCF 2013.

15...cxd6 16.\textit{\textcopyright}c1 \textit{\textcopyright}f7 17.a4 \textit{\textcopyright}f8 18.a5 \textit{\textcopyright}d7

\begin{center}
19.\textit{\textcopyright}b5
\end{center}

19.\textit{\textcopyright}h1 \textit{\textcopyright}g7

\begin{center}
20.\textit{\textcopyright}d3 h5 21.\textit{\textcopyright}b2 g4 22.\textit{\textcopyright}b5 \textit{\textcopyright}h7 23.\textit{\textcopyright}g1 \textit{\textcopyright}g5→ Kloster – Dunlop, ICCF 2014.
\end{center}

After the ambitious line: 20.\textit{\textcopyright}b5 g4 21.\textit{\textcopyright}xa7 g3 22.\textit{\textcopyright}b6 \textit{\textcopyright}e8 23.\textit{\textcopyright}c7, Burgess – Badea, Pritchitt 1990, 23...\textit{\textcopyright}h4?! →, Black’s attack is very powerful and White must defend very precisely. For example, his attempt to gobble a second pawn 24.\textit{\textcopyright}xb7?! would lead to an immediate catastrophe: 24...\textit{\textcopyright}h5 25.\textit{\textcopyright}xd7 \textit{\textcopyright}g6! 26.\textit{\textcopyright}g1 \textit{\textcopyright}xg2!! This knight-sacrifice decides the issue 27.\textit{\textcopyright}xg2 \textit{\textcopyright}h3 28. \textit{\textcopyright}c4 gxh2 29.\textit{\textcopyright}c2 hxg1\textit{\textcopyright}h+ 30. \textit{\textcopyright}xg1 \textit{\textcopyright}xd7 31.\textit{\textcopyright}c6 \textit{\textcopyright}h8 32.\textit{\textcopyright}f2 \textit{\textcopyright}f6 33.b5 \textit{\textcopyright}h5 34.b6 \textit{\textcopyright}g3 35.\textit{\textcopyright}f1 \textit{\textcopyright}h6 36.b7 \textit{\textcopyright}ag8 37. b8\textit{\textcopyright}h \textit{\textcopyright}e2+ 38.\textit{\textcopyright}f2 \textit{\textcopyright}xb8 39.\textit{\textcopyright}e1 \textit{\textcopyright}d4 40. \textit{\textcopyright}xd4 exd4 41.\textit{\textcopyright}f2 \textit{\textcopyright}c8! 42.a6 \textit{\textcopyright}h1+ White has managed to parry the checkmating threats, but this is just small consolation for him. He is incapable of avoiding huge material losses.

20.\textit{\textcopyright}b5. White should better trade his opponent’s powerful bishop. 20...g4 21.\textit{\textcopyright}xd7 \textit{\textcopyright}xd7. Black’s attacking prospects are not so promising without his light-squared bishop. 22.fxg4 \textit{\textcopyright}xg4 23.\textit{\textcopyright}f3 \textit{\textcopyright}xe7 24.\textit{\textcopyright}g1 \textit{\textcopyright}h4 25.\textit{\textcopyright}a4, D.Gurevich – Gruenberg, New York 1991. Here, Black had to enter an approximately equal endgame: 25...\textit{\textcopyright}xa4!? 26.\textit{\textcopyright}xa4 \textit{\textcopyright}xf3 27.gxf3 \textit{\textcopyright}e3=

19...g4 20.\textit{\textcopyright}c7

White has succeeded in realising his plan and has penetrated to the c7-square with his knight, but after

20...g3!
It turns out that Black has seized completely the initiative.

21.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}xa8}?!  
Capturing of the rook would lead immediately to a bad position for White.

It seems better for him to choose 21.hxg3, although even then after 21...fxg3 22.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}xg3} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash h}5} 23.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash f}2} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}f4} 24.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}6} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash f}6} 25.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}3} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}e6} 26.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}xe6} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}7} 27.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}4} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}7} 28.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}f4} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}f4} 29.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}3} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash h}5}↑, Black's chances would not be worse, Bobel – Le Page, ICCF 2009.

21...\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash h}5}!  
Black does not lose a tempo for capturing the knight and prepares the transfer of his queen to h4.

22.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash h}1}  
White parries his opponent's threat.

22...\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}x f2} 23.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}xf2} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}3}+!  
This knight is untouchable, because its capturing would lead to a checkmating attack on the h-file.

24.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash g}1} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}a8} 25.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash c}4} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}6} 26.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}d3} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}7}+ 27.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}5} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}x b5} 28.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash x}b5} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}h1}! After this simple, but elegant tactical strike Black remains with an extra piece. 0–1 Piket – Kasparov, Tilburg 1989.

B) 13.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}4} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}5}

This is the simplest for Black. He prevents immediately the further advance of White's a-pawn.

14.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}3}  
About 14.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}5} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}6} 15.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}d3} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash f}6}, or 15.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}4} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}x b4} 16.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}3} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash f}6} – see 14.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash d}3}.

14...\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}6}  
Now, White will have problems to advance c4-c5. At first he will have to trade the enemy a5-pawn (b2–b4) and then the b6-pawn (a4–a5), but all this would take too much time.

15.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}4}  
About 15.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}5} \texttt{\textit{\textbackslash f}6} 16.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}4} (16.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}1} – see 15.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash e}1}) 16...\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash a}x b4} – see 15.\texttt{\textit{\textbackslash b}4}. 
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15.\( \text{e1} \). This move is played with the idea after \( \text{d3-f2} \) to impede the pawn-advance g5-g4. 15...\( \text{f6} \).

16.b4 axb4 17.\( \text{b5} \) g4 — see 15.b4.

It would not be consistent for White to choose here 16.\( \text{b5} \) g4 17.fxg4 \( \text{dxe4} \). The trade of a flank pawn for a central pawn is advantageous for Black. 18.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 19.\( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{dxe5} \) 20.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 21.\( \text{a2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 22.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 23.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 24.\( \text{c1} \) \( \text{h6} \) Baranowski – Balabanov, ICCF 2011.

16.\( \text{f2} \) h5 17.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h8} \) 18.\( \text{b5} \) (18.b4 \( \text{f7} \) 19.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{eg8} \) – see 18.\( \text{b5} \)) 18...\( \text{eg8} \), Black prepares the transfer of his knight to h6, from where it will support the pawn-advance g5-g4. 19.b4 \( \text{f7} \) 20.bxa5 (20.c5 \( \text{f8} \) 21.cxb6 \( \text{xb6} \) 22.\( \text{c2} \), Hell – Stephan, Saarlouis 2004, 22...\( \text{g7} \)?) 20...\( \text{bxa5} \) 21.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 22.\( \text{cxd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 23.\( \text{c1} \) \( \text{g7} \) 24.\( \text{c2} \) g4 25.\( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{hxg4} \) 26.\( \text{fxg4} \) (26.\( \text{d7} \)!! \( \text{b8} \) 27.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{h5} \), followed by \( \text{g3} \) and \( \text{wh4} \), Da Lima Neto – Binas, ICCF 2009. Black has a powerful attack.) 26...\( \text{h6} \) 27.\( \text{c7} \) \( \text{b8} \) 28.\( \text{e6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 29.dxe6 \( \text{fxg4} \) 30.\( \text{dxg4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 31.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{g4} \) = The pawn-break g5-g4 has led to numerous exchanges, Weiss – Sanchez de Ybar-arguen Gutierrez, ICCF 2014.

16.\( \text{xb4} \)

16.\( \text{xb4} \)

It seems imprecise for White to opt for 16.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 17.\( \text{e1} \) (17.\( \text{xb4} \) g4 – see 16.\( \text{xb4} \)), because after 17...g4!

Black can exploit the lack of protection of the enemy e4-pawn and save a tempo for the move h7-h5. 18.\( \text{xb4} \) (White cannot solve his defensive problems with 18.\( \text{fxg4} \) \( \text{dxe4} \) 19.\( \text{xb4} \) \( \text{g6} \) 20.a5 \( \text{bxa5} \) 21.\( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{e7} \), Stork – Lauzeningsks, Germany 2003, the ex-
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change of the g-pawn for the e-pawn has turned out to be clearly in favour of Black and White's attempt to win a pawn with 22.\textit{\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}a8}}}} \textit{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}a8}}}} 23.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c7?}}} loses immediately due to \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{wa7-+}}}}}) 18...g3 19.h3 (White has no time to organise active actions on the queenside: 19.a5 bxa5 20.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}2}}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}5}}}} 21.h3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}h3!-+}} Kuehne - Oren, ICCF 2011.) 19...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}h3!}}} Black sacrifices a piece and destroys his opponent's king shelter after which White will hardly manage to parry his opponent's crushing attack. 20.gxh3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}7}}}

21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}2}}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}6}}} 22.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}1}}, Krivoshey - Xie, Linares 1997, 22...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}4}}}?--+

Following 21.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}2}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}6}}, Black does not need to be in a hurry to regain the sacrificed material: 22.\texttt{\texttt{d}3} h5 23.\texttt{\texttt{fb}1} \texttt{\texttt{h}7} 24.\texttt{\texttt{f}1} \texttt{\texttt{g}5+} Velilla Velasco - Rizzo, ICCF 2009.

If 21.\texttt{\texttt{g}2}, then after 21...\texttt{\texttt{g}6} 22.\texttt{\texttt{h}1} \texttt{\texttt{h}4+} 23.\texttt{\texttt{g}1}, Black may sacrifice advantageously his second knight: 23...\texttt{\texttt{xe}4!} 24.\texttt{\texttt{x}e}4 f3 25.\texttt{\texttt{d}2} f2+ 26.\texttt{\texttt{xf}2} \texttt{\texttt{xf}2--} Po- gorelov - Matamoros Franco, Dos Hermanas 2003.

21.\texttt{\texttt{c}2} \texttt{\texttt{g}6} 22.\texttt{\texttt{f}2} (22.\texttt{\texttt{d}1} \texttt{\texttt{h}4} 23.\texttt{\texttt{e}1} \texttt{\texttt{h}3} 24.\texttt{\texttt{x}c7} \texttt{\texttt{h}5}

25.\texttt{\texttt{xa}8} g2 26.\texttt{\texttt{x}g}2 \texttt{\texttt{g}3}-- 0-1 Dziuba – Czakon, Koszalin 2005) 22...\texttt{\texttt{h}4} 23.\texttt{\texttt{a}3} \texttt{\texttt{xf}2+} 24.\texttt{\texttt{xf}2} \texttt{\texttt{h}5} 25.\texttt{\texttt{f}1} \texttt{\texttt{x}h3+} 26.\texttt{\texttt{e}1}. White has succeeded in evacuating his king from the danger zone, but Black has already a material advantage. 26...\texttt{\texttt{g}2+} 27.\texttt{\texttt{d}2} \texttt{\texttt{e}3} 28.\texttt{\texttt{b}1} \texttt{\texttt{g}3} 29.\texttt{\texttt{e}1} \texttt{\texttt{f}7} 30.\texttt{\texttt{d}3} \texttt{\texttt{f}6} 31.\texttt{\texttt{c}1} \texttt{\texttt{g}7} 32.\texttt{\texttt{fa}2} \texttt{\texttt{xf}3--} Persson – Boger, ICCF 2005.

16...\texttt{\texttt{f}6}

17.\texttt{\texttt{d}3}

17.\texttt{\texttt{e}1} h5 18.h3, Lauber – Gorovykh, Stockholm 2010, 18...g4 19.\texttt{\texttt{x}g}4 h\texttt{\texttt{x}g}4 20.\texttt{\texttt{x}g}4 \texttt{\texttt{d}7}!?∞

It seems too slow for White to continue with 17.\texttt{\texttt{a}3} \texttt{\texttt{d}7} 18.\texttt{\texttt{b}5} g4!? (It would not be so energetic for Black to choose 18...\texttt{\texttt{h}8} Jussupow – Kasparov, Yerevan 1996.) 19.\texttt{\texttt{h}1} (19.\texttt{\texttt{fx}g}4 \texttt{\texttt{xe}4} 20.\texttt{\texttt{h}4} \texttt{\texttt{f}6} 21.\texttt{\texttt{xf}6} \texttt{\texttt{xf}6} 22.g5 \texttt{\texttt{e}4} 23.\texttt{\texttt{d}3} \texttt{\texttt{f}5+} Abramov – Krebs, ICCF 2008) 19...g3! Black sacrifices a pawn and seizes the initiative. 20.hxg3 \texttt{\texttt{h}5} 21.\texttt{\texttt{e}1} \texttt{\texttt{x}g}3+
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22.\text{hxg3} \text{fxg3} 23.\text{\textbf{W}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}g6} 24. \text{\textbf{Q}d3} \text{\textbf{Q}f4} 25.\text{\textbf{W}f2} \text{\textbf{Q}f6} 26.\text{\textbf{Q}xf4} exf4\text{#} – The dark squares in White’s camp are seriously weakened and he will have great difficulties to parry his opponent’s attack on the h-file, Debnar – Pospisil, ICCF 2015.

After 17.\text{\textbf{Q}b5}, Black may exploit the insufficient protection of the pawn on e4 and play immediately 17...g4, for example: 18.\text{\textbf{Q}h4}, Nielsen – Harestad, Gausdal 1996, 18...\text{\textbf{Q}d7}?! 19.\text{\textbf{Q}xf6} \text{\textbf{Q}xf6} 20. \text{\textbf{Q}xg4} \text{\textbf{W}c8}?! \infty with good compensation for the sacrificed pawn.

17.a5. This attempt to seize the initiative would not promise anything to White. 17...\text{bxa5} 18.\text{\textbf{Q}c6} \text{\textbf{Q}xc6} 19.\text{\textbf{Q}xc6} \text{\textbf{Q}e6} 20.\text{\textbf{W}d2} (20. \text{\textbf{Q}d5}, Muller – Meunier, Saint-Quentin 2015, 20...\text{\textbf{Q}f7}?!\infty) 20...\text{g4} 21.\text{\textbf{Q}d5} \text{\textbf{Q}xd5} 22.\text{\textbf{Q}xd5} g3! 23.\text{\textbf{W}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}h5} \rightarrow Szablowski – Barryshpolets, Pardubice 2010.

After 17.\text{\textbf{Q}c6} \text{\textbf{Q}xc6} 18.\text{\textbf{Q}xc6} \text{\textbf{W}e8} 19.\text{\textbf{Q}d5} \text{\textbf{Q}f7}, White may have problems with the protection of his c6-pawn. 20.a5 (20.\text{\textbf{Q}b3}, Swayams – Kotronias, Moscow 2015, 20...\text{\textbf{Q}h8}?! 21.a5 bxa5 22.\text{\textbf{W}b5} g4\text{#}) 20...bxa5 21.\text{\textbf{W}a4}. He has protected reliably his pawn, but has reduced the control over the g4-square and Black exploits this immediately, advancing g5-g4 without the preliminary move h7-h5. 21...g4.

22.\text{\textbf{W}fb1} \text{g3} 23.\text{\textbf{W}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}xd5} 24.\text{\textbf{Q}xd5} \text{\textbf{Q}xg3} 25.\text{\textbf{Q}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}h6} 26.\text{\textbf{Q}f2} \text{\textbf{W}e7}= Schmidt – Habermehl, ICCF 2010.

22.\text{\textbf{Q}h4} \text{\textbf{Q}xd5} 23.\text{\textbf{Q}xd5} g3 24. \text{\textbf{W}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}xg3} 25.\text{\textbf{Q}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}h6} 26.\text{\textbf{Q}f4} \text{\textbf{W}g7} 27.\text{\textbf{Q}a3} \text{\textbf{Q}xf4} 28.\text{\textbf{Q}xf4} \text{\textbf{Q}xf4} 29.\text{\textbf{Q}xf4} \text{\textbf{W}e5}= Swayams – Matta, Kolkata 2013.

22.\text{\textbf{W}b5} \text{\textbf{Q}xd5} 23.\text{\textbf{Q}xd5} g3! Black seizes the initiative and now, White must defend very precisely. 24.\text{\textbf{W}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}xg3} 25.\text{\textbf{Q}xg3} \text{\textbf{Q}h6} 26.\text{\textbf{Q}f2} \text{\textbf{W}e7}= – The position is approximately equal indeed, but White’s play is much more difficult, because his king is misplaced, Van Oosterom – Timmerman, ICCF 1996.

17...\text{\textbf{Q}h5}
18.\texttt{b5}

After the pawn-sacrifice 18.a5, White cannot even equalise. 18...bxa5 19.c5 g4 20.\texttt{h1 g6} 21.\texttt{b1 g3!} 22.hxg3 fxg3 23.\texttt{xg3 h4} 24.\texttt{f2 h5} 25.\texttt{e1 a4\textsuperscript{+}} — Black not only has a powerful attack, but also a passed pawn on the a-file, which will deflect White's pieces from the protection of his kingside, Thomsen – Kristjánsson, ICCF 2011.

18...\texttt{g4}

Following 19.\texttt{d2}, it is only White who might have problems. 19...\texttt{g6} 20.a5 \texttt{xa5} 21.\texttt{xa5 bxax} 22.\texttt{e5 g3!} 23.hxg3 fxg3 24.\texttt{xg3 h4} 25.\texttt{f2} (It is more reliable for him to opt for 25.\texttt{h2}, since White will at least not be worse. 25...\texttt{h6} 26.\texttt{xc7 e3+} 27.\texttt{h1 cc7} 28.\texttt{c7 h5} 29.f4 \texttt{hxh4} 30.\texttt{xf4 exf4} 31.\texttt{xf4 exf4} 32.\texttt{xf4 efxf4} 33.\texttt{e5=} Leimgruber – Holroyd, ICCF 2015) 25...\texttt{h6} 26.\texttt{d2 h7}. Black prepares \texttt{h6}. 27.\texttt{ea1} \texttt{h6} 28.\texttt{e1 g5} 29.\texttt{a7} \texttt{h8} 30.\texttt{h1 g3+} 31.\texttt{g1 h3} 32.\texttt{f1 xf3} \texttt{b1} Donnenfeld – Cavajda, ICCF 2009.

19.\texttt{e1}

White is preparing a4-a5. His alternatives are not satisfactory at all.

19.\texttt{h4 d7} 20.fgx4 \texttt{xe4\textsuperscript{∞}} Noomen – Hotting, IECG 2004.

19.a5 \texttt{xa5} 20.\texttt{xa5 bxax} 21.\texttt{xa4} c6 22.dxc6 \texttt{xc6} 23.\texttt{d1 e7=} Boyd – Brodda, ICCF 2009.

19.\texttt{e1 gxf3} 20.\texttt{xf3 g4} 21.a5 \texttt{xf2} 22.\texttt{xf2} c6= Onofre Lima – Enin, ICCF 2013.

There might follow: 23.\texttt{c5 g3} 24.\texttt{c6 a8} 25.\texttt{a7}. Here, Black had at his disposal a concealed tactical trick. 25...\texttt{g4!} It turns out now that White's defence is very difficult. 26.hxg3 fxg3 27.\texttt{hxg3 e3} 28.\texttt{a5 xb5} 29.
The move 14.\(\texttt{b5}\) leads to a complicated double-edged fight. 14...\(b6\) 15.\(b4\) a6 16.\(\texttt{c3}\) \(\texttt{e7}\) 17.\(\texttt{d3}\) (It is also possible for White to play immediately 17.\(c5\) \(\texttt{bxc5}\) 18.\(\texttt{bxc5}\) \(\texttt{e8}\) 19.\(\texttt{d3}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 20.\(\texttt{cxd6}\) \(\texttt{e6}\) 21.\(\texttt{a4}\) h5 22.\(\texttt{ac5}\) g4 23.\(\texttt{a4}\) g3! This is a standard pawn-sacrifice in similar positions with which Black obtains sufficient counterplay to maintain the equality. 24.\(hxg3\) \(fxg3\) 25.\(\texttt{xe3}\) \(h4\) 26.\(\texttt{h2}\) \(h5\) 27.\(\texttt{e2}\) \(g7\) Neto – Hefka, ICCF 2013) 17...

C) 13.\(\texttt{c1}\) \(\texttt{g6}\)

14.\(c5\)

This is an interesting idea. White is reluctant to lose time for the preparatory moves (\(\texttt{d3}\), or \(\texttt{b4}\)) and advances immediately \(c4-c5\), sacrificing a pawn for the initiative.

About 14.\(\texttt{b4}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 15.\(\texttt{c5}\) \(\texttt{f7}\) – see variation A.

14.\(\texttt{d3}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) – see variation B.
Giri – Nakamura, Reggio Emilia 2011, 22...db2↑ 21...b4 22. a4 bxa4 23...xa4 g4! This pawn-break leads to simplifications and complete equality. 24.fxg4 hxg4 25...xg4 c5 26...xc8 27...g4 a8 28...xc5 bxc5 29. ...c6 a7= Stephan – Zhak, ICCF 2014.

14...xc5 15.b4 a6

White has a choice now. He can play immediately C2) 16. b5, or can play at first C1) 16.d3.

C1) 16.d3 21
Black protects the weak c7-square.

17.b5

17.a4, Wang – Lin, Suzhou 2001, 17...h5?!∞

17...b6
Black is reluctant to give back the pawn.

(diagram)

18.e1

White prepares the transfer of his knight to f2 and there it will impede the enemy pawn-break g5-g4.

Following 18.cc3 h5 19.e1 20.cc3 b7 21.f2, Black has the possibility to get rid of his “bad” knight in a tactical way. 21...xb4 22.xb4 a6 23.d6 (23. c3 a5) 23...xd6 24.xd6 e8 25.b4 a5 26.d2 b5 27.cc3 b4 28.cc1 a7= Stull – Bokar, ICCF 2012.

18.h5
He is trying to organise active counterplay.

18...f6. This is a passive plan, connected with the transfer of the bishop to d8, for the sake of protection of the pawn on c7, but it cannot solve Black’s defensive problems. 19.f2 h5 20.h3 b7 21.cc2 d7 22.cc3 d8 23.d2 a8 24.cc1− – White maintains long lasting pressure, Topalov – Radjabov, Nanjing 2009.

(diagram)

19.f2
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19. \( \text{d}2 \text{h}6 \) (Once again the transfer of the bishop to d8 leads to a passive position for Black and prevents him from equalising completely. 19...\( \text{f}6 \) 20.\( \text{f}2 \text{e}8 \) 21.\( \text{a}4 \text{d}8 \) 22.\( \text{a}3= \) So – Ding, Bilbao 2015) 20.\( \text{f}2 \text{g}7 \) 21.\( \text{c}3= \) He is preparing the transfer of his knight to the f6-square. 22.\( \text{a}4 \text{h}7= \) Munoz Moreno – Winkler, ICCF 2007.

19...\( \text{f}8 \)

20.\( \text{c}2 \) White’s alternatives would not create any problems for Black.

20.\( \text{h}1 \text{h}7 \) 21.\( \text{g}1 \) (21.\( \text{a}4 \text{f}6 \) 22.\( \text{xd}6 \text{cxd}6 \) 23.\( \text{xa}6 \text{c}7 \) 24.\( \text{c}6? \text{d}7 \) 25.\( \text{b}5 \text{xc}6 \) 26.\( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 25.\( \text{c}3 \text{g}4= \) – The activity of White’s pieces compensates the sacrificed pawn by him, but not more than that, Joppich – Serazeev, ICCF 2012.) 21...\( \text{h}8 \) 22.\( \text{c}2 \text{e}8 \) 23.\( \text{c}6 \text{xc}6 \) 24.\( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 25.\( \text{c}3 \text{g}4= \) – The activity of White’s pieces compensates the sacrificed pawn by him, but not more than that, Joppich – Serazeev, ICCF 2012.

20.\( \text{f}2 \text{h}7 \) 21.\( \text{a}4 \text{f}8 \) 22.\( \text{h}3 \text{g}7 \) 23.\( \text{ec}3 \text{f}6 \) 24.\( \text{f}c1 \text{e}8 \) 25.\( \text{d}1 \text{a}7 \). Black would not mind to give back his extra pawn, but wishes to trade his knight on a6. 26.\( \text{f}1 \text{e}7 \) 27.\( \text{xc}7 \text{xc}7 \) 28.\( \text{xc}7 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 29.\( \text{xa}8 \text{xa}8 \) 30.\( \text{b}5 \text{e}8 \) 31.\( \text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 \) 32.\( \text{c}4 \text{g}4= \) 33.\( \text{hxg}4 \text{hxg}4 \) 34.\( \text{f}1 \text{gx}f3 \) 35.\( \text{gx}f3 \text{g}3 \) 36.\( \text{e}2 \text{g}2= \) – Black’s active rook compensates his “bad” bishop, Schroeder – Blanco Gramajo, ICCF 2015.

20...\( \text{e}8 \) 21.\( \text{a}4 \) (21.\( \text{d}3 \text{f}6= \) ) 21...\( \text{b}7 \) 22.\( \text{h}3 \text{f}6 \) 23.\( \text{a}1 \text{d}7 \). Black’s position is super solid and White has no squares to penetrate into the enemy camp. 24.\( \text{a}5 \text{b}8 \) 25.\( \text{xb}6 \text{xb}6 \) 26.\( \text{xa}8 \text{xa}8 \) 27.\( \text{c}4 \text{g}6 \) 28.\( \text{c}3 \text{h}8 \) 29.\( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 30.\( \text{a}7 \text{c}8= \) Betker – Pantazi, ICCF 2016.
It also seems good for Black to bring his h-pawn into the attack: 18...h4!? 19.\( \texttt{Qxa7} \) \( \texttt{d7} \) 20.\( \texttt{wb3} \) h3→ Cunha – Dzenis, ICCF 2013.

17...\( \texttt{bxa6} \) 18.\( \texttt{b4} \)

White wishes to deploy his knight to the c6-square.

The move 18.\( \texttt{e1} \), preventing g4-g3, looks too slow. 18...\( \texttt{h6} \) 19.\( \texttt{b4} \) \( \texttt{f7} \) 20.\( \texttt{c6} \) \( \texttt{f8} \) 21.\( \texttt{d1} \) \( \texttt{g7} \)→ White will be incapable of preventing the pawn-break g4-g3 anyway. 22.\( \texttt{c3} \) g3! 23.\( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{h4} \) 24.\( \texttt{hxg3} \) \( \texttt{fxg3} \) 25.\( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{h7} \) 26.\( \texttt{cxd6} \) \( \texttt{cxd6} \) 27.\( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{f4} \)→ He is completely helpless against the transfer of Black’s queen to the h4-square. 28.\( \texttt{fd1} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 29.\( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{g2} \) This sacrifice of two pieces is Black’s fastest road to victory. 30.\( \texttt{g2} \) \( \texttt{h3} \)+! 31.\( \texttt{g1} \) (31.\( \texttt{hxh3} \) g2=+) 31...\( \texttt{h4} \) 32.\( \texttt{e7} \) \( \texttt{exe7} \) 33.\( \texttt{xf4} \) \( \texttt{g4} \) 34.\( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{g5} \) 35.\( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{h2} \) 36.\( \texttt{f1} \) g2+ 0–1 Genga – Dijon, ICCF 2016.

18...g3!!

White should possibly forget about any ambitious plans and turn to defence by playing 19. \( \texttt{e1} \)!, impeding the opening of files on the kingside. 19...\( \texttt{e8} \) 20.\( \texttt{hxg3} \). Now, he can play like this, because Black’s knight has retreated to the e8-square. It will not come back easily to h5 (after the preliminary move h5-h4). 20...\( \texttt{fxg3} \) 21.\( \texttt{hxg3} \) \( \texttt{g5} \) 22.\( \texttt{h2} \) \( \texttt{b8} \) 23.\( \texttt{c6} \) \( \texttt{xb2} \)

24.\( \texttt{c1} \) ! Now, there arises an endgame in which White cannot rely on obtaining an advantage, but at least he will not come under a crushing attack (This would be very likely to happen to him in the variation 24.\( \texttt{h1} \) h4 25.\( \texttt{xa7} \) – It is still not too late to trade the queens with 25. \( \texttt{c1} \) !? \( \texttt{xc1} \) 26.\( \texttt{fxc1} \) \( \texttt{h6} \) – 25... \( \texttt{f4} \) 26.\( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 27.\( \texttt{c1} \) \( \texttt{b3} \) 28. \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{6h5} \)!! Black sacrifices a rook and begins a crushing attack, Bensiek – Terreaux, ICCF 2012.) 24...\( \texttt{xc1} \) 25.\( \texttt{fxc1} \) \( \texttt{h6} \) 26.\( \texttt{c1} \) \( \texttt{c2} = \) Vassiliev – Manzo, ICCF 2013.

19...\( \texttt{fxg3} \) 20.\( \texttt{xc3} \) \( \texttt{h4} \) 21. \( \texttt{c6} \)
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C2) 16.\texttt{\textit{b5 d7}}

17.\texttt{\textit{xa7}}

White should better regain his pawn immediately; otherwise, he would not reap any dividends.

17.a3 \texttt{\textit{b8}} 18.\texttt{\textit{b3 h5}} 19.\texttt{\textit{xc7 \textit{xc7}}} Ruemmele – Morozov, ICCF 2007.

17.\texttt{\textit{a4 h5}} 18.h3 \texttt{\textit{f6}} 19.\texttt{\textit{a5}}, Chernuschevich – Oral, Bratislava 1993, 19...\texttt{\textit{e8!?? – Black’s prospects seem already preferable, since White cannot play 20.\texttt{\textit{xc7? xxc7–+ and now, no matter how he captures on c7, his material losses would be unavoidable.}}}

Following 17.a4, Black can activate his knight on a6 and obtain a quite acceptable position. 17...\texttt{\textit{xb4!}} 18.\texttt{\textit{xc7 ec8}} 19.\texttt{\textit{b5 xb5}} 20.axb5, Haumann – Koch, Email 2007, 20...\texttt{\textit{a2!}} 21.\texttt{\textit{xc8 xc8}} 22.\texttt{\textit{a1 c1}} 23.\texttt{\textit{d1 c4=}}

17...\texttt{\textit{f7}}

18.\texttt{\textit{xa6}}

White weakens his opponent’s pawn-structure on the queenside, but without his light-squared bishop he cannot prevent the pawn-break g5-g4.

There arises a calmer position after 18.\texttt{\textit{c2 b8}} 19.\texttt{\textit{xa6 xa7}} 20.\texttt{\textit{e2 b6}} 21.\texttt{\textit{a1 a8}} 22.\texttt{\textit{c3 f6}} 23.a4 \texttt{\textit{xa4}} 24.\texttt{\textit{xa4}} \texttt{\textit{xa4}} 25.\texttt{\textit{xh7. The exchange of the a-pawn for the enemy c-pawn would not promise much to White. Sooner or later the weak pawns on the b-file will be traded and the position will become completely equal.}}

25...\texttt{\textit{xb4}} 26.\texttt{\textit{d3 d2}} 27.\texttt{\textit{e1 b5}} 28.\texttt{\textit{c1 a5}} 29.\texttt{\textit{b2 xd3}} 30.\texttt{\textit{xd3 a7}} 31.\texttt{\textit{xb6 xb6}} 32.\texttt{\textit{xb6 a3 a3 e2 h5}} 34.\texttt{\textit{f1 h8}}!
This is the last fine point. Black’s knight is transferred to the f7-square in order to protect his d6-pawn. 35.\texttt{\textit{b1 f7=}} Telepnev – Nefedov, ICCF 2012.

18.a4 \texttt{\textit{xb4}} 19.a5 \texttt{\textit{b8}} 20.\texttt{\textit{d2 a6}} 21.\texttt{\textit{b5 h5}} 19.\texttt{\textit{f7=}} Tinture – Scholen, ICCF 2008.
are weak and this approximately balances the chances, D.Gurevich – Becerra Rivero, Las Vegas 2007.

It is worse for White to opt here for 21.\texttt{c6} \texttt{d7} 22.a4 g4 23.\texttt{b5} axb5 24.axb5 \texttt{f6} 25.\texttt{h1} \texttt{g7} \texttt{Sigurdsson – Sanchez de Ybar-} 
\texttt{gueen Guti, ICCF 2012, as well as} 
21.\texttt{h1} g4 22.fxg4 \texttt{xa7}! 23.\texttt{xa7} \texttt{b5} 24.\texttt{d3} hxg4∞ Muneret – Gerasimchuk, ICCF 2009 and in both cases Black has very good at-

tacking possibilities.

19...\texttt{h5} \texttt{Black sacrifices a pawn and begins a direct attack against the} 
\texttt{enemy king.} 

20.\texttt{xa6} 

20.\texttt{c6} \texttt{f6} 21.\texttt{a3} g4∞ Pau-
\texttt{wels – Boukal, ICCF 2008.} 

20...\texttt{g4} 

21.\texttt{h1} \texttt{The character of the position remains more or less the same af-}
9. \( \text{d}e1 \text{d}7 \) 10. \( \text{f}e3 \text{f}5 \) 11. \( \text{f}3 \text{f}4 \) 12. \( \text{f}2 \text{g}5 \) 13. \( \text{d}3 \text{g}6 \) 14. \( \text{c}5 \text{f}6 \)

D) 13. \( \text{d}3 \)

White prepares immediately the pawn-break c4-c5.

13. \( \text{g}6 \) 14. \( \text{c}5 \)

About 14. \( \text{c}1 \text{f}6 \) 15. \( \text{c}5 \text{f}7 \) – see variation D2.

14. \( \text{f}6 \) 15. \( \text{c}5 \text{h}5 \), or 15. \( \text{a}5 \text{h}5 \) 16. \( \text{c}5 \text{g}4 \) – see variation D1.

14. \( \text{f}6 \)

Now, White can choose between the simple and logical move D2) 15. \( \text{c}1 \) and the somewhat artificial attempt D1) 15. \( \text{a}4 \).

15. \( \text{cxd}6 \text{cxd}6 \) 16. \( \text{a}4 \) (16. \( \text{c}1 \text{f}7 \) – see variation D2) 16. \( \text{h}5 \) – see variation D1.

Following 15. \( \text{h}1 \text{f}7 \) 16. \( \text{a}4 \) (16. \( \text{c}1 \text{f}8 \) – see variation D2b) 16. \( \text{h}5 \) 17. \( \text{a}5 \text{g}4 \) 18. \( \text{a}6 \), the standard pawn-sacrifice 18... \( \text{g}3 \) promises Black a very good game. 19. \( \text{axb}7 \text{xb}7 \) 20. \( \text{e}1 \text{c}8 \) 21. \( \text{a}4 \text{h}6 \) Meiners – Novak, ICCF 2015.

D1) 15. \( \text{a}4 \)

This move seems a bit dubious. Black is preparing a direct attack against the enemy king and the tempi White has lost on moves with his rook-pawn might cost him dearly later.

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

(diagram)

16. \( \text{a}5 \)
16.\(\texttt{c1} \texttt{f7}\) – see variation D2a.

16.\(\texttt{cxd6}\) \(\texttt{cxd6}\) 17.\(\texttt{a5}\) \(\texttt{g4}\) – see 16.\(\texttt{a5}\).

16.\(\texttt{h3}\). This attempt to impede the pawn-break \(g5-g4\) is not good for White at all. 16...\(\texttt{f7}\) 17.\(\texttt{c6}\) a5 18.\(\texttt{cx} \texttt{xb7}\) \(\texttt{xb7}\) 19.\(\texttt{b4}\) \(\texttt{c8}\) 20.\(\texttt{bxa5}\) \(\texttt{h6}\) 21.\(\texttt{b4}\) \(\texttt{g4}\) 22.\(\texttt{c6}\) \(\texttt{f8}\)→ Black's attack is very powerful. White's try to win a pawn with 23.\(\texttt{fxg4}\)? \(\texttt{hxg4}\) 24.\(\texttt{hxg4}\), led him to a hopeless position. 24...\(\texttt{g5}\)→ Black's attack is developing effortlessly. 25.\(\texttt{f3}\) \(\texttt{wh6}\) 26.\(\texttt{e1}\) \(\texttt{h4}\) 27.\(\texttt{xh4}\) \(\texttt{xh4}\) 28.\(\texttt{g5}\). This pawn-sacrifice postpones White's catastrophe only for a few moves. 28...\(\texttt{w} \texttt{xg5}\) 29.\(\texttt{e2}\) \(\texttt{g4}\) 30.\(\texttt{b1}\) \(\texttt{g3}\) 31.\(\texttt{w} \texttt{d3}\) \(\texttt{w} \texttt{h4}\) 0–1 Korchnoi – Kasparov, Amsterdam 1991.

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

17.\(\texttt{a6}\)

17.\(\texttt{a3}\) \(\texttt{g3}\) 18.\(\texttt{hxg3}\) \(\texttt{fxg3}\) 19.\(\texttt{xg3}\) \(\texttt{h4}\) 20.\(\texttt{h2}\) \(\texttt{h5}\)∞ Muck – Moll, ICCF 2005.

After 17.\(\texttt{c6}\), Korchnoi – Xie, Amsterdam 2001, 17...\(\texttt{bxc6}\)! 18.\(\texttt{dxc6}\) \(\texttt{h6}\) 19.\(\texttt{b4}\), White fails to deploy his bishop to the \(a2-g8\) diagonal. 19...\(\texttt{e6}\) 20.\(\texttt{b3}\). He is preparing \(\texttt{c4}\), but Black's attack has already begun. 20...\(\texttt{g3}\) 21.\(\texttt{hxg3}\) 22.\(\texttt{xg3}\) \(\texttt{h4}\) 23.\(\texttt{e1}\) \(\texttt{h5}\)→ White ends up in a worse position after 17.\(\texttt{cxd6}\) \(\texttt{cxd6}\) 18.\(\texttt{b5}\) (18.\(\texttt{e1}\) \(\texttt{w} \texttt{d7}\)?)

18...\(\texttt{g3}\) 19.\(\texttt{hxg3}\) (19.\(\texttt{xa7}\)? \(\texttt{xd5}\)++) Sanka – Negi, Teheran 2002) 19...\(\texttt{fxg3}\) 20.\(\texttt{hx} \texttt{g3}\) \(\texttt{a6}\) 21.\(\texttt{xc3}\) \(\texttt{h4}\) 22.\(\texttt{h2}\) \(\texttt{h5}\) 23.\(\texttt{d2}\) \(\texttt{g3}\) 24.\(\texttt{fe1}\) \(\texttt{h7}\) 25.\(\texttt{dl}\) \(\texttt{h6}\) – Black has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, Franco Ocampo – Paunovic, Zaragoza 1991.
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21.\texttt{h2 h6}↑

\textbf{21...\texttt{d7}}

\begin{center}
\textbf{22.\texttt{f2}}
\end{center}

White will not save the game even after the other retreat of his bishop. \texttt{22.h2 h6 23.cxd6 e3+ 24.h1 h5!} Black does not lose time for capturing the pawn. His main task is to checkmate his opponent on the h-file as quickly as possible. \texttt{25.e7+ xe7 26.dxe7 g3+! 27.xg3 hxg3 28.xf8 w+ xf8}. White has an extra rook, but his position is absolutely hopeless. \texttt{29.f4 exf4–+ Boychuk – Mercky, ICCF 2006.} \texttt{22...h6 23.cxd6}

\begin{center}
\textbf{23.h2 g7?!–}
\end{center}

Black’s attack is very powerful after \texttt{23.xa6 xa6 24.xa6 g7+ 25.h2 h5 26.cxd6 cxd6 27.c2 f4+ 28.g1 g3 29.a3 xf1 30.xf1 h6–+ Persson – Dothan, ICCF 2008.} \texttt{23...g7!} He breaks quickly his opponent’s defensive fortifications with an energetic play. \texttt{24.e7+ xe7 25.dxe7 h3!! 0–1 Slivko – Yartsev, ICCF 2012.} White’s position is hopeless and later, there may arise the following variation: \texttt{26.exf8 w+ xf8 27.g4 hxg3 28.c5 f4 29.e1 g2 30.f2} (\texttt{30.xf8 g3 31.xa6 wh2+ 32.xf2 g1 w#}) \texttt{30...wh6–+}

\texttt{D2) 15.e1 f7}

\texttt{D2a) 16.a4 and D2b) 16.h1.}
16.b4. This loss of time is not forced. 16...h5 17.cxd6 (17.Wc2 g4 18.cxd6 cxd6 19.Qb5 Qe8 20. Qxa7 Qd7 21.Qc6 Qg5! 22.Qa5 g3=+ Sorensen – Larsen, ICCF 2011) 17...cxd6 18.Qb2 g4 19.Qc4 Qf8 20.Qb5, Svoboda – Zdenek, Czech Republic 1995, 20...g3!?–

The move 16.Wb3 enables Black to play g5-g4. 16...g4!? 17.fxg4 (17.Qfd1? g3! 18.hxg3 fxg3 19.Qxg3 Qh5= Guzy – Winkler, ICCF 2007; 17.Qc2 g3 18.hxg3, Lieb – Aagaard, Germany 2000, 18...Qh5! 19.gxf4 exf4=) 17...Qxe4 18.Qxe4 Qg4 19.Wxb7 f3 20.g3, Spiess – Ohme, Leipzig 2009, 20...Qh3=–

After 16.Qb5. White weakens his control over the e4-square. 16...g4 17.fxg4 (17.cxd6 cxd6 – see 15.cxd6) 17...Qxe4= Del Rio de Angelis – Stets, Fagernes 2012.

16.Qc2. White is preparing the doubling of his rooks on the c-file, but in the meantime Black develops powerful initiative on the kingside. 16...Qf8 17.cxd6 cxd6 18.Wd2. This is the only way for White to play Qfc1, but now Black can advance g5-g4, without losing a tempo for h7-h5. 18...g4 19.Qf1 g3 20.hxg3 fxg3 21.Qxg3 Qh5 22. Qh2 (It seems more resilient for White to try another retreat of his bishop 22.Qf2 Qgf4 23.Qb5 a6 24.Qc7 Qg5– Black has seized completely the initiative, but White still holds the defence, Gligoric – Lukic, Novi Sad 1955) 22...Qe7 23.Qb1 Qd7 24.Qe1, Taimanov – Najdorf, Zuerich 1953, 24...Qh4=+

16.cxd6 cxd6

17.Qh1 Qf8 – see variation D2b.

17.a4 h5 – see variation D2a.

17.Qe1. White is preparing the transfer of his knight to f2 in order to increase his control over the g4-square. 17...h5 18.Qf2 Qf8 19.h3 Qg7 20.Qb5 a6 21.Qa3 b5. Black prevents Qc4, followed by a5 and Qb6. 22.Qc2, Nigalidze – Balogun, Tromso 2014, 22...Qb6!?=
If White refrains from capturing the a7-pawn: 19.\texttt{c2} \texttt{e8} 20.\texttt{h1}, then Black at first ousts the enemy knight from b5 with 20...\texttt{d7} 21.\texttt{d1} a6 22.\texttt{a3} and then begins an attack. 22...g3! 23.\texttt{hxg3} \texttt{h6} 24.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{xf4} 25.\texttt{c3} h4 26.\texttt{e1} \texttt{h7} 27.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f6}. He prepares the transfer of his knight to h5. White's king is already seriously endangered. 28.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{xf4} 29.\texttt{g1} \texttt{h5} 30.\texttt{xh4} \texttt{g5} 31.\texttt{xg5} \texttt{xg5}. White has two extra pawns, but he can defend against the penetration of the enemy knight to g3 only by sacrificing the exchange. 32.\texttt{f4} \texttt{xf4} 33.\texttt{xf4} exf4-- Scherer – Nefedov, ICCF 2013.

19.\texttt{xa7} g3

20.\texttt{h1} \texttt{f8} 21.a5 \texttt{e8} 22.\texttt{b6} \texttt{h4} 23.\texttt{g1} \texttt{d7}. Black has more than sufficient compensation for the pawn. 24.\texttt{a3} \texttt{g5} 25.\texttt{e1} gxh2 26.\texttt{xh2} \texttt{xa5}. He regains the material and preserves all the pluses of his position. 27.\texttt{b3} (27.\texttt{d3} h4\textsuperscript{+}) 27...b5\textsuperscript{+} Van Seben – Percze, LSS 2013.

20.\texttt{e1} \texttt{h6}. Black prepares the transfer of his rook to the g-file. 21.\texttt{hxg3} \texttt{g7}! 22.\texttt{b4} \texttt{e8} 23.
g4 hxg4 24.fxg4 \h4 25.\f2 (25. \xc8 \xc8\+)

25...\xg2! He sacrifices a knight and deprives his opponent's king of any pawn-shelter. 26.\xc8 \xc8 27.\xg2 \c2 28. \ele \xe2 29.\xf3 \e2! Black forces the enemy knight under a double attack. 30.\xc2 \c8 31. \ge1 \xc2 32.\wc3 \xa4\+ – The material on the board is equal, but Black's great positional advantage is doubtless, because White's king is vulnerable and his g4 and e4-pawns are very weak, Aksenov – Nefedov, ICCF 2011.

17...g4

18.cxd6

18...\xg3

Black sacrifices a pawn and deflects White's bishop from the attack against the a7-pawn.

20.\xg3 \xg3 21.\xg3 h4

22.\e1

After this retreat of the bishop White may even fail to equalise.

It seems more reliable for him to choose 22...\f2!? \h6 23. \c3 \g7 24.\wc2 \h3! 25.f4 \xe4 26. gxh3 \xf4+ 27.\h2. Black's
attack looks very dangerous, but White has an extra piece and can hold confidently this position. 27...a6! 28.\textit{xf}4 (28.\textit{xa}3? \textit{xc}3--+) 28...\textit{xf}4+ 29.\textit{h}1 \textit{xf}2+ 30.\textit{xf}2 axb5= – The position has been simplified considerably, Moreno Carretero – Lanz Calavia, ICCF 2014.

22...\textit{h}5

It seems also very good for Black to choose here 22...a6!? 23.\textit{a}3 \textit{h}5+

23.f4 \textit{hxf}4 24.\textit{h}5

This position was reached in the game Volokitin – Cheparinov, Dubai 2014. Here, Black has an interesting piece-sacrifice. 24...\textit{h}3+!? 25.\textit{gxh}3 \textit{xf}1+ 26.\textit{xf}1 \textit{h}3+ 27.\textit{e}2 \textit{g}5 28.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}8 29.\textit{d}2 \textit{g}3. White's pieces are not well coordinated, therefore he should better give back the piece with the idea to simplify the position and to enter an endgame. 30.\textit{h}1 \textit{xf}3 31.\textit{g}1 \textit{f}1! 32.\textit{ex}g3 \textit{h}1 33.\textit{x}g6 \textit{xf}1+ 34.\textit{f}3 \textit{xd}3 35.\textit{e}d6 \textit{h}3† Black has the two-bishop advantage and a passed h-pawn and has the initiative. White must defend very precisely.

D2b) 16.\textit{h}1

White removes immediately his king away from the dangerous g1-a7 diagonal and can use the freed g1-square later either for his rook, or for the retreat of his bishop.

16...\textit{f}8

17.a4

Or 17.\textit{e}1 h5 18.\textit{c}2 g4 19.c6 b6 20.a3 g3 21.\textit{hx}g3 \textit{fx}g3 22.\textit{x}g3 h4 23.\textit{h}2 \textit{h}5† Keuter – Ivanov, ICCF 2012.

White would lose valuable time with 17.a3 h5 18.\textit{cx}d6 \textit{cx}d6 19.\textit{b}5 g4 20.\textit{b}3 g3 21.\textit{xa}7 b6 22.\textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 23.\textit{xb}6 \textit{e}7† and in this complicated middle game, Black’s piece seems stronger than White’s three pawns, Wojnar – Rubio Doblas, ICCF 2012.
17.cxd6 cxd6

18.a4 \$g7 19.b3 h5 20.\$b1. The plan with the transfer of the knight to the c4-square looks rather slow. 20...g4 21.\$d2 g3 22.hxg3 fxg3 23.\$xg3 h4 24.\$h2 \$h5+ Trembecki - Telepnev, ICCF 2011.

The move 18.\$g1 leads to a complicated fight. 18...h5 19.g3 fxg3 20.\$xg3 \$h6 21.\$e3 h4 22.\$xg5. This exchange sacrifice seems very promising, but things are far from simple. 22...\$xg5 23.\$xg5 \$f8 24.\$g1 \$h7 25.\$e3 \$d7 26.\$g5 \$g7 27.\$h6+ \$g8 28.\$g1 \$f7∞ - Black has succeeded in evacuating his king away from the danger zone and has coordinated his pieces, Rogos - Panitovsky, ICCF 2014.

Lately, the seemingly paradoxical move 17.\$g1!? is beginning to gain popularity. White does not wait for his opponent’s kingside attack and wishes to push g2-g3 himself, opening the g-file. 17...h5 (diagram)

18.\$a4?! g4 19.cxd6 cxd6 20.\$d1 g3 21.hxg3 \$g4! 22.\$e1 \$h6 23.\$c2 fxg3 24.\$xg3 \$e3 25.\$e1 \$xc1 26.\$xc1 h4 27.\$h2 \$xh2 28.\$xh2 \$f6+ Furashev - Nefedov, ICCF 2012.

18.\$b5?! g4 19.cxd6 cxd6 20.\$c2 \$d7 21.\$b3 g3 22.hxg3 fxg3 23.\$xg3 h4 24.\$f2 \$h5+ Romm - Burri, ICCF 2006.

18.a4?! g4 19.\$c2 \$h7 20.cxd6 cxd6 21.\$b5 g3 22.hxg3 fxg3 23.\$xg3 a6 24.\$c3 h4 25.\$e1 \$h5+ Oates - Dauga, ICCF 2013.

18.\$c2?! g4 19.b4 \$h7 20.\$e1 \$h6 21.a4 g3 22.hxg3 fxg3 23.\$xg3 h4 24.\$h2 \$h5 25.\$f1 \$g3+ 26.\$g1 \$g7+ Zhak - Cavajda, ICCF 2013.

18.g3 fxg3 (It seems less reliable for Black to opt here for 18...g4, because after 19.gxf4 exf4, White obtains an excellent square for his knight at the middle of the board. 20.cxd6 cxd6 21.\$b5 h4 22.\$d4= Lysyj - Wan, China 2015) 19.\$xg3.
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19...\h6 20.\e3 \h4 21.\g1 (White would not achieve much with the exchange-sacrifice 21. \xg5 \xg5 22.\xg5 \w8 23.\d2 \h7 24.\g1 \h5 25.\b5 \h3 26. \f4 \h5f4 27.\xf4 \exf4 28.\h5 \e5 29.\f2 \f3 30.\xf7 \g2+ 31. \xg2 \xg2+ 32.\xg2 \h3+ 33.\xh3 \wxf7 34.\wxf7+ \xf7= – In this endgame Black's rook can easily hold the defence against White's bishop and two pawns.) 21...\h5 22.\b5 \a6 23.\a3 \gf4 24.\xd6 \xd6 25.\c4 \h3 26.\e1 \c3 \f4 27.\b6 \b8 – Both sides have powerful knights on b6 and f4 and this balances the prospects, Serner – Rydholm, ICCF 2016.

It also seems good for Black to try here 19...\g7!? 20.\d2 (He obtains good compensation for the pawn after 20.\xg5 \g4 21. \h4 \xh4 22.\xg7+ \xg7 23.\xg4 \h6=) 20...\h7 21.\b4 \d7 22.\a4 \a6 23.\a2 \h8 24.\gg1 \e7 \Kozlov – Telepnev, ICCF 2015. Black’s chances are not worse in this complicated position. He has less space indeed, but White’s kingside pawn-structure has been weakened.

17...\h5

(diagram)

18.\a5

After 18.\xd6 \xd6 19.\b5 \g4 20.\xa7, White wins a pawn, but this takes too much time. 20...\d7 21.\b3 (21.\b5 \g3 22.\g1 \xh2 23.\f2 \h4 24.\c7 \h5 Shmeliov – Preotu, Manchester 2016) 21...

h4!? Black refrains from the typical pawn-break in similar positions g4-g3 and prefers to advance his h-pawn. 22.\b6 \b8 23.\b5 \h3 24.\xh3 \g3 25.\xg3 \c7? \xh3 26.\g1 \h7 27. \xa8 \xa8 28.\d1 \e8 – White has an exchange and a pawn more, but his defence would be very difficult, because Black’s attack seems very powerful, Bucur – Tsygankov, ICCF 2015) 25... \h5 26.\g1 \xg3+ 27.\xg3 \xg3 28.\g1 \e7 29.\g3 \h7 30.\c7 \xa4 31.\d1 \f8 32.\e6 \h6 \Petrovic, ICCF 2013.

18...\g4

19.\xd6
The pawn-sacrifice 19.a6 would not provide White even with equality. 19...bxa6 20.b4 (20. cxd6 cxd6 21.a4 g3+ Haugen – Jorgensen, ICCF 2011) 20...g3 21.c6. He cannot obtain anything meaningful out of the “beautiful”, but ineffective placement of his knight on c6. 21...d7 22.hxg3 (22.e1 gxh2 23.xh2 h4+ Kazantsev – Sekretaryov, ICCF 2010) 22...fxg3 23.xg3 h4 24.h2 d5 25.f4 g3+ 26.xg3 hxg3. Black has very good prospects to organise a checkmating attack on the h-file. 27.f5 h5+ 28.g1 f4 29.g4 g7 30.f3 h4+ Baranowski – Serazeev, ICCF 2011.

19...cxd6 20.b5

20...h4!? It also seems good for Black to continue in the standard way 20...g3 21.xa7 h7 22.b6 h4 23.g1 g5∞ and he has good attacking prospects for the sacrificed pawn, Shirov – Radjabov, Baku 2009.

21.xa7 d7 22.a6 bxa6 23.c6 e8 24.e1

24.g1 h5 25.fxg4 g3+ 26.xg3 hxg3∞ Zautzig – Emelyanov, ICCF 2014.

24...g3 25.h3 h7 26.g1 g5 27.f1 g7∞ Shirov – Vocaturo, Reykjavik 2015.

White has succeeded in fortifying reliably his kingside. Still, Black’s idea to sacrifice a piece on h3 will be constantly hanging in the air, so this provides him with excellent counterplay.
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