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+ check
++ double check
# checkmate
x capture
!! brilliant move
! good move
!? interesting move
?! dubious move
? bad move
?? blunder
Ch championship
Cht team championship
Wch world championship
Ct candidates event
IZ interzonal event
Z zonal event
OL olympiad
Ech European Championship
ECC European Clubs Cup
jr junior event
wom women's event
mem memorial event
rpd rapidplay game
corr. correspondence game
qual qualifying event
1-0 the game ends in a win for White
½-½ the game ends in a draw
0-1 the game ends in a win for Black
(n) nth match game
(D) see next diagram
Foreword

This is the first chess book I have written, and also the first time I have written a large manuscript in English, so I submit it uneasily for the reader’s consideration. However, my experience in chess writing is not exactly at beginner level. I have for many years written the bulletin at the Danish championships, and thereby developed my own opinion on how a game of chess should best be annotated. Also I have some experience in coaching and live commentating, and I hope that this background has helped me in writing a good book.

The book is organized so as to present possible repertoires for both White, and for Black. For White I give only one line against 5...g6 and 5...e6 followed by 6...b4, while I have two lines against both 5...e6 followed by 6...e7 and 5...c6. For Black I have decided to provide full repertoire coverage of 5...c6 and 5...e6 followed by 6...b4.

Each chapter begins with explanatory material based on model examples from practice. By using some illustrative games I have tried to give the reader an idea of how the various positions should be handled. By playing through these examples, and studying the theoretical material in the lines one decides to play, I hope that your chances of practical success will be increased.

I have chosen the repertoires from the simple concept that what I like with White, I suggest for White, while what makes me most worried to play against with White, I have suggested for Black. I hope that this has not excluded everyone, even though I know that devotees of some lines might be disappointed by this book. Still I can only recommend that you start playing 5...c6 or 5...e6 followed by 6...b4, if you are Black.

Finally I would like to thank Murray Chandler and Graham Burgess, who have been most kind to me, and encouraged me to write this book. I hope that it will neither let them nor the reader down.

Jacob Aagaard
Denmark, 1998
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The Caro-Kann is one of the most solid openings there are. Some would also be tempted to say one of the most boring. However, White can force the pace with one variation that is more aggressive than the rest – the Panov-Botvinnik Attack.

A great variety of positions occur from the Panov, with a lot of different structures. However, there is one structure that arises from many variations and is not therefore limited to one chapter – the IQP (Isolated Queen’s Pawn):

IQP positions could be dealt with in the different chapters, but it is easier to get it over with at once, and show some games which give an idea of how this pawn structure should be handled.

The position is a struggle between White’s desire to get an attack, and in some way profit from the activity he achieves in these positions, and the black longing for the endgame, where he will be better, because the d-pawn is weak and the d5-square is an excellent outpost, not only for a knight, but also for the bishop, queen or sometimes even a rook. I will start with an example of how bad the position would be for White if all the minor pieces were exchanged.

25...\textit{A}d8 26 f4

White had to prevent ...\textit{e}5. Maybe White could postpone this with 26 \textit{A}d3, but sooner or later he would have to push his f-pawn.

26...g6

Black should never try to play ...f6 to get in ...\textit{e}5, as the e6-pawn would be a target at which White would aim with all his powers. The most likely result would be a draw. What Black does in the game is simple. By taking
control over the only fully open file on the board he gets the possibility of getting in behind the white forces.

27 \textit{\texttt{Kh}}1 \textit{\texttt{Wb}}6 28 \textit{\texttt{Ad}}3 \textit{\texttt{Ec}}8 29 \textit{\texttt{A1d2 Ac1+ 30 Kh2 Wc7 31 g3?!}}

This weakens the white king. I believe it would have been better to see if Black really wanted to play \ldots g6-g5 and be prepared to reply \textit{\texttt{Ed3-g3}}. After the text-move, the white king will never enjoy full safety.

31...\textit{\texttt{a5 32 Ad1 Wc2+ 33 A1d2 Wc4}}

The black position is more or less ideal. All his pieces are active and he is about to create another weakness on b2 (a weakness only exists if it can be attacked), which is enough to win the game.

34 \textit{\texttt{Ad1 b4! 35 axb4 Ad1 36 Ad1 Wxb4}}

White is now losing a pawn, but he could now have retained some drawing chances by giving up the d-pawn and going into a queen ending with 37 \textit{\texttt{We2}}.

Of course this is a nightmare one should not dwell upon when playing the Panov, since the aim is mate, and not a poor endgame. Still, one should remember that there are very few drawing chances in this endgame if one does not have direct counterplay. I could show examples where White drew since he was able to seize an open file, or because his queen generated immediate threats. However, these are in a sense trivial cases, and I will instead show the classical isolated pawn ending. Please note that the following example did not in fact arise from a Panov, and I have reversed the colours to make the parallel with the

Panov ending clearer – I hope nobody will be confused by this.

\textbf{Capablanca – Flohr}
\textit{\texttt{(colours reversed)}}
\textit{\texttt{Moscow 1935}}

This position looks very promising for Black, and before this game was played I do not think anyone believed that White could hold it together. Anyone but Capablanca, that is. With his famous style, where every move is an improvement of the position, but none is a revolution, he finds a way to make the draw.

1 \textit{\texttt{Be2 Bd7 2 Bd3 Bc6 3 b3 f5 4 Bd2 Bf6 5 f3}}

Capablanca is taking control over e4, and also placing all the pawns on the opposite coloured squares from that of his bishop.

5...\textit{\texttt{Ed5 6 a4 Dd7 7 Ce1 Bb8 8 Ce3 Dc6 9 Ec3 a6 10 h3 g6 11 h4!}}

Restricting Black's potential possibilities on the kingside.

11...\textit{\texttt{b5 12 axb5 axb5 13 Bd3 b4!}}

A serious attempt to win the game. After this White is still drawing, but only just.

14 g3 f4! 15 gxf4!
15 \text{xf4} \text{xf4} 16 \text{d2} \text{xf3} 17 \text{xb4} \text{d4} gives Black excellent winning chances, 15...\text{e7} 16 \text{d2} \text{f5} 17 \text{e1}!
An outside passed pawn would decide the game.
17...\text{xd4} 18 \text{xb4} \text{xb3} 19 \text{c3} \text{c5}+ 20 \text{e3} \text{d7} 21 \text{b4}
The rest of the game is about White stopping the knight reaching f5, from where it would support the black king, and decide the game.
21...\text{d8} 22 \text{e7} \text{f7} 23 \text{f8!} \text{d6} 24 \text{xd6} \text{xd6} 25 \text{e4}!
Holding the draw.
25...\text{e7} 26 \text{e5} \text{h6} 27 \text{d4} \text{f6}
28 \text{e4} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}
28...\text{h5} 29 \text{d4} \text{f5} 30 \text{e3} \text{e5} 31 \text{fxe5} \text{xe5} 32 \text{f4+} is completely drawn.

From this game one can learn two things. First of all, you need two weaknesses to win an endgame. In the previous game, b2 was a weakness, but only because there were still major pieces left on the board. In this game only d4 was weak. The second thing is more direct. If you are White, and you have a chance to escape into this endgame from an uncomfortable position, you know you can make a draw. And if you are Black you know that you should not let White get away like this, for instance by exchanging rooks or queens.

With this I want to kiss the endgames goodbye and show some great attacking games. One might claim that White is too successful in my choice of games. Well, first of all these positions are not recommended by me in the black repertoires. Secondly White does have an excellent score from this type of position, provided he gets his pieces to the ideal squares.

\textbf{Dizdar – Dizdarević}  
\textit{Sarajevo 1988}

1 \text{d4} \text{f6} 2 \text{f3} \text{e6} 3 \text{e3} \text{c5} 4 \text{d3} \text{cxd4} 5 \text{exd4} \text{e7} 6 \text{c4} 0-0 7 \text{d5} 8 \text{cxd5} 9 \text{c3}
This is just one of many ways to get to this position, but in this book, the subject is not transpositions, but the positions arising from them.

9...\text{c6}
The Panov move-order to reach this position would be 1 \text{e4} \text{c6} 2 \text{d4} \text{d5} 3 \text{exd5} \text{cxd5} 4 \text{c4} \text{f6} 5 \text{e3} \text{e6} 6 \text{f3} \text{e7} 7 \text{cxd5} \text{cxd5} 8 \text{d3} \text{c6} 9 \text{f4} 0-0.

10 \text{e1} \text{f6} 11 \text{a3} \text{b6} 12 \text{c2} \text{b7}?!  

The black position might still be playable after this move, but as mentioned in Chapter 11, 12...\text{a6}!, preventing \text{w}d3, is the right move.

13 \text{w}d3 \text{e}8? (D)
Black had to protect his king with 13...\text{g}6. Now White has a classical push in the centre.
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14 \text{d5!} \text{exd5} 15 \text{g5} \text{e4}
15...g6 16 ßxc7 wins on the spot. 16 ßxe4 ßxe4 17 ßxe4 g6 18 ßh4
The centre has opened up, and so have the diagonals down to the black
king. Black has no real defence.
18...ßc7 19 ßb3 ßd6
19...ßf8 loses as well after 20 ßf4
ßd7 21 ßg5.
20 ßf6
Black is defenceless.
20...h5 21 ßg5 ßh7 22 ßc2 1-0

This of course looked very easy, but Black was quite a good player, with
the rating of an average grandmaster. The trick employed by White has won
many games, and will occur again in this chapter, I can promise. In the fol-
lowing game Black gets a free tempo, compared with this game, but still ev-
everything is not easy.

Yusupov – Lobron
Nussloch 1996

1 d4 ßf6 2 c4 e6 3 ßc3 ßb4 4 e3 0-0
5 ßd3 d5 6 ßf3 c5 7 0-0 cxd4 8 exd4
dxc4 9 ßxc4 b6
This is a transposition to Chapter 8,
but White plays a line that is not part
of the repertoire I suggest. However,
the game is still a beautiful illustration
of White’s options in IQP positions.
10 ße1 ßb7 11 ßd3 ßc6
11...ßxc3 12 bxc3 ßbd7 is a little
better for White, since he can put his
bishop on b2 instead of g5.
12 a3 ße7 13 ßc2 ße8
13...ßa6! transposes to the game
Sturua-Kutirov (page 11), where Black
has serious chances for equality. Still
it is a difficult move to make, when
you have got a theoretical line a tempo
up. Still it is not a very good line, so
the hard decision had to be taken.
14 ßd3 g6 15 h4 ßd6 16 ßg5
White has a slight pull.
16...ßad8 17 ßad1 ßb8 18 ßb3
a6?
This is careless. Better was 18...ßd5
with an inferior, but playable position.
19 d5! ßa5 (D)
19...ßxd5 20 ßxd5 exd5 21 ßxd5
gives White a huge attack against the
black king, while Black is totally with-
out counterplay.

20 dxec6!! ßxb3
Black was in bad shape anyway.
20...ßxd3 21 exf7+ ßg7 22 fxe8ß+
ßxe8 23 ßxd3 gives White very good
winning chances, especially because
of 23...ßxb3 24 ßde3 ßf7 25 ßxf6!
ßxf6 26 ße6+ ßf7 27 ßg5+ winning
both on attack and material.
21 exf7+ ßxf7 22 ßc4+ ßg7 23
ße5!
The attack does not stop so easily.
White wants more than just a pawn.
23...ßg8 24 ßxd8 ßxd8 25 ßf7+!
Precisely played.
25...ßh8 26 ßxb3 ßd4 27 ße3
ßf8 28 ßxe7 1-0
Black loses further material.
In the following game White plays in a more positional manner, but it is still central control, and in particular d5, that is important. It provides a classical example of how Black comes under pressure in IQP positions, and finds it difficult to defend precisely for a prolonged period. Just a little mistake decides the outcome.

Velimirović – Böhm
_Amsterdam 1976_

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4  Serena 6 5 2 e3 e6 6 f3 7 e7 7 cxd5 5 cxd5 8 2 d3 2 c6 9 0-0 0-0 10 h1 2 f6 11 2 a3 8 b6 12 2 c2 2 b7 13 2 d3 g6 14 2 h6 2 e8 15 2 d1 2 f8 16 2 g5 2 e7

White has emerged from the opening with a slight pull. Black now tries to solve his problems through exchanges.

17 2 b3 2 d5 18 2 xd5!?

18 h4 is the natural move, but White has a very interesting idea.

18... 2 xg5

18...exd5?! 19 2 xc7 2 xe7 20 2 e5 leads to a position where White is clearly better. The bishop on b7 is not worth very much currently.

19 2 xc6 2 xc6 20 d5!

Even though the structure will be very symmetrical after this move, Black is still some way from solving his problems.

20...exd5

20... 2 xd5? 21 2 xd5 exd5 22 2 xe8+ 2 xe8 23 2 xg5 does not work – naturally.

22 2 xe8+ 2 xe8 22 2 xg5 2 xg5 23 2 d4! (D)

White takes control over the dark squares and supports the advance of his h-pawn. Even though the position is defensible here, Black’s task is unpleasant.

23... 2 c6 24 h4 2 e7 25 2 xd5

Rather than taking the pawn back, 25 h5!? was an interesting option, but it seems that Black can defend head-first: 25... 2 d8 26 2 c4 f5! 27 2 f6+ 2 f7 (not 27...2 f8 28 2 xh7+) 28 2 xh7 gxh5 and Black has an extra pawn, even though his position seems a bit shaky. Still, the knight is so badly placed that Black must be better.

25... 2 xd5 26 2 xd5 2 e8 27 h5 2 e5 28 2 d7

White is only slightly better, of course, but an important factor in practice is creating problems for the opponent, and in doing that, White is very successful.

28... 2 e7 29 2 d8+ 2 e8 30 h6!

Putting the king under pressure. Naturally the pawn can sometimes turn out weak, but currently it is a thorn in Black’s side.

30...2 f8!

Avoiding the back-rank mate.

31 2 d7 a5?

This gives White peace to organize his attack and weakens the b6-pawn. Necessary was 31... 2 c7! 32 2 c8+ 2 e8, when it seems hard for White to avoid 33
\[ \text{d8} (33 \text{b7 h5!} \text{ gives Black good chances to defend as well}) 33...\text{w1+ 34 h2 w5+ with perpetual.} \]

32 g3 g5?!

This does not improve anything at all, but 32...\text{c7} 33 \text{d8+} picks up the b6-pawn. Black would also lose after 32...\text{xxb2?} 33 \text{d6+ g8} (33...\text{e7} 34 \text{e1}) 34 \text{w7 f8} 35 \text{g2!!} (not 35 \text{d8? c1+ 36 g2 xh6), when there is no defence against 36 \text{d8 winning.} \]

33 \text{d3 g8} 34 \text{d6}

The black position is now so full of weaknesses that he must be considered lost.

34...\text{e2} 35 \text{d2 e1+ 36 h2 w6}

There was nothing else, but the endgame does not offer any chances for resistance.

37 \text{xe6 fxe6} 38 \text{d7}

Taking the seventh rank, Black could have resigned here.

38...\text{c8} 39 \text{g7+f8} 40 \text{h7 c2} 41 \text{b7 g8} 42 \text{h3 xh2} 43 \text{g4 xf2 44 xg5 f8} 45 \text{g4 e5} 46 \text{h5 1-0}

The following game is one of my favourites at the moment, mainly because of the brilliant combination, but also because it shows how White, by simple means, can produce a small advantage which can trouble a very strong player.

\[ \text{Sturua – Kutirov} \]
\[ \text{Erevan OL 1996} \]

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \text{f6} 5 \text{c3 e6} 6 \text{f3 e7} 7 \text{cxd5 cxd5} 8 \text{d3 c6} 9 0-0 0-0 10 \text{e1 f6} 11 a3 b6 12 \text{c2 a6} 13 \text{g5 c8} 14 \text{d2?! c4?} \]
22 \( \text{Nxe6!!} \) \( \text{Wxe6} \) 23 \( \text{Ke1} \)

The point.

23...\( \text{Wd6} \).

Black is lost after both 23...\( \text{Wxg4} \) 24 \( \text{Qxd5} \)+ and 23...\( \text{Wxe1+} \) 24 \( \text{Qxe1} \) \( \text{Bc8} \) 25 \( \text{Wf4} \).

24 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Wd8} \).

24...\( \text{f5} \) 25 \( \text{Wh3!} \) \( \text{Wxf4} \) 26 \( \text{Wxh7+} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 27 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 28 \( \text{Qe5} \) wins.

25 \( \text{We6+} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 26 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{g5} \) 27 \( \text{Wf7+} \) 1-0

Black is mated after 27...\( \text{Wh6} \) 28 \( \text{Qxg5+} \) \( \text{fxg5} \) 29 \( \text{Qe6+} \).

In the following game Black plays quite sensibly up to a certain point, but the important thing to note is how White is able to keep posing problems for Black, who eventually becomes careless, just when he seems to have come through the worst.

**Borge – Danielsen**

*Danish League 1997/8*

1 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 3 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 4 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 5 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 6 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 7 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 8 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 9 0-0 0-0 10 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 11 \( \text{a3} \)

12 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{a6} \) 13 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 14 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 15 \( \text{h4!} \)

This novelty gives Black some difficulties he had not previously encountered after 14 \( \text{Qc1} \).

15...\( \text{Qxc3} \)

15...\( \text{h6?!} \) 16 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) (16...\( \text{exd5} \) 17 \( \text{Qf5!} \) is terrible for Black) 17 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Wd8} \) 18 \( \text{Qxc7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 19 \( \text{Wa4} \) would give White a significant edge.

16 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{h6} \)

This weakens Black’s kingside, but on the other hand, he had to do something to relieve some of the pressure.

* 1 line please

17 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 18 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 19 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{f5} \)

If Black had time to take over the important light squares in the centre, this would not be a serious weakening. As it is, \( e6 \) is going to be a problem.

20 \( \text{Qa2} \) \( \text{Qc4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 22 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 23 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 24 \( \text{Qd3} \)

This knight manoeuvre poses Black new problems. How is he going to defend his pieces?

24...\( \text{Qd4} \)?

A tactical mistake. 24...\( \text{Qf7} \) would have kept the black forces together. White would be a little better, but Black would have good chances of solving his problems.

25 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( (D) \)

25...\( \text{Qd8xc5?} \)

Black should have taken his chances after 25...\( \text{Qd5} \) 26 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 27 \( \text{c4!} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 28 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 29 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 30 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 31 \( g3 \), which gives White good winning chances, but Black is still fighting.

26 \( \text{dxc5} \) \( \text{Qxc5} \) 27 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 28 \( \text{Qd1} ! \)

The rook should be used in an attack, not to protect a pawn!

28...\( \text{Qh7} \) 29 \( h5 \)!
Closing in on the black king.
29...\textit{Q}xc3 30 \textit{Q}d5
White should win the endgame without too much difficulty. g7 is simply too weak.

30...\textit{Q}c1 31 \textit{Q}xh6+!
The final combination. The rook on c1 is picked up after a few checks.
31...g6xh6 32 \textit{W}f7+ \textit{Q}h8 1-0

Two games from the last ‘normal’ FIDE world championship match illustrate some important ideas in the Panov and IQP positions.

Kamsky – Karpov
\textit{Elisa FIDE Wch (2) 1996}

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \textit{Q}f6
5 \textit{Q}c3 e6 6 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{B}b4 7 cxd5 \textit{Q}xd5 8
\textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}c6 9 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}e7 10 0-0 0-0 11
\textit{W}e2 \textit{Q}f6 12 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{Q}d7

Not good would be 12...\textit{Q}xd4? 13
\textit{Q}xd4 \textit{W}xd4 14 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{W}d8 (14...\textit{B}b6
15 \textit{Q}xf6+ \textit{Q}xf6 16 \textit{W}e4 is awful for Black) 15 \textit{Q}xf6+ \textit{Q}xf6 16 \textit{Q}fd1 \textit{Q}d7
17 \textit{Q}xf6 \textit{W}xf6 18 \textit{Q}xh7+ \textit{Q}xh7 19
\textit{Q}xd7, which gives White strong pressure. It is not immediately apparent
how Black should liberate himself. Better is 12...\textit{B}b6!?, as we shall see in
the next game.

13 \textit{Q}ad1 \textit{Q}c8

13...\textit{B}b6 14 \textit{Q}xf6+ \textit{Q}xf6 15 \textit{W}e4
g6 16 \textit{Q}h6 \textit{Q}g7 17 \textit{Q}xg7 \textit{Q}xg7 18 h4
gave White a slight pull in Mortensen-
Danielsen, Danish Ch 1995.

14 \textit{W}fe1 \textit{Q}d5

Black should try 14...\textit{Q}xe4 15 \textit{W}xe4
g6 since White cannot get an advantage from 16 \textit{Q}h6 \textit{Q}e8 17 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}xe5
18 dxe5 \textit{Q}c6 19 \textit{W}g4 \textit{W}a5.
15 \textit{Q}c3!

Kamsky decides to fight for central control, and at the same time vacates
the e4-square for other pieces.

15...\textit{Q}f6

15...\textit{W}e8 16 \textit{Q}xd5 exd5 17 \textit{Q}e5
gives White an advantage.

16 a3

This ‘luxury’ move makes a lot of sense, since 16 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}d5 would not do much good. Another useful move was 16 \textit{Q}b1, but then 17 a3 would be natural, to have the opportunity to use
the bishop on both diagonals.

16...\textit{W}c7

16...\textit{B}b6 17 \textit{Q}g5 would be uncomfortable, as e7 would be hanging after
17...\textit{Q}d5 18 \textit{Q}xd5. Black only loses a
pawn, but still it is no good, of course.

17 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{W}a5? (D)

The losing mistake. However, Black
was already in great difficulties, and
had to watch out for 18 \textit{Q}xf6 followed
by 19 d5 with a huge attack. 17...\textit{W}e6
would have shown why: 18 \textit{Q}xf6
\textit{Q}f6 19 d5! \textit{Q}xc3 (this is probably
not the best, but a move like 19...\textit{Q}b8
is a symptom that the patient is ill) 20
dxc6 \textit{Q}xe1 21 cxd7 and White has ex-
cellent winning chances. 17...\textit{W}fe8
was the right move, but after 18 \textit{Q}b1
Black will find it difficult to withstand
White’s pressure. As in the previous
games, Black would be clearly worse.

18 d5!

The thematic break carried out in a
beautiful way.

18...\textit{Q}xd5

18...\textit{Q}xd5 does not work. After 19
\textit{Q}xd5 Black has two options:
a) 19...\textit{Q}xd5 20 \textit{Q}xe7 \textit{W}fe8 21
\textit{Q}xh7+! \textit{Q}xh7 21...\textit{W}h8 22 b4 \textit{W}c7
23 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}xe7 24 \textit{W}h5 gives Black no
chance whatsoever) 22 \textit{Q}g5+ \textit{Q}g6
(22...\texttt{g8} 23 \texttt{wh}5 wins) 23 \texttt{wd}3 + \texttt{xf}5
24 \texttt{g}3 with a winning attack, for example 24...
\texttt{wa}4 (trying to come to g4)
25 \texttt{e}4+ \texttt{h}7 26 \texttt{wh}4 + \texttt{g}8 27 \texttt{f}6+
winning the queen and the game.

b) 19...\texttt{xxg}5 20 \texttt{xxg}5 \texttt{h}6 (the only try; 20...\texttt{exd}5 21 \texttt{xxh}7+ \texttt{h}8 22 \texttt{wh}5 is easy) 21 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{wd}8 22 \texttt{h}7 winning
the exchange, and probably the game.
Also 18...\texttt{b}8 19 \texttt{d}6 is disgusting
for Black.

19 \texttt{xf}6 \texttt{xf}6 20 \texttt{xxh}7+!
The point of the combination. The bishop at d7 is the victim.

20...\texttt{wh}7 21 \texttt{xxd}5 \texttt{xc}3!
Karpov is a fighter who always seeks
the line of most resistance. Still, White has a very large
advantage. White is virtually winning after 21...\texttt{wc}7 22
\texttt{wd}3 + \texttt{g}8 23 \texttt{xxd}7 and 21...\texttt{wb}6 22
\texttt{xxd}7, when Black cannot ruin the
white pawn-structure with 22...\texttt{xc}3 because
of 23 \texttt{wd}3+.

22 \texttt{xa}5
White could have gone for complications with 22 \texttt{gg}5+, but the text is
simple and very good for White.

22...\texttt{xa}5
After 22...\texttt{xc}1 23 \texttt{h}5 + \texttt{g}8, 24
\texttt{xe}1! (or 24 \texttt{gg}4) is the simplest way.

23 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{g}8

23...\texttt{xb}4 24 \texttt{axb}4 \texttt{g}8 25 \texttt{wd}3
\texttt{fd}8 26 \texttt{gg}5 gives White a winning
attack.

24 \texttt{bxa}5 \texttt{g}4
Karpov is extremely tough player to
beat, and in a difficult position puts up
a lot of resistance. 24...\texttt{fe}8 25 \texttt{wb}2!
\texttt{xe}1+ 26 \texttt{xe}1 \texttt{c}7 27 \texttt{wc}3 gives a
technically winning position. Also
24...\texttt{xa}5 25 \texttt{wd}2 does not work.

25 \texttt{a}6!
Destabilizing the knight on c6 by
giving up a pawn with very little future.
Still the black position is not so
easy to crack, and Kamsky had to display
excellent technique to grind out the
full point.

After this game, Karpov did some
good preparation and solved Black's
problems in his next game as Black.

Kamsky – Karpov
Elista FIDE Wch (4) 1996

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \texttt{xf}6
5 \texttt{c}3 e6 6 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{b}4 7 cxd5 \texttt{xd}5 8
\texttt{d}2 \texttt{c}6 9 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}7 10 0-0 0-0 11
\texttt{we}2 \texttt{f}6 12 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{wb}6!

An improvement upon the previous
game. Black is simply threatening to
take the b-pawn, which Kamsky
prevents by simple means.

13 \texttt{a}3
13 \texttt{xf}6+ \texttt{xf}6 14 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{b}4! would
also have kept the balance. While 13
\texttt{g}5 \texttt{xd}4 14 \texttt{xd}4 \texttt{wd}4 15 \texttt{xf}6+
\texttt{xe}6 16 \texttt{xf}6 \texttt{wb}6 17 \texttt{fd}1 does not
offer sufficient compensation, Black
is only microscopically better.

13...\texttt{d}7
13...\texttt{xb}2? 14 \texttt{xf}6+ \texttt{xf}6 (or
14...\texttt{xf}6 15 \texttt{fb}1 \texttt{xd}4 16 \texttt{xe}7+!}
h8 17 Qxd4 w xd4 18 w h5 with a mating attack) 15 w e4 g6 16 f b1.
14 f d1
The idea behind Karpov's new move is simple. White is not capable of putting the rooks on their best squares, since 14 f d1 w x b2! would be preferable for Black. 14 Q e5!? is suggested by Ftačnik, but he himself gives the simplest way for Black to keep the balance: 14...Q e8!? (14...Q xd4? 15 Q x f6+ Q x f6 16 w e4; 14...w x d4? 15 c 3 w d5 16 e d1 would give Black two problems: the queen's bad placement, and the threats against his king, and he would not be able to solve both) 15 Q x f6+ Q x f6 16 w e4 g6 17 Q h 6 (17 Q e3!? w x b2 18 w b1 w a 3 19 Q g 4 Q g 7 20 w x b 7 gives White some compensation, and might be the way to put Black under pressure) 17...Q g 7 18 Q x g 7 Q x g 7, where White has to be careful, since he has not yet generated any threats, but has two pawns hanging.
14...Q ad8
14...Q xd 4 15 Q xd 4 w xd 4 16 c 3 w a 4 17 Q x f 6+ Q x f 6 18 Q x f 6 g x f 6 19 b 3! w a 5 20 w h 7+ Q x h 7 21 w d 7 would give Black grey hair for no reason. 14...w x b 2? has not changed from the previous move.
15 Q x f 6+
15 b 4!? to keep some tension was possibly a better move.
15...Q f 6 16 w e 4 g 6 17 c 3
Planning tricks with d 5, but here they are much more benign than in the previous game.
17...Q e 7!
A strong move, taking control over d 5, making way for the bishop at d 7 to come to c 6, and preparing to bring the knight to the active square f 5. Black is probably already a little better.
18 Q e 5
18 d 5 w x b 2 is better for Black.
18...Q f 5
The knight is stronger on f 5 than d 5. Nimzowitsch said that you should blockade the isolated pawn, which is more or less correct, but Larsen also said you should try to grab them, which cannot be wrong either.
19 Q c 4 w a 6!
Karpov is not afraid of ghosts. Black is planning to play 20...Q b 5, which would lead to exchanges favourable for Black.
20 a 4
Preventing ...Q b 5, but when White is defending, there are no real chances for exerting pressure any more. 20 Q e 5 is met, of course, by 20...Q b 5.
20...Q c 6 21 w f 4
Threatening 22 g 4.
21...Q d 5
The bishop is an even stronger blockader than the knight, since from d 5 it points to all corners of the board. Also the bishop could not be included in an attack on the d 4-pawn, so it might as well be the blockader. 21...Q x d 4?!
22 Q x f 5 Q x e 3 23 Q x e 3 e x f 5 24 Q x f 5 Q x d 1+ 25 Q x d 1 w a 4 26 Q h 6+ Q g 7 27 Q f 5+ gives White the chance of escaping with a perpetual.
22 Q e 5
On 22 g 4?? Black has 22...g 5!.
22...w b 6 (D)
23 Q x f 5
White sees no other option but to give up his bishop for the powerful knight. After this, Black is better as long as he keeps control over d 5, which does not seem to be a problem.
23...exf5 24 \text{\textit{d}}{d}2 \text{\textit{g}}7
Karpov is taking it easy. It is hard to
spot any white counterplay, and he has
some weaknesses that Black can irritate.
25 h4 \text{\textit{f}}{f}8 26 \text{\textit{g}}3 \text{\textit{c}}{c}8
Black has gradually transferred all
his pieces to their best squares, and
now he is ready to take action.
27 \text{\textit{d}}{d}7
27 \text{\textit{d}}{d}3 is more cautious.
27...\text{\textit{c}}{c}6 28 \text{\textit{c}}{c}5
Forcing a weakness, so that he, hope-
fully, can use his advanced a-pawn in a
constructive manner, instead of just
being tied to its defence.
28...b6 29 \text{\textit{d}}{d}3 \text{\textit{d}}{d}7 30 a5
30 \text{\textit{e}}{e}5 \text{\textit{b}}{b}7 31 a5 bxa5! was pos-
sibly better, even though the b2-pawn
is left weaker than the a7-pawn.
30...\text{\textit{e}}{e}4!
With the idea 31...\text{\textit{g}}{g}4.
31 \text{\textit{f}}{f}4
The attempt to complicate the game
by 31 axb6 is easily refuted with
31...\text{\textit{g}}{g}4! 32 x{a}7 \text{\textit{d}}{d}8 33 \text{\textit{h}}{h}3 \text{\textit{x}}{x}b6
34 f3 \text{\textit{x}}{x}d4 35 \text{\textit{x}}{x}d4 \text{\textit{x}}{x}d4+ 36 \text{\textit{f}}{f}2
\text{\textit{x}}{x}f3, when Black makes decisive
material gains.
31...b5 32 \text{\textit{d}}{d}d1
32 \text{\textit{d}}{d}xd5 does not help White, as the
blockade on the light squares cannot
be broken. It only leaves all the white
pieces tied to the defence of the d4-
pawn, with no other prospects. In these
kind of positions there is no chance to
swindle a player like Karpov.
32...\text{\textit{c}}{c}4 33 \text{\textit{a}}{a}c1 (D)
33 h5?!

33...h6!
This stops White achieving any
counter-chances on the kingside with
h4-h5.
34 \text{\textit{c}}{c}3 b4 35 \text{\textit{c}}{c}2 \text{\textit{c}}{c}6 36 \text{\textit{d}}{d}c1
36 d5 \text{\textit{c}}{c}8 37 \text{\textit{d}}{d}c1 b3 would give
Black good winning chances, since b2
is permanently ill.
36...\text{\textit{b}}{b}5 37 \text{\textit{h}}{h}2 \text{\textit{h}}{h}7 38 \text{\textit{e}}{e}c6
\text{\textit{x}}{x}c6 39 \text{\textit{c}}{c}4
39 d5! is given by Karpov as the
only move. Now Black is winning.
39...\text{\textit{f}}{f}8!
Taking the bishop to a square with
more future.
40 \text{\textit{d}}{d}3
40 \text{\textit{c}}{c}2 \text{\textit{d}}{d}6 does not give White
any chance to get out of the pin in a
good way.
40...\text{\textit{e}}{e}6?!
On the last move before the time-
control Black makes a little mistake.
Immediately winning was 40...\text{\textit{d}}{d}5!
41 \text{c}c1 (41 \text{d}e5 \text{xe}5 42 \text{xc}6 \text{xe}3 is also losing for White) 41...\text{d}d6 42 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 43 dxe5 \text{h}h4+ 44 \text{g}g1 \text{g}g4.

41 d5

41 \text{xc}1?! \text{d}d6 42 \text{f}f4 \text{xf}4 43 \text{xf}4 \text{e}4 and Black wins.

41...\text{xd}5

41...\text{d}d6?? would lose to 42 dxe6! \text{xg}3+ 43 \text{gx}3 \text{xc}4 44 \text{xf}7 \text{g}7 (44...\text{g}g4+ also loses) 45 \text{h}h6+! \text{xf}7 46 \text{e}5+.

42 \text{xe}4

The alternatives 42 \text{c}c5 \text{d}d6 and 42 \text{f}f4 \text{d}d6 would not give White any saving chances.

42...\text{xe}4 43 \text{xa}7?

43 \text{c}c5 \text{d}d5 44 \text{xe}4 \text{xe}4 would give a lost ending, but White could have played 43 \text{c}c5 \text{xc}5 44 \text{xc}5 \text{we}7 45 \text{xe}4 \text{f}xe4 46 \text{f}f4 when he still has some drawing chances, although they are dim.

43...\text{d}d6!

43...\text{d}d7? 44 \text{c}c5!.

44 \text{f}f4

44 f4 loses straight away to 44...\text{d}d7! 45 \text{d}d4 \text{xd}3 46 \text{xd}3 \text{xf}4+ 47 g3 \text{e}5.

44...\text{we}5

White is passive and his pawns are weak, so there is in reality no defence any more. Still the breakdown now became complete.

45 \text{h}h3?

45 \text{e}3 \text{xb}2 would give the b-pawn a prosperous future, while the white a-pawn would fall or get stuck.

45...\text{we}7 0-1

Black wins a piece.
The classical endgame variation arises from the following moves:

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4
\( \mathcal{f}6 \) 5 \( \mathcal{c}3 \) \( \mathcal{c}6 \) 6 \( \mathcal{f}3 \) \( \mathcal{g}4 \) 7 \( \text{cxd5} \)
\( \text{xd5} \) 8 \( \mathbf{b}3 \) \( \mathbf{x}f3 \) 9 \( \mathbf{x}f3 \) \( e6 \) 10 \( \mathbf{x}b7 \)
\( \text{xd4} \) 11 \( \mathbf{b}5+ \) \( \mathbf{x}b5 \) 12 \( \mathbf{c}6+ \) \( e7 \)
13 \( \mathbf{x}b5 \) (D)

Even though this is no longer the most popular variation for White, it is very suitable for players whose style doesn’t include going for the throat, who prefer a less tactical game, but who still want to play for advantage.

Players wishing to keep the position as complicated as possible should deviate with 6 \( \mathbf{g}5 \) as White, or 9...\( \mathbf{b}6 \) as Black.

Before I start discussing the different subjects in this ending, I would like to make it clear that if White is well prepared, Black’s winning chances are reduced to a minimum. I believe no novelty can shake the pillars of this line, but on the other hand Black does have “excellent drawing chances”; to quote Kasparov. If Black is well-prepared, he should not especially fear this line. It’s true he’s under the pressure of the disadvantage of the first move all the way into the endgame, but if White does not really know where to put his pieces, or in other ways breaks the unwritten ‘laws’ of chess, he will soon understand the disadvantages of doubled pawns.

I will try to explain what I have discovered about the following subjects:
- The important check
- The simplified endings
- The role of the bishop
- The initiative
- The role of the rooks
- Where to put the king
- The blockade

The important check

If we proceed from the moves given above, White will soon have to make an important decision. After 13...\( \mathbf{d}7 \)
14 \( \mathbf{x}d5+ \) \( \mathbf{x}d5 \) two moves are possible: 15 \( \mathbf{x}d5 \) and 15 \( \mathbf{g}5+ \). I think the bishop check changes the pawn-structure in such a favourable way for White that it should always be played. First of all, Black is forced to put another pawn on a dark square, and thus limit the potential activity of his bishop. Secondly, the weakening of the e6-square shouldn’t be underestimated.
When the check is played, one already senses the invasion with the rooks or king via e6 in one’s fingers.

**The simplified endings**

When one decides to play an opening that leads directly into the endgame, it’s necessary to know which exchanges are preferable, and under which circumstances they should be carried out. The primary aim of this chapter is to discuss these issues.

I will in turn cover the pawn ending, the bishop ending, the rook ending, and the double rook ending.

Since the bishop + rook ending is very similar to the ending as a whole, I will not give it special attention.

**The king and pawn ending**

First I will start with an option missed by one of the heroes of this endgame, Onishchuk.

25 Ec7+! Dd7 26 Ec1+ Dd8 27 Dxd7+ Dxd7 28 Dxc8 Dxc8 29 Dc2 Dc7 30 Dd3 Dc6 31 Dd4 a5 32 b3

White wins by creating a distant passed pawn on the queenside after improving his position as much as possible on the kingside – very classical. Instead, Onishchuk continued 25 Ec1+? Db8 26 Dxc8+ Dxc8 27 h3 Dc4 28 Ec8+ Db7 29 Ec7+ Db6 30 Dxb7 Df4 31 Dg3, but after 31...h5 32 Dc2 h4 33 Dg4 Dxf3 Black was never in danger of losing.

Here is another Onishchuk game:

![Chess Board](image)

**Onishchuk – Gretarsson**  
*Wijk aan Zee 1996*

Here Black played the correct move 22...He7, but had he proceeded with 22...Dc5? he would have lost as follows: 23 Dc3 Dc8 24 Dc1 Db6 25 Dxc7 Dxc7 26 Dxb6! (ensuring the liquidation of all the remaining pieces) 26...Dxc1+ 27 Dxc1 axb6 28 a4! d4 29 b4 Dd5 30 Dd2 Dc4 31 a5 bxa5 32 bxa5 Dc5 33 Dd3 Dxa5 34 Dxd4 Dd4 35 f4! and White wins. Again the distant passed pawn proved the decisive factor.
The bishop ending

In the pure bishop ending, White has lost one of his two advantages, the initiative guaranteed by the rooks and the lead in development. The second, the possibility of creating a passed pawn on the queenside, is left to compensate for the doubled pawns on the kingside. These pros and cons are the reason why this endgame is quite drawish. I have found two examples of different set-ups where Black has completely equalized.

If Black for some reason cannot get his king to c6 quickly enough, there is another strategy that can be employed.

There is no way Black can prevent the birth of a passed pawn on the queenside, so he chooses to exchange a pawn, and wait. If White takes his king to the centre, the black king will attack and conquer the white h-pawn, and thereby create a dangerous passed pawn for himself, and if he keeps his king on the kingside, there is no way he can remove the blockade the black bishop can provide from b8. The game ended as follows:

39 \textcolor{red}{$\text{e}3$} a6 40 b5 axb5 41 axb5 \textcolor{red}{$\text{g}6$} $\frac{1}{2}$-$\frac{1}{2}$

Trying to win this endgame as White is not in general a good idea, and will at best lead to a draw.

The rook ending

It’s difficult to make general comments about rook endings in this variation. If you take the endings where no
pawns have been exchanged, the ending is rather drawish. Normally the pawn-structure changes slightly when exchanges are made, but this doesn’t change the assessment. The most frequent exchange is the one of rooks or bishops on e3 – and sometimes even both. This change is slightly favourable for White, and he might hope for a small advantage, but it’s unlikely to be decisive unless the opponent is much weaker than oneself. Here is one example:

```
W

Adams – Morovic
Leon 1995

White has a slight advantage, because Black lacks active counterplay. The first thing White does is improve the position of his king.

27 a4 d6 28 h4 c5 29 g3 b6 30 b4+ c5 31 a4 b6 32 d4 c6 33 f4 e7 34 b4

White can make no more progress without changing the pawn-structure. He will then exert combined pressure on the kingside and queenside. However, this proves to be insufficient to win, but the attempt should always be made.
```

34...h6 35 e4 dxe4 36 fxe4 e6 37 c4+ b7 38 c5 a6 39 f5 f6 40 b5+ c7 41 a4 g5!

Or else 42 h5! locks the black kingside up. Next would be the invasion of the white king, and victory.

42 hXg5 hxg5+ 43 f5 b6 44 c5+ c6 45 a5 a6 46 b4 b6 47 c5+ c6 48 a5 ½-½

The most interesting rook endings in this opening also come after some pawns have been exchanged. The theme that is most characteristic of these endgames is the strength of White’s queenside majority. Black should always be careful and not underestimate this force. In the first example Black, a strong GM, ignores this (presumably due to time-pressure) and loses.

```
B

A. Sokolov – Spraggett
Saint John Ct (2) 1988

The position should be drawn after 38...a8!, keeping an eye on the pawns. Instead came:

38...c1? 39 a4 c4 40 b6 xf2 41 a5 f3 42 a6 c1 43 b5 d1+ 44 c3 d4+ 45 b2 d2+ 46 b3 d1 47 a7 1-0
```
This might seem to be very far from the opening, but the study of simple positions makes it easier to understand more complex situations, since the same principles are valid. And here the core of the structure in the endgame is shown quite beautifully.

In the next example Black is more careful, and solves what seem to be serious problems by adopting radical measures.

![Chess Diagram]

Wahls – Brunner  
_Biel 1994_

27...\text{Ac}4!  
The two rooks were generating some unpleasant threats against the black king, so one must be exchanged. The pawn on c4 limits the white pawns' ambitions, and this way Black is OK.  
28 \text{H}_1\text{xc}4 \text{d}xc4 29 \text{Cc}7  
The next problem arises. Black cannot hold his pawns, and so he goes for active counterplay by totally ignoring the threats on his pawns.  
29...\text{Ke}8! 30 \text{Axa}7 \text{Ke}2 31 \text{Ab}7+ \text{Ce}6 32 \text{Ab}4 \text{Cc}5 33 \text{Ab}7 \text{Axf}2  
...and Black made the draw comfortably after 48 moves.

By accurate play Black achieved a draw in this game, but normally he should be very careful about which kind of rook endgames he goes into. The following example is a fine illustration of how dangerous the queenside majority can be in a more complex rook ending.

![Chess Diagram]

A. Rotshtein – Neron de Surgy  
_French Cht 1996_

50 a5!  
Starting an attack on the queenside with the pawns. This should have been stopped with 50...a6.  
50...\text{Cc}3?! 51 \text{Axc}3 dxc3+ 52 \text{Cc}3 \text{Axf}3+ 53 \text{Cc}4 \text{Axf}2  
53...a6 would no longer be a simple solution to Black's problems. After 54 \text{Cc}7+ \text{b}8 (not 54...\text{Cc}6 55 \text{Aa}7 with serious winning chances for White, due to a similar manoeuvre as in the game) 55 \text{Cc}5 \text{Axf}3 56 \text{b}6 \text{Cc}3 57 \text{Axa}6 \text{Cc}7 58 \text{Ae}6 Black still has a lot of defending ahead of him.  
54 \text{Cc}7+ \text{a}6 55 \text{Ae}6+ \text{b}7 56 a6+!  
Starting an attack on a7 that is hard to meet.  
56...\text{Cc}7 57 b5 \text{Af}4+ 58 \text{Cc}5 \text{Axf}5+ 59 \text{b}4 \text{Af}4+?
59...\textit{d}7! 60 \textit{b}6!? \textit{f}4+! 61 \textit{b}5 \textit{f}5+ would still have made the draw. 
60 \textit{a}5 \textit{f}3 61 \textit{e}7+ \textit{b}8 62 \textit{e}8+ \textit{c}7 63 \textit{a}8

Winning the a-pawn and the game. The pawns are too far advanced to be stopped.
63...\textit{a}3+ 64 \textit{b}4 \textit{x}h3 65 \textit{x}a7+ \textit{d}6 66 \textit{f}7 \textit{h}1 67 \textit{a}7 \textit{a}1 68 \textit{x}f6+ \textit{c}7 69 \textit{a}6 1-0

In covering the rook endings I have excluded positions with uneven material. Still there is one endgame I would like to show. It is a simple win, which everyone should know. White’s method of achieving victory from the following position is very instructive.

\begin{center}
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\textbf{Antunes – J. Delaney}
\textit{Thessaloniki OL 1984}

36 \textit{h}6 \textit{d}7 37 \textit{a}3 \textit{h}4 38 \textit{b}1 \textit{h}3 39 \textit{a}2 \textit{h}1 40 \textit{b}3 \textit{h}2 41 \textit{a}4 \textit{c}7 42 \textit{b}4 \textit{b}7 43 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}7 44 \textit{h}7+ \textit{b}8 45 \textit{a}5 \textit{a}8 46 \textit{b}6 1-0

The double rook ending

This ending is the most natural, since Black often wants to exchange bishops to take the pressure off a7. But White also has his advantages from the exchange. Penetration by the rooks is far more possible once the bishop no longer protects the most important squares. If White does penetrate, he gets either a combined attack on the king and the 7th rank pawns, or ties down one or both of Black’s rooks to the defence of a weak pawn (often a7).

Judging from practical results, this endgame is rather dangerous for Black – White has a 67% score. This is mostly because Black exchanges into difficult endgames, believing exchanges as a whole enhance his chances to equalize. Sometimes they do, but often not.

The main question one has to put to oneself before deciding whether one should exchange bishops is: is my rook more or less active than my opponent’s, and who has the safer king? Also the speed with which one can attack the opponent’s pawns is important. I will give some practical examples. The first example is a position where White has the initiative on account of his active rooks.

\begin{center}
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\textbf{Ji. Nun – Timmer}
\textit{Dortmund 1988}
In Informator Dreev calls this position, in which Black intends 23...\( \text{A}c4 \), equal, but this is simply not true. The white rooks are far more active and will penetrate along the e-file. Still, Black has some practical drawing chances, if he can get his rooks activated. Maybe the endgame is even a draw, but Black surely has to suffer a lot to get it.

23 \( \text{A}de1 \text{A}c4 \)!

Still the best move though. Black has to activate his rooks whatever the cost.

24 \( b3 \)!!

I don’t like this move. There is no reason to weaken the pawn and the c3-square. Even though these are only potential weaknesses, I would have preferred to start the attack immediately with 24 \( \text{A}e6+ \), instead of this loss of tempo – see the theory section.

24...\( \text{A}b8 \)? (D)

A very unfortunate decision. The rook is not really doing anything on c4, and neither is the rook on b8. Black could have done much better with 24...\( \text{A}h4 \)!!? or 24...\( \text{A}f4 \) 25 \( \text{A}e6+ \text{A}c5 \) 26 \( \text{A}1e3 \) g5 27 \( \text{A}e7 \) h5.

Not good enough, but 26...\( \text{A}h4 \) 27 \( \text{A}c1+ \text{A}d4 \) 28 \( \text{A}d1+ \text{A}c5 \) 29 b4+ \( \text{A}c4 \) 30 \( \text{A}c6+ \text{A}b5 \) 31 \( \text{A}c7 \) shows how easily the black king can be targeted in a combined attack.

27 \( \text{A}a6 \text{A}b5 \) 28 \( \text{A}e7 \text{A}f4 \) 29 \( \text{A}c7+ \text{A}d4 \) 30 a4

Winning the a-pawn, and thus creating the traditional two ‘roadrunners’.

30...\( \text{A}b8 \) 31 \( \text{A}xa5 \text{A}xf3 \) 32 \( \text{A}b5 \text{A}xf2+ \) 33 \( \text{A}a3 \text{A}e8 \) 34 h4 \( \text{A}e4 \) 35 \( \text{A}xg7 \) d4 36 \( \text{A}xh7 \)

White went on to win due to his queenside passed pawns and his beautiful endgame play in general.

In the next example Black sacrifices a pawn to activate his rooks, using the slightly early advance of the b-pawn as a hook, and grabbing onto it he gains counterplay in instructive fashion.

\[ B \]

24...a5! 25 \( \text{A}ed1 \)!

This is preferable to 25 \( \text{A}b2 \) axb4 26 axb4 \( \text{A}a4 \) 27 \( \text{A}b3 \) \( \text{A}ca8 \), when his active rooks guarantee Black sufficient counterplay to draw.

25 \( \text{A}e6+ \) \( \text{A}c5 \) 26 \( \text{A}b2 \) a5

Dolmatov – Christiansen
Lucerne Wcht 1993
25...axb4 26 \textit{A}xd5+ \textit{W}e6 27 axb4
Now Black could have regained his sacrificed pawn by 27...\textit{A}a3 28 \textit{A}5d3 \textit{A}cc3!, after which the draw is only a handshake away.

The next game is one of the highest-level examples of this variation.

Karpov – Kramnik
\textit{Linares 1993}

26 \textit{A}dxel3+?!  
Black’s rooks are ideally placed on the d-file (helping the d-pawn) and on the c-file (preventing the white king from helping stop the d-pawn), so the activity of White’s rooks is not superior in this position. This is why he should have settled for a less ambitious approach with 26 fxe3.

26...\textit{W}f5!
The king can be both safe and active on the f-file.

27 \textit{A}c7 \textit{W}f4 28 \textit{A}1e3 a5 29 h3
29 \textit{A}xh7 \textit{A}h8 30 \textit{A}xh8 \textit{A}xh8 would only favour Black.

29...h5 30 \textit{A}7e6 \textit{W}g5 31 \textit{A}a6 d4
Black is better due to his activity. All Black’s pieces are playing, while the white king is totally passive.

32 f4+!
White has to be careful. Greed would have been punished: 32 \textit{A}xa5+ \textit{W}h4 33 \textit{A}d3 \textit{W}xh3 34 \textit{A}a6 \textit{W}g2 35 \textit{A}xf6 \textit{W}xf2 36 \textit{A}xg6 \textit{W}e2 37 \textit{A}b3 d3 and Black wins.

32...\textit{W}f5 33 \textit{A}xa5+ \textit{W}xf4 34 \textit{A}d3 \textit{W}e4 35 \textit{A}d2 g5
Black is better here, but White can defend.

The last example shows a slightly different situation. Here the black king is unable to create counterplay on the f-file, mainly because his rooks are tied down to the defence of the d-pawn. It is also a final illustration of the three important elements in the double rook endgame: activity, activity and activity.

Namyslo – W. Mack
\textit{Oberliga Württemberg 1993}

27 \textit{A}e3!
Maintaining a tight defence, while the king and the other rook tie down the black forces to the defence of d5.

27...f5 28 \textit{A}c5 \textit{A}bd8 29 a4
The next step. The queenside majority is used to create a passed pawn.
29...g5 30 b5 h5 31 a5 g4 32 Bb3!
The rook now serves both aggressive and defensive purposes.
32...gx$f3 33 Hc3 He7 34 Hxf3+ Hg5 35 b6
Black now gets a few checks, but the white king is totally safe.
35...Hc4+ 36 Hc5 axb6+ 37 axb6
Hc4+ 38 Hb5 He4 39 b7
The rest is easy and needs no comment.
39...d4 40 Hc6 Hxf3 41 Hxf3 d3
42 Hxd3 Hxd3 43 b8w 1-0
That was the end of the simplified endings. Now we turn to the various general elements in the ending.

The role of the bishop

The role of the bishop naturally differs from White to Black. For White there are two important ways of using the bishop. The first one is the natural development square e3, from where it threatens a7 and has the following latent manoeuvre:

A good decision by the young Englishman (an IM at the time). Defending the pawn would tie down his pieces and almost surely lead to defeat. Instead he gives up the d-pawn, and in return gets his rook to White's second rank.

29 Hcxd5+ Hxd5 30 Hxd5+ He5!
31 He1
After 31 Hxe5+ Hxe5 the black king is ready for the dish of the day.
31...He2 32 Hb6 He5 33 Hd3
Onishchuk believes he is better here, and although he might be right, Black was still able to make a draw by at the right time sacrificing a pawn on the kingside to push the h-pawn.

The second role the bishop can play is closely connected to the black d-pawn. Alone or together with the king, it can block the pawn, and at the same time keep an eye on the key squares b4 and a5 on the queenside, helping the advancement of the queenside majority,
and the equal important f4 (g5), a key square for the black counterplay.

In the first example the white king is far from the centre, so the bishop has to do the job itself.

33...a6! 34 c3 axb5 35 axb5 b6!, after which Black is no worse.

34 c3!
Actually the start of an attack on a7 – a new twist to an old theme.

34...c3+ 35 xxc3 xhx2 36 c7 h5

36...e4 37 fxe4+ xxe4 38 xa7 d2+ 39 xd2 xf2+ 40 c3 would not have saved Black. The white pawns are too far advanced.

37 xa7 d2+ 38 d1 xf2 39 b6 xf3?!

But also 39...f1+ 40 xd2 b1 41 a5 wins comfortably for White.

40 f7+ g4 41 xf3 xf3 42 b7 1-0

For Black it is very easy. In the positions with the pawn already on f6, the bishop should go to e5, while with no pawn on f6, this is the most logical square for the bishop (see Onishchuk-Summerscale, where Black's bishop clearly had a lot to do with him making the draw). A lot of the strategic fight has to do with the placement of the black bishop. A single illustration:

Reinderman – Khenkin
Antwerp 1993

25 d2 e8 26 f1

Preventing the invasion of the rooks.

26...e6?!

Probably Black should have insisted on bringing his rooks into White’s position by 26...de7?! 27 a6 e6! 28 xa7 e2. After the text-move he slowly loses ground.

27 ac4 d3 28 c6 f7

Not 28...e2? 29 c3 e6 30 xc6 fx6 31 e1, when White has won time.

29 xc6 fx6 30 e1

The king prepares to take over the job of watching the d-pawn, so the bishop can be used more aggressively.

30...d4 31 a4

The standard advance of the queenside majority.

31...e5 32 b4 d6 33 b5 h6?

This way of creating counterplay is too slow. It would have been better to start eliminating White's pawns by
22...\textcopyright e7?!
Better was 22...\textcopyright f7 to keep a way home open for the bishop.

23 h3!
A standard move, stopping the black bishop gaining a tempo, and thereby making the manoeuvre ...\textcopyright b4-d6-e5 much harder.

23...\textcopyright bb7 24 a3?
A tactical mistake neither of the players understood during the game. Correct was 24 \textcopyright a6! \textcopyright f7 25 a3 \textcopyright f8 26 b4 with a lot of problems for Black.

24...\textcopyright a5??
Missing that after 24...\textcopyright d6! Black is fine, because of 25 \textcopyright x\textcopyright d5 \textcopyright x\textcopyright a3.

25 \textcopyright c5
White wins a pawn, and later he won the game.

The initiative

I could also have called this section 'Activity'. In this line only a few strategic concepts occur. I have tried to illustrate the importance of the pawn-structure in the endgames, the fight for and against a black bishop on e5 and the idea of penetrating via the e- and c-file with the rooks. What I have not shown is how the principles of development are sometimes neglected, and how this can lead to the loss of the initiative.

In the following example we are still in the opening, and the main aim should be to develop the pieces. Instead White decides to begin an immediate attack, which unfortunately ends with his rook stranded on the fourth rank, running around without finding a really useful square.
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P.H. Nielsen – Filippov
Gistrup 1996

20 \textcopyright d4? \textcopyright c5! 21 \textcopyright f4+ \textcopyright e5 22 \textcopyright c1 \textcopyright b6!
Preparing the advance of the d-pawn, which White is by no means ready to meet.

23 \textcopyright h4 d4 24 \textcopyright e4+ \textcopyright f5 25 \textcopyright f4+ \textcopyright g6 26 \textcopyright g4+ \textcopyright f6 27 \textcopyright f4+ \textcopyright e7 28 \textcopyright e4+ \textcopyright d8

A shelter from the storm. Black is better, and now regroups before pushing for the win.

29 \textcopyright d2 \textcopyright d5! 30 a4 \textcopyright d7 31 \textcopyright e1 \textcopyright c5 32 \textcopyright e5 \textcopyright x\textcopyright e5 33 \textcopyright x\textcopyright e5 \textcopyright d6 34 \textcopyright f4 \textcopyright c6 35 \textcopyright f1 f6 36 \textcopyright e4 g5

With the plan 37 \textcopyright d2 \textcopyright b8 and curtails.

37 b4 \textcopyright xb4 38 \textcopyright e3 dxe3 39 \textcopyright xb4 \textcopyright e8 40 f4 g4

...and Black won.

A similar mistake, and also the most common in this opening, is when Black plays ...\textcopyright ac8+ followed by ...\textcopyright c5 (see the theoretical section).

In this line, as in most openings, you have to develop your pieces before attacking. As shown, even GMs sometimes break that rule.
33 b4 $b6 34 a4 d3 35 b5+
White realizes that he has to make a draw in a rook vs rook and bishop endgame, so he starts to eliminate pawns.
35...axb5 36 axb5+ $xb5 37 $g5 d2 38 $h3 h5 39 $h4 $xf2 40 $xh5 $c4 41 $h8 $b6 42 $xd2 $xd2
Black won this endgame, which is known to be a theoretical draw. This game illustrates how Black sometimes can sacrifice pawns to get the initiative.

The role of the rooks

As always, one should keep the rooks on open files, behind passed pawns, on the 7th rank and so on. The normal role of the rooks is valid, but for White there are some extra possibilities due to his lead in development. Actually these manoeuvres are often the only way to keep the initiative in the opening.

First I would like to say something about where to put the rooks as Black. If he’s not put under pressure he should place them on c8 and d8, where they will do the most good. Sometimes he will have to put the one rook on d7 for defensive purposes and hope to get the other rook active via the b- or c-file. Sometimes, as in the game Ji.Nun-Timmer (see page 23), Black’s counterplay lies in the manoeuvre ...$c8-c4-f4 (or h4). When to do what is always difficult, and I can’t provide any smart answer. I’ll just hope the samples in this chapter will help you in making decisions.

When White castles queenside (as he should), there are two active rook manoeuvres to put Black under pressure. Everything starts from the key-move
\( \text{d1-d3!} \). Now both rooks have a future.

As indicated the whole way through this chapter, and in the diagram, the a7- and d5-pawns are White's only sensible objects of attack. The rook-manoeuvres indicated are the most aggressive ways of putting pressure on these two pawns, and the black king, which is often on e6.

After kingside castling the manoeuvre \( \text{c1-c6-a6} \) is still possible, and often strong, as we shall see in the next game sample (D). But there is also another possibility of attack, which we met in an ill-advised form in the game P.H.Nielsen-Filippov (page 28). I speak of the manoeuvre \( \text{d1-d4-f4/a4/g4} \). More about this manoeuvre can be seen in the theory section.

(see following diagram)

21 \( \text{c6!} \) \( \text{hc8} \) 22 \( \text{a6} \)

With a combined attack on the sixth rank and by the other rook on the d-pawn. Black found no defence.

22...\( \text{g5?} \)

This loses tactically. It was necessary to improve the position of the queen's rook with a little tactical trick:

22...\( \text{ab8!} \) 23 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 24 \( \text{xa7?} \) \( \text{xa7} \)

25 \( \text{xe5!} \) with a dead draw.

23 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 24 \( \text{f5+!} \)

Winning the house.

24...\( \text{e7} \) 25 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{f4} \) 26 \( \text{c5+} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 27 \( \text{xc5} \) 1-0

Where to put the king

For White there are two strategies, of which I find one clearly preferable to the other.

The king should go to b1 quickly to make room for the rooks, and then later, when the rooks are as far improved as possible, it should go to d3 or b3, from where it can go anywhere. I really dislike kingside castling, as it puts the king out of play. There is, however, a third option, which is even worse: keeping the king in the centre (see following diagram).

18 \( \text{e2?} \)

The king should not be taken to the centre before development has been completed. Now it becomes an object of attack, and is not able to fulfil any defensive duties on the queenside.
Losev – Zhachev
Moscow 1990

18...\textit{d}6!

This is not possible normally, as White would frustrate Black’s plans by bringing a rook to e1. However, with White’s king on e2, there is nothing for Black to worry about.

19 \textit{He}c1 \textit{Hb}8 20 \textit{Kc}2 a5!

The queenside majority is not a strength in this game, but a weakness to attack.

21 \textit{Gg}1 g6 22 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}5 23 \textit{c}1?

23 \textit{d}4 is better, hoping to draw, although the position is still very difficult.

23...\textit{Hb}4 24 h3 \textit{Hh}4 25 \textit{Hh}1 a4 26 \textit{e}2 \textit{Hb}8 27 \textit{Ad}1 \textit{Hb}6 28 \textit{Ad}3 \textit{Hb}4!

29 \textit{f}1 \textit{xb}2 30 a3 \textit{c}4

...and Black went on to win.

For Black a different strategy has to be employed. The king should be a more active piece, although this sometimes can be dangerous too. For example, when White has played a3 and b4, an active manoeuvre could be ...\textit{e}6-d6-c6-b5-a4, sometimes even giving up the d-pawn on the way. Another square from which the king can be active is f5. Sometimes it’s necessary to be careful and withdraw the king to f7. It all depends on the position.

**The blockade**

The three most important elements in this opening are the queenside majority, the initiative and the blockade. These three elements prove relevant in most games.

When I speak of the blockade, I naturally mean the blockade of Black’s d-pawn. It can be successfully blockaded by the king, the rook and/or sometimes the bishop. Here I shall consider the blockade by rook and king. The case of the bishop is covered in ‘The role of the bishop’ on page 26.

First, though, I want to explain why the d-pawn is often successfully blockaded on d4 (and not too often on d3). First of all, it’s on the bishop’s colour, and thereby limits its potential activity. Also the blockade-square (with the pawn on d4) is a light one, and with the absence of light-squared bishops and knights, it’s very hard to challenge this kind of blockade.

With the pawn on d3 other guidelines are valid, and will be dealt with as and when the position arises.

In the following diagram Black’s position is on the edge of collapse. The blockade of the d-pawn limits his bishop beyond what White normally could dream of. The rook on a6 is a thorn in Black’s side, which prevents him from organizing a defence against the advance of the queenside majority. Also the white bishop on d2 is doing an excellent job in protecting both the queenside and the kingside pawns.
The success of the blockade is always evaluated by two factors: how the blockading piece benefits, and whether the blockader succeeds in winning the pawn. With the rook as a blockader one cannot talk about any benefit to the rook, but on the other hand it exerts a constant attack on the pawn.

32 f4 \( \texttt{b8} \)?

Keeping an eye on \( f4 \), but this is an unfortunate strategy. It would be correct to keep the d-pawn safely protected with \( 32...\texttt{h8}! \) 33 \( \texttt{dh3} \) (33 \( f3 \) \( \texttt{g6} \) offers no problems for Black) 33...\( \texttt{g2} \) 34 \( \texttt{xh7} \) \( \texttt{xh7} \) 35 \( \texttt{xh7} \) \( \texttt{f6} \), when Black should make the draw easily. White should not be tempted by 36 \( \texttt{xa7} \) \( \texttt{xf2} \) 37 \( \texttt{c2} \) \( \texttt{e4} \), when the blockade is gone, and the d-pawn suddenly is a very dangerous attacking weapon.

33 \( \texttt{f3} \)

This is the key move, preventing \( ...\texttt{e4} \) by Black. Meanwhile, the white king covers \( c4 \), and the pawns on \( f4 \) and \( b4 \) limit the black king to \( d5 \), if it wants to protect the pawn itself.

33...\( \texttt{g6} \) 34 \( \texttt{h1} \! \)

White could win a pawn by 34 \( \texttt{xd6? hxd6} \) 35 \( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 36 \( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{xd4} \) 37 \( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{xf4} \) 38 \( \texttt{xa7} \) \( g5 \) but Black would then easily draw. In the worst case he can defend with the king in the corner vs bishop and ‘wrong’ rook’s pawn.

34...\( \texttt{a6} \) 35 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 36 \( \texttt{e8} \) \( \texttt{c7} \) 37 \( \texttt{c4} \)

The rook and king put irksome pressure on the black pawn.

37...\( \texttt{g6} \) 38 a4 \( \texttt{b7} \) 39 \( \texttt{f8} \) \( d5 \)

40 \( \texttt{f6} \) \( b6 \) 41 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( c7 \)?! 42 \( \texttt{f2} \) \( d6 \) 43 \( \texttt{f7} \) \( d7 \) 44 \( \texttt{xh7} \) \( xf4 \) 45 \( \texttt{xd7} \) + \( \texttt{xd7} \) 46 \( \texttt{xd4} \)

White went on to win.
The Theory of the Classical Endgame

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 6 f6 5 c3 c6 6 f3 g4 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 wB3 Axf3 9 gxf3 e6 10 wB7 Axd4 11 Axb5+ Axb5 12 wC6+!

12 wxb5 is inferior, as the black king ends up on a better square after the exchanges. 12...wD7 13 wD7+ wD7 14 wD5 1/2-1/2 Rosito-Ginzburg, Villa Gesell 1997.

12...wE7 13 wB5 wD7

13...f6?! transposes to the main line after 14 wD5+ wD5 15 wD5 exd5 16 wC3. The only difference is that the move-number is reduced by 1 relative to the main line. It seems there are no promising alternatives for White. This way Black can avoid facing the line with kingside castling. But on the other hand, probably Black should be hoping for that.

On the other hand, 13...wC3?! is not really a playable alternative to 13...wD7, though the possibilities are far from exhausted. 14 Bxc3 and now:

a) 14...wD7 15 Bb1! (an improvement at the time) 15...wD8 16 wC3 wB5 17 wB5 wD7 18 wE2 16 19 wD1! (exchanging Black's only active piece leaves him defenceless) 19...wD1 20 wD1 wD7 21 wB8 wC6 22 wA7 g5 23 a4 and White won in the game Fischer-Euwe, Leipzig OL 1960.

b) 14...f6?! seems to lose by force: 15 wA3+ wF7 16 wB7+! (an improvement on 16 wD1 wC8 17 wD7+ wB8, when Black has reasonable counter-chances, Christiansen-Shamkovitch, USA 1981) 16...wG8 17 wD1 wC8 18 wC8 wC8 19 wF8 20 wD7 doesn't leave Black any hope of developing his h8-rook: 20...wXc3 21 wD2 wC8 22 wB1 and after doubling on the seventh rank, White can slowly improve his position, with Black unable to offer a lot of resistance) 20 wD2 wD7 21 wD7 wF7 22 wD1 15 23 wD8+! wF7 24 wXh8+ wXh8 25 wD8+ wF7 26 c4 and the passed pawn decides, Kerker-Fahimi, Hamburg 1997. Very impressive play by White.

c) 14...wD5 (if 13...wC3 is playable at all, this is the key move; compared to 14...wD7 the queen occupies a far superior square) and now:

c1) 15 wB1? wF3 (the difference from the Fischer game, without which Black would have gained little) 16 wG1 wE4+ (seems best; 16...wC3+ 17 wD2 wF3 18 wB4+ wD8 19 wD1+ and White wins; 16...wB4 17 wE3 a6 18 wC5+ wD8 19 wA5+ wC8 20 wD1 with a winning initiative) 17 wE3 a6 18 wB7+ wB7 19 wB7+ wE8 20 wE2 and White has a dangerous initiative for the pawn.

c2) 15 wD5?! (if this were forced, the entire ending should be evaluated as better for Black; compared to the main lines, White has a weak pawn on c3, and no real compensation for this) 15...exd5 16 wE3 wE6 17 wB1 wD6 18 wD2 wB8 19 h3 wXb1 20 wXb1 wB8 21 wXb8 wXb8 22 wD3 a6, Schenker-Szep, Balatonbereny 1996. White has reached a bad ending, with only slim chances of a draw.

14 wC5+

14 wA5 really doesn't make much sense. The only reason for accepting the weakness on f3 is quick development and the initiative. By using a move to avoid exchanges, valuable
time is lost. 14...f6 15 0-0  \( \square \)xc3 16 hxc3? (accepting another weakness in unjustified optimism) 16...\( \Box \)f7 17 \( \Box \)a6? (ignoring the need for development, and providing Black with the ideal square for the bishop; after 17 \( \Box \)e3 White would, at most, be slightly worse) 17...\( \Box \)c5 18 \( \Box \)f4 \( \Box \)hc8 19 \( \Box \)ab1 \( \Box \)b6 20 \( \Box \)g2 \( \Box \)c6 21 \( \Box \)fc1 g5 22 \( \Box \)g3 g4 23 \( \Box \)d3 \( \Box \)xf3+ 24 \( \Box \)xf3 gxf3+ 25 \( \Box \)xf3 e5 with a clearly better endgame for Black, Onischuk-Dreev, Yalta rpd 1995. He has no weaknesses and his bishop is much stronger than its counterpart.

14 \( \Box \)b3?! (also illogical) 14...f6 15 \( \Box \)d2 \( \Box \)xc3 16 \( \Box \)xc3 \( \Box \)f7 17 \( \Box \)d1 \( \Box \)c6 18 0-0 \( \Box \)e7 19 \( \Box \)d3 \( \Box \)hd8 20 \( \Box \)fd1 \( \Box \)xd3 21 \( \Box \)xd3 \( \Box \)d8 22 \( \Box \)d1 \( \Box \)xe3 23 \( \Box \)xd3 h6 24 \( \Box \)e4 \( \Box \)c7 results in a completely level position, Namyslo-Seeger, Giengen 1987. Only stubbornness made White lose this game.

14...\( \Box \)xd5 (D)

14...\( \Box \)xd5? 15 \( \Box \)b4+ \( \Box \)e8 16 \( \Box \)d4 gives White a clear advantage according to Fischer. After 16...f6 17 0-0 \( \Box \)e8 18 \( \Box \)d1 \( \Box \)c5 19 \( \Box \)f4 \( \Box \)c4 (19...\( \Box \)f7 20 \( \Box \)ac1 \( \Box \)xc1 21 \( \Box \)xc1 is no alternative; neither is 19...\( \Box \)d6 20 \( \Box \)b4 \( \Box \)c4 21 \( \Box \)xd5 \( \Box \)xf4 22 \( \Box \)wxd6 \( \Box \)xd6 23 \( \Box \)xd6 \( \Box \)xb4 24 \( \Box \)e1+ \( \Box \)f7 25 \( \Box \)d7+ \( \Box \)g6 26 \( \Box \)c7 with an easily winning endgame) 20 \( \Box \)xc4 dxc4 21 \( \Box \)xc4 22 \( \Box \)xd7 \( \Box \)xd7 22 \( \Box \)c1 \( \Box \)c5 23 \( \Box \)xc4 White has a pawn for nothing, S.Hill-L.Jones, Adelaide jr Wch 1988.

Now White has three options: castling kingside, castling queenside without interposing 15 \( \Box \)g5+, and with 15 \( \Box \)g5+ interposed.

A: 15 \( \Box \)xd5 exd5 16 0-0 34

B: 15 \( \Box \)xd5 exd5 without 16 0-0 35

C: 15 \( \Box \)g5+! 36

A)

15 \( \Box \)xd5 exd5 16 0-0 \( \Box \)e6

The only move that enables Black to solve the problem of developing his kingside pieces.

17 \( \Box \)e1+ \( \Box \)f5 18 \( \Box \)e3

18 \( \Box \)d1!? might give some chances for an advantage, as Black must either return with his king, or play the 'wrong' rook to d8. 18...\( \Box \)d8! (18...\( \Box \)e6 19 \( \Box \)e3 is better for White, since Black can't play the normal rook manoeuvre to d7) 19 \( \Box \)e3 \( \Box \)d7 20 \( \Box \)ac1 (20 \( \Box \)d4? is a classic mistake, attacking before achieving full development; White also soon found himself in a worse position after 20...\( \Box \)c5 21 \( \Box \)f4+ \( \Box \)e5 22 \( \Box \)c1 \( \Box \)b6 23 \( \Box \)h4 d4 24 \( \Box \)c4+ \( \Box \)f5 25 \( \Box \)f4+ \( \Box \)g6 26 \( \Box \)g4+ \( \Box \)f6 27 \( \Box \)f4+ \( \Box \)e7 28 \( \Box \)c4+ \( \Box \)d8 29 \( \Box \)d2 \( \Box \)d5 30 \( \Box \)a4 \( \Box \)d7 in P.H.Nielsen-Filippov, Gistrup 1996; White hasn't achieved the traditional initiative, and the d4-pawn is becoming a strong asset) 20...\( \Box \)e7 21 \( \Box \)c4!? (it's difficult to decide whether it's preferable to keep the rook on d1, where it's keeping an eye on d5, or on c1, from where it could be used more aggressively) and now 21...g5! is the best way to protect the king. White might still enjoy a slight initiative, but
Black should not fear this, since his chances are close to even.

18...\textit{\textbar}e7
18...\textit{\textbar}b4!? is an interesting move, not yet tried in practice.

19 \textit{\textbar}ad1
19 \textit{\textbar}ac1!? \textit{\textbar}hc8?? (19...\textit{\textbar}f6 20 b4 is preferable, with unclear consequences) 20 \textit{\textbar}xc8 \textit{\textbar}xc8 21 \textit{\textbar}xa7 \textit{\textbar}f6 22 \textit{\textbar}d1 \textit{\textbar}d4 23 \textit{\textbar}d2 with an extra pawn in the endgame, Buchweitz-E.Schmid, 2nd Bundesliga 1988.

19...\textit{\textbar}hd8 20 \textit{\textbar}d4 g5! (D)
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Black has no problems.

21 \textit{\textbar}ed1 \textit{\textbar}e6 22 \textit{\textbar}e1 \textit{\textbar}f5 23 \textit{\textbar}ed1 \textit{\textbar}e6 24 \textit{\textbar}e1

Now Black should play 24...\textit{\textbar}f5 with a draw. Instead in A.Ivanov-Seirawan, USA Ch (Durango) 1992, Black took risks with no real chances of winning: 24...\textit{\textbar}c5?! 25 \textit{\textbar}xg5+ \textit{\textbar}f5 26 \textit{\textbar}xd8 \textit{\textbar}xd4 27 \textit{\textbar}d1!!, and went on to lose in the end.

B)

15 \textit{\textbar}xd5 exd5 16 \textit{\textbar}e3
16 \textit{\textbar}f4 \textit{\textbar}d7!? (16...\textit{\textbar}e6 has also been played, but here it makes less sense, since White has not decided upon the placement of his king, and not blocked the e-file with his bishop) 17 0-0-0 \textit{\textbar}c6 18 \textit{\textbar}b1 \textit{\textbar}d6 (this original king manoeuvre equalizes easily) 19 \textit{\textbar}d4 \textit{\textbar}xf4 20 \textit{\textbar}xf4 \textit{f}6 21 \textit{\textbar}g1 \textit{\textbar}hg8 22 \textit{\textbar}b4 \textit{\textbar}ae8 23 \textit{\textbar}c1+ \textit{\textbar}d6 24 \textit{\textbar}a4 \textit{\textbar}e2 25 \textit{\textbar}c2 \textit{\textbar}e1+ 26 \textit{\textbar}c1 \textit{\textbar}e2, Rechlis-Khuzman, Tel-Aviv rpd 1996.

16...\textit{\textbar}e6 (D)
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17 0-0-0
17 \textit{\textbar}e2 \textit{\textbar}d6 18 \textit{\textbar}ac1 \textit{\textbar}hc8 19 \textit{\textbar}e5 gives Black more than enough, Sierro-M.Martinez, Buenos Aires 1995. Black would have liked to interpose ...\textit{\textbar}b4 and a3, but you can't have it all!

17 0-0 \textit{\textbar}e7 (17...\textit{\textbar}b4!? 18 a3 \textit{\textbar}e7) 18 \textit{\textbar}fe1 \textit{\textbar}f5 transposes to Line A.

17 \textit{\textbar}g1 \textit{\textbar}d6 18 \textit{\textbar}xg7 \textit{\textbar}e5 19 \textit{\textbar}g4 \textit{\textbar}xb2 and Black is without worries, I.Rogers-Adams, London NatWest 1988.

17 \textit{\textbar}c1 \textit{\textbar}b4+ 18 \textit{\textbar}e2 \textit{\textbar}hc8 19 \textit{\textbar}d3 a6 19...a5 20 \textit{\textbar}h3 a4 21 \textit{\textbar}d4 \textit{\textbar}g6 22 \textit{\textbar}h1 \textit{\textbar}h5 23 a3 \textit{\textbar}d6 24 \textit{\textbar}c1+ \textit{\textbar}d7 25 \textit{\textbar}c1 \textit{\textbar}f4 26 \textit{\textbar}xc8 \textit{\textbar}xc8 27 \textit{\textbar}c3 \textit{\textbar}c4 28 \textit{\textbar}d1 \textit{\textbar}c6 29 \textit{\textbar}e1 \textit{\textbar}d6 30 \textit{\textbar}d4 \textit{\textbar}d7 31 \textit{\textbar}b1 \textit{\textbar}c8 32 \textit{\textbar}e1 ½-½ Hofmann-Henzner, Hessen 1994) 20 a3 \textit{\textbar}d6 21 \textit{\textbar}he1 \textit{\textbar}f5 22 h3 \textit{\textbar}e5. The white king is misplaced on d3, while
Black has achieved the desired set-up. White should be able to hold a draw, but failed in Rajcsanyi-Ju.Horvath, Budapest won 1991.

17...\( \text{\textit{b4}} \)

17...\( \text{\textit{c8+?!}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{b1}} \) \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{he1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe3?}} \) (19...\( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{f4+}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{e1}} \) \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) gives White an advantage, but Black had to go in for this; note that if White had interposed \( \text{\textit{g5+!}} \), this line would be winning after 21 \( \text{\textit{c6+}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{xe3+}} \) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{a3}} \) \( \text{\textit{c7}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{a5}} \) winning a pawn and the game in Franco-Onat, Lucerne OL 1982.

18 \( \text{\textit{b1!}} \)

18 \( \text{\textit{a3}} \) \( \text{\textit{hc8+!}} \) (the right rook; the other rook is doing fine defending the a-pawn for the time being) 19 \( \text{\textit{b1}} \) \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{he1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe3}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{fxc3}} \) (21 \( \text{\textit{exc3+}} \) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{ed3}} \) \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) is completely equal) 21...\( \text{\textit{c4}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{d2}} \) \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{ed1}} \) \( \text{\textit{b5}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) g5 25 \( \text{\textit{d1d2}} \) f5 26 b3 \( \text{\textit{h4}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{d2}} \) a5 \( \frac{1}{2} \) \( \frac{1}{2} \) Kalinichev-Komarov, Novosibirsk 1989. Probably White shouldn’t be unhappy with a draw in this position. The ending is drawish, but Black would be the one pressing.

18...\( \text{\textit{hd8}} \)

18...\( \text{\textit{hc8}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) \( \text{\textit{c7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{hd1}} \) \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{a3}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) (21...\( \text{\textit{a5}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{b3}} \) gives White a little something) 22 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) f6 with equal chances.

19 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) \( \text{\textit{d7}} \)

Obviously the best. The rook belongs on this square, where it can defend Black’s second rank and help the d-pawn simultaneously.

20 \( \text{\textit{c1}} \)

20 \( \text{\textit{b3?!}} \) (the other rook should be developed first) 20...\( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{c1}} \) \( \text{\textit{f5}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{h3}} \) \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) (exchanging White’s potentially most dangerous piece) 23 \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) f6 and Black was doing fine in Laczo-Ju.Horvath, Hungarian Ch 1991/2.

20...\( \text{\textit{b8}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{c6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{f5}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) \( \text{\textit{bb7}} \) 23 h3 \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) f6 25 \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{a4}} \) a5 27 \( \text{\textit{c2}} \) \( \text{\textit{b5}} \) 28 b3 \( \text{\textit{c7}} \)

Black has solved all his problems, Benko-Schwalfenegg, 2nd Bundesliga 1995/6.

C)

15 \( \text{\textit{g5+!}} \)

I believe White should play this check (at least if he is planning to castle queenside). It forces Black to weaken his second rank defence (the king currently protects f7, while g7 becomes harder to protect), and put a pawn on the bishop’s colour. Also the e6-square is unprotected. Potentially White will penetrate via this square with his rooks or king.

15...\( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{wd5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) \( \text{\textit{e6}} \)

17...\( \text{\textit{f7?!}} \) is inferior. The king has to protect the d-pawn, and also help in the defence of the queenside later. The only advantage is that White cannot gain a tempo on the e-file, but this is hardly a major advantage given that the king normally goes towards the queenside, where it belongs, when driven off the e-file. 18 0-0-0 \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \)! (no good is 19 \( \text{\textit{xa7}} \) \( \text{\textit{a8}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) (20 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa2}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{b1}} \) \( \text{\textit{a5}} \) 20...\( \text{\textit{xa2}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{b1}} \) \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 19...\( \text{\textit{d7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{hd1}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{a3}} \) (this wonderful move stops Black developing his bishop to a useful square) 21...\( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) \( \text{\textit{hd8?}} \) (22...\( \text{\textit{b8}} \) was better) 23 \( \text{\textit{c6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 24 h3 with a big advantage for White, Dolmatov-Lechtynsky, Hradec Kralove 1981.

18 0-0-0 \( \text{\textit{b4}} \) (D)
On 18...a5?! White should proceed with his development with 19 ♗d3!.

18...♗c8+? (this attempt to solve Black’s problems at once meets a tough fate; it is better simply to develop – most likely he should bring his king’s rook into play before thinking of exchanges) 19 ♗b1 ♘c5 20 ♖he1 ♗d6 (20...♗xe3 21 ♖xe3+ ♔d6 22 ♖de1 is very similar to 18...♗b4 19 a3 ♘ac8+; the difference of the a-pawn being on a2 or a3 is not so major) 21 ♖f4+ ♗c6 22 ♖e6+ ♔d7 23 ♖e2 d4 (23...♗c6 24 ♖c2! isn’t any better) 24 ♖e3 ♖he8 25 ♖ed2 and, as often happens when Black neglects his development, the d-pawn is lost, Antunes-J.Delaney, Thessaloniki OL 1984.

19 ♗b1!

Or 19 a3 and now:
a) 19...♘ac8+? (the wrong rook; now the a-pawn becomes exposed for no reason at all) 20 ♗b1 ♘c5 21 ♖he1 ♗xe3 22 ♖xe3+ ♔d6 23 ♖de1 ♖hd8 (23...d4 24 ♖e7 ♖hd8 25 ♖xa7 d3 26 ♖xg7 d2 27 ♖d1 ♖e5 28 ♖e7+ ♖f4 29 ♖e2, with a winning position in Sievers-Krug, Bundesliga 1989/90) 24 ♖e6+ ♔c7, Onischuk-Delemaarre, Wijk aan Zee 1996. Now we have reached the first diagram on page 19. White could now win with 25 ♖e7+!

b) 19...♗a5! is an interesting idea, only tested once, where White went berserk with 20 b4?, forcing the bishop to a better square, and giving Black a hook for his attack to latch onto. Instead 20 ♖d3!, to activate both rooks, would maybe have given him the better chances. To be honest, then I find the position very difficult to evaluate, but my senses tell me that Black is doing better here than in the 19 ♗b1! line.

c) 19...♖hc8+ 20 ♗b1 ♘c5 21 ♖he1 ♗xe3 22 ♖xe3+ ♔d6 23 ♖de1 ♖c4! with equal play according to ECO, but studying the position has convinced me that White is in fact doing a lot better here. 24 ♖e6+ (best) 24...♕c5 25 ♖a6 ♗f4 26 ♖c1+ ♔d4 27 ♖c3 and White retains a certain amount of pressure, A.Rotshtein-Neron de Surgy, French Cht 1996.

19 ♖d3 ♖hd8 20 a3 (20 ♗b1 is preferable, transposing to the main line) 20...♘ac8+ 21 ♗b1 ♘c5 22 ♖he1 ♖d6! (22...♗f7 23 ♖c1 ♗xe3 24 fxe3 ♖xc1+ 25 ♖xc1 is preferable for White, according to Kramnik) with equal play, Karpov-Kramnik, Linares 1993. 23 ♖f4+ ♖c6 24 ♖e6+ ♖b7 25 ♖e3 d4 26 ♖f4 ♖e8 would be one way to confirm that verdict.

19...♖hd8

19...♖hc8 20 ♖d3 ♖c7 21 ♖hd1 ♖d8 22 a3 ♖e7 and now 23 ♗b3! is Onischuk’s suggestion, by which White keeps the initiative.

20 ♖d3 ♖d7

20...a5!? – Onischuk.

21 ♖c1 ♖ad8 22 a3 ♖f8 23 ♖c6+ ♖f5 24 ♖d4! (D)
Stopping the bishop getting active. The price of the weakened pawn is worth paying.

27...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}}b8} 28 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c5 \texttt{\texttt{e}}e6 29 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c2 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d6 30 \texttt{\texttt{b}}b4 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c7 31 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d3 \texttt{\texttt{b}}b6 32 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c1 d4?

Since the blockade is very powerful, and the pawn is eventually lost, this is a decisive mistake. After 32...\texttt{\texttt{f}}f5 Black still has reasonable drawing chances.

33 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d2 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d5 34 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a6 \texttt{\texttt{h}}h5 35 \texttt{\texttt{h}}h1 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d5 36 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a4

The winning plan.

36...\texttt{\texttt{h}}h4 37 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f3

We have reached the starting position in 'The Blockade' section (p. 32), from the game Lerner-Rogozenko, Berlin 1994.

With this move White activates his rook and delays Black's counterplay. White is clearly better here.

24...\texttt{\texttt{b}}b8 25 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a4 \texttt{\texttt{bb}}7 26 \texttt{\texttt{h}}h3

Always a useful prophylactic.

26...\texttt{\texttt{d}}d6 27 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f4!
2 Avoiding the Endgame

Those who do not wish to defend the endgame we examined in the previous chapter often avoid it as follows:

1 e4 c6 2 c4 d5 3 cxd5 cxd5 4 exd5
\(\square f6\) 5 \(\square c3\) \(\square xd5\) 6 \(\square f3\) \(\square c6\) 7 d4
\(\square g4\) 8 \(\square b3\) \(\square xf3\) 9 gxf3 \(\square b6!\)? (D)

However, White should have the better chances in this middlegame due to his bishop-pair. On the other hand Black has many tactics, and because of this usually good counter-chances. There are two distinct structures that arise most often, and they come from two different main lines.

Themes in the 10 \(\square e3\) line

The structure (with a few key pieces added) in the line I recommend for White looks like this (D):

The white pawn-structure is obviously wrecked, but this has its advantages too. The bishop belongs on the a8-h1 diagonal, and the queen is ideally placed on b3. From these squares they combine in attack on the black pawns on b7 and f7. For Black this will always be uncomfortable, because the elimination of this pressure is hard, since he has parted with his light- squared bishop. On the other hand White has some weaknesses on the dark squares, especially f4 and h2, and in some positions also b2, with mating threats.

Here is an example of the strong pressure White can exert on the light squares (see diagram on the next page):

White is planning \(\square c1\), attacking c6 and indirectly b7 and a7. Black does not find a way to meet this, and, moreover, an even better opportunity arises for White.

18...\(\square xd5\) 19 \(\square xd5\) \(\square d7?!\)
Placing to secure counterplay with ...
\(\square f5+\) followed by ...
\(\square b4\) with threats against the white king and the bishop on d5, but there is a serious flaw. Black should play 19...
\(\square d6\),
although he remains with the inferior position after 20 \( \text{wc}4! \).

20 \( \text{ae}4! \)

Taking complete control of the light squares, and preparing an attack against the black king. Black is already far worse.

20...\( \text{qd}8? \)

20...\( \text{g}7 \) was better, though White still has a dangerous initiative after 21 \( \text{f}5 \).

21 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{g}7 \)

21...\( \text{da}5 \) to remove the queen from its ideal square does not work, due to the loss of time. White wins in superb style:

22 \( \text{wc}3 \) \( \text{dc}6 \) 23 \( \text{fxg}6 \) \( \text{hxg}6 \) 24 \( \text{xdg}6! \) \( \text{fxg}6 \) 25 \( \text{xdg}6+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 26 \( \text{wg}7+ \) \( \text{e}8 \) 27 \( \text{wg}8+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 28 \( \text{e}6+ \) \( \text{e}7 \) 29 \( \text{wg}6\# \).

22 \( \text{fxg}6 \) \( \text{hxg}6? \)

Black could still put up a lot of resistance with 22...\( \text{fxg}6 \) but it is easy to make a mistake when you are under pressure.

23 \( \text{h}6+!! \)

A nice blow.

23...\( \text{xh}6 \)

To enter the middle of the board is also painful. White wins after 23...\( \text{f}6 \)

24 \( \text{wf}3+ \) \( \text{e}6 \) (24...\( \text{e}5 \) 25 \( \text{g}7+! \)) 25 \( \text{xe}6! \), when the black king soon will find eternal rest.

24 \( \text{xf}7 \) \( \text{d}1+ \)

When a move like this is forced, it is no surprise that Black is lost.

25 \( \text{xd}1 \) \( \text{xd}1+ \) 26 \( \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 27 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 28 \( \text{wg}8 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 29 \( \text{f}3+ \) 1-0

Mate follows.

In the next example, White’s queenside pressure pays off. It shows clearly how difficult it is to eliminate the pressure generated by the bishop on g2.

Yagupov – Petrov
Briansk 1995

19 \( \text{ac}1 \)

The threats are, among others, to play 20 \( \text{dc}5 \) and 20 \( \text{xa}7 \). Black tries to play on the kingside, which seems like the only way of reaching sufficient counterplay. Black’s position is very difficult, yet it is symptomatic for the line in general.

19...\( \text{wc}8! \)

19...\( \text{xd}5 \) 20 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{wd}7 \) 21 \( \text{wc}4! \) \( \text{da}5 \) 22 \( \text{wb}4 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 23 \( \text{xf}7 \) gives White preferable chances – not due to the extra pawn, but because White has easier
access to the black queenside in an endgame than Black has to the white kingside.

20 \texttt{Hb5} \texttt{Wg4} 21 \texttt{Hxc6 bxc6} 22 \texttt{Hxc6 Wg1+} 23 \texttt{Hc1 Wh2} 24 \texttt{Wa4 Hc8?}

24...\texttt{Ha8!} would make it painful for White to win the a-pawn. An example is 25 \texttt{Ha5?! Hfb8!}, when Black has excellent counterplay.

25 \texttt{Wxa7 Hxc1+} 26 \texttt{Hxc1 h5} 27 \texttt{Wc5 Hg8} 28 \texttt{Wxh5}

White has won a pawn, and Black suffered for 20 further moves before resigning.

Quite often, White’s winning plan in the 10 \texttt{He3} line is to win a pawn on the queenside, and then promote his extra pawn. This may happen via an exchange of the knight on c6. The following example shows a way for White to prevent counterplay on the files that are thereby opened.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\caption{Rachels – L. Jones \textit{Adelaide jr Wch 1988}}
\end{figure}

19 \texttt{He1}

The pressure on c6 is obvious. Even though it does not seem too obvious how White should break through, the pressure is smothering for Black. There is no counterplay, and no easy way to get relief. That is why White is successful, and wins a pawn.

19...\texttt{Wd8}

19...\texttt{Wxh2} 20 f4! with the plan \texttt{Hh1} is hard to meet. 19...\texttt{g6?}, to develop the bishop, might be slightly better though.

20 \texttt{Hb5!}

After this move there is no way for Black to hold on to material equilibrium.

20...\texttt{Ha5}

Of course 20...\texttt{Hb8?} does not work because of 21 \texttt{Hxc6}, while 20...\texttt{Wc7} is met by a simple combination winning a pawn: 21 \texttt{Hxb7! Wxb7} 22 \texttt{Wxb7 Hxb7} 23 \texttt{Hxc6}.

21 \texttt{Wc3 Hc6} 22 \texttt{Hxc6 bxc6} 23 \texttt{Wxc6}

The rook on b5 was not only important in winning the pawn, but now creates a front shield for the white king. Black slowly improves his position, but it is lost.

23...\texttt{He7} 24 \texttt{Wc2 h6} 25 a3

Creating a safe haven for the king, away from the b-file.

25...\texttt{He6} 26 \texttt{Ha2 We7} 27 \texttt{We4}

Of course exchanges would favour White, but this move is also a simple centralization which cannot be bad.

27...\texttt{Wd8} 28 \texttt{Hc2}

Simple prophylaxis.

28...\texttt{Hb8} 29 \texttt{Hxb8 Wxb8} 30 \texttt{Wc6!}

Threatening \texttt{Wc8+}.

30...\texttt{Ed8} 31 \texttt{Hxh6 Whxh2} 32 \texttt{He3 Wb8} 33 \texttt{Wc7}

Exchanging the unimportant pawn on f3 for Black's last defence, the pawn on a7.
33...\textbf{b}5 34 \textbf{a}xa7 \textbf{d}5+ 35 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{x}f3 36 \textbf{e}e3 \textbf{f}5 37 \textbf{c}1 \textbf{g}6 38 \textbf{b}3 \textbf{g}7 39 \textbf{c}7 \textbf{e}5 40 \textbf{c}5 1-0

Black lost in time in this position, in which his drawing chances are slight.

Normally I would like to show some games where Black won due to his counter-chances, but unfortunately, these games do not really exist. Black only wins in these positions when White makes a blunder of some kind.

So the next example is a successful liquidation of the white pressure, resulting in a draw.

Black improves his defence with tempo.

22 \textbf{a}4 \textbf{d}6!

Simple chess. Black is organizing his pieces in a way that makes it easy to take control of the d4-square. After this Black has no problems.

23 \textbf{e}4 \textbf{d}7 24 \textbf{b}3 \textbf{g}7 25 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{d}4 26 \textbf{d}1 \textbf{b}5 27 \textbf{c}5 \textbf{e}6 28 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{f}2-\textbf{f}2

\textbf{Themes in the 10 d5 line}

10 d5 is more popular at top level, even though 10 \textbf{c}3 seems to give White better prospects, and 10 d5 is only enough for equality.

This is the start position in the main line after 10 d5 \textbf{d}4 11 \textbf{d}1 e5 12 dxe6 (D).

This structure gives chances for a totally different game to that investigated above. The f-file is about to be opened, and this is the basis for a direct attack on the f3-pawn. If this is assisted by the knight on d4, the result might be an assault on the white king. These are the main prospects that attract Black to the 9...\textbf{b}6 line. In the diagram Black has two options, which
Avoiding the Endgame

seem to be of almost equal value, 12...fxe6 and 12...\textit{c}5!??. The latter was successful employed by Shirov against Greensfeld (see the theory section).

The following example of what can happen in this variation is mainly chosen to scare White into sticking to 10 \textit{e}3.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\begin{scope}
\clip (0,0) rectangle (8,8);
\draw (0,0) grid (8,8);
\end{scope}
\begin{scope}
\clip (0,0) rectangle (8,8);
\draw (0,0) grid (8,8);
\end{scope}
\draw (0,0) grid (8,8);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

L.B. Hansen – Kuijf
Grästed 1990

22 \textit{b}1?!

A mistake. White should not worry so much about the development of his rook when he had a chance to hang on to his advanced pawn with 22 bxa7! \textit{b}5+ 23 \textit{e}3. This should be a little better for White – see the theory section.

22...\textit{x}h2

The obvious drawback of White’s last move.

23 \textit{f}1 axb6 24 \textit{x}b6?

The decisive mistake. The rook is much needed in the defence of the first rank. Black now takes immediate action. Better is 24 \textit{b}3 \textit{h}6 25 \textit{xb}6 \textit{a}8 26 \textit{xb}7 \textit{xa}2 27 \textit{b}3 \textit{a}5 28 \textit{c}3 \textit{h}5 29 \textit{e}1 \textit{e}5 (29...\textit{af}5!?) would give a lot of chances to play for a win) 30 \textit{x}e5 \textit{1}2-\textit{f}2 Kestler-Hermann, Bundesliga 1982/3.

24...\textit{c}8 25 \textit{b}2 \textit{f}4! 26 \textit{g}1

Forced since 26 \textit{x}b7 loses at once to 26...\textit{c}1+ 27 \textit{e}2 \textit{g}4+.

26...\textit{c}1+ 27 \textit{f}1 \textit{xf}1+ 28 \textit{xf}1 \textit{xe}4 29 \textit{b}3?

A little extra mistake, but White is also suffering after 29 \textit{x}b7 \textit{h}1+ 30 \textit{e}2 \textit{g}2 31 \textit{b}6!, though this at least offers some resistance.

29...\textit{d}4! 30 \textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3+ 31 \textit{xf}3 \textit{xb}6 0-1

I was a spectator on this game. And frankly, it didn’t seem like my countryman had a lot of fun...

The Theory when Black Avoids the Endgame

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \textit{f}6 5 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 6 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}4

6...e6 7 \textit{g}5 leads to a line favouring White – see Chapter 3.

6...\textit{g}6 7 \textit{g}5 \textit{g}7 8 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 9 c5 should give White an edge, and is similar to lines in Chapter 3.

6...\textit{e}6 7 c5 g6 8 \textit{b}5 \textit{g}7 9 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}7 10 \textit{xc}6 bxc6 11 0-0 gives White a slight edge, Anand-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1989.

7 cxd5 \textit{xd}5 8 \textit{b}3

8 \textit{e}2 e6 results in a standard position where Black has achieved smooth development and succeeded in getting his bishop to the active outpost on g4. Black is equal after 9 0-0 \textit{e}7 10 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}6!.

8 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}8 9 0-0 e6 10 h3 \textit{h}5 11 \textit{g}4 \textit{g}6 12 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}6 13 \textit{xd}5 exd5 14 \textit{e}1 0-0 didn’t give White any
advantage at all in the game del Rio-Gomez Esteban, Spanish Chl (Ponferrada) 1997.

8...\(\mathcal{Q}xf3\) 9 \(gf3\) \(\mathcal{Q}b6!?\) (\(D\))

9...\(\mathcal{Q}xc3\)? 10 \(bxc3\) \(\mathcal{W}b6\) 11 \(\mathcal{W}xb6\) axb6 12 \(\mathcal{D}bl\) virtually wins for White, Plaskett-Kaufman, London 1998.

With 9...\(\mathcal{Q}b6\) we have reached a crossroad. My recommendation is 10
\(\mathcal{L}e3\), but also 10 d5 enjoys a lot of popularity.

A: 10 d5 44
B: 10 \(\mathcal{L}e3\) 47

A)

10 d5

This has been played many times, but it is not the best from a practical point of view. Black simply has all the fun!

10...\(\mathcal{D}d4\) 11 \(\mathcal{W}d1\)

11 \(\mathcal{Q}b5+!?\) \(\mathcal{D}d7\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}a4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xf3+!?\)

(12...\(\mathcal{Q}xb5\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}xb5\) g6 has also been played, and is completely safe: 14 0-0 \(\mathcal{L}g7\) 15 \(\mathcal{L}e1\) 0-0 16 \(\mathcal{Q}g5\) \(\mathcal{F}f6\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xf6\) exf6 18 \(\mathcal{A}d1\) \(\mathcal{Q}e5\) left Black very close to equality in Dolmatov-Diachkov, Russian Ch 1996) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) (13 \(\mathcal{W}f1!\) is untested, but probably best; the e2-square is vacant for the queen after 13...\(\mathcal{Q}e5\) 14 \(\mathcal{L}f4\) a6 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) axb5)

13...\(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) 14 \(\mathcal{L}f4!\) \(\mathcal{g}6??\) (14...a6! 15 \(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) axb5 16 \(\mathcal{W}d4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}xe5\) \(\mathcal{W}d7\) gives Black the better game; true, he has problems developing, but an extra pawn and the forever exposed white king are important elements as well) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) a6 16 \(\mathcal{Q}xd7+\) \(\mathcal{W}xd7\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}xd7+\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd7\) 18 \(\mathcal{A}a4!\) 1-0 Carlier-Boersma, Amsterdam 1987.

11...e5 12 dxe6 (\(D\))

Now:

A1: 12...\(\mathcal{F}xe6\) 44
A2: 12...\(\mathcal{Q}c5!?\) 47

Instead 12...\(\mathcal{W}f6??\)! is poor: 13 \(\mathcal{Q}b5+!\)
\(\mathcal{Q}xb5\) 14 \(\mathcal{C}xf7+\) \(\mathcal{Q}xf7\) (14...\(\mathcal{W}xf7\) 15 \(\mathcal{Q}e2+\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 16 \(\mathcal{W}xb5+\) \(\mathcal{Q}d7\) 17 \(\mathcal{W}xb7\)

seems crushing too) 15 \(\mathcal{W}b3+\) \(\mathcal{W}e6+\)
16 \(\mathcal{W}xe6+\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe6\) 17 \(\mathcal{Q}xb5\) \(\mathcal{Q}b4+\) 18 \(\mathcal{Q}e2\) \(\mathcal{Q}d5\) 19 \(\mathcal{Q}c3\) and Black doesn't have sufficient compensation for the pawn, and lost in Bichsel-Preissmann, Swiss Ch 1988.

A1)

12...\(\mathcal{F}xe6\)

The best move, albeit a little dull.

13 \(\mathcal{Q}e3\)

This is an ambitious move. You have to be very up to date with theory, and it
is likely that your opponent will be well prepared. It is safest simply to develop with 13...\( \text{g2} \):

a) 13...\( \text{Wh}4 \) 14 f4 \( \text{Ed}8 \) 15 0-0 \( \text{Ed}7 \)
16 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 17 \( \text{Wb}3 \). White has emerged from the opening with a clear plus, due to the two bishops and the weaknesses on the light squares in the black camp. However, Black can avoid catastrophe if he continues with 17...\( \text{Wh}6 \) instead of 17...\( \text{g4} \) 18 \( \text{h}1 \)
\( \text{d}6 \) 19 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 20 fxe3 \( \text{f}5 \) 21
\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 22 \( \text{g}5 \) 0-0 23 \( \text{ag}1 \) \( \text{wh}6 \) 24
\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 25 \( \text{e}4 \) 1-0 Greenfeld-Kuijff, Munich 1992.

b) 13...\( \text{c}7 \) 14 0-0 0-0 15 f4 \( \text{Wd}7 \)
16 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 17 \( \text{we}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) (17...\( \text{b}4 \) !)
18 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 19 bxc3 \( \text{e}2+2 \) 20 \( \text{h}1 \)
\( \text{xc}3 \) is totally level) 18 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{xb}7 \)
19 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 20 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 21 bxa3
\( \text{xc}3 \) 22 \( \text{e}3 \) with a very small advantage for White, even though ECO
calls it equal, Kindermann-K.Müller, Bundesliga 1990/1.

13...\( \text{f}5 \)

13...\( \text{f}5 \)!? is a perfectly reasonable alternative to the critical piece sacrifice.
14 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 15 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 16
\( \text{x} b 6 \) axb6 17 \( \text{c}4 \) h6 18 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 19
\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{c}5 \) left Black with a better position in Schikor-Poenisch, Germany
1993, but then again, White's play could be improved.

14 b4

14 \( \text{g}2 \) looks slow, and is not to my taste. There is no reason to get to this position, and then play this sluggish move. 14...\( \text{Wh}4 \)! (immediately taking action) 15 0-0 \( \text{d}6 \) 16 h3 \( \text{f}5 \) 17
\( \text{b}5 \)!? (losing time making a silly exchange; more careful is 17 \( \text{b}3 \) 0-0
18 \( \text{xe}6+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 19 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 20 \( \text{g}4 \)
\( \text{f}7 \) 21 f4 \( \text{c}4 \) 22 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 23 \( \text{f}3 \)
\( \text{xf}4 \) 1/2-1/2 Malaniuk-Yudasin, USSR
Ch (Moscow) 1991) 17...\( \text{d}8 \) 18
\( \text{xd}6+ \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 19 \( \text{we}2 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 20 \( \text{fd}1 \)
\( \text{d}5 \) 21 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{hd}8 \), Winants-Adams, Wijk an Zee 1995. Black's knights are
in no way inferior to White's bishops, and his structure and king-position are preferable. Adams went on to win.

14...0-0

After 14...\( \text{xb}4 \)! the king will soon find itself stuck in the centre. The exchange of queens is naturally good for White's health: 15 \( \text{xd}4 \)
\( \text{xd}4 \) 16 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 17 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 18
\( \text{d}2 \) 0-0 19 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{fd}8 \) 20 \( \text{hd}1 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
21 a3 \( \text{a}5 \) (21...\( \text{xa}3 \) 22 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 23
\( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 24 \( \text{xd}3 \) e5 25 \( \text{xa}3 \)
\( \text{xd}4+ \) 26 \( \text{e}2 \) ends up with a clear advantage for White) 22 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{xc}3+ \)
23 \( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 24 \( \text{xc}3 \) gives White a much better position once he untangles himself.

15 bxc5 \( \text{xf}3+ \) 16 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \)

The main line, but 16...\( \text{Wh}4 \)!? was sufficient to make a quick draw in one
game. 17 cxb6 \( \text{ad}8 \) and now:

a) 18 \( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 19 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{wh}5+ \)
with a perpetual, Callergard-Hellborg, Saltsjöbaden Rilton Cup 1987.

b) 18 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}4+ \) 19 \( \text{d}1 \)! is the
critical test. Black would have to play the right moves all the way to make the
draw: 19...\( \text{xf}2 \)! (19...\( \text{xb}3+ \) ? 20 \( \text{c}2 \)
\( \text{xa}1+ \) 21 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{xa}4 \) 22 \( \text{xa}4 \) \( \text{d}1 \)
23 bxa7 and White wins) 20 \( \text{xf}2 \)
\( \text{xf}2 \) 21 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{e}1+ \) 22 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{d}2+ \) 23
\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{e}1+ \) 24 \( \text{d}1 \) (24 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{xc}3 \)
25 a4 \( \text{b}4+ \) 26 \( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 27 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f}2 \) 28
\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 29 \( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{c}4+ \) 30 \( \text{b}1 \) and
Black has to take the perpetual with 30...\( \text{b}4+ \), since after 30...\( \text{xe}2 ? \) 31
\( \text{d}8+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 32 \( \text{c}7+ \) White wins; also 24 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{d}2+ \) ends with perpetual)
24...\textit{W}c4+ 25 \textit{B}h2 \textit{W}xh1 26 bxa7 \textit{W}xf1 27 \textit{W}xd4 \textit{W}b5+ 28 \textit{B}e2 \textit{W}xd4 29 a8\textit{W}+ \textit{B}f7 30 \textit{D}c3 \textit{W}d3+ 31 \textit{B}b3 \textit{W}c4+ with a draw.

17 \textit{C}xb6 (D)

Not 17 \textit{D}c1? \textit{D}ad8 18 \textit{D}e4 \textit{W}b2+ 19 \textit{D}d2 \textit{W}b5+ 20 \textit{D}e3 \textit{D}d5# (0-1) S. Arkell-Wilson, London Lloyds Bank 1987.

17 \textit{G}g2 is also inferior due to 17...\textit{C}c4! with initiative for Black. 17...\textit{W}xc3!?

\begin{center}
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This is an interesting move that is worth investigating.

The more standard approach is 17...\textit{D}ad8 18 \textit{W}c2 (18 \textit{G}g2 \textit{D}xd1 19 \textit{D}axd1 \textit{W}xc3 20 \textit{D}xf3 \textit{W}c4+ 21 \textit{D}d3 \textit{D}xf3 22 \textit{D}xf3 \textit{W}xd3 23 bxa7 \textit{W}f5+½/2 Kuijf-Boersma, Dutch Ch 1987) 18...\textit{D}d4+ 19 \textit{D}xd4 \textit{W}xd4 20 \textit{D}e4 \textit{W}xa1 21 \textit{G}g2 \textit{W}c5 22 bxa7 \textit{W}b5+ 23 \textit{D}e3, when 23...\textit{W}a6 24 \textit{D}c1 \textit{W}xa7+ 25 \textit{G}e2 \textit{W}a6+ 26 \textit{W}c4 \textit{D}c8 results in an ending where Black has excellent drawing chances. Instead 23...\textit{W}b6+? 24 \textit{W}c5 \textit{W}a6 25 \textit{G}f1 \textit{W}xa2 26 \textit{G}c4 \textit{W}b2 27 \textit{D}d1 led to a win for White in Tirard-Bilalić, Medellin U-20 Wch 1996.

18 \textit{G}g2

The attempt to refute Black's opening play with 18 \textit{D}c1!? does not give him a big headache if he plays 18...\textit{W}b2+ 19 \textit{W}c2 (19 \textit{D}c2 \textit{W}b5+ 20 \textit{D}d3 \textit{W}h5 is much better for Black) 19...\textit{D}d4+ 20 \textit{D}xd4 \textit{W}xd4 21 \textit{D}f3 (21 \textit{D}e1 \textit{W}b4+! 22 \textit{D}c2 \textit{W}f4 with repetition of moves) 21...\textit{D}xf3! 22 \textit{D}xf3 \textit{D}f8+ 23 \textit{D}e2 (23 \textit{G}g3? \textit{W}f4+ leads to mate) 23...\textit{D}f2+ 24 \textit{D}e1 \textit{D}xc2 25 \textit{D}xc2 \textit{W}c4+ 26 \textit{D}e2 \textit{W}b4+! (but not 26...\textit{W}xh1?? losing to 27 bxa7 b5 28 \textit{G}g2!) 27 \textit{D}f2 \textit{W}f4+ and Black makes a draw by perpetual check.

18...\textit{D}ad8!

This move gives Black fine play. Instead 18...\textit{W}c4+? is not good. It's essential to get the remaining forces into play. After 19 \textit{W}d3 \textit{W}g4 20 \textit{G}f1 Black did not have sufficient compensation in Zhuravliov-Gutman, USSR 1972. After 20...axb6 21 h3 \textit{W}h5 22 \textit{W}e2 \textit{W}e5 23 \textit{D}d1 (23 \textit{D}xf3 \textit{W}xa1+ 24 \textit{G}g2 \textit{W}xa2 25 \textit{W}xa2 \textit{D}xa2 26 \textit{D}b1 gives White some advantage) 23...\textit{D}h4, rather than 24 \textit{G}g1?, which left the h2-square open for a black queen invasion, 24 \textit{D}xb7 \textit{D}f5 25 \textit{D}g2 seems to refute the black attack.

19 \textit{D}c1!

White must enter the complications.

19...\textit{W}b2+ 20 \textit{W}c2

20 \textit{D}c2?? fails to 20...\textit{W}b5+!

20...\textit{D}d2+! 21 \textit{W}xd2!

21 \textit{D}xd2?! \textit{D}d4+ 22 \textit{D}d1 \textit{D}xc2 23 \textit{D}xc2 \textit{W}xb6 leaves the white pieces worse coordinated.

21...\textit{D}xd2 22 \textit{D}xd2 \textit{W}xb6 23 f4

The lack of safety for the white king compensates for Black's missing material. If this is a slight advantage to White, or just equal is not so easy to evaluate.
A2)

12...\(\text{\&}c5!\) (D)

Since White hasn’t developed at all, and the position is quite open, it’s logical for Black to hurry on with his own development. This is the simple explanation why this is a reasonable pawn sacrifice.

Compared to 17 0-0 the black rook is placed better for both attack and defense. Black has sufficient compensation for the pawn, Greenfeld-Shirov, Budapest 1996.

B)

10 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(e6\) (D)

13 \(e\text{xf7+}\)

13 \(\text{\&}e3\) 0-0 14 \(f4\) \(\text{\&}xe6\) 15 \(\text{\\w}xd8\) \(\text{\\fa}xd8\) 16 \(\text{\&}d1\) \(\text{\\fd}1+\) 17 \(\text{\\w}xd1\) \(\text{\\fa}d8+\) \(1/2-1/2\) Bichsel-Neuenschwander, Swiss Cht 1995 is not a problem for Black.

13 \(\text{\&}b5+\) \(\text{\\w}f8\) 14 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}xe6\) with a slight advantage for Black – Shirov.

13...\(\text{\&xf7}\) 14 \(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\\we}8\) 15 \(\text{\&}d3\)

15 \(\text{\&}e2\) \(\text{\\wh}4\) 16 \(\text{\&}e4\) \(\text{\\we}4\) 17 \(\text{fxe4}\) \(\text{\\we}4\) 18 0-0 \(\text{\&}xe2+\) 19 \(\text{\\we}c2\) \(\text{\\we}g6+\) 20 \(\text{\&}h1\) \(\text{\\we}4+\) with perpetual, as suggested independently by Shirov and Hiarcs.

15...\(\text{\\wh}4\) 16 \(\text{\&}e4\)

16 \(\text{\&}e4\) \(\text{\\ad}d8\) 17 0-0 \(\text{\&}e6\)! followed by \(\text{\&}d6\) gives Black the better chances.

16...\(\text{\\ad}d8\) 17 \(\text{\&}xd4\)

17 0-0 \(\text{\&}d6\) 18 \(\text{\&}xd6+\) \(\text{\\fa}xd6\) 19 \(\text{\&}xd4\) \(\text{\\fa}xd4\) 20 \(\text{\\wb}b3+\) is White’s best try for an advantage.

17...\(\text{\fa}xd4\) 18 0-0 \(\text{\&}d6\) 19 \(\text{\\wb}b3+\) \(\text{\&}f8\) 20 \(\text{\&}xd6\) \(\text{\\fa}xd6\)

Now:

B1: 11 \(\text{\\ge}g1\) 47
B2: 11 0-0-0 48

Instead 11 \(\text{\\ad}d1\) \(\text{\&}b4\) 12 a3 \(\text{\&}a5\) 13 \(\text{\&}d3\) \(\text{\\ec}8\) 14 \(\text{\\ge}g1\) 0-0 15 \(\text{\&}f1\) \(\text{\&}xc3\) 16 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(g6\) 17 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\\fa}e8\) 18 \(\text{\\ge}g5\) was the game Marin-Magem, Berga 1995. Now Black could have obtained the better position with 18...\(\text{\\fc}7\) 19 \(\text{\&}g1\) \(\text{\\ad}d5\), as suggested by Magem.

B1)

11 \(\text{\\ge}g1\)

This move has been the main line over the last few years. White tries to trouble Black’s development, and at the same time activate his rook. If this is better or worse than 11 0-0-0 is hard to say.

11...\(g6\)

Or:
a) 11...b4 12 axg7 d5 13 0-0-0 e8 14 b1 xc3 15 bxc3 a6 16 c1 a5 17 wa3 b5 18 a1 with insufficient compensation, Reeh-Heinemann, Delmenhorst 1987.

b) 11...wd6 12 0-0-0 0-0-0 13 d5! (threatening 14 xa7+) 13...wb4 14 xbx4 xb4 15 xg7 was a pawn up for insufficient compensation in Reeh-Molinari, Dortmund 1987.

c) 11...e7 has been tried, but the critical test 12 xg7 is not OK for Black:

c1) 12...xd4 13 b5+! xbx5 (13...f8 14 h6 with an irresistible attack) 14 xb5+ wd7 15 d1 with initiative.

c2) 12...f6 13 g4 and Black can’t take on d4: 13...xd4 14 0-0-0 e5 15 b5 with a huge initiative.

12 0-0-0 e7 13 d5

13 h6 wc7 14 h3 f6 15 b5 wc7 16 b1 d5 is no worse for Black, Al Modiahki-Nascimento, Moscow OL 1994.

13...exd5 14 xd5 xd5 15 xd5 wc7 16 b1 0-0 17 f4 ad8 18 g2 f6

18...xd5?! is suspect, e.g. 19 xd5 wd7 20 e4 d8 21 f5 g7 22 fxg6 hxg6 23 h6+ xh6 24 xf7 wd1+ 25 xd1 xd1+ 26 c2 d6 27 f4 f6 28 wg8 f5 29 f3+ 1-0 Koch-Hauchard, Narbonne 1997.

19 xc1 xd5 20 xd5

20 xd5?! , to attack both c6 and f7 directly must be better. Now Black can’t reach the same defence as before: 20...d8 21 wc4 d6 22 c5! (22 xa7? directly is a mistake, as after 22...d7 23 xc6 xc6 24 wb3 xf5+ 25 c2 xc2 26 xc2 xf4 27 c8+ g7 28 xb7 xh2 Black is slightly better; his safer king makes it easier to push the h-pawn) 22...d8 23 xa7 and White is a pawn up for seemingly nothing.

20...d8 21 wb5 a6 22 wa4 d6


B2)

11 0-0-0 (D)

11...e7

Or:

a) 11...b4 12 d5 exd5 13 xd5 xc5 14 xc5 wc7 15 b1 0-0 16 f4 fd8 17 g2 ½-½ Grund-Lauber, Hungary 1997. In my opinion the bishop is worse on b4 than e7, and White has good chances to gain an advantage here.

b) 11...wc7 12 b1 e7 and now White should now transpose to the main line with 13 d5 xd5 14 xd5 exd5 15 xd5. Black has the option of a quick ...d8, but it’s not obvious that this should be an improvement. Instead, 13 g1 f6 14 h3 e7 15 b5 d7 16 d5 bxd5 17 g5 a5 18 xf6 gxf6 19 c3 xc3+ 20 xc3 d5 21 b3 0-0-0 didn’t give White

c) 11..\(\text{c8}\) 12 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{c7}\) (12...\(\text{wc7}\)? 13 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{b8}\) 14 \(\text{xa7!}\) 15 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{exd5}\) 15 \(\text{h3!}\) 0-0 16 \(\text{xc8}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 17 \(\text{xd5}\) gives White a winning position he managed to lose in Pogats-Kasa, Hungary 1991.

12 \(\text{d5}\)

12 \(\text{g1}\) (this makes little sense now compared to move 11) 12...0-0 and now:

a) 13 \(\text{d5}\) is an unwise opening of position after the tempo-loss. White is punished after 13...\(\text{xd5}\) 14 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{exd5}\) 15 \(\text{xh5}\) \(\text{c7}\) 16 \(\text{c3}\) (16 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{w xh2}\) 17 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{ad8}\) leaves Black on top as well) 16...\(\text{f6}\) 17 \(\text{wc4}\) \(\text{fd8}\) 18 \(\text{h5}\) \(g6\) 19 \(\text{f4}\) and now, rather than 19...\(\text{d4}\) with a better game for Black, Ehlvest-Oll, Riga 1995, 19...\(\text{ac8}\)! with a winning position was even stronger.

b) 13 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{h8}\) 14 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{d5}\) 15 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{a5}\) 16 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{b4}\) 17 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{xd3}\) 18 \(\text{xd3}\) b5! with a strong attack in Krockenberger-Frick, Württemberg Cht 1994.

c) 13 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{d5}\) 14 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{xd5}\) 15 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{exd5}\) 16 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{ac8}\) 17 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{f5}\) 18 \(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{bxc6}\) 19 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f6}\) 20 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 21 \(\text{de5}\) with total equality, Lagunov-Hermann, 2nd Bundesliga 1994/5.

12...\(\text{xd5}\)

12...\(\text{exd5}\) 13 \(\text{xb6}\) ?! \(\text{xb6}\) 14 \(\text{xb6}\) \(\text{axb6}\) 15 \(\text{xd5}\) 0-0 16 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{c5}\) is totally level.

13 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{exd5}\) 14 \(\text{xd5}\) \(D\)

14 \(\text{xd5}\) 0-0 15 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 16 \(\text{xc8}\) \(\text{ac8}\) 17 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{cd8}\) 18 \(\text{xd8}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 19 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{xd1}\) + 20 \(\text{xd1}\) is a way of obtaining a draw, if that’s what you want. Without any obvious black weaknesses, it’s not right to claim any white advantage just because he has the two bishops, Nordsieck-Kemna, NRW-Liga 1989/90.

\[B\]

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

14...\(\text{c8}\)!? provides the queen with more future squares, but at the same time it limits the options of the rooks, and therefore forces Black to move his queen again soon. After 15 \(\text{b1}\) 0-0 16 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{we6}\), Ahmels-Kordsachia, Bundesliga 1981/2, White should try 17 \(\text{g1}\), 17 \(\text{c4}\) or 17 \(\text{a2}\) !?.

15 \(\text{b1}\) 0-0 16 \(\text{f4}\)!

After 16 \(\text{g2}\) ?! \(\text{b4}\) 17 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{c6}\) ! 18 \(\text{g4}\), 18...\(\text{xd8}\) ½-½ was Kraut-Schlemermeyer, Bundesliga 1990/1, but 18...a5! with equality seems even simpler.

\[B\]
16...\(\mathcal{Db}4\)

16...\(\mathcal{Da}d8\) might be better, when 17 \(\mathcal{A}g2\) \(\mathcal{A}xd5\) 18 \(\mathcal{A}xd5\) \(\mathcal{W}d7?!\) (rather than 18...\(\mathcal{A}d6\) 19 \(\mathcal{W}c4\), which gives White a small plus) is very interesting. When I faced it at the board, and for a long time thereafter, I felt that it wasn’t a very good move. Only when working on this book did I find an improvement for Black, which holds the position: 19 \(\mathcal{A}d1!\) (19 \(\mathcal{a}3\) \(\mathcal{W}f5+\) 20 \(\mathcal{a}2\) \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 21 \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) \(\mathcal{Bxc}6\) 22 \(\mathcal{A}xa7\) \(\mathcal{W}xf4\) is level) 19...\(\mathcal{W}f5+\) 20 \(\mathcal{W}c2\) \(\mathcal{W}xc2+\) 21 \(\mathcal{A}xc2\) and now:

a) 21...\(\mathcal{D}b4+\)? 22 \(\mathcal{b}b3\) \(\mathcal{D}d8!\)? (after 22...\(\mathcal{D}xd5\) White gains material by 23 \(\mathcal{D}xd5\) followed by 24 \(\mathcal{D}d7\)) 23 \(\mathcal{A}f3\)! (23 \(\mathcal{A}xf7+?\) \(\mathcal{W}xf7\) 24 \(\mathcal{D}xd8\) \(\mathcal{A}xd8\) 25 \(\mathcal{A}xb4\) a6 26 \(\mathcal{D}c5\) \(\mathcal{A}c7\) and Black holds the draw) 23...\(\mathcal{D}xd1\) 24 \(\mathcal{A}xd1\) a6 25 \(\mathcal{A}f3\) b5 26 \(\mathcal{A}e4\)! (now the knight is in trouble) 26...a5 27 a4! (this creates a second weakness on a5 – the poor position of the king is the first weakness – and leaves Black in a lost position) 27...\(\mathcal{D}a6!?!\) 28 \(\mathcal{a}xb5\) \(\mathcal{D}c5+\) 29 \(\mathcal{c}4!!\) (29 \(\mathcal{A}xc5\) is, surprisingly, only a draw) 29...\(\mathcal{D}xe4\) 30 \(\mathcal{D}d5\) \(\mathcal{D}d6\) 31 \(\mathcal{A}c5\) \(\mathcal{D}xb5\) 32 \(\mathcal{A}xe7\) and the active king decided matters in Aagaard–Ej-Kher, Copenhagen (1) 1996.

b) 21...\(\mathcal{D}c8!\) 22 \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) \(\mathcal{A}xe6+\) 23 \(\mathcal{B}b3\) \(\mathcal{D}d6\) still gives Black reasonable chances of defending.

17 \(\mathcal{D}d4!\) (D)

17...\(\mathcal{D}c6\)

17...a5! is a serious improvement. Black should not give up the control of the light squares so easily. However, the move seriously weakens the b6-square, so Black is still some way from achieving equality.

18 \(\mathcal{D}d1\) \(\mathcal{D}f6\)

This looks active, but the attack on b2 is unassisted, and therefore not very effective.

19 \(\mathcal{A}g2\) \(\mathcal{A}d8\) 20 \(\mathcal{A}e4\) \(\mathcal{A}xd1+\) 21 \(\mathcal{A}xd1\) \(\mathcal{A}d8?\) 22 \(\mathcal{A}xd8+\) \(\mathcal{A}xd8\) 23 \(\mathcal{W}d3\)

Winning a pawn.

23...h5 24 \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) \(\mathcal{Bxc}6\) 25 \(\mathcal{A}xa7\) \(\mathcal{W}xa7?!\)

Exchanging the bishops doesn’t help Black.

26 \(\mathcal{W}xd8+\) \(\mathcal{D}h7\) 27 \(\mathcal{W}d3+\) g6 28 \(\mathcal{W}e3\)

White has a winning queen ending, which he transformed into a full point in Anand-Karolyi, Frunze 1987.
1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \( \mathcal{Q} \) f6
5 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c3 \( \mathcal{Q} \) c6 6 \( \mathcal{Q} \) g5 (D)

Whereas 6 \( \mathcal{Q} \) f3 strives for an endgame plus, with this line White seeks complications and a sharp middlegame. For this reason it attracts a lot of players. Personally I believe 6 \( \mathcal{Q} \) f3 poses more problems for Black, but such factors as style and personality should be taken into account when one chooses a repertoire. 6 \( \mathcal{Q} \) g5 requires more theoretical knowledge, and also leads to more entertaining positions than the endgame after 6 \( \mathcal{Q} \) f3.

The traditional main line continues with 6...e6, when there are a lot of different possibilities. Often the pawnstructure ends up like this (D):

Often the b-pawns are exchanged, but sometimes not. White is generally better in this structure, since he has more space, and can use the e5-square for his cavalry to point its gun at various places, such f7 and c6. Also the more space makes it easier for him to enter the b-file and somehow to profit from his pressure on the e-file.

Black would normally be happy to break in the centre with ...e6-e5, but this is not always possible, so sometimes he has to attack the white pawnchain at its head with ...b6. Sometimes White answers b4, and sometimes he has to give in and play cxb6. If this happens Black is normally equal, but of course other influences play a part as well.

The difficulties in this structure for Black have led to him trying a lot of other ideas on move 6. The best of these, 6...\( \mathcal{Q} \)e6, is investigated in the next chapter, while the rest can be found in the theoretical section.

In the position in the following diagram, White has achieved almost everything he could hope for.

White has a significant advantage due to his better structure. Also his
29 \textit{\textbf{x}}e6 \textit{\textbf{x}}xd4 30 c6 \textit{\textbf{w}}f7 31 \textit{\textbf{e}}e8+ \textit{\textbf{x}}e8 32 \textit{\textbf{w}}xe8+ \textit{\textbf{w}}f8 33 \textit{\textbf{w}}xf8+1\textsuperscript{-0} \\
White wins after 33...\textit{\textbf{w}}xf8 34 \textit{\textbf{c}}c1!.

This was a very clear-cut example of how White would like things to go. Although he was a strong player, Black was made to look like a patzér. This was what the position did to him.

In the following example Black has kept both his bishops, but as we shall see, the knights are not inferior to the bishop-pair in this kind of position.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Ehlvest – Granda} \\
\textit{\textbf{Erevan OL 1996}}
\end{center}

White is better on account of the pawn-structure and his superior development. But still he has to keep a grip on the position.

15 \textit{\textbf{c}}xc6! \textit{\textbf{c}}xc6 16 b4

This is a standard reaction, which secures the structure under examination.

16...\textit{\textbf{b}}xc5 17 \textit{\textbf{b}}xc5 \textit{\textbf{e}}b8 18 \textit{\textbf{e}}e5 \textit{\textbf{e}}e8 19 \textit{\textbf{f}}4 \textit{\textbf{f}}6 20 \textit{\textbf{d}}d3

Black is in deep trouble here. He cannot find any play for his bishops, so he tries to open up the kingside. In
the meantime White takes over the b-file.
20...\textbf{\textit{f7}} 21 \textbf{\textit{b1}} g5 22 \textbf{\textit{xb8}} \textbf{\textit{xb8}}
23 \textbf{\textit{b1}} \textbf{\textit{c8}} 24 \textbf{\textit{db5}}

The knight comes around and is clearly worth more than either of the black bishops.
24...\textbf{\textit{g6}} 25 \textbf{\textit{d6}} \textbf{\textit{a6}} 26 \textbf{\textit{b4}}
\textbf{\textit{a5}} 27 \textbf{\textit{f5}}!

Breaking up the black structure and closing in the bishops.
27...\textbf{\textit{exf5}} 28 \textbf{\textit{b2}} \textbf{\textit{d8}}?

An understandable mistake, but he was under a lot of pressure, and, with 29 \textbf{\textit{dx5}} coming, in very poor shape.
29 \textbf{\textit{db7}} 1-0

In the following game Black tries another, less efficient, strategy.

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

Shamkovich – Commons
\textit{USA 1978}

In this game Black has chosen a Stonewall structure, and given White free play on the queenside. This strategy was also employed in Botvinnik-Kmoch, which can be found on page 60. In the present game White decides to grab space on the queenside.
14 \textbf{\textit{b4}} a6 15 \textbf{\textit{e1}} \textbf{\textit{f4}} 16 \textbf{\textit{f1}} \textbf{\textit{e8}}

This is a bad bishop, and Black naturally decides to try to get it into play. However, while this plan is very simple, it is also easy to prevent.
17 \textbf{\textit{g3}} \textbf{\textit{h5}} 18 \textbf{\textit{e5}}

White possesses a very large advantage. Black has no counterplay, and White has plenty of ways to improve his position.
18...\textbf{\textit{f6}} 19 \textbf{\textit{g2}} \textbf{\textit{h6}}

This attack is doomed to fail.
20 \textbf{\textit{f3}} \textbf{\textit{g5}} 21 \textbf{\textit{w2}} \textbf{\textit{f7}} 22 \textbf{\textit{g4}}! (D)

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

Winning a piece. The mere threat of advancing on the queenside made Black lose all by himself.
22...\textbf{\textit{wh4}} 23 \textbf{\textit{xf7}} \textbf{\textit{xf7}} 24 \textbf{\textit{gxh5}}
\textbf{\textit{exh5}} 25 \textbf{\textit{h3}}

Over and out.
25...\textbf{\textit{g5}} 26 \textbf{\textit{e2}} h6 27 \textbf{\textit{f4}} 1-0

This looked very easy, but Black chose a very bad plan. Things did not improve either when he tried to start an attack, instead of finding some way to defend.

In the following position Black has managed to exchange knights on c3 in a position where White had to recapture with the pawn, and thereby wreck his own structure.
Black's strategy in this game is interesting. If he gets this kind of position, and then is able to play the manoeuvre we see here, then White is drifting towards an inferior position.

11...\textit{Q}d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}a5

Black has already equalized. If White exchanges bishops, then Black will easily get counterplay on the queenside with the break ...b6, but if not, then the counterplay comes immediately. So White has no good options. He decides to keep the bishops on, which is very understandable.

14 \textit{Q}d3 b6!

Opening files towards c3 and a2, which are weaker than b6 will ever be.

15 cxb6 axb6 16 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{R}fc8 17 \textit{R}e3

White is hoping to start an attack, but too many pieces have been exchanged, so Black easily takes care of the threats.

17...g6 18 \textit{Q}b1 \textit{Q}c6 19 \textit{Q}g4?

This loses. After the continuation 19 \textit{Q}xd7 \textit{W}xd7 20 \textit{W}b3 (20 \textit{R}xb6?! \textit{R}xa2 21 \textit{Q}b5? \textit{W}a7! wins for Black) 20...\textit{R}cb8 21 \textit{R}ee1 the position is more or less equal, although Black's play is easier, and White will need to defend.

19...h5!

Winning a pawn. The safety of the king is not really endangered.

20 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}xe5 21 dxe5 \textit{R}xc3 22 h3 \textit{R}xa2 23 \textit{R}xb6 \textit{W}h4

Black went on to win.

Of course there are also examples with this structure where White is doing well, but they are outnumbered. Still, this is an important game:

This position has a certain resemblance to the previous game. Black is about to play ...b7-b6, after which he would be equal. Kasparov gives 13 \textit{R}c1 b6 14 \textit{R}a6 \textit{R}c8 as equal, probably with the idea of 15 \textit{R}b5 \textit{Q}d7 with repetition. Instead he finds a move he himself was extremely proud of.

13 \textit{R}c1!! \textit{R}e8?

If Black goes for 13...b6 anyway, he will be met with a surprise: 14 c4! opens the centre, when White is much better developed. Moreover, Black cannot then latch onto any weaknesses in
the white camp. White is better after 14...dxc4 15 ᴇxc4 since Black must avoid the clearly inferior endgame after 15...bxc5 16 dxc5 ᴇxc5 17 ᴇb5 ᴇe7 18 ᴇc2 ᴇd4 19 ᴇxc5 ᴇxc5 20 ᴇxc5 ᴇxb5 (20...ISOString? 21 a4 ᴇa3 22 ᴇc3) 21 ᴇxd4 生产总 22 ᴇxf1.

14 ᴇe1 ᴇf6 15 ᴇb1

Here Kasparov thinks White should have played 15 ᴇd3 b6 16 cxb6 axb6 17 ᴇb1, when his possibilities of starting an attack are more important than the weaknesses on the queenside. Note that had Black not played...h6 he could defend everything quite easily with...g6, but now it is more difficult.

15...b6 16 ᴇa6 ᴇc8 17 ᴇb5 ᴇd7 18 ᴇa6 ᴇc8 19 ᴇd3?!

White decides to sacrifice a pawn and go for the attack.

19...bxc5 20 ᴇe5 ᴇd7?

20...ISOString? loses directly to 21 dxe5 ᴇg5 (21...ISOString 22 ᴇh5 gives White a winning attack) 22 ᴇxg5 hxg5 (22...ISOString 23 ᴇb5 ᴇd8 24 ᴇc6 wins material) 23 ᴇh5, when Black has no sufficient defense. One line given by Kasparov is 23...g6 24 ᴇxg6 fxg6 25 ᴇxg6+ ᴇf8 26 ᴇe3 g4 27 ᴇxg4.

Instead Black should have played 20...ISOString 21 dxe5 f5! 22 ᴇe3, after which White has compensation for the sacrificed material, but the consequences are far from clear.

21 ᴇb7 ᴇxe5 22 dxe5 ᴇb8

22...ISOString would lose to 23 ᴇg4! ᴇf8 (23...ISOString 24 ᴇxh6 g6 25 ᴇxg6 ᴇh8 26 ᴇxf7 ᴇg8 27 ᴇh5) 24 ᴇxh6 gxh6 25 ᴇxf7+ ᴇxf7 26 ᴇg6+ with mate to follow.

23 ᴇxb8 ᴇxb8 24 ᴇg4 ᴇf8 25 ᴇe3

It is a pure pleasure to see how, in simple fashion, Kasparov makes his pieces work. Black is incapable of defending g7.

25...ISOString 26 ᴇb2 26 ᴇh4! c4 27 ᴇg3 g5 28 hxg5! cxd3 29 gxd6 ᴇc8 30 ᴇh4 d2 31 h7 d1ISOString+ 32 ᴇh2, when the two queens do not help Black at all.

26 ᴇh4 ᴇa5 27 ᴇg3 ᴇe7 28 ᴇxg7 ᴇd8 29 ᴇxf7

White's attack has broken through. Although the black king has escaped for the moment, it will soon meet its fate.

29...ISOString 30 ᴇb5 ᴇa5 31 ᴇg7?!

Kasparov thinks that he missed an easier win with 31 ᴇxc6! ᴇxc6 32 ᴇxh6 d4 33 h5 c4 34 ᴇg5+ ᴇc8 35 h6 d3 36 h7 d2 37 ᴇxd2 ᴇxd2 38 ᴇxe8+.

31...ISOString 32 ᴇxd7 ᴇxd7 33 ᴇf6! d4?!

This lets White go into an easily winning pawn endgame, but White also wins after the superior 33...c4: 34 ᴇxh6 c3 35 ᴇg5 ᴇc5 36 h5 c2 37 ᴇf4 ᴇc8 38 h6 ᴇf5 39 ᴇf7 ᴇd4 40 ᴇh2! and the white h-pawn is clearly superior to the black c-pawn.

34 ᴇxh6 c4 35 ᴇg5 ᴇc5 36 ᴇxe7+ 1-0

After the mass exchange White brings his king to the queenside, and his three pawns on the kingside decide.

The Theory of 6 ᴇg5

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 ᴇf6 5 ᴇc3 ᴇc6 6 ᴇg5
Here there are a large number of possibilities:

A: 6...dxc4 56
B: 6...wxa5?! 57
C: 6...wb6?! 57
D: 6...a4?! 58
E: 6...e4?! 59
F: 6...e6 59

Note that 6...e6 is discussed in the next chapter.

A)

6...dxc4 7 a4c4! (D)

7 d5 is often played, but the text is the sharpest and probably also the best.

B

7...wxd4

7...e6 8 e3 f3 e7 9 0-0 0-0 10 a1\(\text{e}1\) b6 11 a3 b5 12 w3 leaves White with a traditional isolated queen’s pawn position, where he has good chances to gain an advantage. See the introduction chapter.

7...dxc4?! is very risky because of 8 e3! f3+ 9 w3f3, when White has strong development for his sacrificed pawn, e.g. 9 w7 10 b5+ d7 11 0-0 x5 12 x5 w6 13 a4 a6 14 e3 w8 15 f1 d7 16 w7! axb5 17 x7 w8 18 a5 (the advance of this pawn is decisive) 18 b4 19 a6 w7 20 x7 e5 21 a7 d6 22 a6 1-0 Gipslis-Schulze, Biel 1995.

8 x4d4 e4 9 0-0-0 e5

9...e6!? is an alternative, but White is reckoned to have the better chances after 10 exf6 xf6 11 a5+ e7 12 f3!.

10 f4!

10 e3?! surrenders the initiative:

10...f3 11 xf3 e6! 12 b5+ d7 13 f6 e4 0-0 15 xe5 x5 16 x8+ d8 17 e1 d6 and White has only just enough compensation, Lanka-Preissmann, Geneva 1993.

10...g4

10...c5 11 xe5 g4 12 f3 c6 13 h1 ensures White a big plus, Paronle-Lundquist, corr. 1970. 14 e4 is coming, and it is not apparent what Black should do.

11 f3 x3f3

Gipslis gives the line 11...f3! 12 gxf3 x3f3 13 xe5 xh1 14 xf6 with the evaluation that White has compensation. I have tried to analyse a possible continuation, and have come to the conclusion that White has enough for a draw, but that might be all: 14...h6! 15 e1+ d7 16 d1+ c8 17 d8+! c7 18 b5+ b6 19 fxg7 xg7 20 c3+ a5 21 d6 c6 22 a7 with equal chances, though nothing is clear yet.

12 gxf3 0-0-0!

12...c8?! 13 xe5 xc4 14 xf6 g6 15 h1+ e6 16 b1 c6 17 d5 d6 was S.B.Hansen-P.H.Nielsen, Copenhagen 1996. Now 18 e2! would have been very strong, when Black is verging on lost.

13 xe5 x3f3 14 x8+ d8 15 d1+ c8
Now 16 exf6?! led quickly to a draw in Stein-Speckner, Dortmund 1993. Instead 16 ∮xf6! gxf6 17 exf6 would ensure White a significant advantage due to the attack on f7 and the future possibilities of the white f-pawn.

B) 6...⪿a5?! 7 a3 (D)

White cannot win a pawn due to the drawing sequence 7 ∮xf6 exf6 8 cxd5 ♦b4! 9 dxc6 ∮xc3+ 10 bxc3 ♢xc3+ 11 ♦e2 0-0 12 f3 ♤e8+ 13 ♦f2 ♤e3+ 14 ♦g3 ♤g5+ 15 ♦f2 ♤e3+. This is of course not completely forced, but anyway good enough for equality for Black.

Now:

B1: 7...dxc4 57
B2: 7...♕e4 57

B1)

7...dxc4 8 d5 ♦e5 9 ♤d4 ♤d3+
9...h6!? 10 ♦f4 ♤g6 11 ♤g3 is suggested by Lanka, giving White a big plus.

10 ♦xd3 cxd3 11 ♦f3 ♦f5
11...d2+ 12 ♦xd2 ♤a6 13 ♦c4 b5
14 ♦e5 ♦d7 15 ♦d3 f6 16 ♦e3 ♦f7 17 0-0 is completely awful for Black, Liss-Metz, Budapest 1995.

12 0-0 ♦d8 13 ♦h4 ♦d7 14 ♦f1
White has an overwhelming advantage. Black has no easy way to get his king into safety.

14...⪿b6 15 ♦xd3 ♤c6 16 ♦xf6
gxf6 17 ♦f3 ♤d7 18 ♦e4 ♤g7 19 d6!
Cracking open the black pawn-structure, and thereby deciding the game, Lanka-Fridman, Vilnius 1993.

B2)

7...♕e4 8 ♤d2!
8 b4? has been suggested, claiming to give White a clear advantage after 8...♕xc3 9 ♦c1 ♦a2 10 ♦b2 but all I see is misery: 10...♕xb4 11 axb4 ♤xb4+ 12 ♦xb4 ♦xb4 13 ♦c1 ♦e6!.

8...♕xd2 9 ♤xd2 dxc4 10 ♤xc4 e6
11 ♦f3 ♤e7 12 0-0 0-0 13 b4 ♤h5 14
♕e4 ♦d8 15 ♤f1 b6 16 ♦g3 ♤g4 17 ♤e4 ♤g6 18 ♦ae1
White has complete control over the position, and went on to win in Lanka-Guliev, Cappelle la Grande 1997.

C)

6...⪿b6?! 7 cxd5 ♤xd4!
7...♕xb2? is a classic mistake, leading directly to disaster: 8 ♦c1! ♦b4 9 ♦a4 ♤xa2 10 ♦c4 ♤g4 11 ♦f3 ♤xf3
12 gxf3 1-0 Botvinnik-Spielmann, Moscow 1935.

7...♕xd5?! also leads to a terrible position after the continuation 8 ♤xd5
♕a5+ 9 ♦c3 ♤xg5 10 ♦f3 ♤h5 11 d5
♕e5 12 ♦b5+ ♤d8 13 ♤e2 with an overwhelming advantage for White, Borge-Greger, Denmark 1997.

8 ♦e3
8 ♦f3 ♦f5 9 ♤xf6 exf6 10 ♦b5+
♕d8 11 0-0 ♦d6 12 ♦e2 ♤d7 gives
rise to an interesting game with chances for both players, Heppkeausen-Kurr, NRW-Liga 1991/2.
8...e5 9 dxe6 c5
This is the idea, but perhaps it is too optimistic. According to my analysis White gains the advantage.
10 exf7+ e7 (D)

White should return the material with an advantage by 13 a4! xd1 (13...a5+ 14 d2 is clearly better for White) 14 xb6 axb6 15 xd1 xa2 16 b1 and even though Black still has some activity, White's lasting advantages should give him the better game.
13...ac8 14 h3 f5 15 xf5 xf5 16 xc5+ xc5 17 f4 e6+? (D).
17...xb2 18 ge2 dd4! restores the material balance, and levels the chances. One idea is the trick 19 b1? xb1+! 20 xb1 cc2+ and Black mates.

Now:
C1: 11 c4!? 58
C2: 11 d3! 58

C1)
11 c4!? d8 12 f3 g4 13 xd4 xd4 14 e2+ f8 15 b3 a5 16 0-0 a4 17 c4 xf3 18 gxf3 h4
Now, rather than 19 e4? xe4 20 fxe4 d6 21 e5 d4 22 e6 f4 23 h3 a6! (all the pieces are involved in the attack) 24 g4 g3+ 0-1 Rothgen-Gelenczei, corr. 1967, White should play 19 b5! d6 20 f1 c2+ 21 f1, when White is better, although matters are still rather unclear.

C2)
11 d3!
This is probably the right move. White blocks the d-file.
11...d8 12 c1 g4!? 13 d2?

18 ge2 cc4 19 f3 dd4
Now instead of 20 xb7+? d7 21 b8 xf7 22 0-0?! (22 f1 is a better attempt, even though it is difficult to see White’s future prospects after 22...xe2 23 e1 xc3 24 xec3 d2) 22...xe2+ with a winning position for Black, Schubert-Pasman, Groningen 1977, White can refute the black attack and gain an edge with 20 cc3!.

D)
6...g4?!
This has been known to be bad for a very long time.
7 a2xe2 a5xe2 8 gxe2 dxc4 9 d5
d5 e5 10 0-0 h6 11 a4 f4 g6 12 a4+
d7 13 a4xc4 c8 14 a4b3 e5 15 a6b6
a6xe6 16 a6xb7 c5 17 d4 d4 xd4 18
dxe1

White has a very large advantage,
Tal-Bronstein, USSR Ch (Leningrad)
1971.

E)

6...a4?!?

This breaks a lot of general opening
principles, and White also gets a lot of
free play.

7 a2xe4 dxe4 8 d5 a5 9 d4 h6
10 a3 g4 11 a6e4 a5+ 12 a2 d2
a2b6 13 a2h3 a6xb2 14 a4b1 a6f6 15 c5

White has by far the better position,
Smirnov-Burlak, Moscow 1995.

F)

6...e6 7 a4f3 (D)

. .

7...a5e7

7...dxc4 8 a5xc4 a5e7 9 0-0 0-0 10
a3 a6 11 a2 a6 12 a6b3 a6b7 13 a6d1
gives White a traditional slight advan-
tage, with possibilities of attack against
the king.

8 c5 0-0

Or:

a) 8...h6?! 9 a4f4 a4e4 10 a5b5
d5xc3 11 a4xc3 a5d7 12 0-0 0-0 13
a5c1! a5e8 (13...b6 14 c4! poses Black
serious problems on the c-file) 14 a5e1
a5f6 15 a5d3 (15 a5b1 was Kasparov-
Anand, Amsterdam 1996 – see page
54) 15...b6 16 exb6 axb6 17 a5b1 with
an advantage for White according to
Kasparov.

b) 8...b6?! 9 a5b5 a5d7 10 a5xc6!
gives White a slight advantage after
10...a6xc6 11 b4 bxc5 12 a4e5 a7c7 13
bxc5 0-0 14 0-0.

c) 8...a4e4 9 a5xe7 a5xe7 (9...a5c3
10 a5xd8 a5xd1 11 a5xd1 a5xd8 12
a5b5 a5d7 13 0-0 gives White a slight
but significant edge, Dueball-Pieper
Emden, NRW-Liga 1994/5) 10 a5d3
a5b4! (probably bad for Black is 10...
a5f5 11 a5e3 0-0 12 a5b5 a5b4 13
a5c1 a5d7 14 a5xd7 a5xd7 15 a5e5 a5e7
16 0-0 a5c6 17 a5xc6 a6xc6 18 f4 f4 19
a5e2 a5g5 20 a5f1 Rogers-Kuijf, Wijk
aan Zee 1993) 11 a5b5+ a5c6 12 a5xe4
dxe4 13 a5e5 a5c7 (13...0-0!? Gelf-
fand) 14 0-0 0-0 0-0 (14...a5d7 15 a5xd7
a5xd7 16 a5e2 f5 is suggested to give
equality by Gelfand, but I think White
might be better due to the advantage of
having a bishop against a knight) 15
a5xc6 a6xc6 16 a5e2 a5a5 17 a5 a3 f5 18 f3
and even though matters are unclear,
White should possess an edge, despite
Black’s chances of gaining counter-
play on the b-file, Gelfand-Kuczynski,
Moscow OL 1994.

9 a5b5

9 a5c1!? might actually prove to be
better:

a) 9...b6 10 a5b5 a5d7 11 a5xc6
a5xc6 12 b4 bxc5 13 a5e5 a5c8 14 bxc5
gives White an advantage, Hort-Mestel,
b) 9...\( \text{Qc4} \) 10 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 11 \( \text{Qxe2} \) and now:

b1) 11...\( \text{Qxc3??} \) 12 \( \text{Qxc3} \) e5 13 \( \text{Qxe5!} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 14 \( \text{Qc3} \) gives White the better chances after 14...\( \text{Qg5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 16 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 17 h4! \( \text{Qd7??} \) 18 h5 \( \text{Qa6} \) 19 h6!, Stohl-Ye Rongguang, Novi Sad OL 1990.

b2) 11...\( \text{Qd8?!} \) (overprotecting d5 to liberate the position with ...e6-e5) 12 0-0 e5 13 dxe5 (an improvement over 13 \( \text{Qxe5} \), Liberezon-A.Zaitsev, USSR Ch (Alma-Ata) 1968) and then:

b21) 13...\( \text{Qxe5?} \) gives White a big plus after the queen sacrifice 14 \( \text{Qxd5!} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 15 \( \text{Qc7} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \) 16 \( \text{Qf1xd1} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qxa8} \) even though there is still a lot to play for.

b22) White is slightly better after 13...\( \text{Qxc3} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc3} \) d4 15 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 16 \( \text{Qc1} \) (16 \( \text{Qxd4?!} \) looks too shaky for my taste, but perhaps it is not bad at all) 16...\( \text{Qxf3+} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 18 \( \text{Qd3} \).

9...\( \text{Qc4} \) (D)

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

10 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \)

10...\( \text{Qxe7??} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{Qg5} \) 12 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 13 f3 h6 14 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 15 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 16 f4 \( \text{Qc4} \) 17 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 18 fxe5 \( \text{Qg5} \) 19 \( \text{Qxe4} \) dxe4 20 \( \text{Qe2} \) and White has a winning position, Lanka-Wach, Linz 1997.

11 \( \text{Qc1} \) b6!

The following classic illustrates what happens if Black delays this move: 11...\( \text{Qg6} \) 12 0-0 \( \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) f5 14 b4 (White is already much better: he has queenside activity, and Black has almost nothing) 14...\( \text{Qe8} \) 15 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 16 \( \text{Qa1} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 17 a3 \( \text{Qe7} \) 18 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qh6} \) 19 f3 \( \text{Qf2} \) 20 \( \text{Qe2} \) (White ignores Black’s attempt to complicate the position and consolidates his advantage) 20...\( \text{Qh3+} \) 21 \( \text{Qg2} \) g5 22 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qxb5} \) 23 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 24 \( \text{Qd7} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 25 b5 \( \text{Qh5} \) 26 c6 \( \text{Qh6} \) 27 \( \text{Qh1} \) 1-0 Botvinnik-Kmoch, Leningrad 1934.

12 c6?!

12...\( \text{Qxb6} \) axb6 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) with equality is another option.

12...\( \text{Qd6}! \)

After 12...\( \text{Qd6} \) 13 0-0 \( \text{Qxb5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxb5} \) a6 15 \( \text{Qa4} \) White has good play, and the pawn is not weak at all. Here Black would be well advised to avoid the complications of 15...\( \text{Qxc6??} \) 16 \( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 18 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 19 \( \text{Qxf7} \) \( \text{Qxf7} \) 20 \( \text{Qxc7} \) \( \text{Qxa4} \) 21 \( \text{Qc8} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 22 \( \text{Qxc8+} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 23 \( \text{Qc3} \) with a clear advantage for White, Yurtayev-Ivanchuk, Tashkent 1987.

13 0-0 h6 14 \( \text{Qd3} \)?

14 \( \text{Qc2} \) f5 15 \( \text{Qc2} \) with a slight advantage would be a lot better. Now Black rounds up the c-pawn.

14...a6 15 \( \text{Qa4} \) b5 16 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qg5} \) 17 \( \text{Qe5} \) f6 18 f4 \( \text{Qf7} \) 19 \( \text{Qc2} \) f5 20 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 21 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 22 \( \text{Qfc1} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 23 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qdxc6} \)

With only some compensation for the pawn, Pâhtz-Hertan, Vienna 1996.
6...\textit{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e6}}}!}\?

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \textit{\textbf{f6}} 5 \textit{\textbf{c3}} \textit{\textbf{c6}} 6 \textit{\textbf{g5 e6}} (D)

6...\textit{\textbf{e6}} is not necessarily the strongest move, but I see no reason why it should be inferior to the other possibilities. Moreover, it also promises Black sharper and more interesting play than other lines. That is why I have decided to have this as the main response to 6 \textit{\textbf{g5}}. 6...\textit{\textbf{e6}} is the pet variation of prominent players such as Leko and Dreev, who have both achieved some attractive victories in the line. There is no clear-cut way for White to gain an advantage, but for the time being 7 a3 seems to have greatest popularity. White also has several entertaining ideas, such as the ‘coffee-house’ move 7 \textit{\textbf{gge2}}, which offers possibilities to fight right from the start to players who want to surprise their opponents.

In this chapter, I have decided to let a lot of the sharp variations talk for themselves, so I recommend careful study of the theory section, from which plenty of insights into the middlegame themes can also be gained.

The most common structure after the opening is the following.

White has the better structure, but Black is not necessarily worse. White has the simple plan b2-b4-b5 to put pressure on the queenside, and can potentially create a passed pawn. Black does not have any favourable pawn-pushes, but sometimes he can play \textit{\textbf{...e7-e5}} followed by the advance of the d-pawn. This is often a tactical weapon, and not with promotion in mind. Besides this Black also has the g-file for his rook, and the advantage of the two bishops (which he gets in return for the doubling of his pawns). The dark-squared bishop can prove very useful on h6 or sometimes g7.

Here is an example where Black has already gained a positional advantage:
Black has a superior pawn structure. White will never be able to achieve the h2-b4-b5 advance, and Black has useful pressure against d4. Miles shows with great efficiency how this can be used.

16...\textbf{W}c7! 17 \textbf{A}ad1 \textbf{b}6

White now has no good options. No matter how he continues, he will have problems on the dark squares in the centre.

18 \textbf{b}4

18 \textbf{c}xb6 gives Black a huge positional advantage after 18...\textbf{W}xb6 as the combination 19 \textbf{Q}xd5 exd5 20 \textbf{A}b3 \textbf{W}c7 21 \textbf{A}c1 does not work because of 21...\textbf{R}fe8!! with the idea of ...\textbf{A}c6, or 22 \textbf{A}xc6 \textbf{R}xe2! winning.

18...\textbf{b}xc5 19 \textbf{d}xc5?!  
Even after the preferable 19 \textbf{b}xc5 Black would have a clear edge with 19...\textbf{R}b8.

19...\textbf{a}5!  
Black wins a pawn and thereby the game.

20 \textbf{b}5 \textbf{Q}b4 21 \textbf{Q}g3  
21 c6!? was another try, but still Black would have a good blockade, so

the exchange and the central pawns should decide.

21...\textbf{W}xc5 22 \textbf{W}b3 \textbf{f}4 23 \textbf{H}h3 \textbf{f}fc8 24 \textbf{Q}a4 \textbf{W}c2

Black is on his way to a winning endgame.

25 \textbf{A}d3 \textbf{Q}xd3 26 \textbf{H}hxd3 \textbf{M}ab8 27 \textbf{b}6 \textbf{A}c4!

Black takes control of the position with this real grandmaster move.

28 \textbf{M}f1 \textbf{A}f6 29 \textbf{H}1d2 \textbf{W}xb3 30 \textbf{a}xb3 \textbf{A}c6 31 \textbf{A}f3 \textbf{d}d8

Black succeeded in winning this endgame.

This was a positional win by Black, something that does not happen too often. Normally if Black wins, it is by tactical means. Good examples of this are Miles-Yusupov and Mainka-Miles from the theory section (Lines D3 and D4 respectively). Another is the following:

White has played a very interesting idea, and Black has not reacted in the best way. Black is now forced to initiate some complications with a piece
sacrifice, which, despite its favourable outcome in practice, is unlikely to stand up to close analytical scrutiny.

10...dxc4!? 11 d5 e5

Black cannot avoid losing material. He would have to give up the exchange after 11...c7 12 wa4! e5+ 13 dg2.

12 dxe6 xe6 13 we2

Black has two pawns for the piece and a significant lead in development. White's task is certainly difficult over the board.

13...h6 14 we4?

Wasting time with a regrouping that does not work at all. White has good chances of a successful defence and a full point after 14 ed1! xxd1+ 15 xdx1 ed8 16 ge3! with the idea of blocking the bishop's diagonal. Following 16...ed3+ 17 f1 it seems that Black cannot do White any great harm.

14...ed7 15 xe2

After 15 ge2 f5 16 wh4 xf3 17 gxf3 ed2 Black has excellent play for his material, but White is not without chances. One line is 18 b1 (18 0-0? does not work, because of 18...xe2! 19 xex2 xe2 20 wh6?? eg8+) 18...hd8 19 b3 cxb3 20 wa4, when Black's game is preferable, but gunsmoke still irritates the eye.

15...f5 16 wh4 ed2 17 xf3?

17 ed1! was the answer again. White is then hoping for the line 17...ed3+? (17...hd8! 18 edx2 edx2 keeps the pressure, but still White got rid of one of the rooks) 18 f1 xb2 19 edx2 edx2 20 wd4!, when White has good counterplay. A very plausible line is 20...ed8 21 wc5+!, when Black has no good moves, and is forced to play 21...wc6 22 xf5+ ef6 23 wc2, which is attractive for White.

17...xf3+ 18 xf3 xb2

White's pieces now lack coherence, and he decides to give up the knight to get the king into safety.

19 0-0 g7 20 xc4 wg6+ 21 wh1 xc3 22 ac1 w66 23 xf6 xf6 24 xf7+ b8

Black has a winning ending, which he concluded with great efficiency.

This was a very typical sort of game for this variation. White goes for the attack right from the start, and Black replies with various tactical ideas, and the outcome is almost always very difficult to anticipate. It depends on who is the better player on the day.

White's strongest plans are to prevent Black from getting counterplay, and not open up the position for his two bishops. A very good example of how this can be done is the following.

This position occurs from Line I in the theoretical section. White is better. His central control is not about to be broken, and he has good attacking chances against Black's rather fragile
queenside. That is why Black decides to create some confusion in the white camp.

14...\(\text{\textit{h6}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) bxc6 16 \(\text{\textit{e1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e3}}\)!

Fighting for control of d4, a fight Black is doomed to lose.

17 \(\text{\textit{wa4}}\) \(\text{\textit{d7}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{g3}}\)!

Eliminating the light-squared bishop would please White greatly, and it is also nice to get rid of the bishop on e3. Black now goes in for complications but they turn out to favour White.

18...exd4 19 \(\text{\textit{ce2}}\) \(\text{\textit{d3}}\) 20 \(\text{\textit{xd4}}\) \(\text{\textit{b5}}\) 21 \(\text{\textit{d1}}\) \(\text{\textit{e5}}\) 22 \(\text{\textit{g5}}\)

Winning the queen, and thereby the game.

22...\(\text{\textit{xd4}}\) 23 \(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) \(\text{\textit{xe5}}\) 24 \(\text{\textit{wd2}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\) 25 a4 \(\text{\textit{c4}}\) 26 \(\text{\textit{c1}}\) \(\text{\textit{b3}}\) 27 \(\text{\textit{we3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xa4}}\) 28 f4

Crowning the masterpiece with the win of a piece.

28...d4 29 \(\text{\textit{we4}}\) d3 30 \(\text{\textit{xa4}}\) d2 31 \(\text{\textit{xd1}}\) \(\text{\textit{xb2}}\) 32 \(\text{\textit{xc6+}}\) \(\text{\textit{b8}}\) 33 h3 \(\text{\textit{e1+}}\) 34 \(\text{\textit{h2}}\) \(\text{\textit{c7}}\) 35 \(\text{\textit{wb5+}}\) 1-0

When White takes on f6 Black has a choice that is worth thinking about in advance. In the following game Black decides to go into another structure than the one previously discussed in this chapter, by recapturing with the e-pawn (see next diagram).

9 \(\text{\textit{xf6}}\)

White is more or less forced to take. If he, for instance, plays 9 c5 he will find himself in deep trouble at once after 9...\(\text{\textit{ce4}}\)! 10 \(\text{\textit{xe4}}\) dxe4.

9...\(\text{\textit{xf6}}\)!

This recapture helps with the natural development of the bishop, but gives White a far superior structure.

10 c5!

\[ \text{Lanka – Bauer} \]
\[ \text{Cappelle la Grande 1994} \]

The queenside expansion is ready to begin.

10...g6 11 \(\text{\textit{b5}}\)!

This bishop manoeuvre illustrates fine understanding of the position. The bishop could not go to d3, because of the d-pawn’s fragility, and it does not wish to take the e2-square from the knight, so it puts itself in the way for the pawn, but only temporarily.

11...\(\text{\textit{h6}}\)

The bishop has no other good squares.

12 \(\text{\textit{xe2}}\) 0-0 13 0-0 \(\text{\textit{f5}}\)!

This kills the bishop on e6, after which White is much better. Better is 13...\(\text{\textit{fe8}}\) and ...\(\text{\textit{g4}}\) to create some counterplay, although White is still better.

14 \(\text{\textit{xa4}}\) \(\text{\textit{we7}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{f4}}\)!

White closes the position, and thereby dooms the bishops to passivity.

15...\(\text{\textit{g7}}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{wd2}}\) \(\text{\textit{c8}}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{ad1}}\) \(\text{\textit{fe8}}\) 18 \(\text{\textit{h1}}\) \(\text{\textit{we3}}\) 19 \(\text{\textit{wa2}}\)

White does not want to exchange queens since this would lessen the impact of his space advantage. Every
exchange makes it easier for Black to find useful squares for his pieces. Instead White starts to exert pressure on d5, which is not so easy to protect.

19...\texttt{Ae7} 20 \texttt{Af3} \texttt{We6} 21 h3 h6 22 \texttt{Ab3} \texttt{Ah8} 23 \texttt{Fd3}

Making way for the knight to improve its position.

23...\texttt{Ed7} 24 \texttt{Gg1} g5

Black is getting pretty desperate. What to do about the knight’s forthcoming invasion? His answer fails to solve his problems, and only creates new ones.

25 \texttt{Df3} gxf4 26 \texttt{De2} \texttt{We4} 27 \texttt{Wd2} \texttt{Dc7} 28 \texttt{Dxf4} \texttt{Dg6} 29 \texttt{Dxg6}+ \texttt{fxg6} 30 \texttt{Hc3}

Winning the queen, and, of course, the game.

30...\texttt{Dh7} 31 \texttt{Hee1} g5 32 \texttt{Hxe4} dxe4 33 \texttt{Dxg5}+ \texttt{hxg5} 34 \texttt{Wxg5} 1-0

Naturally there are also good games with this approach by Black. I will not go further into this, since my goal with this example was to show how White should play the position. However, it is worth noting that Kasparov refrained from giving Black this structure in his game with Dreev (Line I in the theory section), but then his pawn was on f3, and the bishop had a chance to enter the position on the dark squares.

Quite often Black has the chance to grab a pawn in the opening. Sometimes he can hold on to it, but sometimes White’s initiative is more important than the pawn. The next diagram features an example of the latter case:

12 \texttt{Cc1}

White tries to regain his pawn at once. This gives Black the chance to win an exchange, but matters are not so simple. Black is behind in development, and his king could easily be caught in the centre.

12...\texttt{Ah6} 13 \texttt{Dxd5}? \texttt{Dxc1}?

Greedy. Black could have kept the balance with 13...\texttt{Dxd5}! 14 \texttt{Dxc4} \texttt{Dxc1} 15 \texttt{Dxd5} \texttt{Wxd5} 16 \texttt{Wxc1} \texttt{Dg8} 17 \texttt{Df4} \texttt{Dg6}, when White has to fight for squares and equality with 18 \texttt{Dc4}.

14 \texttt{Dxf6}+!

This little interposition makes all the difference.

14...\texttt{Dxf6} 15 \texttt{Dxc4}+ \texttt{Df8}

Maybe Black would have had better chances of a successful defence after 15...\texttt{Dd7}!? 16 \texttt{Wxc1} \texttt{Dhe8} 17 \texttt{Dxe8} \texttt{Dxe8} 18 \texttt{Dxe3}+ \texttt{Dc7} 19 \texttt{Db3}, but White has an awful lot of play for the exchange.

16 \texttt{Wxc1} \texttt{Dg7} 17 \texttt{Dd5}!

This forces Black to return his extra exchange, after which he is definitely worse due to his wrecked pawn-structure, and the lack of safety for his king.

17...\texttt{Dxd5}

17...\texttt{Dc4} loses to 18 \texttt{Dd4} \texttt{Dhe8} (18...\texttt{h6} 19 \texttt{Df5}+ \texttt{Df8} puts up more
resistance, but Black is in deep trouble) 19 Qf5+ Wh8 20 Hxe8+ Hxe8 21 Wh6 Hc1+ 22 Ag1 with mate to follow.

18 Ag4 Ad5 19 Wh4 Ad8 20 b3 Ad4 21 Agx4 Wxd4 22 Wg3+ Wh8 23 h3

White has no need to rush to exploit his advantage. The black king will never become safe, and his pawns will never look healthy.

23...Ad7 24 Ae3 Wd1+ 25 Wh2 Wd6 26 f4

No more exchanges, of course.

26...Wd2 27 Ac3 Ad4 28 Ac8+ Ad8 29 Ac7 Ad7 30 Ac3

White did not succeed directly, but before he could try a more sophisticated form of attack Black decides to lose the game. Presumably these decisions were influenced by time-trouble.

30...Ad4 31 f5 Wf4? 32 Ac8+

White is winning.

The Theory of 6...Be6

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 Qf6 5 Ac3 Ac6 6 Ag5 Ae6

Here it can be hard for White to decide which variation to adopt. Some of the lines mentioned below are not intimidating, while others are quite interesting. I believe 7 a3 is the strongest idea, but 7 Ag2 is also attractive.

A: 7 c5 66
B: 7 Ae2 66
C: 7 Wd2 67
D: 7 Af6 67
E: 7 g3 69
F: 7 Ag3 69
G: 7 Ag2 70
H: 7 Ac1 70
I: 7 a3 70

B)

7 Ae2 (D)

This is one of the more logical continuations. White continues his development, and may sometimes play Af3 to attack d5.

7...Wa5 8 Ag3 dxc4

8...Ag4!? seems adequate as well.

Black will come under some pressure, but may succeed in keeping the pawn, for example 9 0-0 Ag3 10 bxc3 dxc4 11 Af4 Ad5 12 Ab1 e6 13 Ac2 Ae3 14 Be2 Ac7 15 Ac5 0-0 16 Ag5 Ag6 17 h4 f5 with a preferable position,
Glavina-Izeta, Spanish Cht 1995. Still, I feel that White should be able to improve on this game, so following it should be regarded as a gamble, but perhaps a profitable one.

9 0-0 \textit{exd8}

On 9...0-0-0 Rogers claims that White can gain an advantage with 10 \textit{wc1}!

10 \textit{wc1 h6 11 \textit{xd2}}

11 \textit{e3} would restrict the mobility of White's bishop severely, and Black could gain a significant advantage with 11...g5! intending to finish his development without worrying about the defence of h6.

11...\textit{xd4! 12 \textit{xd4 exd4 13 b4!}}

The only way to prove compensation.

13...\textit{wd8}

13...\textit{f5} is less effective. White would have a clear plus after 14 \textit{e3 \textit{h4 15 wa3}} -- Rogers.

14 \textit{e3 \textit{d7}}

Here White could have retained the tension with 15 \textit{xa7 g5 16 \textit{b5} but instead in Rogers-Dreev, Biel IZ 1993, he played 15...\textit{xd1?!, after which 15...a6 gave Black the better game.}

C)

7 \textit{wd2}

This is also quite a natural move, but like 7 \textit{e2} it is not very dangerous for Black. After the simple 7...g6 8 \textit{xf6 exf6 9 c5 h5 10 \textit{b5 \textit{h6 11 f4 0-0 12 \textit{xc6 bxc6 13 \textit{ge2 b8}}}} White did not think he had any reasons to play on, and a draw was agreed in Sveshnikov-Oll, Podolsk 1993.

D)

7 \textit{xf6}

This is actually rather a dubious move. Black gains good counterplay in the g-file, and his grip on the centre is not really loosened. Nevertheless, this has been one of the more frequently played moves.

7...\textit{gxf6! (D)}

This is really the only good move. White gains a slight edge after 7...\textit{xf6 8 c5}.

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

Now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 \textit{d3}</td>
<td>8 \textit{h5}</td>
<td>8 \textit{d2}</td>
<td>8 \textit{c5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D1)

8 \textit{d3 \textit{d7 9 c5 \textit{g4! 10 \textit{e2 \textit{xf3! 11 \textit{xf3 e6}}}}}}

Black is better due to the weakness of the white d4-pawn.

12 0-0 \textit{g7 13 \textit{e2 a6! 14 \textit{a4 0-0 15 \textit{d1 f5 16 \textit{d3 \textit{c7! 17 \textit{d1 b6}}}}}}}

Black has a clear advantage, Sax-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1989 -- see p. 62.

D2)

8 \textit{h5}

Black can now obtain good play with 8...\textit{b6!}, a move based on the
idea \(9 \, 0-0-0 \, \text{Qxd4} \, 10 \, \text{Qxd5} \, \text{Qxd5} \, 11 \, \text{Wxd5} \, \text{Qh6+}.

Instead \(8... \text{Wxa5?} \) was the first step towards disaster in Howell-Marusenko, Hastings 1991: \(9 \, \text{cxd5} \, 0-0-0 \, 10 \, 0-0-0 \, \text{Qb4} \, 11 \, \text{Qc4} \, \text{Qxd5} \, 12 \, \text{Qge2} \, \text{Ag8} \, 13 \, \text{Qxd5} \, \text{Qxd5} \, 14 \, \text{Qf4} \, e6 \, 15 \, \text{Qcxd5} \, \text{Qd6} \, 16 \, \text{Qc7+} \, 1-0.

\(D3\)

\(8 \, \text{Wd2} \, \text{Wxa5} \, 9 \, \text{c5} \)

\(9 \, \text{Qxd5} \) is met by \(9... \text{Wxd2+} \, 10 \, \text{Qxd2} \, 0-0-0.

\(9...0-0-0 \, 10 \, \text{Qb5} \)

Yusupov recommends \(10 \, \text{Qge2} \) followed by \(g3 \) and \( \text{Qg2} \).

\(10... \text{Ag8} \)

Black naturally exploits the open file.

\(11 \, \text{f4} \, \text{Qh6} \, 12 \, \text{Wf2} \, \text{Bb4} \, (D)\)

\(14... \text{Qc2+} \, 15 \, \text{Qd2} \, \text{Qe4} \)

White is dead lost.

\(16 \, \text{Qge2} \, \text{Axg2} \, 17 \, \text{Wh4} \, \text{Qxd4} \, 18 \, \text{Wh3+} \, f5 \, 19 \, \text{Qd3} \, \text{Qxe2} \, 20 \, \text{Qxe2} \, \text{Qxf4+} \, 21 \, \text{Qe1} \, d4 \, 22 \, \text{Qf3} \, \text{dxc3} \, 23 \, \text{Qxd8+} \, \text{Qxd8} \, 24 \, \text{Wxg2} \, \text{exb2+} \, 0-1 \) Miles-Yusupov, Tunis IZ 1985.

\(D4\)

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

A natural move, by which White tries to make the bishop on e6 look silly. However, he does not manage to do so by this move-order.

\(8... \text{Wd7} \, 9 \, \text{Qb5} \, \text{Ag8}! ?\)

The most natural, and also the sharpest move.

\(10 \, \text{g3} \, 0-0-0 \, 11 \, \text{Wh5}?! \)

White should care more about his development. Now Black takes over the initiative.

\(11... \text{Qg4}! \, 12 \, \text{Wh7} \)

\(12 \, \text{Wxf7?} \) loses immediately to \(12... \text{Ag7} \).

\(12... \text{We6}+ \, 13 \, \text{Qf1} \)

\(13 \, \text{Qge2} \) is met by \(13... \text{Qxd4}! \) with a powerful attack.

\(13... \text{Qxd4}! \)

Black does not give White any rest, but sacrifices a full rook to get another piece into the game.

\(14 \, \text{Wxg8} \)

\(14 \, \text{Qe1} \) is inferior on account of \(14... \text{Wf5}! \), after which White will be mated if he takes the rook: \(15 \, \text{Wxg8?} \, \text{Ah3+} \, 16 \, \text{Qxh3} \, \text{Wxh3+} \, 17 \, \text{Qg1} \, \text{Qf3#}. \)

\(14... \text{Qh6}! \, 15 \, \text{Qe8}! \)

Very strong play. White loses after \(15 \, \text{Wh7?} \, \text{Ah3+} \, 16 \, \text{Qxh3} \, \text{Wxh3+} \, 17 \, \text{Qe1} \, \text{Qd2+} \), while his position is inferior after \(15 \, \text{Wxd8+} \, \text{Qxd8} \, 16 \, \text{h3} \, \text{Qh5} \, 17 \, \text{Qc1} \, \text{Qc8}. \)
15...\textit{Q}h3+ 16 \textit{Q}xh3 \textit{W}xh3+ 17 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}c2+ 18 \textit{Q}e2
18 \textit{Q}d1? would be met by 18...\textit{W}f5!
19 \textit{Q}e2 d4, with a winning attack.
18...\textit{Q}d4+ 19 \textit{Q}e1
19 \textit{Q}d3? \textit{W}f5+ 20 \textit{Q}xd4 e5#, and
19 \textit{Q}d1 \textit{W}h5+ 20 g4 \textit{W}h3! win for Black.
19...\textit{Q}c2+ 20 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{W}h5+ 21 g4
\textit{W}e5+ 22 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}xa1 23 \textit{Q}xa1 d4 (D)

24 \textit{Q}e2??
24 \textit{Q}d1! would have saved the game.
The position is equal after 24...\textit{Q}g5!?
25 \textit{Q}g2! dxc3.
24...d3 25 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{W}xh2 26 \textit{Q}d1
\textit{W}h3+ 27 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{W}g2+ 28 f3 f5+!
0-1 Mainka-Miles, Bad Wörishofen 1989. White is mated.

E)
7 \textit{g}3
This does not seem right. White does not have time for this kind of play, even though he did well in the main game here.
7...\textit{W}a5
7...\textit{W}b6! seems to be an improvement. White could easily be worse after 8 \textit{Q}xf6 exf6 9 cxd5? \textit{W}xb2 10 \textit{A}c1? \textit{Q}b4, when Black wins.

8 \textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}e4 9 \textit{Q}xe4! dxe4 10 d5
0-0-0 11 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}b4 12 \textit{Q}xe4 \textit{Q}f5 13
\textit{W}b1 \textit{W}b6 14 \textit{Q}e2 e6 15 \textit{Q}e3 \textit{W}a6 16
0-0 \textit{Q}b8 17 \textit{Q}d4 \textit{W}xc4 18 \textit{Q}xf5 exf5
19 \textit{Q}f4+ \textit{Q}a8 20 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{W}xd5 21 \textit{Q}d1
\textit{Q}d3 22 \textit{Q}xd3 \textit{W}xd3 23 \textit{Q}xf7 \textit{W}xb1+
24 \textit{Q}xb1 \textit{Q}c5 25 \textit{Q}xh8 \textit{W}xh8 26 \textit{Q}d1
White has the better endgame, Tal-Hodgson, Sochi 1986.

F)
7 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}e4! (D)

8 cxd5
Or:
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{a}) 8 \textit{Q}d3? offers no compensation after 8...\textit{Q}xc3 9 \textit{Q}xc3 dxc4 10 \textit{Q}e4
  \textit{Q}d5 11 \textit{Q}e2 h6 12 \textit{Q}h4 \textit{W}d7 13 \textit{Q}b1
  0-0-0 14 \textit{Q}xd5 \textit{W}xd5 15 0-0 \textit{Q}d7,
  \item \textit{b}) 8 \textit{Q}xe4 dxe4 9 d5 exf3 10 dxe6
  \textit{W}a5+ 11 \textit{Q}d2 gives Black the chance of taking a draw with 11...\textit{W}xd2+!
  (11...\textit{W}e5+?! 12 \textit{Q}e3 \textit{W}xe6 13 gxf3
  \textit{Q}d8 14 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{W}f5 15 \textit{Q}e2 e6 16 0-0
gives White good attacking prospects, e.g. 16...\textit{W}g6+ 17 \textit{Q}h1 \textit{Q}b4 18 \textit{W}b3
  0-0 19 a3 \textit{Q}d6 20 \textit{Q}g1 \textit{W}h5 21 \textit{Q}g2
  \textit{Q}d7 22 \textit{Q}ag1 with a strong initiative,
  Thiede-von Alvensleben, Regionalliga Niedersachsen 1990) 12 \textit{Q}xd2 fxe6 13
gxf3 g6 14 c3 e5 15 f4 d4! 16 0-0-0 h6 17 xd4 exd4 ½-½ D. Popović-N. Danilov, Tallinn U-14 Wch 1997. The fact that this was an under-14 game does not spoil the impression that Black’s chances are no worse.

8...xd5 9 xe4 xe4 10 c4 a5+ 11 d2 f5 12 g5 d5
Black has good play, Minasian-Shurygin, Dečín 1996.

G)

7 gxe2!? 
This is a very interesting idea. White aims directly at annoying the bishop on e6. Not too many games have been played with this, so it is difficult to come to any final conclusions, but still it deserves close attention.

7...dxc4 8 e4!
White does not gain anything from 8 xf6 exf6 9 d5 e5 10 g3 g4 11 f3 a7 12 f4 g4 13 e2+ e7 14 ge4 0-0-0 15 xc4+ b8 16 0-0-0 b4 with more than equality for Black, del Rio-Izeta, Pamplona 1994/5.

8...xd4
8...xd4!? is an interesting alternative, which might prove stronger. The idea is 9 xe6 e5+. Still, White has a lead in development, so the outcome is unclear.

9 xe6 xe6 10 xc4 xc5?!
10...a6! is an improvement, though White has a fine initiative.

11 a4+!
The start of a brilliant idea.

11...d7 12 0-0-0 a6 13 xd7! xd7 14 b5 axb5 15 xa8+ d8 16 xb7 (D)

White has a very strong attack, and in two games Black was not able to find any defence:

a) 16...e5?! 17 xb5+ d7 18 xe5+ e6 19 d1 b7 20 f4 e7 21 f5 and White won in Velimirović-Cirić, Yugoslavia 1966.

b) 16...f6 17 d1 a5 18 f4 e6 19 f5 d8 20 d7+ f7 21 d5+ (21 xd8? xd8 22 xd8 g6 gives Black the better chances) 21...f6 (21...e8 22 xb5! planning 23 d6+) 22 d7+! (22 xd8? xd8 23 xd8 b4! 24 bd5 exf5 is only equal, Mortensen-Fette, Malmö 1987) 22 e7 23 bx5 f8 24 d6+ g8 25 xe7 exf5 26 b1 winning.

H)

7 c1

This move does not do any good for White. Black is fine after the continuation 7...a5 8 c5 e4 9 e3 g6, Berndt-Blecken, Regionalliga Niedersachsen 1991.

I)

7 a3 (D)
7...d7

Instead 7...g4!? has been played by Dreev, reason enough to trust the move. 8 f3 e6 9 c5 g6 (the point of Black’s play is that the normally inferior structure after exf6 is viable
since White has played f3, and so weakened the c1-h6 diagonal) 10 \( \text{b5} \) (10 \( \text{xf6}? \) is a try, but Black should be fine after 10...exf6 11 \( \text{wd2} \) (11 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{h6}!? \) 11...h5 with a resemblance to Line C) 10...\( \text{g7} \) 11 \( \text{ge2} \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \text{f5} \) 13 b4 a6 14 \( \text{a4} \) h6 15 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 16 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{h7} \) 17 \( \text{g3} \) e6 18 \( \text{ge2} \) g5 19 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 20 \( \text{xc2}+ \) f5 with an interesting fight ahead, Kasparov-Dreev, Moscow (rdp) 1996.

8 \( \text{xf6} \)

8 \( \text{e2} \) 0-0-0 9 c5 \( \text{c4} \) 10 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 11 \( \text{f4} \) f6 12 0-0 g5 13 \( \text{e3} \) e5 14 dxe5 d4 left White struggling for a draw in the game Kobaliya-Khalifman, Russian Club Cup (Maikop) 1998, which he achieved after 15 e6 \( \text{xe6} \) 16 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 17 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 18 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{b8} \) 19 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 20 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{c5} \) 1/2-1/2.

8...gx \( \text{xf6} \) 9 c5!

9 g3? led to a catastrophe in Topalov-Leko, Vienna 1996: 9...0-0-0 10 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{g4}! \) 11 f3 \( \text{e6} \) 12 c5 \( \text{f5} \) 13 b4 e5 14 \( \text{ge2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 15 dxe5 d4! (Black takes over the initiative) 16 \( \text{e4} \) d3 17 \( \text{d4} \) d2+ 18 \( \text{f2} \) (D).

18...\( \text{c4} \)!(White is defenceless) 19 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h3} \) 20 \( \text{xh3} \) \( \text{d4}+ \) 21 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 22 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 23 \( \text{hd1} \) f5 24 \( \text{e5} \) d7 25 f4 \( \text{g7} \) 26 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{d5}+ \) 27 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xal} \) 28 \( \text{xal} \) \( \text{e8} \) 0-1.

9...\( \text{g4} \) 10 f3 \( \text{f5} \) 11 \( \text{b5} \) e5?!

Black does no better with 11...\( \text{g8} \)!!, as White can immediately seize the initiative: 12 g4 \( \text{g6} \) 13 \( \text{ge2} \) h5 14 gxh5! \( \text{h5} \) 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h8} \) 16 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 17 f4! \( \text{h4} \) 18 0-0 \( \text{h6} \) 19 \( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 20 f5 with a position close to winning, Sveshnikov-Soln, Bled 1998.

Black should try 11...h5! with the idea...\( \text{g8} \) and...\( \text{h6} \). Tests are needed to see if Black is OK, but I suspect that he is.

12 \( \text{ge2} \) 0-0-0 13 0-0 \( \text{e6} \) 14 \( \text{h1} \)

White has emerged from the opening with a small plus, Lanka-Leko, Budapest 1996.
5 5...g6

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 ȳf6 5 ȳc3 g6 (D)

I have divided the positions into three categories: the black pawn is on d5; the black pawn is on d6; and White grabs the pawn on b7.

The black pawn is on d5

I have selected the first example to show how the pawn-structure is more suitable for the white pieces. Besides the bishop on a6, the knight's position on b6 is also awkward, since it has nowhere to go, and is not doing too well where it is.

First of all, I want to make it clear that because I cannot recommend this line for Black, this chapter has been written with the intention to educate white players only.

This line is not seen so much in high-level tournaments any more, and for a good reason: White simply has a very secure plus in the main line. Still from time to time, players like Adams and Timman try out some new ideas, and use the variation as a surprise weapon. In my opinion the variation is insufficient for equality, and therefore not to be recommended.

In this chapter I mainly examine positions where White forces Black to sacrifice the pawn on d5, and then returns it with d5-d6, and Black recaptures with the e-pawn. Other ways of dealing with the position are not so critical.

Dolmatov – Adams
Hastings 1989/90

Black has just played 22...d6-d5, to prevent White from playing d4-d5, which, at least, would annoy the b6-knight. Black's position is solid, but he has problems with his queenside minor pieces, and for this reason White generally holds the advantage
in these positions. On balance, Black should probably have left his pawn on d6.

23 \( \square f4 \) \( \square c7 \) 24 \( \square d3 \)

Following 22...d5, two excellent squares have become available to the white knight. Black has no choice but to give up the bishop-pair. Even though Black is not proud of the a6-bishop, its exchange will leave his pawns on light squares vulnerable for the rest of the game.

24...\( \square xd3 \) 25 \( \square xd3 \) \( \square c8 \) 26 a4!

Dolmatov is rightly the champion of this line. He understands White's strategy of gradual improvement very well. Here a5 is transformed into a permanent weakness, while the knight on b6 is forced to keep an eye on d5.

26...\( \square f8 \) 27 \( \square d2 \) \( \square xe1+ \) 28 \( \square xe1 \) \( \square d8 \) 29 \( \square e2 \)

White slowly improves the position of his pieces. The knight is more active on f4, where it retains the option of manoeuvring \( \square d3-e5/c5 \), while it exerts pressure on d5. Also Black has to respect the immediate threat on a5.

29...\( \square a8 \) 30 \( \square f4 \) b6 31 \( \square b5 \) \( \square c2 \)
32 \( \square e3 \) \( \square b4 \) 33 \( \square c1 \) \( \square xc1+ \) 34 \( \square xc1 \) \( \square g7 \) 35 \( \square e3! \)

The pawn will not run away.

35...\( \square d6 \) 36 \( \square xd5 \) \( \square c7 \) 37 \( \square xc7 \) \( \square xc7 \) 38 \( \square c6 \)

White is completely winning.

38...\( \square e7 \) 39 \( \square xb6 \) \( \square xg3 \) 40 \( \square xa5 \) \( \square d6 \) 41 \( \square b5 \) g5 42 a5 1-0

Wonderful play by Dolmatov.

Next we consider the consequences of Black failing to meet a4 with ...a5.

White is better in the next diagram, which is reached via Line B below. a7 is a permanent weakness, and d5 is not too healthy either. White's bishop is no inferior to its counterpart, even though the g7-bishop might appear to exert some pressure against d4. The knight on g4 is doing nothing, and the one on c8 is clearly misplaced. However, White also has his problems. The rook is a little strange on b5, the other rook has no better square than d1, and the knights not ideally placed, protecting each other.

20...\( \square f6 \) 21 \( \square e5 \) \( \square d6?! \)

Black enters a minefield of complications, from which White gains most. Even though Black exchanges off both his knights, White solves almost all the problems listed above.

Black should have chosen instead 21...\( \square e7 \).

22 \( \square xf6 \) \( \square xb5 \) 23 \( \square xd8 \) \( \square xc3 \) 24 \( \square xc3 \)

24 \( \square xc3? \) \( \square b5! \) would give Black a lot of play for no good reason.

24...\( \square xd8 \) 25 \( \square d1 \) h5 26 h3 \( \square f6 \) 27 \( \square b5! \)

White has a large plus. The bishop is hopeless, and the knight will have an easy job attacking d5 and a7.
From the next position we consider two important games. The first shows a situation where Black profits by playing ...d5, on account of a rather clever trick.

\[ \text{Diagram:} \]

\[ B \]

Sveshnikov – Burović
Torcy 1991

The interposition of h3 and ...h5 benefits White, since his bishop has an excellent retreat square on h2. But also Black can benefit from this, as seen in this game.

15...d5!? 16 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} e5 g4!

This is the trick that solves Black's problem with the bishop. White, in this game, tries to punish this move. But believing this is possible is a misunderstanding of the position.

17 hxg4 hxg4 18 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf6?
18 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} d3 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} ac8 19 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} f4 gxf3 20 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf3 might offer White some chances for an advantage, but I doubt that it is really dangerous for Black.

18...\texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf6 19 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} e4 dxe4 20 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xe4 g7 21 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} c3 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} e7 22 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} d5 g3!

Opening up the white king's position on the dark squares, where Black is superior.

23 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} f1

23 fxg3 loses at once to 23...\texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} e3+.
23...\texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf2+ 24 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf2 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} d6 25 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xb7 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} ab8 26 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} b5 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} f4+

White can't avoid losing the exchange now.
27 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} f3 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} h4+ 28 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} g1 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf3 29 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xf3 \texttt{\textquotesingle\textquotesingle} xe1

Black went on to win the endgame due to his obvious advantage.

As we have seen, the structure is preferable for White when Black moves his pawn to d5, even though everything depends on the placement of the bishops and especially the knights. For example, Black is often forced to play ...d5 in positions where the light-squared bishops have not been exchanged. This can give him substantial problems with the bishop, while he can hardly exchange it for a knight, since the white bishop would then be the master of the board.

I suggest that the Dolmatov-Adams game should be studied again and again, since Dolmatov has reached the soul of this kind of positions with his slow positional play.

The black pawn is on d6

In these positions it's harder for White to get through the black defences, but it's also harder for Black to create counterplay. The position can be divided into two categories, according to whether the light-squared bishops have been exchanged or not. In the first example Black neglects the problems it causes not to have exchanged these pieces, and meets a terrible end.

The following position is quite typical for this whole line. White has good
pressure on the central squares, while Black has some coordination problems. In this game Black tries to activate his rook, but it doesn’t bring him a lot of luck.

15...\textit{a}c8?! 
The start of a bad plan. Black would have done better with 15...d5, as in the previous example.

16 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}4? 17 \textit{g}5
Threatening 18 \textit{x}f6 \textit{x}f6 19 \textit{d}5! with material gains.

17...\textit{d}c8
17...d5 doesn’t work because of 18 \textit{x}f6 \textit{x}f6 19 \textit{d}x\textit{d}5!. 17...\textit{c}c8 was the lesser evil.

18 \textit{e}2 \textit{e}6
Black has problems finding the right square for his bishop. This is what provoked this move. No better was 18...\textit{f}4c7 19 \textit{x}f6 \textit{x}f6 20 \textit{x}f5 \textit{xf}5 21 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}2 (21...\textit{d}7 22 \textit{x}a7 wins for White) 22 \textit{xc}7, which is totally winning for White too.

19 d5! \textit{x}h3?! 
19...\textit{f}xd5 20 \textit{xd}5 \textit{x}d5 21 \textit{x}d5! was the idea behind 19 d5.

20 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4 21 \textit{xf}6!

White is in no hurry to cash in. First he eliminates all possible counterplay.

21...\textit{xf}6 22 \textit{ce}4 \textit{e}5 23 \textit{gx}h3 \textit{hx}3 24 f4!

24 \textit{f}3 h4 would give Black counter-chances.

24...\textit{g}7
After 24...\textit{d}4+, 25 \textit{f}2 \textit{h}4 26 \textit{f}3 is the safest win. Black has nothing for his heavy investment.

25 \textit{g}5 \textit{g}4 26 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}4+ 27 \textit{xd}4!

All in all just a simplification, but the more exchanges, the more sure White will be.

27...\textit{xd}4 28 \textit{e}3 1-0

Not a very impressive game from Timman, who clearly was trapped in a line he didn’t know exactly how to handle. Ehvest, on the other hand, didn’t hesitate to exploit the chance given to him by Black’s faulty play.

In the next example the light-squared bishops have been exchanged, and it seems harder for White to get some action going, but still he finds a fine way to get an advantage.

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

\textit{Sax – Gipslis}

\textit{Copenhagen 1994}
In this position White holds a small advantage, mainly because of the lack of coordination amongst the black forces. So far nothing new. In this game Black tries to defend, rather than trying to create counterplay. The pawn stays on d6, and the rest of the pieces try to hold on, rather than improving their positions.

18 \text{\textit{d}c3} \text{\textit{a}6}!

18...\text{\textit{w}c6} is worse, since this puts the queen on an awkward square, and it will need to find a new one after 19 \text{\textit{e}e3} and 20 \text{\textit{a}ac1}.

19 \text{\textit{a}e3} \text{\textit{c}c8} 20 \text{\textit{h}3} \text{\textit{c}c4}

Generally I don't like these rook manoeuvres to b4. A regrouping starting with 20...\text{\textit{w}d8}, to hold all the dark squares, is more to my taste, but I wouldn't bet that it is better.

21 \text{\textit{d}d3}!

Threatening the tactical blow 22 \text{\textit{c}c5}!

21...\text{\textit{w}d8}?!  

21...\text{\textit{w}f5}! would have given Black better chances to fight for equality. The queen on d8 doesn't harmonize with the rook on c4. I believe the queen should be on a light square to offer some support.

22 \text{\textit{d}e5}?! \text{\textit{x}e5}:

22...\text{\textit{a}a7} 23 \text{\textit{b}b5} \text{\textit{e}e7} 24 \text{\textit{g}g5} \text{\textit{x}e5} 25 \text{\textit{x}e5} \text{\textit{d}d7} 26 \text{\textit{a}xf6} \text{\textit{x}xf6} 27 \text{\textit{x}xf6} \text{\textit{w}xf6} gives White a slight edge, since the rook is strangely placed at a6. Still, maybe it was a better option.

23 \text{\textit{x}e5} \text{\textit{w}e8} 24 \text{\textit{a}xf6} \text{\textit{b}b4} 25 \text{\textit{w}c2} \text{\textit{x}xf6} 26 \text{\textit{b}3}!

Now both the black rooks are rather oddly placed.

26...\text{\textit{w}e6}

26...\text{\textit{a}a8}?! is met by the nasty trick 27 \text{\textit{a}ac1} \text{\textit{c}c8} 28 \text{\textit{d}d5}!.

27 \text{\textit{a}ab1} \text{\textit{a}8} 28 \text{\textit{b}b5} \text{\textit{c}c8} 29 \text{\textit{w}d3} \text{\textit{h}h4} 30 \text{\textit{w}d2} \text{\textit{b}b4} 31 \text{\textit{w}d3} \text{\textit{h}h4} 1/2-1/2

White now agreed to a draw due to his problems with the clock, but he could have obtained a close to winning position with 32 \text{\textit{w}d6}! \text{\textit{c}c6} 33 \text{\textit{w}b8}+.

The next example is not directly connected with the lines I suggest in the theoretical section, meaning that the starting position could never happen to you, if you follow my suggestions. Still it is a very beautiful illustration of the tactics which can occur in this line.

\begin{center}
\textbf{J. Polgar – Skembris}
\textbf{Corfu 1990}
\end{center}

16 \text{\textit{c}c7}!

16 d6 would be met by the surprising 16...\text{\textit{e}5}!.

16...\text{\textit{a}a7} 17 d6

An forceful way to obtain the desired structure. Here it leads to a beautiful combination.

17...\text{\textit{e}x}d6 18 \text{\textit{a}xb6} \text{\textit{w}xb6} 19 \text{\textit{d}d5} \text{\textit{w}a7} (D)

19...\text{\textit{w}c6} will cost the queen its head after 20 \text{\textit{e}f4} \text{\textit{f}f6} 21 \text{\textit{c}c1}. 19...\text{\textit{w}a6} is maybe the best move, but Black is still uncomfortable after 20 \text{\textit{e}ec3}. 

16...\text{\textit{e}5}!
20 $\text{Qe}c3! $\text{Wxd4}$
20...$\text{Qf6}$ 21 $\text{Qb5}$ $\text{Wb8}$ 22 $\text{Qb6}$ is easy to understand.
21 $\text{h3!}$
21 $\text{Wxd4}$ is wrong, due to 21...$\text{Qxd4}$
22 $\text{Qb5}$ $\text{Qf6}$!
21...$\text{Qh6}$
21...$\text{Qxd1}$ 22 $\text{Raxd1}$ $\text{Qf6}$ 23 $\text{Qb6}$.
22 $\text{Wxd4}$ $\text{Qxd4}$ 23 $\text{Qb5}$ $\text{Qxb2}$ 24 $\text{Qa2!}$ $\text{Qg7}$ 25 $\text{Qb6}$
White went on to win with her extra exchange.

**White grabs the pawn on b7**

This little section will mainly try to illustrate the dangers White has to handle, if he, in his greed, takes the poisoned pawn on b7. Even though this might give some advantage if it's played with great care, I feel that the positional handling of the position offers at least as good winning chances, and has a far better record.

At the same time, it's important to note that if Black recaptures on d6 with his queen, the pawn should be taken (see the theory section).

The following game illustrates what White is up against if he decides to grab the pawn.

**Dolmatov – Tomaszewski**

*Polanica Zdroj 1987*

11 $d6$
Probably premature. 11 0-0 $\text{Qd3}$ 12 $d6$ exd6 would give Black some problems with the bishop.

11...exd6 12 $\text{Qxb7!}?$ $\text{Qb8}$ 13 $\text{Qf3}$
$\text{Qbd5}$ 14 $\text{Wd1}$ $\text{Qxc3}$ 15 $\text{bxc3}$ $\text{Wa5}$
The extra pawn will come under a lot of pressure. To my mind, there are no reasons why White should be preferred here.

16 0-0 $\text{Kfc8}$ 17 a4 $\text{Qg4!}$
Exchanging the light-squared bishop gives Black chances due to the immobility of White's pawn-centre.

18 $\text{Qa3?!}$
18 $\text{Qxg4}$ had to be played, after which Black has a lot of compensation for his pawn.

18...$\text{Qxf3}$ 19 $\text{gxf3}$ $\text{Wa6!}$
Not only protecting the d6-pawn, but also exerting pressure on the light squares.

20 $\text{Wd2}$ $\text{Qd5}$ 21 $\text{Qfb1}$
White has no way of pushing his pawns currently, so he aims for simplifications.

21...$\text{Axbl+}$ 22 $\text{Axbl}$ $\text{Qf8}$ 23 $\text{Wc2}$
$\text{Qb6}$ 24 $\text{Qb4}$ $d5$
The pawn on c3 is so weak that it demands permanent attention, while the c4-square is a perfect transit-point for the black pieces.

25 \( \mathcal{D} \text{f4}\)?
25 \( \mathcal{A} \text{x}f8 \mathcal{W} \text{xf8} \) 26 \( \mathcal{M} \text{h}4 \mathcal{M} \text{e}8 \) 27 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}3 \) was better, with an unclear struggle.
25...\( \mathcal{E} \text{h}6! \) 26 \( \mathcal{D} \text{e}2 \mathcal{M} \text{e}8 \) 27 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}3 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{c}4 \) (D)

Now only the queen is not superior to its counterpart. Black couldn’t care less about pawns around here.

28 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}2 \mathcal{G} \text{g}5 \) 29 \( \mathcal{A} \text{c}5 \mathcal{A} \text{f}4 \) 30 \( \mathcal{A} \text{b}5 \) \( \mathcal{H} \text{h}5 \)

The white king’s position is permanently scarred, so after improving all his pieces, Black finally builds the pillars for an attack.

31 \( \mathcal{H} \text{h}3 \mathcal{A} \text{xg}3! \)

Now the knight has no counterpart, and can enjoy life fully.

32 \( \mathcal{A} \text{xg}3 \mathcal{W} \text{f}6 \) 33 \( \mathcal{W} \text{c}1 \mathcal{H} \text{h}4+ \) 34 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}2 \)
35 \( \mathcal{M} \text{b}7 \mathcal{W} \text{h}7 \) 36 \( \mathcal{D} \text{d}7 \mathcal{W} \text{e}6 \) 37 \( \mathcal{D} \text{b}7 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{e}2! \)

The winning move, exploiting the check on e3 to its maximum.

38 \( \mathcal{E} \text{x}f7+ \mathcal{G} \text{g}8 \) 39 \( \mathcal{F} \text{f}4 \)
Or 39 \( \mathcal{W} \text{f}4 \mathcal{D} \text{c}3+ \) 40 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}1 \mathcal{W} \text{f}1+ \) and Black wins.

39...\( \mathcal{D} \text{e}3+ \) 40 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}1 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{d}1 \) 0-1

The Theory of 5...\( \mathcal{G} \text{g}6 \)

1 \( e4 \) \( c6 \) 2 \( d4 \) \( d5 \) 3 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \) 4 \( c4 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{f}6 \)
5 \( \mathcal{D} \text{c}3 \) \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}6 \) 6 \( \mathcal{W} \text{b}3 \) \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}7 \) 7 \( \text{cxd}5 \) 0-0 8 \( \mathcal{E} \text{e}2 \) (D)

8...\( \mathcal{D} \text{bd}7 \)

Here there are several alternatives. None of them should be feared by White, but nevertheless it’s necessary to have some idea of what to do against them.

a) 8...\( \mathcal{B} \text{b}6 \) 9 \( \mathcal{G} \text{g}5 \) \( \mathcal{B} \text{b}7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A} \text{x}f6 \) \( \text{exf}6 \) (10...\( \mathcal{A} \text{x}f6 \) is not really an alternative, since White now has the c5-square at his disposal, which he exploited to the full by 11 \( \mathcal{D} \text{f}3 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{D} \text{e}5 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{d}6 \) 13 0-0 \( \mathcal{X} \text{xe}5 \) 14 \( \text{dxe}5 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \mathcal{X} \text{xa}6 \) \( \mathcal{X} \text{xa}6 \)
16 \( \mathcal{L} \text{fe}1 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{d}6 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W} \text{a}4 \) \( \mathcal{B} \text{b}7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A} \text{ad}1 \) \( \mathcal{A} \text{fd}8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{W} \text{h}4 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{f}6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{W} \text{xf}6 \) \( \mathcal{E} \text{xf}6 \) 21 \( \mathcal{E} \text{c}7 \) with a clear advantage in Winsnes-M.S.Hansen, Gausdal 1990) 11 \( \mathcal{F} \text{f}3 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \mathcal{D} \text{ge}2 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{d}6 \) 13 0-0 \( \mathcal{A} \text{fd}8 \)
14 \( \mathcal{A} \text{ad}1 \) \( f5 \) (14...\( \mathcal{D} \text{c}7 \) 15 \( \mathcal{D} \text{e}4 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{D} \text{d}6 \) gives White a big plus) 15 \( \mathcal{A} \text{fe}1 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{c}7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{D} \text{c}1 \) \( \mathcal{A} \text{d}7 \) (16...\( \mathcal{A} \text{x}d5 \)?? 17 \( \mathcal{A} \text{xd}5 \) \( \mathcal{A} \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{A} \text{xd}5 \) \( \mathcal{W} \text{x}d5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{D} \text{e}8+ \))
17 \( \mathcal{D} \text{d}3 \) \( \mathcal{A} \text{x}d4 \) (17...\( \mathcal{A} \text{x}d5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{D} \text{e}5 \) \( \mathcal{A} \text{xc}3 \) 19 \( \mathcal{W} \text{xc}3 \) only gives White a slight pull) 18 \( \mathcal{D} \text{b}4 \) \( \mathcal{A} \text{xc}3 \) (18...\( \mathcal{A} \text{f}6 \) is maybe better) 19 \( \mathcal{W} \text{xc}3 \) \( \mathcal{D} \text{a}6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{D} \text{c}6 \)


\[ \text{B} \]

b1) 9...\text{\texttt{a}5} 10 \text{\texttt{d}ge2} \text{\texttt{d}d8} 11 0-0 \text{\texttt{w}b4} 12 \text{\texttt{w}d1} \text{\texttt{d}c7} 13 a3 \text{\texttt{w}c4} 14 \text{\texttt{g}f4} (14 \text{d6!?}) 14...\text{\texttt{g}b5} 15 \text{\texttt{g}xb5} \text{\texttt{w}xb5} 16 \text{\texttt{e}e1} \text{\texttt{f}f8} 17 a4 \text{\texttt{w}b6} 18 a5 \text{\texttt{d}d6} 19 b3 and White is better, Mainka-Schwab, Oberwart 1991.

b2) 9...\text{\texttt{g}g4} 10 \text{\texttt{g}g5} (exploiting the fact that he hasn't developed the knight yet) 10...\text{\texttt{w}d7} 11 h3 \text{\texttt{g}xf3} 12 \text{\texttt{g}xf3} b5 13 0-0 \text{\texttt{d}c7} 14 \text{\texttt{g}xf6} \text{\texttt{e}xf6} 15 a4 b4 16 \text{\texttt{w}xb4} \text{\texttt{g}fb8} 17 \text{\texttt{w}c5} \text{\texttt{f}f8} 18 \text{\texttt{w}c6} \text{\texttt{d}d8} 19 a5 and Black has insufficient compensation for the pawn, Jo.Diaz-Schmitzer, Hessen Ch 1989.

b3) 9...\text{\texttt{w}b6} 10 \text{\texttt{w}d1} \text{\texttt{d}d8} 11 \text{\texttt{g}ge2} \text{\texttt{g}b4} 12 d6 \text{\texttt{g}xd6} 13 \text{\texttt{g}f4} \text{\texttt{g}d8} 14 0-0 \text{\texttt{g}bd5} 15 \text{\texttt{d}a4} \text{\texttt{w}b5} 16 \text{\texttt{g}ec3} \text{\texttt{w}e8} 17 \text{\texttt{g}e5} is good for White in view of his free piece-play and Black's poor coordination, Nordsieck-Hoppe, NRW-Liga 1990/1.

b4) 9...\text{\texttt{d}c7} 10 \text{\texttt{g}ge2} \text{\texttt{g}g4} 11 \text{\texttt{g}xg4} \text{\texttt{g}xg4} 12 \text{\texttt{f}f4} b6 13 0-0 \text{\texttt{g}f6} 14 d6 exd6 15 d5 \text{\texttt{d}d7} 16 \text{\texttt{d}ad1} \text{\texttt{d}ac8} 17 \text{\texttt{w}a3} \text{\texttt{d}e8} 18 \text{\texttt{d}d4} with an overwhelming position for White, Berenyi-Zoister, Balatonbereny 1993.

c) 8...\text{\texttt{a}5} 9 \text{\texttt{g}f3} \text{\texttt{a}6} 10 \text{\texttt{g}g5} and now:

c1) 10...\text{\texttt{d}c7} 11 \text{\texttt{g}xf6} \text{\texttt{g}xf6} 12 0-0 a4 13 \text{\texttt{g}xa4} \text{\texttt{g}xd5} 14 \text{\texttt{c}c4} \text{\texttt{w}a5} 15 \text{\texttt{g}c5} \text{\texttt{b}6} 16 \text{\texttt{a}b5} \text{\texttt{d}d8} 17 a4 leaves Black a pawn down with problems developing his queenside, Hebden-Skembris, Vrnjačka Banja 1989. 17...\text{\texttt{g}xd4} 18 \text{\texttt{d}ad1} \text{\texttt{g}d5} 19 \text{\texttt{g}xd4} \text{\texttt{g}c5} 20 \text{\texttt{d}d3} gives White a winning attack.

c2) After 10...\text{\texttt{f}f5} 11 a3 \text{\texttt{e}e4} 12 \text{\texttt{f}f4} \text{\texttt{g}xc3} 13 bxc3 \text{\texttt{e}e4} 14 \text{\texttt{w}xb7} \text{\texttt{g}xd5} 15 \text{\texttt{w}b2} Black again has insufficient compensation for the pawn, Hebden-Trzaska, Hastings 1995/6.

d) 8...\text{e}6!? is an over-optimistic pawn sacrifice. After 9 dxe6 \text{\texttt{g}xe6} 10 \text{\texttt{w}xb7} \text{\texttt{w}a5} 11 b4 \text{\texttt{b}6} 12 \text{\texttt{g}f3} \text{\texttt{a}6} 13 \text{\texttt{w}xb6} axb6 14 \text{\texttt{g}xa8} \text{\texttt{g}xb4} 15 \text{\texttt{g}f3} \text{\texttt{g}c2+} 16 \text{\texttt{d}d2} \text{\texttt{g}xa1} 17 \text{\texttt{g}b2} White won in Zeller-Rabl, Württemberg Ch 1991.

e) 8...\text{\texttt{w}b6} 9 \text{\texttt{w}xb6} axb6 10 \text{\texttt{g}f3} \text{\texttt{d}d8} 11 \text{\texttt{g}c4} \text{\texttt{a}6} 12 0-0 \text{\texttt{g}b4} 13 d6 exd6 14 \text{\texttt{g}g5} d5 15 \text{\texttt{a}b3} and here the white pieces are better organized, and the black pawns are potentially weak, besides the immediate problems with the protection of the d5-pawn, Smekal-Beikert, Viernheim 1995.

f) With 8...\text{\texttt{d}e8} Black doesn't even try to win back his pawn, but establishes a solid blockade. Since this can never be sufficient in the long run, this move is not to be taken seriously, but still it's no worse than, for example 8...b6. It's just more obvious that it's silly! After 9 \text{\texttt{d}e3} \text{\texttt{d}d7} 10 \text{\texttt{f}f3} \text{\texttt{b}6} 11 \text{\texttt{g}ge2} \text{\texttt{d}d6} 12 \text{\texttt{d}d1} a6 13 0-0 \text{\texttt{g}bc4}
14 əf4 White was substantially better in Erlbeck-Hepting, Mittelfranken Ch 1995.

9 əf3 əb6 10 əge2 (D)

Here Black has two main continuations, between which the choice is a matter of taste. 10...əg4 is more solid, but 10...əf5 offers a more unbalanced game. Both lines are overall to be considered slightly more comfortable for White.

A: 10...əg4 80

B: 10...əf5 81

Or 10...a5!? and now:

a) 11 0-0 (White chooses not to worry about his queen's safety) 11...a4 12 əb5 əd7 13 əb4 əe8 14 d6 əf8 15 əd1 exd6 16 d5 (White has a positional plus) 16...əf5 17 əg5 əbd7 18 əh4 əe7 19 əg3 (Black is punished for the lack of coordination between his pieces) 19...əe5 20 əxf5 əxf3+ 21 gxf3 əxf5 22 əel! a3 (there is nothing else) 23 əxe7 axb2 24 əb1 əxe7 25 əxf6 əwa5 26 əwh6 1-0 Hazai-Lenart, Hungary 1994.

b) 11 a4 is similar to the main line, except for the interpolation of a4 and ...a5. Yet this seems to be an advantage for White, as he can use the b5-square better than Black can exploit b4:

b1) 11...əg4 12 əxg4 əxg4 13 əf4 əf6 14 d6 exd6 15 0-0 əe8 16 əad1 əc8 17 əb5 əc4 18 əg5 h6 19 əxf6 əxf6 20 b3 əb4 21 əxa5 əxb3 22 əb1 gives White a very obvious advantage, Dolmatov-O'Cinneide, Bern 1994.

b2) 11...əwd6!? 12 əb5 əb4+ 13 əxb4 axb4 14 d6 exd6 15 b3 (establishing b4 as a permanent weakness) 15...əe6 16 əc7 əab8 17 əxe6 fxe6 18 əd2 əbd5 19 0-0 əf7 20 əfc1 əfc8 21 g4! (Dolmatov exploits the weakness in Black's very delicate defensive chain: too many pieces are protecting each other) 21...əc3 22 əxc3 bxc3 23 əxc3 əxc3 24 əxc3 əd5 25 əxd5 exd5 26 əd1 and White is a healthy pawn up, Dolmatov-Halldorsson, Reykjavik 1988.

A)

10...əg4 11 əxg4 əxg4 12 əf4 əwd7!?

12 əf6 13 d6 exd6 14 0-0 (14 h3! to keep the bishop on the diagonal is the right move, but still untested in practice) 14...əwd7? (on the preferable 14...əh5! 15 əc3 d5 Black is so close to equality that any talk about a real advantage is in vain) 15 ədb5! əfe8 16 əec3 əc8 17 əg5! a6? (17...əe7 is necessary) 18 əxf6 əxf6 19 əd5 əd8 20 əbc7! 1-0 Vujčić-Tringov, Belgrade 1988.

13 a4 əad8 14 d6 exd6 15 a5 əc8 16 0-0 əfe8 17 əa4!?

An interesting plan. White transfers the rook to the fourth rank, to exert pressure on b7.

17...d5??
Stoica suggests 17...b5!? 18 axb6 (18 Bb4 a6 19 h3 Qf6 20 d5 appears to give White a little something, but Black can exploit the rook’s bad position through a brilliant combination: 20...Ec7 21 Qd4 Qe7 22 Aa1 Qfxd5! 23 Qxd5 Qxd5 24 Wxd5 Ec5!! and Black wins material) 18...Qxb6 19 Aa5 Bc8 (19...Bb8 20 Bb5 is preferable for White) 20 Bfa1 Bc7 with a complicated game ahead.

18 Bb4 b6 19 Bb5 Ec6 20 a6!

White has the advantage, Stoica-Suciu, Romania 1994 – see p. 73. a7 is a permanent problem for Black.

B) 10...Qf5 11 0-0 (D)

11...Ed7
11...a5 12 a4 (12 Qf4 Qd3 13 d6 exd6 14 Ed1 a6 15 b3 h6 16 h3 Qh7 17 g3 Ae8 18 Qg2 Be8 19 Be1 Qf6 20 Ae1 Ed7 21 Ed2 Qh7 22 a3 led to a small advantage for White in Dolmatov-Adams, Hastings 1989/90 – see p. 72) 12...Ed6 13 Qb5 Ed7 14 d6 exd6 15 Qf4 Ec6 16 Ed1 Qe8 17 d5 Qg4 18 Qec3 gave White the advantage in Van Baarle-Gaprindashvili, Amsterdam 1976.

11...Qd3 is premature. The bishop is poorly placed after 12 d6! exd6 (12...Ead8? 13 Qxb7 Qad8 14 Ad1 Qc4 15 Ec2 doesn’t offer Black a lot for the pawn, Manyai-Wozny, Zalakaros 1991):

a) 13 Qxb7!? is the chance for people who love grabbing the b7-pawn. Even though this move seems to be justifiable, Black gets a lot of play, and Black’s 11...Qd3 now makes some sense. 13...Bb8 14 Qf3 and now:

a1) 14...Qe8 15 Qd1 a6 16 Ae1 Ec8 17 Qg3 left Black with very little for the pawn in Hort-Dolmatov, Amsterdam 1980.

a2) 14...Ed7 15 Qd1 a6 16 b3 Fe8 17 Ae1 Bc8 18 Qf4! (almost always the right square in this variation) 18...d5 19 Ae1 Qe4 20 g3 g5 21 Qxe4 gxf4 22 Qd3 Qxd3 23 Qxd3 fxd3 24 hxd3 White went on to win in Merklinger-Merkel, Verbandsliga Süd-Baden 1993. I don’t know how much I trust this variation. Even though White got away with it here, Black has a good score when White grabs the b7-pawn after...exd6.

b) 13 Qf4 Be8 14 Qf1 d5 15 Qg3 Ed7 16 Qe5 Qc4 17 Qc2 leaves White clearly better. The bishop on c4 is clearly a problem for Black. In what follows it ends up on a6 and prevents him from defending against a4-a5 undermining the defence of d5. 17...Qg4 18 Qxg7 Qxg7 19 Ed2 h6 20 b3 Qa6 21 Qxg4 Wxg4 22 a4 Ed8 (22...Qxe1+ 23 Qxe1 Ed8 24 a5 Qc8 25 Be5 also leaves Black in difficulties) 23 Be8 Qxe8 24 a5 Qd7 25 Qxd5 and White went on to win in Orlov-Malofeev, St Petersburg 1997.

12 a4
12 Qd1 Qfd8 13 d6 exd6 14 a4 Ab8 15 a5 Qc8 16 Ra4!? Qd7 17 h3 b5 18 Rb4 a6 19 d5 Qc7 20 Qd4 Qbc8 21 g4 Qd7 22 Qf4 leaves White slightly better, although he has problems with the rook on b4, Kontorovich-Rogers, Canberra 1996. Still the space advantage is more important.

12...Qd3
12...Qfd8 is answered strongly by 13 d6!.

13 d6 Qc4
13...exd6 14 a5 Qc4 15 Qb4 Qxc2 16 Qxe2 Qbd5 17 Qb3 Qfe8 18 Qc3 Qxc3 19 bxc3 d5 20 Qb1 leaves Black with nothing else but the right to defend, Sziva-Franke, NRW-Liga 1994/5.

14 Qb4 Qxe2?! 
14...Qxd6 15 Qxd6 exd6 16 Qxb7 Ab8 is better, but I doubt that Black has enough now the queens have left the board.

15 Qxe2 Qbd5 16 Wa3 exd6

16...Qxd6 17 Qxd6 exd6 18 Qd2 gives White a light-squared dominance in the endgame. Nevertheless, it was Black's best try.

17 Qb3!
White clearly has control. His two bishops offer him the better chances in the forthcoming struggle.

17...Qfe8 18 Qe1 Qd7 19 Qxb7 Qxb7 20 Qxb7 Qab8 21 a6 Qf5 22 Qd1 Qd5 23 Qc4 Qb4

23...Qb4 24 Qf1 Qc2 25 Qa2 Qcx4 26 Qxd4 Qxd4 27 Qe3 gives White a big plus.

24 Qxd5 Qxe2 25 Qf1 Qe8 26 b3! Qxd4?

26...Qxd4 27 Qxd4 Qxd4 28 Qb1 would not have been nice for Black, but still he would have had some chances to defend.

27 Qa3 Qbb8 28 Qac1 Qb6 29 g4 White went on win in Milos-Christiansen, Szirak IZ 1987.
6 5...e6 6 ♜f3 ♙b4 7 cxd5

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 ♕f6 5 ♕c3 e6 6 ♜f3 ♙b4 7 cxd5 (D)

This chapter will not have as large a practical section as most of the other chapters, mainly because there are few positions here that are alike, and the ones that are, have been covered in the Introduction. There is one kind of position that often occurs from the variations after 7 cxd5 – the symmetrical structure arising when White exchanges knights on d5, and Black recaptures with the e-pawn. The next diagram is an example (D):

The position is equal. Black has good pressure against d4, but on the other hand d5 is not protected at all. White now played ambitiously.

15 ♕e3 ♕e6 16 ♙d2 ♕e7!

A good manoeuvre: Black wants to gain the bishop-pair by ...♕f5xe3.

17 ♙ac1

17 ♕f4 with the idea 18 ♕e5 was better. Now Black gets the two bishops, after which there will always be a small advantage for him.

17...♕f5 18 ♕xf5 ♕xf5 19 ♕c5 ♕e6 20 ♕f4

As often happens when you lose something (here the two bishops), you get some activity. The white position is solid enough, and he should now exchange all the major pieces, since he will have problems defending both flanks against the two bishops.

20...♕xc8 21 ♙dc1 ♙xc5 22 ♙xc5 ♕e8 23 ♙xc8+ ♙xc8 24 ♕e5 ♕e7 25 ♙c3 ♕f5 26 ♕c7 ♙b5 27 ♕f4 g5 28 ♕b8 a6 29 ♙c7 ♙d7

Now by keeping the queens on the board, White would have retained the excellent team of queen and knight. A draw would be a likely outcome.

Instead by 30 ♙xd7? White gave his opponent real winning chances. Although White probably should hold
the draw, Black is a good deal better and actually went on to win.

The Theory of 5...e6 6 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}b4 \) 7 cxd5

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \)
5 \( \mathcal{Q}c3 \) e6 6 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}b4 \) 7 cxd5 \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \)

7...exd5 is not so good. White’s best is 8 \( \mathcal{Q}b5+! \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{W}e2+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) (9...
\( \mathcal{W}e7 \)
10 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}f6+ \)
\( \mathcal{D}d8 \) 13 \( \mathcal{W}xe7+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}xe7 \) 14 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xf6 \)
15 \( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) gave White better prospects in Prokopchuk-Neumann, Dresden 1993; 9...
\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) 0-0 11 0-0 a6 12 \( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}f3 \) is also better for White, Doghri-Vadasz, Budapest 1996) 10
\( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) 0-0 (10...
\( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 11 \( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}xb5 \) 12
\( \mathcal{W}xb5+ \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}xe4 \) dxe4 14 \( \mathcal{W}xb7 \)
0-0 15 0-0 and White was a pawn up and went on to win in Shvidler-Haba,
Kecskemet 1993) 11 \( \mathcal{Q}dxe4 \) dxe4 12
0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 13 \( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{W}e8 \) 14 \( \mathcal{B}b1 \) a6 15
\( \mathcal{Q}xd7 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd7 \) 16 \( \mathcal{B}b6! \) \( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}b2 \)
\( \mathcal{E}a7 \) 18 d5, which was terrible for Black in Ashley-Vadasz, Budapest
1997.

Now:
A: 8 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) 84
B: 8 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) 86

Instead 8 \( \mathcal{W}b3 \) is an old line, which is not considered dangerous today.
8...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) \( \mathcal{W}b6! \) (the simplest equalizing method) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) (10 0-0
loses a pawn to 10...
\( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 11 \( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{W}xb3 \) 12 axb3 \( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \)) 10...
\( \mathcal{Q}a5 \) 11 0-0
\( \mathcal{W}xb3 \) 12 axb3 \( \mathcal{Q}b6 \) with equal chances, J.Polgar-Smyslov, Aruba 1992.

A)
8 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) (D)

This is quite popular nowadays, but I have my doubts about White’s chances of gaining an advantage.

Now:
A1: 8...\( \mathcal{D}d7 \) 84
A2: 8...\( \mathcal{Q}c6 \) 85

Others can be dealt with briefly:

a) 8...\( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 9 a3 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) exd5
11 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \( \mathcal{Q}e1 \) h6 14
\( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) is good for White, Suba-Smagin,
Moscow 1986.

b) 8...\( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Q}d2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 10 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \)
\( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 11 \( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) 0-0 12 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \), Holzke-
Lorincz, Budapest 1993. This is similar
to the typical positions investigated in Chapter 8, where White normally is
a little better.

c) 8...0-0 0 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) h6 10 0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}e7 \) 11
\( \mathcal{W}c2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 12 \( \mathcal{Q}xd5 \) exd5 13 \( \mathcal{Q}e5 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \)
14 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) \( \mathcal{W}b6 \) 15 \( \mathcal{Q}e3 \) was a little better
for White in Sveshnikov-Dolmatov,
Erevan 1982.

A1)
8...\( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \)
9...\( \mathcal{W}c7 \) 10 0-0 \( \mathcal{Q}xc3 \) 11 \( \mathcal{B}xc3 \) \( \mathcal{W}xc3 \)
12 \( \mathcal{Q}b1! \) \( \mathcal{W}b4 \) 13 \( \mathcal{Q}xh7 \) secured White
an advantage in Malaniuk-Vlassov, St
Petersburg 1994.
10 0-0 0-0
10...\textit{c}7 11 \textit{g}5 \textit{b}4 12 \textit{b}5+ \textit{d}7 13 \textit{xd}7+ \textit{xd}7 14 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}6 15 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 16 a3 \textit{4d}5 17 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 18 \textit{fe}1 gives Black problems completing his development, Kharlov-Gutov, Russia 1997.

11 \textit{xd}5 \textit{exd}5 12 \textit{g}5 h6 13 \textit{h}4 \textit{e}7 14 \textit{fe}1 \textit{e}6 15 \textit{f}5

White has emerged from the opening with an advantage, but Black’s debacle in C.Bauer-J.Petrov, Vejen U-18 Ech 1993 was unnecessary: 15...\textit{b}4? 16 \textit{xe}6! \textit{fxe}6 17 \textit{xe}6+ \textit{h}8 18 \textit{e}5 g5 19 \textit{wg}6 \textit{gh}7 20 \textit{wh}6 \textit{f}6 21 \textit{xg}5 \textit{hxh}6 22 \textit{df}7+ \textit{g}7 23 \textit{hxh}6+ 1-0.

\textbf{A2)}

8...\textit{c}6 (D)

A21: 9 \textit{e}2

A22: 9 \textit{d}3

Instead:

a) 9 a3 \textit{a}5 10 b4 \textit{b}6 11 \textit{b}2 (developing the queenside first seems careless) 11...a5 12 \textit{xd}5 \textit{exd}5 13 b5 \textit{e}7 14 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}4 15 \textit{e}5 \textit{c}8 16 \textit{wb}1 \textit{h}5 17 0-0 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3 19 \textit{gxf}3 \textit{wd}6 20 \textit{e}1 \textit{f}7 and Black is already much better, Miles-Djurić, San Francisco 1987.

b) 9 \textit{c}4 seems to lack any real idea. 9...\textit{b}6! 10 \textit{b}3? (10 \textit{b}5 is better, but not good) 10...\textit{xd}4 11 \textit{xd}4 \textit{wh}4 12 0-0 13 \textit{d}7 13 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}4 14 \textit{ad}1 \textit{g}6 15 \textit{we}2 \textit{c}6 16 f3 \textit{xc}3 17 bxc3 0-0 and White has insufficient compensation, if any at all, Martorelli-Zelčič, Saint Vincent 1998.

\textbf{A21)}

9 \textit{e}2

This is for some reason very popular these days, but Black should not experience any difficulties if he is careful.

9...0-0 10 0-0 \textit{e}7 11 \textit{d}1 \textit{f}6 12 \textit{we}4

12 \textit{de}4 h6 13 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 14 \textit{c}4 \textit{f}5! 15 \textit{wh}4 \textit{f}6 equalized in Renet-Loeben, Uzes tt 1990.

12...\textit{ce}7 13 \textit{d}3 g6 14 \textit{h}6 \textit{e}8 15 \textit{h}4

It seems that White has some initiative, but his pieces are worse placed than in the games in the Introduction, so Black has time to find a good defence.

15...\textit{d}7 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}6 17 \textit{g}4 \textit{f}5

The knights love to be here.

18 \textit{de}4 h6 19 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 20 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6


\textbf{A22)}

9 \textit{d}3

An interesting pawn sacrifice, but not necessarily a good one.

9...\textit{a}5!

The critical test. After 9...\textit{c}7 10 a3 \textit{f}6 11 0-0 \textit{de}7 12 \textit{e}3 h6 13
Black has better prospects due to his extra pawn. After 21 \textit{Bg}3 \textit{f}8 22 \textit{b}2 \textit{f}6 23 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}2 White is already lost, Mi.Pavlović-Tukmakov, Biel 1997.

10 a3
10 0-0 \textit{Q}db4 11 \textit{W}e2 \textit{Q}xd3 12 \textit{W}xd3 h6 13 \textit{Q}d1 0-0 14 \textit{W}e4 \textit{Q}xc3 15 \textit{b}xc3 \textit{W}d5 16 \textit{W}d3 \textit{Q}d8 is preferable for Black, Plaskett-Smagin, Belgrade 1988.

10...\textit{Q}xc3 11 \textit{b}xc3 \textit{Q}xd4 12 \textit{Q}xd4 \textit{W}xd4 13 \textit{Q}b5+
13 0-0? \textit{W}e5 14 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}c7 does not provide any compensation, Subašić-Groszpeter, Zenica 1987. White does not have to hurry castling anyway.

13...\textit{Q}d7
13...\textit{W}e7 14 0-0 \textit{W}e5 15 a4 \textit{Q}b6 16 \textit{Q}a3+ \textit{Q}c5 17 \textit{W}e2 \textit{W}c7 18 \textit{W}g4 \textit{Q}f8 and Black survived in Kotronias-Kourkounakis, Athens Cup 1996.

14 0-0 \textit{W}d5
14...\textit{W}e5? 15 \textit{Q}xd7+ \textit{Q}xd7 16 \textit{W}a4+ \textit{W}e7 17 \textit{Q}f4 gives White a flowing initiative, Mi.Pavlović-Piankov, Linares 1997.

15 c4 \textit{W}f5
15...\textit{W}h5?? loses a piece to 16 \textit{W}a4 \textit{Q}xb5 17 \textit{W}xa5.

16 \textit{Q}xd7+ \textit{Q}xd7 17 \textit{W}d1+
17 \textit{W}a4+ \textit{Q}e7 18 c5 b6! (I have talked to the white player in this game, and his analysis, which he did not show me, suggests that the position is equal, but that it is White who has to be careful not to be worse) 19 \textit{Q}f4 (19 \textit{Q}e3 \textit{Q}hd8 seems safe enough) 19...\textit{b}xc5 20 \textit{Q}ad1 \textit{Q}b6! 21 \textit{Q}d6+ \textit{Q}f6 22 \textit{W}c4 h5 23 \textit{Q}fe1 \textit{Q}ad8 24 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}g6 and Black's position is preferable, S.B.Hansen-P.Schlosser, Lippstadt 1997.

17...\textit{W}e7 18 \textit{Q}b1 b6 19 \textit{W}e2 \textit{Q}hd8 20 \textit{Q}b3 \textit{Q}ac8

8...\textit{Q}c6
8...0-0 9 \textit{Q}d3 b6?! 10 0-0 \textit{Q}b7 11 \textit{Q}xd5 \textit{Q}xd2 12 \textit{W}xd2 \textit{Q}xd5 13 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}e5 Sariego-Pecorelli, Cuba 1993. I suspect this was a prearranged draw, but the chances are even.

9 \textit{Q}d3
9 \textit{Q}b5 looks like a beginner's move, and does not pose Black any problems: 9...0-0 10 0-0 \textit{Q}e7 11 \textit{Q}c1 \textit{Q}cb4 12 \textit{Q}xd5?! (I do not understand why White should help Black reorganize his pieces) 12...\textit{Q}xd5 13 \textit{W}e2 \textit{Q}d7 14 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{W}b6 15 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}ad8 16 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}f6 and Black is already a good deal better, Vucković-Lobron, Wiesbaden 1993.

9 \textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}f6 10 0-0 0-0 11 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}e7 12 a3 a6 13 \textit{Q}c1 b5 14 \textit{Q}a2 \textit{Q}b7 must be even, Zso.Polgar-Kosashvili, Rishon le Zion 1996. This position is interesting, and only the fact that White placed the rook on c1 irritates.
9...\( \text{\texttt{e7}} \)

9...\( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 10 a3 \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wb6}} \) 13 0-0 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) (13...\( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{wd3}} \)! g6 15 \( \text{\texttt{flb1}} \) wins) 14 \( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) h6 15 \( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{g4}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{ad1}} \) gives White good chances of creating an attack, Christiaansen-Hulak, Surakarta/Denpasar 1982.

9...h6?! is a different plan. I do not completely trust it, but in practice it has turned out fine, e.g. 10 0-0 0-0 11 a3 \( \text{\texttt{a5}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{b1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b6}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) f5 14 \( \text{\texttt{a2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{ce7}} \) and Black is pretending to be OK, and maybe he is right, Totsky-Brodsky, Kstovo 1994.

9...b6?! 10 \( \text{\texttt{wa4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc3}} \) 11 bxc3 \( \text{\texttt{d7}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) h6 13 a3 0-0 14 c4 leaves Black disorganized, and White with a clear edge, Brunner-Kiefhaber, Budapest 1989.

10 0-0

10 \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) exd5 11 h3 \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e6}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{e1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wd7}} \) with even chances, Onischuk-Adams, Lucerne Wcht 1997.

10 \( \text{\texttt{we2}} \)! 0-0 11 \( \text{\texttt{d1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 12 0-0 \( \text{\texttt{b4}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{bl}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d7}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{fe1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{bd5}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{wf3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{wh3}} \) with ideal position for White, Suba-L.Spassov, L’Hospitalet 1994. Still, further tests are needed to verify whether this is a good plan.

10...0-0 (D)

10...\( \text{\texttt{db4?!}} \) might be another way to equalize. After 11 \( \text{\texttt{b5}} \) a6 12 \( \text{\texttt{xc6+}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{db4}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{wb3}} \) 0-0 15 a3 \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{xd5}} \) exd5 18 \( \text{\texttt{mac1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) 19 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) Black does not seem to be worse, Vratanjić-Papaioannou, Aegina 1995.

11 \( \text{\texttt{we2}} \)

White has tried a large number of alternatives:

a) 11 a3?! \( \text{\texttt{xc3}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{xc3}} \) (12 bxc3 b6 13 \( \text{\texttt{e1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \) 14 h4! gives White good attacking chances, as shown in the Chapter 10) 12...\( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) as was fine for Black in J.Polgar-Karpov, Monaco blindfold 1993.

b) 11 \( \text{\texttt{wc2?!}} \) \( \text{\texttt{db4}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{xe7h7+}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h8}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{wb1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) is fine for Black. White’s development is hardly excessive.

c) 11 \( \text{\texttt{c1}} \) is a fairly new pawn sacrifice, but probably it will not be around for long. After 11...\( \text{\texttt{db4}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{bl}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{b5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{df6}} \) (also very safe is 14...\( \text{\texttt{wd8}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b8}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{we2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{fd1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{db5}} \) b6 19 \( \text{\texttt{xa7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wf6}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{xc8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{fxc8}} \) 21 \( \text{\texttt{xc8+}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc8}} \) 22 \( \text{\texttt{c1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) with equal play, Rechlis-Agdestein, Jerusalem 1986) 15 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) e5 16 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b8}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{g3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{wh5}} \) g6 19 \( \text{\texttt{c1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) White has some initiative, but I doubt that it is sufficient, Onischuk-Polak, Vienna 1996.

d) 11 \( \text{\texttt{e4?!}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) bxc6 13 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{da4}} \) e5! 15 \( \text{\texttt{xc5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf3}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{xf3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) and Black is already close to winning, K.Müller-Lobron, Bundesliga 1993/4.

e) 11 \( \text{\texttt{c3?!}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe3}} \) (when Black has not weakened himself, this is quite
safe) 12 fxe3 b6 13 ♞c4 ♞b7 14 ♞e5 ♞e8 15 ♞h5 g6 16 ♞f3 ♞c8 17 ♞xc6 ♞xc6 18 ♞ac1 f5 and Black is already a little better, O.Rodriguez-Magem, Spanish Cht 1994.

f) 11 ♞e4 ♞b6 12 ♞c3 (the bishop is horrible here, but still b2 has to be defended) 12...♕d7 13 ♞d2 ♞fd8 14 ♞ad1 ♞ac8 15 ♞fe1 ♞e8 and Black was better all the way to the draw in B.Kristensen-P.H.Nielsen, Danish Ch (Esbjerg) 1997.

g) 11 ♞xd5 (not very ambitious) 11...exd5 12 ♞b3 ♞f6 13 ♞fe1 ♞wd6 14 ♞ac1 ♞d8 15 h3 g6 16 ♞e3 b6 17 ♞b5 ♞a5 is dead equal, Sermek-Berg, Luxembourg 1993.

h) 11 ♞e1!? ♞f6 (11...♕db4 12 ♞f4 ♞xd3 13 ♞xd3 might give White some chance of getting a positional advantage, due to his better development and the threat of d4-d5, e.g. 13...♕b4 14 ♞e4 ♞d7 15 d5 is better for White) 12 ♞g5 b6 13 a3 ♞b7 14 ♞c2 g6 15 ♞wd3 ♞d5 16 ♞h6 (16 h4 is better) 16...♕e8 and now 17 ♞b3 gave White a slight advantage in Ferher-Ellers, Balatonbereny 1995.

11...♕f6
11...♕f6 12 ♞e4 g6 13 ♞h6 ♞e8 14 ♞e5 ♞de7 is totally fine for Black, Vajda-Nisipeanu, Budapest 1996.

11...♕db4 looks dangerous, but with only one game available it is hard to come to any clear conclusions. 12 ♞e4 ♞xd4 13 ♞xd4 ♞xd4 14 ♞e3 ♞we5 15 ♞f3 a5 (Black's main problem is that he has no easy way to develop) 16 ♞ad1 ♞c6 17 ♞fe1 ♞f6 18 ♞h5 h6 19 ♞b5 ♞b4 20 ♞b1 ♞e5 21 ♞d3 ♞f5 22 ♞e2 ♞e5 23 f4 ♞b8 24 a3 ♞c7 25 ♞a4 ♞c7 26 ♞c2 g6 27 ♞e5 ♞xf5 28 ♞b6 ♞c6 29 ♞xa8 ♞xa8 30 ♞xe6 Yudasin-Yuldachev, Erevan OL 1996. White is preferable, though the game ended in a draw.

12 ♞e3
12 ♞e4 is covered in the two Kamsky-Karpov games in the Introduction.

12...♕b4 13 ♞c4
13 ♞b1 b6 is OK for Black as well.

13...a6 14 a3 ♞bd5 15 ♞e5 ♞d7 16 ♞d2 ♞c8 17 ♞fe1 ♞c6
Black is fine, Sermek-Gerber, Cannes 1995.
7 7  

**d3: Introduction and Unusual 9th Moves**

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4  

\[\Box f6\]

5  

\[\Box c3\]  

6  

\[\Box f3\]  

\[\Box b4\]  

7  

\[\Box d3\] (D)

A way to winning the World Championship.

I have no doubt whatsoever that the 6...\[\Box b4\] line is Black’s most reliable reply to the Panov-Botvinnik Attack. There is no easy way for White to develop an initiative.

This chapter discusses alternatives to the main lines, which are dealt with in the next two chapters. There are two kind of positions from this chapter that are worth discussing: firstly positions where Black tries to grab a pawn on e3 (which is also possible in the 9...\[b6\] line) and secondly the traditional IQP positions, arising after 9...\[c6\], but these are to be found in the introduction to this book.

Let’s now take a look at a rather famous game from the 1980s, where Kasparov met some problems on the

Beliavsky – Kasparov  
Moscow Ct (4) 1983

14...\[\Box c7??\]

Later Black improved with 14...\[\Box c6\], which gives him better chances of resisting White’s initiative.

15  

\[d5!!\]

A beautiful move, opening a line for the b2-bishop. If Black had time to blockade d5, the bishop would prove misplaced on b2, and the compensation for the pawn would be insufficient.

15...\[\Box xd5\]

This seems forced. 15...\[\Box xd5\] leaves the king without protection. White has a very strong attack after 16  

\[g5\]  

g6 (16...\[h6\] is worse, as 17  

\[h5!!\] probably leaves Black defenceless: 17...\[f4\] 18  

\[\Box xh6!!\] with mate soon to follow;
17...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d8 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h7+! \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f8 \) (18...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 19 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xh6 \) leaves Black without defence) 19 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}a3+ \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e8 20 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xe6 \) with a winning attack, besides the material gains; 17...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c3 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h7+ \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 19 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c4! \) and Black is lost, since he is so badly placed that he cannot avoid losing a piece) 17 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xh7! \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c8 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}g4. \) If Black can survive this is very doubtful.

16 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xf6 \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}xf6 17 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}e3\)

The black king’s position has been seriously weakened and he is behind in development. Still, it is not obvious that White has sufficient compensation.

17...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g7 18 \text{\textit{\textbf{H}}}ac1 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c6 19 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e4! \)

Forcing further weaknesses in the black camp.

19...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d6\)

The queen was misplaced and had to move. After 19...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xe4 20 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xe4 \text{\textit{\textbf{H}}}ac8 21 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d4 \) Black loses a piece and the game.

20 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xd5 \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}xd5 21 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c4!\)

Now the king comes under attack. It is forceful moves like this that are needed to make a two-pawn investment pay off.

21...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d7!\)

Black is forced to prevent the check on g4. The variation 21...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{H}}}ae8 22 \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g4+ \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 23 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h6 \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g8 24 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xd5!! \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}e6 25 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xh7+! \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xh7 26 \text{\textit{\textbf{H}}}h5# \) illustrates why.

22 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{H}}}h4 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f5 23 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xd5!\)

Not very difficult tactics, but still beautiful.

23...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e5 24 \text{\textit{\textbf{H}}3}\)

All White’s pieces are well placed, and he has to do something about his back-rank problems. It’s true prophylaxis at its simplest.

24...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{F}}}e8 25 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d4 \)

The knight belongs on the f5-square.

25...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g6 26 \text{\textit{\textbf{F}}}f4 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}ad8 27 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f5+ \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h8 28 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xd8 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xd8 29 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}e4\)

White no longer has the initiative, but as so often the advantage has just changed its character. Black is left with permanent weaknesses around his king, and a knight that will have trouble finding a really good square. Also the queen might in some lines get in trouble. Black has an extra pawn, but it is not apparent how he should make any use of it. If he moves the queenside pawns they will just be lost.

29...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c8 30 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h2 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c4?\)

Black loses his nerve after a good defence. After 30...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d8\) it was still up to White to find some ways to attack. The trick behind it is 31 f4?! \(\text{\textit{\textbf{F}}}f3+!\), when Black is still in the game.

31 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}a8+ \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g8 32 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}a7 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xh4 33 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}xh4\)

After these exchanges the two main factors in the position are the position of the queens and the weaknesses of the pawns. On both counts White is clearly better. The position must be considered winning for White.

33...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}g5 34 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}a8+ \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g7 35 \text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}e4\)

h5?

The final mistake, but also after 35...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}g8 36 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f5 \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g6 37 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}g3\) it would be impossible to defend the black position. 37...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{W}}}d2 38 \text{\textit{\textbf{A}}}a8+ \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f8 39 \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g2\) leaves White in total control, even though he still has some work ahead of him.

36 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}f5+ \text{\textit{\textbf{G}}}g6 37 \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e7+ \text{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}h6 38 \text{\textit{\textbf{F}}}4\)

1-0

The important lesson from this game is the same as in the main line in
the theoretical section: White must use the initiative vigorously, and not let the power of his attack fade out, while Black has to be very careful to avoid losing on almost every move. Normally the chances must be evaluated as being preferable for White in practice, since it is easier to attack than it is to defend. Also I have not seen any games where Black proves that it is safe to take the pawn.

**The Theory of 7 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c3}} \)**

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c3}} \) e6 5 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c3}} \) e6 6 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{f3}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d4}} \) 7 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d3}} \) dxc4

Black has also tried other moves. Here are two important examples which do not end with a transposition to the main line:

a) 7...0-0 8 cxd5 exd5 9 0-0 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{g4}} \) 10 h3 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{h5}} \) 11 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{g5}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c3}} \) 12 bxc3 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{bd7}} \) 13 c4 dxc4 14 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xc4}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b6}} \) 15 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b3}} \) gave White an edge in the game S.B. Hansen-Kumaras, Copenhagen 1996.

b) 7...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c6}} \) 8 0-0 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e7}} \) 9 a3 0-0 10 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e1}} \) b6 11 cxd5 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xd5}} \) 12 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xd5}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xd5}} \) 13 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e4}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d6}} \) 14 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c5}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b7}} \) 15 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{f4}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{f6}} \) 16 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{g6}} \) gave White a winning position in Berndt-Tomann, Berlin 1996.

8 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xc4}} \) 0-0

8...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d5}} \) 9 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d3}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c6}} \) 10 0-0 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b6}} \) 11 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b3}} \) 0-0 12 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c2}} \) g6 13 a3 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e7}} \) 14 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{h6}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e8}} \) 15 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{ad1}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d5}} \) 16 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{fe1}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d7}} \) 17 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e4}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{f6}} \) 18 h4 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c8}} \) 19 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xf6}} \) 20 h5 gave White a fantastic attacking position in Nixon-Sejdini, Redcar 1995.

9 0-0 (D)

Now:

A: 9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d7}} \)!

B: 9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{bd7}} \)

Or:

a) 9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c6}} \) is a perfectly reasonable alternative to the main lines, and should not be underestimated. 10 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{g5}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e7}} \) 11 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e1}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d7}} \) 12 a3 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c8}} \) 13 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d3}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d5}} \) 14 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xe7}} \) (14 h4!? is an interesting option) 14...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{dx7}} \) 15 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{ad1}} \) with an interesting position, Tal-Ljubojević, Manila IZ 1990. In the game White rushed with d4-d5 and forced drawish simplifications. Preferable was the aggressive set-up with \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{a2}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b1}} \).

b) 9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xc3}} \) 10 bxc3 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{w7}} \) 11 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d3}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{bd7}} \) (11...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xc3}} \)! 12 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{g5}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{bd7}} \) transposes to Line B) 12 c4 b6 13 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b2}} \) looks fairly normal, but White has developed the bishop to b2, which is not possible in the standard lines after any other move than 9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{xc3}} \). Then the straightforward 13...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b7}} \) 14 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e1}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e8}} \) 15 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{e3}} \)! \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{ad8}} \) 16 h3 h6 17 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{c1}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{h5}} \) 18 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{b1}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{f4}} \) 19 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{wc2}} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{g6}} \) 20 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{ac1}} \) gave White a very promising position in Lesiège-Peptan, Bermuda 1998.

c) 9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{w7}} \) should not have independent significance after the standard 10 \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d3}} \)!

A)

9...\( \textcolor{blue}{\text{d7}} \)?
This very interesting idea has not met any kind of refutation. I think that White's approach has been mistaken in both the games played with 9...\texttt{d}d7. The move \texttt{e}5 does not improve White's position at all, and should be replaced by standard play with \texttt{w}d3 and \texttt{a}d1.

10 \texttt{g}5

10 \texttt{e}5?! \texttt{c}6 11 \texttt{g}5 (11 \texttt{xc}6? \texttt{xc}6! 12 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{c}8 gives Black the better chances) 11...\texttt{bd}7 12 \texttt{b}3 (other options are 12 \texttt{xc}6 with equality, and 12 \texttt{xd}7 \texttt{xd}7! with complicated play) 12...\texttt{a}5 13 \texttt{fe}1 \texttt{ac}8 14 \texttt{ac}1 \texttt{xc}3! 15 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{xe}5 16 \texttt{xe}5 \texttt{d}5. Black has already won the opening battle. Now White is forced to enter a position where his prospects are small, since he has no compensation for his weakened pawn-structure. After 17 \texttt{e}7 \texttt{fe}8 18 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{wc}7 19 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{xb}4 20 \texttt{xb}4 \texttt{ed}8 Black went on to convert his advantage into a full point in Scherbakov-Shipov, Norresundby 1993.

10...\texttt{e}7

10...\texttt{c}6 11 \texttt{wd}3 \texttt{bd}7 12 \texttt{ad}1.

11 \texttt{le}1 \texttt{c}6 12 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{d}5

Here White agreed a draw in Ginzburg-Tempone, Argentina 1996. However, he had an interesting possibility at his disposal:

13 \texttt{xe}7! \texttt{xe}7

13...\texttt{xc}3? loses to 14 \texttt{xd}8 \texttt{xd}1 15 \texttt{e}7, and 13...\texttt{we}7?? 14 \texttt{xc}6 \texttt{bxc}6 15 \texttt{xd}5 \texttt{cxd}5 16 \texttt{xd}5 is totally finished.

14 \texttt{xf}7!? \texttt{xf}7 15 \texttt{xe}6

In this unbalanced position, White has good chances to gain a large advantage, because Black has some problems with his development.

B)

9...\texttt{bd}7 10 \texttt{g}5 (D)

10...\texttt{xc}3

Alternatives:

a) 10...\texttt{a}6 makes less sense now, compared to move 9, when the knight has already decided on d7. After 11 \texttt{a}4 White is slightly better.

b) 10...\texttt{wa}5!? is a very interesting possibility. Black wants to play ...\texttt{xc}3 and ...\texttt{b}5 to take control over the light squares on the queenside, mainly to use d5. 11 \texttt{wd}3! (wise by experience, Vaissner puts his queen on d3 instead of e2; two years earlier he had chosen the other approach and lost horribly to Korchnoi) 11...\texttt{h}6 12 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{b}6?! (12...\texttt{b}6 is better, but White still has a better position; Black's queen might sometimes go to h5, but it's not always certain that it can do good there) 13 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{xc}3 14 \texttt{bxc}3 \texttt{bd}5 15 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{wc}7 16 \texttt{de}5 \texttt{d}7 17 \texttt{f}4, White is far better and won a good game in Vaissner-Kudrin, Erevan open 1996.

11 \texttt{bxc}3 \texttt{wc}7 12 \texttt{d}3!

12 \texttt{wd}3 was played previously.

12...\texttt{xc}3

12...\texttt{b}6 13 \texttt{c}4 is better for White according to Dolmatov.
13 \textit{Hc1} \textit{Wa5} 14 \textit{De5}!
White must act immediately. 14 \textit{Hxe1} b6 15 \textit{De5} \textit{Hb7} would not give any compensation for the pawn.
14...\textit{Qxe5}
14...b6?! 15 \textit{Wf3} \textit{Wd5} 16 \textit{Wh3} would give White a very strong attack. Black is not developed, and White is ready for action.
14...\textit{Wd5}?! is interesting. After 15 \textit{He1} \textit{Hh8} 16 \textit{He3} and now rather than 16...\textit{Wxd4}? 17 \textit{Cc4} \textit{Wd5} (B.Ivanović-Mirković, Yugoslav Ch 1991) 18 \textit{Qxd7!} \textit{Qxd7} 19 \textit{Wh5} f5 (19...h6 20 \textit{Bg3};
19...g6 20 \textit{Wh6} \textit{Bg8} 21 \textit{Cc7} \textit{Wd4} 22 \textit{Hf3}) 20 \textit{Hh4} \textit{Bg8} 21 \textit{Wxh7+} \textit{Hf7} 22
\textit{Hh6!} with a winning attack for White, 16...b5! threatening to take on d4, as there is no \textit{Cc4} now, was better, with a double-edged position.
15 \textit{Cc5} \textit{Wa3} 16 \textit{dx5}!
Necessary. 16 \textit{Hxe5}?! \textit{Qd5} gives White no easy way to continue the attack.
16...\textit{Wxc5}
16...\textit{Qe4}?! 17 \textit{Hxc8} \textit{Qxg5} 18 \textit{Hxa8}
\textit{Hxa8} 19 h4 g6 20 \textit{Qb1}! wins a piece. Also 16...\textit{Qd7} 17 \textit{Hb5!} is very dangerous for Black, as he has no development – Speelman.
17 \textit{Qxf6} \textit{He8}?! (D)
After this Black is in deep trouble. He can stay in the fight with 17...\textit{gx6!} 18 \textit{Wg4+} \textit{Hh8} 19 \textit{Wh4} (19 \textit{exf6} is refuted by 19...\textit{Bg8} 20 \textit{Wh4} h5! 19...\textit{f5}
20 \textit{Wf6+} \textit{Bg8} 21 \textit{Wg5+} \textit{Bh8} 22 \textit{Wf6+} \textit{Bg8} 23 \textit{He1}! \textit? \textit{Qd7} 24 \textit{He3} \textit{Wc1+} 25
\textit{Qf1} \textit{Wxe3} 26 \textit{fxe3}. This position is interesting, as Black is fine materially, but has some problems with his king.

Dolmatov thinks White retains some winning chances, although he has not found a forced win.
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18 \textit{Qh7+!!} \textit{Qh7}
18...\textit{f8} 19 \textit{Wg4} \textit{gx6} 20 \textit{exf6} and White wins.
19 \textit{Wh5+} \textit{Bg8} 20 \textit{Wg5} \textit{Wf8}
20...g6? is met by 21 \textit{Wh6}.
21 \textit{Hd1}!
Now Black has only one way to try to defend.
21...b6 22 \textit{Hd4} \textit{Hd8} 23 \textit{Hg4} \textit{He2}
24 \textit{Qg7}?
24 \textit{Hg3}? is not a good idea. 24...\textit{Red8}
25 h3 \textit{Hd3!} gives Black counterplay, and after 26 f3?! \textit{Hd1+} 27 \textit{Hh2} \textit{Qd3!}
28 \textit{Qxg7} \textit{Cc5} he is actually winning.
Also 24 \textit{Wxg7+} \textit{Wxg7} 25 \textit{Hxg7+}
does not work in view of the cool reply 25...\textit{Hh8}!.
24...\textit{Lxg4} 25 \textit{Lxf8+} \textit{Lxf8} 26 \textit{Wxg4}
\textit{Lac8}
Now, rather than 27 h4, as in Dolmatov-Speelman, Hastings 1989/90, 27 \textit{Wg5!} is stronger, to imprison the king on f8 and only then start the march with the h-pawn.
1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 ćf6 5 ćc3 e6 6 ćf3 ćb4 7 ćd3 dxc4 8 ćxc4 0-0 9 0-0 b6 (D)

This line is the most popular line in the 6...ćb4 variation, and therefore it receives more detailed coverage than 9...a6, which I actually consider more critical. Yet even top-level players such as Karpov and Polugaevsky have preferred 9...b6, so maybe it is just me!?

The pawn structure often arising from this line looks like this.

Black’s structure, in principle, is superior. White has three pawn-islands, and the c- and d-pawns could easily turn out to be weak. On the other hand, with pieces on the board, White has a space advantage, and a very strong plan in a2-a4-a5xb6 to create a weakness, as in the Christiansen game below.

The plan I suggest White uses is the one including the exchange of a pair of knights. The examples below illustrate how that benefits White. Sometimes Black gives up the two bishops, and there are also instances of Black being careless in exchanging on c3, giving White a kingside attack. I also present one example where I myself am incredibly stupid in my hope of quick victory.

Sadler – J. Cooper
British League (4NCL) 1997/8

This position occurs rather easily if one follows my suggestions in the
theoretical section. This is a rather one-sided example where White has a considerably higher rating, but still it is important to see how he keeps everything under control.

15 \textit{b}3

This is the key idea: the bishop is stronger on b3 than anywhere else. This actually came as a surprise for me – I had always placed it on d3.

15...e5?! 

This opens the diagonal for the bishop on b3, while the advance itself does not really accomplish anything. White is better already.

16 \textit{g}4 h8 

17 \textit{h}6 was threatened. 

17 \textit{h}4 f6?!

Black is trying to liberate his rook, but the pawn-chain is not so solid as it appears.

18 \textit{c}2!

Forcing Black to make further concessions. If Black could maintain his fragile set-up he might only be slightly worse.

18...e4 19 \textit{d}2! 

After 19 \textit{f}4 White cuts off his control over e4 and has to reckon with...g5.

19...f5 20 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}6 21 c4 

White’s central pawns are very intimidating, and Black feels forced to create counterplay. It turns out to be clearly insufficient, so he would have been better off waiting for White to come at him, though there would only be small chances of saving the game.

21...\textit{ae}8 22 \textit{b}3 e3?! 23 f3 \textit{f}6 

24 \textit{fe}1

The pawn is simply picked up.

24...e2 25 \textit{f}2 \textit{g}4 

Desperation.

26 \textit{fx}g4 \textit{fx}g4 27 d5 \textit{f}6 28 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}5 29 \textit{xe}2 1-0 

The following game shows some positional ideas for White against a solid defence. It is one of my all-time favourite games in the Panov.

Christiansen – Winants 
Antwerp 1993 

23 \textit{g}3 \textit{b}7 24 \textit{d}6 

White should have started to play on the queenside at once with 24 a4! with the same plan as in the game.

24...\textit{f}6 25 f3 \textit{ed}8 26 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}7 

27 \textit{g}3 \textit{f}8 28 a4!

White is planning to create a weakness on the queenside, and at the same time to get rid of his isolated pawn. Against this plan there is no defence, and White gains a clear advantage.

28...\textit{wd}7 29 \textit{wa}3 \textit{c}6 30 a5 \textit{g}6 

Christiansen gives the line 30...b5 31 d5 exd5 32 \textit{e}7 b4 33 \textit{xb}4 \textit{f}5 34 \textit{e}5 with a clear advantage to White.

31 axb6 axb6 32 \textit{b}4 

Black is under a lot of pressure, not least because he lacks an active plan. The normal central breaks with...b5 and...e5, to create squares, are not
possible, and the pawn on b6 is weak. Also White can always have fun with his two bishops, while he is thinking about opening the position for tactics with d4-d5.

32...h5!?

This is an attempt to gain counterplay that in the end turns out to be a weakening of the black king's position. However, it is hard to blame Black for not waiting for his fate.

33 h3!

33 \textit{W}xb6 is possible, but allows Black some counterplay after 33...h4 34 \textit{A}f2 h3, when the white king is seriously weakened, and the white pawns cannot advance without problems.

33...\textit{W}b7 34 \textit{W}b2 \textit{A}d7 35 \textit{A}b1 \textit{Q}e7 36 \textit{A}f2 \textit{A}b8 37 \textit{W}c3

White is manoeuvring and trying to catch Black in a position where he cannot defend everything. Meanwhile he does not change the structure. Note that the bishop would be stronger on b3. There are no defensive duties that have to be taken care of, so it could as well have influence over the d5-square. Nevertheless, Christiansen was unhappy with his last move. He mentions 37 \textit{A}e5! as an improvement. The idea is to create further weaknesses in the black position. But as before, he gets the chance again.

37...\textit{W}c7 38 \textit{A}e5 \textit{A}f5

With the black queen on b7 White would have had d4-d5 to undermine the black knight.

39 \textit{W}b2

White takes the queen out of the pin and threatens 40 d5.

39...g6 40 \textit{A}be1 \textit{W}d8

Now White could have started an unstoppable attack with 41 d5! exd5 42 \textit{A}xf5 gxf5 43 \textit{W}e5 followed by \textit{A}d4. Instead the game was less clear after 41 \textit{A}d1?! h4 42 d5! b5!, although White won in the end.

The following game is an illustration of what happens if White is not careful, and says goodbye to his bishop-pair.
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\textit{Østenstad – B. Stein}

\textit{Gausdal 1992}

This position has not come from the move-order I suggest, but still White would maintain the standard position with 17 \textit{A}b3!, and then also a little advantage. Instead he adopted a quite different plan:

17 \textit{A}b5?! \textit{A}c6 18 \textit{A}d3 \textit{Q}g6

Black is already close to being equal here, but after the next move he is even better.

19 \textit{W}h5? h6! 20 \textit{A}e3 \textit{Q}f4 21 \textit{A}xf4 \textit{W}xf4

Now that he has given up the bishop-pair, White has no compensation for his fragile pawn-structure; his position has lost much of its dynamism. The following is a powerful demonstration from Black of how one should
increase the pressure in a slightly better position.

22 \text{He}3 \text{He}d8 23 \text{Hce}1 \text{Hd}5 24 \text{We}2 \text{Hg}5 25 g3? (D)

This must be wrong. The light squares around the white king are now permanently ill. After 25 f3 White would only suffer from a slight discomfort.

25...\text{Wf}6 26 \text{Cc}2 \text{Hd}8 27 \text{Wd}3

This is rather naïve. The weakening of the black king’s position is insignificant, since White has no knight or bishop that can take advantage of it.

27...g6 28 \text{Bb}3 \text{Gg}7

Black has all the time in the world.

29 \text{We}2 \text{Hd}6 30 f3 \text{Ha}5 31 f4

These two moves with the f-pawn do not really make any sense. White is now positionally lost.

31...\text{Hd}5 32 \text{Ee}5 \text{Hd}8 33 \text{Wf}2 \text{Ec}8

Black now focuses on White’s permanent weakness – and not before, since White could never solve the problem. Previously Black was occupied with creating further weakness, since one weakness alone is not enough for a full point.

34 \text{Wb}2 \text{Wd}8 35 \text{Cc}1 b5

The final attack is started.

36 \text{Hxd}5 \text{exd}5 37 \text{Wg}2 b4 38 c4 \text{Hxc}4 0-1

The following two games illustrate White’s attacking chances in this line. In both cases Black is careless in the opening, but still there is something in the structure that provides White with good chances of gaining an attack.

\text{Acs – Vadasz}
\text{Budapest 1997}

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 e6 5 \text{Cc}3 \text{Df}6 6 \text{Df}3 \text{Bb}4 7 \text{Hd}3 \text{Dxc}4 8 \text{Hxc}4 0-0 9 0-0 b6 10 \text{Gg}5 \text{Ab}7 11 \text{Cc}1

Here I recommend 11 \text{De}5 as the most dangerous plan, but what happens in these games is not without interest.

11...\text{Gb}d7 12 \text{He}1 \text{Hxc}3?!

This lands Black in trouble. A lot better is 12...\text{Cc}8 13 \text{Cd}3 \text{Hxc}3 14 bxc3 with another main line, but not one considered in this book.

13 \text{Hxc}3 \text{Wb}8 14 \text{De}5!

Clearing the way for the queen.

14...\text{Dxe}5 15 \text{Dxe}5 (D)

15...\text{Dd}7
An even bigger disaster for Black was the following game: 15...\textit{Q}e4?! 16 \textit{W}g4! f5 (Black is lost after 16...\textit{Q}xc3 17 \textit{Q}f6 g6 18 \textit{W}h4 \textit{Q}e4 \{18...\textit{Q}d5 19 \textit{Q}xd5!\} 19 \textit{Q}xe4 h5 20 \textit{W}g5 \textit{Q}h7 21 \textit{Q}h4) 17 \textit{Q}xe6+ \textit{Q}h8 18 \textit{Q}xf5 (White has two pawns for the exchange, and Black can find no way to defend his king) 18...\textit{Q}xc3 19 bxc3 \textit{W}c7 20 \textit{W}g3 (20 \textit{W}h3 would have forced Black to give up another pawn with 20...g6, since 20...h6 21 \textit{Q}xh6 is hopeless) 20...h6 21 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{W}d6 22 h3 (White finds himself in good time; the queen will sooner or later start a decisive attack on the b1-h7 diagonal) 22...\textit{Q}d5 23 \textit{Q}f4 \textit{W}c6 24 \textit{Q}e7 \textit{Q}f7 25 \textit{Q}xf7 \textit{Q}xf7 26 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}g8 27 \textit{Q}c2 \textit{Q}c4 (27...h5 28 \textit{W}d3 \textit{W}h6 29 \textit{W}f4! would also win) 28 \textit{W}g4 1-0 Kumaran-Hellsten, Copenhagen 1996. There is no defiance to 29 \textit{W}f5 with mate or equivalent to follow.

16 \textit{K}e3 \textit{W}d6 17 \textit{W}g4 \textit{K}e8 18 \textit{K}b5!

The opposite-coloured bishops will be an advantage for White, since he has the attack.

18...\textit{K}ec8 19 \textit{K}xd7 \textit{W}xd7 20 \textit{K}f6 g6 21 h4!

White should not rush. After 21 \textit{K}h3 \textit{K}xc3 22 bxc3 \textit{K}b5! Black gains counterplay.

21...h5 22 \textit{W}g5 \textit{Q}h7 23 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{W}d5?

Black could still have put up a lot of resistance with 23...\textit{W}e8! 24 \textit{W}f6 \textit{W}f8 although White has excellent winning chances.

24 \textit{K}f3! 1-0

In the following game I tried to out-prepare my opponent, without success. The game was played in the last round, with both players needing to win to make a GM norm. My only positive memory from this game is that my opponent finally made his GM title, which I had swindled from him in a game one year earlier. He played well, and deserved to win the game:
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14...h6!

This was what I feared, and naturally he blitzed it out. After this I tried to get back to the structure I had seen in the Christiansen game, but Black played with all the speed needed to avoid this.

15 \textit{Q}h4 \textit{W}e8 16 \textit{K}b5

This was a new move, but I suspect that White already has to think about equality here with 16 \textit{Q}e5.

16...\textit{Q}xc3 17 bxc3 a6 18 \textit{K}f1 \textit{W}a8!

Black’s pieces are more harmoniously placed, and White is forced to enter a bad structure.

19 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}xe5 20 \textit{Q}xe5 \textit{Q}d5! 21 c4 \textit{Q}f4 22 \textit{Q}g3 \textit{Q}g6!

This was the idea. After 22...\textit{Q}xg2?, 23 d5! exd5 24 cxd5 f6 25 d6+ \textit{Q}h8 26 \textit{Q}e7 prevents all counterplay and
thereby gives White a winning position, where he can exploit the bad knight and the weaknesses in the black position.

23 $\text{He}1$ b5! 24 c5?!

I was simply so disgusted with my play that I stopped caring about making good moves. 24 $\text{cx}b5$ $\text{ax}b5$ 25 $\text{W}x$b5 $\text{f}$d5 wins back the pawn with a superior structure for Black, although the game should be a draw.

24...$\text{d}$d5

With a fine game for Black, which he won. It was so badly played by White that I will spare myself the rest. I ought to mention that John Emms found a draw later for White, so it's not that bad yet.

In this game Black had the chance to wreck the white king's position with 18...$\text{xf}3$, but he refrained from it, with good reason. Sometimes, though, this exchange can be good. Here are three interesting examples featuring an exchange on f3.

This is prevented by White's next move.

21 $\text{Ab}$1! $\text{Wa}$5!

The queen is an embarrassment after 21...$\text{Gb}$8 22 $\text{Ab}$5! $\text{W}h$3 23 $\text{Af}$1, when it has to be disadvantageously exchanged by 23...$\text{W}h$6 24 $\text{W}x$h6 $\text{gx}h6$. Black's position must then be considered a lot worse.

22 $\text{Ad}$6 $\text{f}$8!

Black is forced to allow $\text{Ne}$7, since otherwise he will never have any counterplay. Therefore he brings the knight to the kingside to avoid denuding his king completely.

23 $\text{Ne}$7?!

White would have kept equality with 23 $\text{Nb}$4!, forcing the queen back to the kingside, where it can't grab pawns.

23...$\text{Ed}$7 24 $\text{xf}$6 $\text{gx}f6$ 25 $\text{Ab}$5?

A bad pawn sacrifice, but passive play would be an admission that White is worse.

25...$\text{Wxa}$2 26 $\text{Hh}$5 $\text{Ax}c$4!

A strong sacrifice, by which Black takes control of the central squares and eliminates an important part of White's attacking potential. I am sure Nisipeanu was counting on winning the game here.

27 $\text{xc}$4 $\text{xc}$4 28 $\text{Hh}$4 $\text{Gg}$6 29 $\text{Ec}$1 $\text{Wd}$5 30 $\text{Ec}$8+ $\text{Ed}$8 31 $\text{Wxd}$8 $\text{Wxd}$8

This endgame is obviously without real saving chances for White. Black's queen and knight work well together, his king is safe and his pawns are very strong.

Thorhallsson – Nisipeanu
Erevan OL 1996

19...$\text{xf}$3 20 $\text{gxf}$3 $\text{Ed}$8

Black would love to bring his knight to c6 and put pressure on d4.
16...\texttt{\textit{xf}3} 17 \texttt{gx}f3 \texttt{\textit{xf}d}8 18 \texttt{\textit{cd}1} e5

Black is trying to create squares for his knights, but at the same time he also opens up diagonals for White's bishops. 19 d5 \texttt{\textit{e}8} 20 \texttt{\textit{h}}1 \texttt{\textit{h}5}?

Black is going for f4, which does not give him any targets, but otherwise it is difficult for him to generate active counterplay. It is perhaps doubtful whether this structure is good for Black, despite the good squares he has for his pieces.

21 \texttt{\textit{g}1} \texttt{\textit{f}8} 22 \texttt{\textit{c}1} \texttt{\textit{g}6} 23 \texttt{\textit{e}3} \texttt{\textit{c}7} 24 a4

White is starting her queenside play in the traditional way.

24...\texttt{\textit{f}6} 25 a5 \texttt{\textit{f}4} 26 axb6 axb6 27 \texttt{\textit{b}1} \texttt{\textit{xd}3} 28 \texttt{\textit{xb}6} \texttt{\textit{a}3}

Black enters a mass-exchange that leaves him in a lost position.

29 \texttt{\textit{xf}6} \texttt{\textit{xc}4} 30 \texttt{\textit{c}6}! \texttt{\textit{xc}6} 31 dxc6 \texttt{\textit{f}4} 32 \texttt{\textit{d}7} \texttt{\textit{a}8} 33 \texttt{\textit{xf}4} \texttt{\textit{exf}4} 34 \texttt{\textit{d}1} \texttt{\textit{f}8} 35 \texttt{\textit{g}2} g6 36 c7 1-0

The pawn queens sooner or later.

The following game is in some ways similar. The main difference is White's kingside structure.

17...\texttt{\textit{xf}3}

This exchange does not damage White's pawn structure, but it does give Black a chance to create squares for his knights in the centre. 18 \texttt{\textit{xf}3} e5 19 \texttt{\textit{gg}3}?

White is playing to win. If White played 19 d5 the game would be level or maybe even slightly better for White. 19...\texttt{\textit{exd}4} 20 \texttt{\textit{xe}8+} \texttt{\textit{xe}8} 21 \texttt{\textit{f}4} \texttt{\textit{c}6} 22 \texttt{\textit{f}5} \texttt{\textit{d}8}

Black untangles himself without much difficulty.

23 h3 \texttt{\textit{c}5} 24 \texttt{\textit{d}1} \texttt{\textit{f}6} 25 \texttt{\textit{b}1}

White lacks scope for his bishops, and is clearly worse.

25...\texttt{\textit{e}6} 26 \texttt{\textit{h}2} \texttt{\textit{f}8} 27 \texttt{\textit{e}5} \texttt{\textit{xc}4}

Another pawn goes, and without any visible compensation at all.

28 \texttt{\textit{f}4} \texttt{\textit{e}6} 29 \texttt{\textit{e}4} \texttt{\textit{d}5} 30 \texttt{\textit{e}2} \texttt{\textit{d}6}

White has no compensation at all and he soon had to resign.

Sometimes White is forced to give up his light-squared bishop, often because of ...\texttt{\textit{g}4}, forcing White to play
9...b6

\( \texttt{Le4} \) and exchange the bishop. This often leaves him with no positive prospects. One of the worst examples of what can happen if White gives up the bishop-pair is the following.

\[
\text{\texttt{B}}
\]

Taimanov – Karpov

*Moscow tt 1973*

White would be about equal, if he had time to play 18 c4. Black prevents this with a superb pawn sacrifice.

\[
\text{17...\texttt{Ec4!} 18 \texttt{Wxa7 Wc6}}
\]

Threatening to win the queen with \( \ldots \texttt{Aa8} \) and \( \ldots \texttt{Aa4} \).

\[
\text{19 \texttt{Wa3 Ec8}}
\]

Black has more than enough compensation. White has no active play, and Black can simply improve his position before he tries to prove an advantage.

\[
\text{20 h3 h6 21 \texttt{Hb1 Aa4 22 Wb3 Bd5}}
\]

\[
\text{23 Axc1 Ae4 24 Hb2 f6}
\]

Karpov is the champion of this kind of chess. His play is super-prophylactic. It is not possible to imagine what possibilities he prevents with a move like this.

\[
\text{25 Ael f7 26 Wd1 Ef8}
\]

The knight is brought to a better square – chess that everyone understands.

\[
\text{27 Axb3 Dg6 28 Wb1 Aa8 29 Ae4}
\]

\[
\text{Cc4 30 Hb2 Ae8 31 Wd3 Ac4 32}
\]

\[
\text{Ee1 Aa3 33 Wb1 Ag6 34 Ac1 Axc3}
\]

Black was not making any progress any more, and he had to take the pawn back, though this gives White some air.

\[
\text{35 Wd3 Ae2+ 36 Wxe2 Axc1+ 37}
\]

\[
\text{Axc1 Wxc1+ 38 Ah2 Wxf3! 39 gxf3}
\]

\[
\text{Ah4 0-1}
\]

This position is very promising for Black, but White has no reason to resign. That is why I assume that he lost on time. A possible continuation was \[
\text{40 Ac2 Wf4+ 41 Ah1 Wxf3 42 Ag2}
\]

\[
\text{Axd4 43 Ae3! Wd6 44 Ae2 with good}
\]

\[
\text{chances for a successful defence.}
\]

**The Theory of 9...b6**

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \( \texttt{Af6} \)

\[
\text{5 Ac3 e6 6 Af3 Ab4 7 Ac3 dxc4 8}
\]

\[
\text{Axh4 0-0 9 0-0 b6 10 Ag5 (D)}
\]

10 \( \texttt{Wc2} \) can often transpose, and is given as the main line in ECO, but I have decided to concentrate on 10 \( \texttt{Ag5} \), which in my opinion is the most logical move, and is also preferred by Sadler and Gelfand, the best players who use this line. 10 \( \texttt{Ae1} \) is another way of treating this position.

\[
\text{B}
\]
10...\(\text{b7}\)

Black cannot solve his problems with 10...h6 11 \(\text{cxb6}!\) \(\text{xf6}\) 12 \(\text{c5}\) \(\text{b7}\) 13 \(\text{g4}\):

a) 13...\(\text{g5}\) 14 \(\text{xg5}\) h\(\text{g}5\) 15 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{g4}\) 16 \(\text{f5}\) gives White tremendous pressure against \(\text{f7}\).

b) 13...\(\text{c6}\) 14 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{c6}\) 15 \(\text{xd6}\)! \(\text{xc6}\) 16 \(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 17 \(\text{xe6}\) gives Black a lot to think about. If the position can be saved at all is doubtful.

c) 13...\(\text{xe3}\) 14 \(\text{bxc6}\) \(\text{c8}\) and now White should play 15 \(\text{a1}\) (instead of 15 \(\text{f4}\) as played in Velimirović–Iličić, Vrnjačka Banja 1992) 15...\(\text{c7}\) (protecting \(\text{f7}\); 15...\(\text{c6}\) 16 \(\text{xf7}\)\(\text{xd4}\) 17 \(\text{gxd4}\)\(\text{xd4}\) 18 \(\text{cxd4}\) \(\text{c4}\) 19 \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{c7}\) 20 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{xb7}\) \(\text{xb7}\) 21 \(\text{xe6}\) is obviously a lot better for White) 16 \(\text{g3}\)! \(\text{d8}\) (16...\(\text{e7}\) would be met by 17 \(\text{f4}\) with the idea of 18 \(\text{f5}\) and a strong attack) 17 \(\text{xf7}\)!\(\text{xf7}\) 18 \(\text{xe6}\) with good compensation for the sacrificed material.

11 \(\text{e5}\) (D)

Or 11 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 12 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{b7}\) 13 \(\text{e5}\) and play transposes to the main line.

11 \(\text{f6}\) is an obvious alternative to exchanging the knights:

a) 11...\(\text{xc3}\) is pretty standard, but I would prefer to keep the bishop a few moves, to maintain more options. 12 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{d7}\) 13 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{c7}\) 14 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{b5}\) 15 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 16 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{d5}\) 17 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{g6}\) 18 \(\text{wh3}\) (White is developing a strong attack along traditional lines) 18...\(\text{d8}\) 19 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 20 \(\text{xex5}\) \(\text{d7}\) 21 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{c5}\) 22 \(\text{e7}\)! (this shuts the queen out, and traps the black king on the kingside) 22...\(\text{c7}\) 23 \(\text{wh6}\) \(\text{f5}\) 24 \(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{f8}\) 1-0 Rozentalis–Benko, New York 1994.

b) 11...\(\text{xd7}\) is the most natural move, since the bishop can always be parted with later. 12 \(\text{c1}\) \(\text{c8}\) 13 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{e8}\) 14 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 15 \(\text{bxc3}\) \(\text{c7}\) 16 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{d6}\)?, Gukko-Short, New York PCA Ct (4) 1994. This is a very typical position from this line, where the result will depend more on the level of play than on the opening preparation.

11...\(\text{xc3}\)

Or:

a) 11...\(\text{c6}\)! is an interesting exchange sacrifice. There are two logical continuations:

a1) 12 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 13 \(\text{d7}\) \(\text{wh4}\) 14 \(\text{xf8}\) \(\text{xf8}\) (14...\(\text{xd4}\) has been suggested, but White seems to hang on to a central blockade, and thereby a clear advantage due to his material gains after 15 \(\text{d7}\) \(\text{d6}\) 16 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{h3}\) 17 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{exd5}\) 18 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{xd7}\) 19 \(\text{dxd5}\) and now (D):

a11) 15 \(\text{e2}\)? (this leads only to equal play) 15...\(\text{b3}\)! (White has to be careful; after 16 \(\text{a3}\) \(\text{d6}\) 17 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{h3}\) 18 \(\text{f3}\) Black would have a beautiful attack with 18...\(\text{xd4}\)!! 19 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 20 \(\text{hxg3}\) \(\text{xe2}\)! limits the damage, though White is struggling after 20...\(\text{xd4}\) 21 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{e5}\)!}
with the trick 22 \text{\textit{W}}xe5?? \text{\textit{B}}g4+! 23 \text{\textit{Q}}f2 \text{\textit{W}}xf3+ 24 \text{\textit{Q}}e1 \text{\textit{B}}e4+! 20...\text{\textit{W}}xg3+ 21 \text{\textit{Q}}h1 \text{\textit{W}}h4+ 22 \text{\textit{Q}}g2 \text{\textit{B}}xd4 and besides the attack on the white king, Black is also about to be material up) 16...\text{\textit{Q}}xd4 17 \text{\textit{Q}}xd4 \text{\textit{B}}xd4 18 \text{\textit{W}}xb4 \text{\textit{Q}}xg2! 19 \text{\textit{W}}b5! (unpinning the bishop and threatening mate; besides, the queen can help the king later from e5) 19...g6 20 \text{\textit{Q}}e2 (20 \text{\textit{F}}d1!? \text{\textit{B}}g4! leaves White’s king with no defence) 20...\text{\textit{Q}}h3 and here 21 \text{\textit{Q}}f3?? \text{\textit{B}}g4+! 0-1 was the sudden finish of Farago-Rigo, Hungary 1976. Instead 21 \text{\textit{W}}e5! would have kept the position alive, owing to the possibility of using the queen as a blockader on g3. A realistic line is 21...\text{\textit{R}}d5 22 \text{\textit{W}}b8+ \text{\textit{B}}g7 23 f4! (not 23 \text{\textit{Q}}f3?? \text{\textit{B}}g5+ 24 \text{\textit{Q}}h1 \text{\textit{Q}}xf1 25 \text{\textit{F}}xf1 \text{\textit{W}}h3 with mate or something even more painful) 23...\text{\textit{Q}}xf1 24 \text{\textit{Q}}xf1 \text{\textit{R}}d2 25 \text{\textit{W}}e5+ \text{\textit{F}}f6 26 \text{\textit{F}}f2 \text{\textit{Q}}xb2 27 \text{\textit{Q}}d3 \text{\textit{F}}b4, when Black has three pawns for the piece, and approximately equal chances.

a2) White could try for more with 15 a3!, the idea being to limit the attack on d4. 15...\text{\textit{Q}}d6 16 g3 \text{\textit{W}}h3 17 d5 (forced) 17...\text{\textit{Q}}e5 18 \text{\textit{Q}}e2 exd5 19 \text{\textit{Q}}xd5 and again it seems that White will be able to defend his king, and slowly bring his rooks to better squares. Still, Black has a lot of tricks.

b) 11...\text{\textit{Q}}bd7 is a perfectly playable move, which lets White try a very interesting idea: 12 \text{\textit{Q}}xd4!? \text{\textit{W}}xd4 13 \text{\textit{B}}b3 \text{\textit{Q}}e7 14 \text{\textit{F}}ad1 keeps a small advantage.

b) 11...\text{\textit{Q}}bd7 is a perfectly playable move, which lets White try a very interesting idea: 12 \text{\textit{Q}}xd4!? \text{\textit{W}}xd4 13 \text{\textit{B}}b3 \text{\textit{Q}}e7 14 \text{\textit{F}}ad1 keeps a small advantage.

b) 11...\text{\textit{Q}}bd7 is a perfectly playable move, which lets White try a very interesting idea: 12 \text{\textit{Q}}xd4!? \text{\textit{W}}xd4 13 \text{\textit{B}}b3 \text{\textit{Q}}e7 14 \text{\textit{F}}ad1 keeps a small advantage.

b) 11...\text{\textit{Q}}bd7 is a perfectly playable move, which lets White try a very interesting idea: 12 \text{\textit{Q}}xd4!? \text{\textit{W}}xd4 13 \text{\textit{B}}b3 \text{\textit{Q}}e7 14 \text{\textit{F}}ad1 keeps a small advantage.
14 \( \text{Qxc6} \text{Wd6} 15 \text{Qxe7+} \text{Wxe7} 16 \text{Qd5 is disgusting}) 14 \text{Qxb7 Wxb7} 15 \text{Wf3 Aac8} 16 \text{Aac1 and now:

c1) 16...\text{Qd5?!} 17 \text{Qxd5 Qxg5} 18 \text{Qxc6! exd5} 19 \text{Wxd5} (White has won a pawn for nothing, and Black decided to give up his queen) 19...\text{Qxc1} 20 \text{Qe7+ Wxe7} 21 \text{Wxe7 Qxb2} 22 g3 with a clear plus for White in M.Gurevich-L.B.Hansen, Tästrup 1992.

c2) Gurevich suggests 16...\text{Af8!} 17 \text{Qc4} (17 \text{Qxf6?! Qxf6} 18 \text{Qe4 Qxe5} 19 dxe5 \text{We7} 20 \text{Wf4 gives White a pleasant position as well}) 17...\text{Qxe4} 18 \text{Wxf7+ Qh8} 19 \text{Qxc6 Qxg5} 20 \text{Wxe7 Ad7} 21 \text{Wxg5 Axc6 as a better chance of survival. Still I believe the extra pawn should count for more than the small advantage, which is Gurevich’s judgement.}

12 bxc3 (D)

B

\[ \]

12...\text{Qbd7}
12...\text{Wc7} 13 \text{Aac1 Qbd7} 14 \text{Qxd7 Qxd7} 15 \text{Qb3} (Sadler-J.Cooper, British League (4NCL) 1997/8) leads to a position similar to the main line – see p. 94.

13 \text{We2 Wc7} 14 \text{Qxd7}

14 \text{Aac1?! is wrong. Black is better after 14...Qxe5 15 dxe5 Qe4} 16 \text{Qf4 Aac8} 17 \text{Aad3 f5!}, when White entered a permanently bad position with 18 \text{Qxe4 fxe4} 19 \text{Wg4 Axd5} 20 \text{Qfe1 Wf7} 21 \text{Qg3 Cc4 in Franić-Lalić, Makarska Tucepi 1995. Black went on to score a win by good technique.}

14...\text{Qxd7}

A mistake would be 14...\text{Wxd7?} 15 \text{Qxf6 gxf6} 16 d5!! (destroying Black’s pawn structure) 16...\text{Qxd5} (16...exd5 17 \text{Qd3 Qg7} 18 \text{Wh5 Qh8} 19 \text{Qab1! would give White a dangerous attack}) 17 \text{Qad1 Qd8} (17...\text{Qxc4??} 18 \text{Wg4+} 18 \text{Wg4+ Qf8} (18...Qh8? is a mistake because of 19 \text{Wh4 with the idea 19...We7? 20 Ad3, when Black might as well resign}) 19 \text{Qxd5 exd5} 20 \text{Wh5 Qg7} 21 \text{Qd3} (Black has difficulties defending) 21...\text{Qe8} and now 22 \text{Qg3+! Qf8} 23 \text{Wxh7! Aac8} 24 \text{Wg7+ We7} 25 \text{Qe3+ Qd6} 26 \text{Wxf6+ leaves White close to winning. Instead after 22 \text{Qxd5? We6} 23 \text{Qd3 f5!} 24 \text{Qf3 (Vaiser-Polugaevsky, Sochi 1988) 24...Qad8!, there will be no counterplay against the c-pawn, but perhaps against the white king.}

15 \text{Aac1 Wc6}

Or:

a) 15...\text{Qe8} should not make a lot of difference, although Black managed to equalize in Dokhoian-Rogers, Wijk an Zee 1989: 16 \text{Qe1 Wc6} 17 f3 \text{Aec8} 18 \text{Qd3} (18 \text{Qb3 is probably an improvement, to follow the same concept as the main line) 18...Wd6 19 Wf2 h6 20 Qd2. White might be slightly better, but he could not prove it, and the game ended in a draw.

b) 15...e5 must be premature, since it opens a diagonal against the sensitive square f7 for the white bishop. In the game Kindermann-Stanec, Vienna
1996 White gained an advantage with a straightforward plan: 16 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a}e8 \) 17 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 18 \( \text{g}3 \)! (a good move that exerts some pressure on the black centre) 18...\( \text{f}6 \) 19 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 20 \( \text{fe}1 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 21 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 22 \( \text{f}2 \).

16 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 17 \( \text{fd}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 18 \( \text{b}3 \)

\[ (D) \]

This is the concept. The bishop supports the advance of the pawns in the centre, instead of being in the way on \( \text{d}3 \).

18...\( \text{ac}8 \) 19 \( \text{h}4 \)

Beautiful prophylaxis. The bishop is ready to enter the game from \( \text{g}3 \) and \( \text{f}2 \), and it also leaves its slightly fragile spot on \( \text{g}5 \).

19...\( \text{a}3 \) 20 \( \text{c}4 \)

Here White is slightly better due to his bishop-pair and central control. Nevertheless, Black should not be so badly off. Another possibility here is 20...\( \text{b5} \)? 21 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{a}6 \) with the idea ...\( \text{b}8\text{-c}6 \), but I doubt that this suffices for equality.

20...\( \text{a}5 \) 21 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \)

21...\( \text{a}4 \) 22 \( \text{c}2 \) yields nothing.

22 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{e}4 \)

This attempt to create counterplay allows the bishop manoeuvre \( \text{c}2\text{-f}5 \), which caused some problems in the game Gelfand-J.Polgar, Wijk aan Zee 1998.
9 9...a6!

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \f6 5 \c3 e6 6 f3 b4 7 d3 dxc4 8 xc4 0-0 9 0-0 a6! (D)

I believe this is Black's best line in the Panov. I know many players who have abandoned the Panov due to the 6...b4 lines. I don't think that one should be so drastic, but instead prepare for it! I believe White has lasting structural advantages in the 9...b6 line, but this might not be the case in this line. The structure Black is hoping for is shown in the next diagram:

By playing 9...a6 instead of 9...b6, Black delays the development of his bishop one move. To compensate for this, he has the possibility of controlling the light squares. White has no structural advantages, but will have to play for a kingside attack or to undermine the queenside structure by a2-a4. Often White has the two bishops, while Black has given up his king's bishop to change the structure. Generally it's difficult to say anything definitive about the variation, as it has been insufficiently tested at top level. Why this is the case is hard to say – probably it's a matter of fashion.

How White should play against this line is also not easy to say. There follow two instructive examples where White was successful, which might be an indication of what is needed.

Sadler – Emms
British Ch (Hove) 1997
Black's only true regret is the loss of the dark-squared bishop. By an ingenious rook manoeuvre, Sadler tries to take advantage of this.

21 Hf5!!

The two exclamation marks are mainly for the originality of the idea. The rook is transferred to h3, where it would be hopelessly stuck if the attack turns out to fail. But everything seems to have been well calculated...

21...Dd7
21...a5?! 22 c4! would leave the pawn on a5 as a hopelessly lost target.

22 Hh5 Df6

This also seems to be forced. The knight belongs on f6. Trying to bring the queen into the defence is no better: 22...Hd6 23 Hh4 We7 (23...Df6 24 Hxh6! gxh6 25 Hxh6 with a winning attack) 24 Kg3 Qh7 25 Kg5! and Black has to resign after a few moves, e.g. 25...Df6 26 Qc2+ Qh8 27 Hxh6+ gxh6 28 Hh4.

23 Hh3 e5! (D)

Black calmly tries to open files, not for the rooks in the centre, but for the defence of the kingside over the sixth rank. 23...Hd6 24 Hxh6 gxh6 25 Hh4 would mean an immediate disaster.

24 Hxh6! gxh6 25 Hxh6

The main threat is naturally 26 Wh4, but also 26 Wg3+ could prove deadly.

25...Dg4?

Unfortunately Black now loses his cool. Some other options:

a) 25...Hd6? loses at once to 26 dxe5.

b) 25...Df7?! puts up more resistance, but White still enjoys a very strong, probably winning, attack after 26 Wh4 Dd6 27 Wg5+ Dh8 28 He8+ Dh7 29 Axe5+ Dh8 30 Axe5+ Dh6 31 Af7.

c) The right move is the calm 25...Df8!, which prevents checks on g3 and prepares ...Hd6 to defend the knight. Still, the position might prove to be a little better for White after 26 Wh4 Dd6 27 Wg5 e4! 28 He8+ (not 28 He1? Axe3) 28...Dh7 29 We5+ Dh6 30 Axe8 Axe8 31 Axe7 Dh6 although everything seems to be very unclear. The black king is close to safety on the queenside, while the white king can soon be exposed. On the other hand, the black pieces give a very clumsy impression, so possibly there is a way for White to maintain the initiative.

26 Axe6 Dh7 27 Hc7 Dh3+ 28 gxh3 Dd5 29 Axe7 30 Axe1 Dh6 31 Axe5 Axe5 32 dxe5 Axe5 33 Dh2

This rook endgame is of course lost for Black, and White managed to win after many moves.

In the following game Ibragimov makes the most out of a slight weakness in the black king's position. Naturally the difficult part is mainly to create this weakness in the opponent's
Ibragimov – Zagrebeltzy
St Petersburg Chigorin mem 1997

18 \( \text{Q}g4 \text{Q}d7 19 \text{a}4 \text{H}b7 20 \text{axb}5 \text{axb}5 21 \text{Q}e3 \
The knight has been transferred to a useful square, instead of wasting its time on f3.
21...\( \text{W}d6 22 \text{H}ab1 \text{H}fb8 23 \text{d}5! \
Attacking the black pawn-structure and thereby trying to create more air around the black king. Black cannot keep the position closed due to the knight’s possibilities of using the f5-square.
23...f5 24 \( \text{H}fd1 \text{W}e5 25 \text{Q}e2! \
The knight has no further job to do on e3, so it is transferred to d4, where it attacks both the black weaknesses, h5 and e6. Black is probably positionally lost by now.
25...\( \text{Q}f6 26 \text{d}xe6 \text{f}xe6 27 \text{Q}d4 \
Now the e6-pawn is doomed.
27...\( \text{H}b6 28 \text{H}e1 \text{W}d5 29 \text{H}xe6! \
A little combination finishes the job.
29...\( \text{H}xe6 30 \text{H}g3+ \text{H}f7 31 \text{H}xb8 \
Black has no defence, and White went on to win in 40 moves.

In the following example White did not manage to win, although he had all the chances. If White answers 9...a6 with 10 a4, with a likely transposition to the Queen’s Gambit Accepted, this is how he should place his pieces.

Vaissé – Marciano
Narbonne 1997

The rooks should be where they are now, since in this way they support action on the kingside best. The queen would love to be on h3, but this is not always possible, and then e2 is normally a good square for the queen. White is not too happy about having played a4, but this belongs to the problems of the opening, and not of the middlegame, which starts with a central break.

15 \( \text{d}5! \text{exd}5 \
15...\( \text{H}hx\text{d}5?? 16 \text{H}xd5 \text{H}xd5 17 \text{H}xd5! gives White a winning position, although Black can avoid losing a full piece with 17...f6.
16 \text{W}xe7 \text{H}xc4 17 \text{H}xf6 \text{gxf6} 18 \text{H}xd5 \
It’s obvious that White is better, but Black is successful in limiting the damage.
18...\text{\textalpha}xd5 19 \text{\textw}xd8 \text{\textalpha}xd8 20 \text{\textalpha}xd5 \text{\textf}f8 21 h3 \text{\textalpha}cc8

This position is preferable for White, but it is not easy to use the advantage for anything. Over the following moves his superiority simply disappears.

22 \text{\textd}d6 \text{\textcc}c6 23 \text{\textd}d4 \text{\textalpha}cc8 24 \text{\textf}f4 \text{\textg}g7 25 \text{\textd}d4 \text{\texte}e8 26 \text{\textd}d1 \text{\texte}e5!

A good move that defends a lot of important squares.

27 \text{\textd}d3 \text{\textcc}c5! (D)

\begin{center}
\text{\textw} \text{\textd}b3 b5 29 axb5 axb5 30 \text{\texta}3 \text{\textc}d5 31 \text{\texth}h2

Here Black is only minimally worse – in other words, he is defending but there is no reason why the defence should not be successful. With his next move he causes himself some unnecessary problems. The right move must be 31...\text{\textd}d6 defending his third rank.

31...f5? 32 f3 \text{\textd}d6 33 \text{\textb}b3 \text{\textc}c5 34 \text{\textb}b4 \text{\textc}c4!

Black escapes into a drawn rook endgame. Still, it did not have to come to this.

35 \text{\textxf}5+ \text{\textxf}5 36 \text{\textb}xc4 bxc4 37 \text{\textxf}5 \text{\textb}b6 38 \text{\textf}f4 \text{\textxb}2 39 \text{\textxc}4 f6

This endgame is a theoretical draw, and although White tried for another 20 moves, our interest ends here.

In the following game Black has completely won the opening battle.

\begin{center}
\text{\texta}cs – \text{\texta}talik
\textit{Budapest 1998}
\end{center}

In this position Black is clearly superior due to his strong pressure on the white pawns and all the weaknesses in the white camp. Nevertheless, it is not so easy to win this kind of position, although Black made progress without problems:

19 c4 bxc4 20 \text{\textxc}4 \text{\textd}7b6 21 \text{\textf}1 \text{\textw}d2!

Winning the c-file.

22 \text{\textxc}8 \text{\textxc}8 23 \text{\textd}d1 \text{\texta}5 24 \text{\textw}d3 \text{\texta}4

Black is slowly winning squares, while White can do nothing but wait for his chance. One should never underestimate the power of the two bishops, and when his pawns fall, White will find useful diagonals for them.

25 \text{\textb}1 a5 26 \text{\textg}3 \text{\textc}3
Black starts to cash in, but the rook ends up on a stupid square.

27 \textit{Wa6} \textit{Wxd4} 28 \textit{Wxa5} \textit{Axf3} 29 \textit{Wb5}

Now Black should choose between 29...\textit{g5}!, which keeps the bishops under control and gives air for the king, and the more solid option, 29...\textit{g6}, which excludes the aggressive possibilities against the white king, which the pawn could support.

Instead Black blundered material with 29...\textit{h5}? 30 \textit{Ae2}.

The ideal position for Black is one where only the pawn-structure is important, as in the following game.

\textbf{B}

\textbf{Sigurjonsson – Larsen}
\textit{Geneva 1977}

The black position is preferable, since the white pawn-centre is weak and troubled. Black can hope for a blockade on the light squares d5 and c4, while White has little to keep him warm. The course of the game makes the position look hopeless for White.

17...\textit{Af6} 18 \textit{Wg3}

18 \textit{Wf4}!? was an idea, to be able to transfer the rook quickly to the third rank and simply because the queen is better here.

18...\textit{Ad5}

Black’s light-square strategy gets under way.

19 \textit{Be1} \textit{Wd7} 20 \textit{Wg4}?!

The attack White is trying to get started is too slow. While he is playing all these small moves Black is getting mobilized, and his advantage is increasing.

20...\textit{Af8} 21 \textit{Be3} \textit{g6}

Black’s advantages are lasting, so he takes care to defend the king, since a bonus is awaiting him if nothing dramatic happens.

22 \textit{Wf4} \textit{Ag7} 23 \textit{h4}

Finally White adopts the set-up that he should have been aiming for some time ago.

23...\textit{Wc7}

An exchange of queens would certainly favour Black, since all White has got is his attack. This is the fact that Black uses to take over the initiative.

24 \textit{Wg5} \textit{h6} 25 \textit{Wg4} \textit{h5} 26 \textit{Wg5} \textit{Wd8} 27 \textit{Wf4} \textit{Wf6} 28 \textit{Wg3} \textit{b4}!

The white pawn-centre is undermined, and Black is on his way to victory.

\textbf{The Theory of 9...a6}

This line differs from the others in this book, since there is no specific reply that suggests itself for White. Therefore I provide a range of ideas at move 10, from which I suggest you choose the line that fits your style and taste the best. This complete coverage will also be helpful to those playing this line as Black.
9...a6!

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 Qf6 5 Qc3 e6 6 Qf3 Qb4 7 Qd3 dxc4 8 Qxc4 0-0 9 0-0 a6!

Now:
A: 10 Qe5 111
B: 10 a4 111
C: 10 Qb3 112
D: 10 Wd2 112
E: 10 Qd3 113
F: 10 Qg5 113

Instead 10 a3?! Qxc3 11 bxc3 b5 12 Qd3 Qb7 13 a4 Wd5 gives Black no problems whatsoever, Goldin-Kharitonov, Moscow 1989.

A)
10 Qe5

This has a lot of logic behind it, but unfortunately is not a very good move. In the two games played at top level Black made draws, and even had some chances to gain an advantage in the Salov game.
10...b5 11 Wf3

The idea behind the previous move.
11...Wxd4!

On other moves White benefits from the active position of the queen, so this exchange sacrifice is more or less forced. On the other hand it is very good, so there is no need to avoid it.
12 Wxa8 Wxe5 13 Qe2 Qxc3 14 bxc3 Wxe2 15 Wxb8

Now:

a) 15...Qd5 16 Qg3 Wc4 17 Qd2. It has been suggested that White should be a little better here, but I think this evaluation is mistaken. 17...f6 18 Qe1 e5 19 Wf3 Qg4 20 We4 Qc8 with no problems for Black, Hübner-Dreev, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

b) 15...Wc4! 16 Qa3 Qe8 17 Qb4 Qd5 18 a3 Wc6 19 We5 Qb7 20 f3 f6 21 Wd4 e5 22 Wf2 Qc7 with a better game for Black, Lautier-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1997.

B)
10 a4

This is suggested in several places with a claim that White’s game should be preferred. The position is the same as a harmless line of the Queen’s Gambit Accepted, but with the difference that the bishop is on b4.
10...Qc6 11 Qg5 Qe7

This position can be reached from a great variety of move-orders and openings, including the QGA.
12 Wd2

Others:

a) 12 Qc1 (I dislike the way White deploys his rooks in this game; when he has played a4, there is no way to gain a queenside advantage, so the rooks should be on d1 and e1 or f1) 12...Wa5 13 Wd2 Qd8 14 Qfd1 Qd7 15 Wc3 Qe8 with a good solid position for Black, Conquest-Kharitonov, Moscow 1988.

b) 12 Qe1 Qd7 13 Qe2 Qe8 14 Qf4 Wa5 15 Qed1 (White does not seem to have any idea how to handle the position) 15...Qd5 16 Qd2 Qb4 (Black is completely level) 17 Wd3 Qad8 18 Qb3 Qf6 19 Qa2 Wh5 ½-½ Ehvest-P.Schlosser, Calcutta 1998.

12...b6 13 Qad1 Qb7 14 Qe5 Qb4 15 f4 Qe4!

This simplification turns out to solve Black’s problems.
16 Qxe4 Qxe4 17 Qde1 Qd5 18 Qxd5 Qxd5 19 Qc6 Wd6 20 Qxe7+ Qxe7 21 Qxe7 Wxe7 22 f5 (D)
This perhaps looks dangerous, but too many pieces have been exchanged, so Black will not get crushed on the kingside.

After 22...\(\text{Wd6}\) 23 \(\text{f6 efd8}\) Black has sufficient counterplay. Zviagintsev-Benjamin, Groningen FIDE KO Wch 1997 ended shortly in a draw.

\[ \text{C)} \]

10 \(\text{b3 b5}\) 11 \(\text{d5!}\)?

This entertaining sacrifice unfortunately cannot be totally correct. It should be borne in mind that our main line here is based on a blitz game, a form of chess in which the surprise value of a new move is more important than its objective strength, as the opponent lacks the time to adjust to the new situation.

11...\(\text{xc3}\) 12 \(\text{dxe6}\)

Otherwise White’s play would not make sense.

12...\(\text{a5}\) 13 \(\text{exf7+ wh8}\) 14 \(\text{f4 c6}\)

15 \(\text{d6 (D)}\)

15...\(\text{g4?!}\)

15...\(\text{e7}\) is my suggestion for the logical approach. 16 \(\text{c5 d7}\) does not seem to give White sufficient compensation for the piece.

16 \(\text{c1}\)

16 \(\text{xf8}\) only gives some chances of equality.

16...\(\text{e7}\) 17 \(\text{c5 e4}\)

17...\(\text{d7}\) 18 \(\text{d6!}\) would not give Black any chances to liberate himself from the pressure, and he has to repeat the position with 18...\(\text{f6}\) 19 \(\text{c5}\).

18 \(\text{xd8 xd8}\) 19 \(\text{xe7 xe7}\) 20 \(\text{e1!}\)

20 \(\text{c1 f3}\) 21 \(\text{gxf3 d2}\) 22 \(\text{xe7 xf1}\) 23 \(\text{xf1}\) gives compensation for the exchange, although Black has some possibilities to untangle himself and blockade the passed pawn with his king, and so liberate the rooks for aggressive purposes.

Now (after 20 \(\text{e1}\)):

a) 20...\(\text{f5}\) 21 \(\text{c2 a8}\) 22 \(\text{d4}\)

23 \(\text{g6}\) 24 \(\text{xe6}\) 25 \(\text{xe4}\) 26 \(\text{c8+}\) with a winning endgame for White, which he managed to lose in Ivanchuk-Kramnik, New York blitz 1994.

b) 20...\(\text{g5}\) 21 \(\text{xg5}\) 22 \(\text{h6}\) 23 \(\text{h4}\) 24 \(\text{h7}\) 25 \(\text{c7}\) gives White a lot of compensation, but Black might actually have the better chances.

\[ \text{D)} \]

10 \(\text{We2 b5}\) 11 \(\text{d3 b7}\) 12 \(\text{a4 bxa4}\) 13 \(\text{xa4?!}\)
The knight has nothing to do on a4, as the b8-knight goes to d7 and covers the c5-square. Better is 13 \( \mathsf{Axa4} \ \mathsf{Cc6} \ 14 \mathsf{Ag5} \) with normal play.

13...\( \mathsf{Wd6} \) 14 \( \mathsf{Ad1} \ \mathsf{Dbd7} \) 15 \( \mathsf{Ce3} \ \mathsf{Dg4!} \) (\( D \))

Black is already better. White has no way to avoid his kingside being stripped bare. 16 \( \mathsf{Axh7+} \ \mathsf{Ah8} \) 17 \( \mathsf{Cc2} \ \mathsf{Axh3} \) 18 \( \mathsf{Wxf3} \ \mathsf{Wxh2}+ \) 19 \( \mathsf{Kf1} \ \mathsf{Dxe3}+ \) 20 \( fxe3 \) \( g6 \) gave Black a better position in Liss-Kosashvili, Rishon le Zion 1994, although White went on to escape with a draw.

\[ \]

E)

10 \( \mathsf{Ad3} \)

This move might seem natural, but in this type of position the bishop often turns out to be better placed on b3.

10...\( \mathsf{b5} \) 11 \( \mathsf{Cxe4?} \)?

There is no good reason for this move. 11 \( \mathsf{Ag5} \) would give a more or less normal position.

11...\( \mathsf{Dbd7} \) 12 \( \mathsf{Af4} \ \mathsf{Ab7} \)

Black has absolutely no problems at all.

13 \( \mathsf{Dd6} \)?

After this mistake White ends up in a nightmare of a position.

13...\( \mathsf{Wb8!} \) 14 \( \mathsf{Dxb7} \ \mathsf{Wxf4} \) 15 \( a3 \ \mathsf{Wb8!} \)

Stopping White playing b2-b4 and \( \mathsf{Cc5} \).

16 \( \mathsf{axb4} \ \mathsf{Wxb7} \) 17 \( \mathsf{Ce2} \ \mathsf{Dd5} \)

The white pawns are weak, and the knight on d5 is dominant, Knaak-Wirthensohn, Mitropa Cup (Bad Wörishofen) 1993.

\[ \]

F)

10 \( \mathsf{Ag5} \) \( b5 \) (\( D \))

11 \( \mathsf{Ab3} \)

11 \( \mathsf{Ad3} \) is probably inferior. The light-squared bishop has more prospects on b3, where it exerts pressure on d5. 11...\( \mathsf{Ab7} \) and now:

a) 12 \( \mathsf{We2} \) looks right, but Black quickly equalized and was even a little better after 12...\( \mathsf{Dbd7} \) 13 \( \mathsf{Fd1} \) (13 \( \mathsf{Ad1} \) is a better try) 13...\( \mathsf{Ce7} \) 14 \( \mathsf{Ce5} \) \( \mathsf{Dd5} \) 15 \( \mathsf{Dd2} \ \mathsf{Cxc3} \) 16 \( \mathsf{Bxc3} \ \mathsf{Cxe5} \) 17 \( \mathsf{Wxe5} \ \mathsf{Df6} \) in Sigurjonsson-Larsen, Geneva 1977 – see p. 110.

b) 12 \( \mathsf{Ce1} \ \mathsf{Dbd7} \) 13 \( \mathsf{Cc1} \) (the rook is not effective on this square; White should play 13 \( \mathsf{We2} \) and 14 \( \mathsf{Ad1} \), with a standard position) 13...\( \mathsf{Cc8} \) 14 \( a3 \) \( \mathsf{Cc3} \) 15 \( \mathsf{Bxc3} \) \( h6 \) 16 \( \mathsf{Ah4} \ \mathsf{Wa5} \). Black has already more than equalized. I
believe only few people would find joy in the two bishops after 17 \texttt{Wb3 Axf3 18 gxf3 Qd5}, Acs-Atalik, Budapest 1998 – see p. 109.

11...\texttt{Qb7} 12 \texttt{We2!}

This seems to be the only move that gives some play. Others:

a) 12 \texttt{Ac1 Qbd7} 13 \texttt{Ac2 Ac8} 14 \texttt{Wd3 Ac3} 15 bxc3 \texttt{Wc7!} 16 \texttt{De5 Wxc3} 17 \texttt{Qxd7 Wxd3} 18 \texttt{Qxd3 Qxd7} with insufficient compensation for White, Lyrberg-Ornstein, Stockholm 1995.

b) 12 \texttt{Wd3} (the drawback of putting the queen on d3 instead of e2 will soon become clear) 12...\texttt{Qbd7} 13 \texttt{Afd1 Ac3} 14 bxc3 \texttt{Wc7} 15 \texttt{Ac1 Ae4!} (stopping all White's dreams) 16 \texttt{We2 Ad5} (controlling the light squares and threatening...\texttt{Afc8} with a strong blockade) 17 c4 (the only move) 17...bxc4 18 \texttt{Axc4 Wa5} 19 Axf6 Axf6 20 Ax\texttt{Qxd5} Qxd5. Black is more comfortable and went on to win in Mancini-Marciano, Noyon 1998.

12...\texttt{Qxc3} 13 bxc3 \texttt{Qbd7} 14 \texttt{De5}

This is the critical move. After 14 a4 \texttt{Wc7} 15 \texttt{Afc1 Qc4} 16 \texttt{We3} (entering is 16 axb5 axb5 17 Axa8 Axa8 18 Wxb5 Ab8 19 Wa6 Qxg5 20 Qxg5 Wf4 0-1 Levitt-Emms, Cappelle la Grande 1994) 16...\texttt{Qxg5} 17 Qxg5 Qf6 18 f3 White's position is slightly weakened, and Black is a tiny bit better, Ibragimov-Dreev, Vienna 1996.

14...\texttt{Wc7} 15 Qxd7 Qxd7 16 Aac1

16 \texttt{Wg4} leads to equality after 16...\texttt{Qh8} 17 Aae1!? \texttt{Wxc3} 18 d5 Qf6 19 Axf6 Wxf6 20 dxc6 \texttt{Qd6} Balashov-Kharitonov, Pinsk 1993.

16...h6 17 Aeg2 Aef6 18 Afe1 \texttt{Wc6} 19 f3 Aed8 20 Wf2 Afe8

This position might superficially be assessed as equal, as Black has good play on the light squares and no weaknesses. On the other hand, White has two bishops and nothing to fear. However, the position is in no way drawish. White went on to win in the game Sadler-Emms, British Ch (Hove) 1997, which is the first example in this chapter.
10 6...e7 7 cxd5 d5
8 c4

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 f6 5 e3 c3 e6 6 f3 e7 7 cxd5 d5 8 c4 (D)

The difference from the 8 d3 line (discussed in the next chapter) is that White is trying to exert pressure on d5, which causes Black problems in the smooth development of his position. On the other hand, the bishop might sometimes turn out to be on the wrong diagonal. The core of the idea is visible in the following position that arises after the further moves 8...0-0 9 0-0 c6 10 e1 (D).

Black has some problems with his development. After 10...b6?! 11 d5 exd5 12 b5 he is severely worse. Black has many ways to handle this problem. One way is 10...a6, another 10...f6 (for these moves, please see the theory section). The most dangerous idea is apparent after 10...xc3 11 bxc3 b6 12 d3 b7 13 h4! (D). White tries to start an attack on the kingside with this sacrifice. In my opinion the chances already clearly favour White. Here are some examples showing why.

Kasparov – Gonda
Cannes simul 1988

13 xh4
The critical test. Other moves are considered in the theory section.
14 \(\text{Q}x\text{h}4 \text{W}x\text{h}4 15 \text{E}e3! (D)\)

This is the idea behind the pawn sacrifice. The white rook wins another tempo on the black queen. But Black is not destroyed by a kingside attack, as one might believe, but by more positional means.
15...g6
The best move. Black has also tried 15...f5, but with no luck. After 15...h6 16 \(\text{Q}h3 \text{Wf}6 17 \text{W}g4\) White has a very strong attack, since after 17...\(\text{W}h8 18 \text{Q}g5!\) Black can only resign.
16 \(\text{Q}h3 \text{Wf}6 17 \text{Q}h6 \text{E}e8 18 \text{W}g4\)
Black is of course very vulnerable on the dark squares, but White has no direct way to the goal.
18...\(\text{E}a\text{c}8 19 \text{Q}g5 \text{W}g7 20 \text{W}h4 f5\)
Although this is forced, Black must have had a very sour feeling here. White’s centre is very strong and he is not currently missing the h-pawn a lot. Kasparov shows with his superb understanding of dynamic positions that White has now achieved everything he wanted on the kingside, and now takes his pieces to the centre.
21 \(\text{E}e1 \text{a}5 22 \text{E}he3 \text{Wf}7 23 \text{Q}b5!\)

Forcing the exchange of the bishop, after which Black is very weak on the light squares.
23...\(\text{Q}c6 24 \text{Q}xc6 \text{Q}xc6 25 c4\)
There seems to be nothing Black can do about the creation of a passed pawn in the centre. With the bishop controlling the promotion-square, it becomes a very strong candidate.
25...\(\text{W}d7 26 \text{Q}f6 \text{W}f7\)
Black has no plan, but must wait and see what White will do.
27 d5!?
If this is White’s best, I am very disappointed. The heavy exchanges gives Black relief and possibilities of survival. Currently he can do nothing but wait. But on the other hand the white pieces do stand very well, and it could be difficult to improve the position further before breaking the centre.
27...\(\text{Exd}5 28 \text{Q}xe8+ \text{Q}xe8 29 \text{Q}xe8+ \text{W}xe8 30 \text{cx}d5 \text{W}e1+ 31 \text{Q}h2 \text{Q}e5 32 d6 \text{Q}d7?\)
32...\(\text{Q}g4+\) does not work because of 33 \(\text{Wx}g4!\) \(\text{fx}g4 34 d7\) winning.
Black could have put up a lot of resistance with 32...\(\text{W}e2!\) with the idea 33 \(\text{W}d4 \text{Q}g4+ 34 \text{Q}g3 \text{Q}xf6 35 \text{W}xf6 \text{W}g4+\) with perpetual check.
33 \(\text{W}c4+ \text{Q}f8 34 \text{W}c8+ \text{W}e8 35 \text{Q}e7+ \text{Q}f7 36 \text{W}c4+ \text{Q}g7 37 \text{W}e6\)
Black has no way to prevent the following little trick.
37...\(\text{g}5 38 \text{Q}f6+! 1-0\)

Here is another example, starting from the same line (D):
16 \(\text{Q}g3\)
Instead of Kasparov’s 16 \(\text{Q}h3\). This does not make a big difference, as the queen still has to go back.
16...\(\text{W}f6 17 \text{W}g4 \text{W}g7 18 \text{W}h4 f5\)
Black will never have time to win the pawn at c4.
27...\(\text{Qf}8\)
27...\(\text{dxc4?} 28 \text{fxf7} \text{xf7} 29 \text{xf7} \text{xf7} 30 \text{wh7+}.\)
28 \(\text{h6} \text{xf4} 29 \text{xf4}\)
Threatening 30 \(\text{wh8+}.\)
29...\(\text{we7} 30 \text{c5}!\)
The pawn is untouchable.
30...\(\text{c6} 31 \text{g5} \text{wd7} 32 \text{wd6!}\)
With total control over the promotion-square, it is hard for the rook and knight to defend against this passed pawn. Black’s cause is hopeless, and he could have resigned here with a clear conscience.

Many of the other attacking themes in this line are covered in the Introduction, so now we move on to the theory.

The Theory of 6...\(\text{e7} 7 \text{cxd5} \text{xd5} 8 \text{c4}\)

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 \(\text{f6}\)
5 \(\text{c3} \text{e6} 6 \text{f3} \text{e7} 7 \text{cxd5} \text{xd5} 8 \text{c4} 0-0 9 0-0 \text{c6}\)

Or:

a) 9...b6!? and now:

a1) 10 \(\text{e1?!} (\text{White should take on d5, having created the threat}) 10...\text{b7} 11 \text{e5} \text{xc3} 12 \text{bxc3} \text{d7} \text{and Black is already on his way to being better. The position is comparable with Sigurjonsson-Larsen in Chapter 9. That is why in Aagaard-Danielsen, Copenhagen 1997 I decided to create complications with 13 \text{xf7}!?, but Black was still doing well.}\)

a2) 10 \(\text{xd5 exd5} 11 \text{b3} \text{with the idea of 11...\text{g4} 12 \text{wd3} \text{c6} 13 \text{e5} \text{with a preferable position.}\)
a3) 10 \(\text{Qxd5?!}\) exd5 11 \(\text{Qf4 Qg4}\) 12 \(\text{Wd3}\) again with some advantage for White.

b) 9...\(\text{Qxc3}\) 10 bxc3 b6 (10...\(\text{Wc7}\) gives White the chance of building up the traditional preferable positions from Chapter 8 with 11 \(\text{We2 Qd7}\) 12 \(\text{Qb2}\) b6 13 \(\text{Qd3 Qb7}\) 14 c4 Alterman-Khliian, Rostov 1993) and now:

b1) 11 \(\text{Qe5?!}\) (I guess he wanted the draw badly, because look what happened) 11...\(\text{Qb7}\) 12 \(\text{Wh5 Qc6}\) 13 \(\text{Qd3 g6}\) 14 \(\text{Qxg6 fxg6}\) 15 \(\text{Qxg6 hxg6}\) 16 \(\text{Qxg6 h8}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) \(\text{Qe3}\) A.Adamski-Cirić, Copenhagen 1995.

b2) White should continue 11 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qb7}\) 12 \(\text{Ne1 Qd7?!}\) (12...\(\text{Qc6}\) 13 h4! transposes to Line D) 13 c4 with a plus.

10 \(\text{Ne1}\)

The options now are:

A: 10...\(\text{Qf6}\) 118

B: 10...\(\text{Qf6?!}\) 119

C: 10...b6?! 119

D: 10...\(\text{Qxc3}\) 119

E: 10...\(\text{Qe8?!}\) 120

F: 10...\(\text{Wd6?!}\) 120

G: 10...\(\text{a6}\) 120

A1)

Now:

A1: 11...\(\text{Qa5?!}\) 118

A2: 11...b6 118

A1)

11...\(\text{Qa5?!}\)

It is never good to let the knight lose control over the e5-square, since the white knight will be very strong there.

12 \(\text{Qd3}\) b6 13 \(\text{Qe2}\) \(\text{Qb7}\) 14 \(\text{Qad1}\) \(\text{Qd5}\)?

Allowing White to create threats.

15 \(\text{We4}\) g6 16 \(\text{Wh4}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 17 \(\text{Qb5!}\) \(\text{Qxc3}\)

17...\(\text{Qc6}\) loses as well after 18 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Wxd5}\) 19 \(\text{Qxe7}\) \(\text{Wxb5}\) 20 \(\text{Qg5}\) h5 21 \(\text{Qxf7}\).

17...\(\text{Qc6}\) 18 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Wxd5}\) 19 \(\text{Qxc6}\) is very simple.

18 \(\text{Qxe8}\) \(\text{Qxf3}\)

18...\(\text{Qxd1}\) 19 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 20 \(\text{Qh6+}\) \(\text{Qxf7}\) 21 \(\text{Qxh7+}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 22 \(\text{Qe5}\) mates.

19 \(\text{Qxf7+}\) \(\text{Qxf7}\) 20 \(\text{Qxh7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 21 \(\text{Qh6+}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 22 \(\text{Qxe6}\) 23 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 23 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qe8}\)

23...\(\text{Qc7}\) 24 \(\text{Qxe7}\) \(\text{Qxc7}\) 25 \(\text{Qxe7+}\) \(\text{Qd6}\) 26 \(\text{Qd6}\) wins as well.

24 gxf3

The reason for resigning is the attack starting with 24...\(\text{Qxd1}\) 25 \(\text{Qg5!}\).

A2)

11...b6 12 a3 \(\text{Qb7}\) 13 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(\text{Qc8}\) 14 \(\text{Qad1}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 15 h4

Ribli has of course studied these kind of positions, while Wells does not find a way to stop the white attack. After the next move it is over.

15...\(\text{Qg6?}\) 16 d5 \(\text{Qxd5}\) 17 \(\text{Qxd5}\) exd5 18 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Qxg5}\) 19 hxg5 \(\text{Qxe1+}\) 20 \(\text{Qxe1}\) \(\text{Wf8}\) 21 \(\text{Qf6+}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 22 \(\text{Wd7}\) \(\text{Qa8}\) 23 \(\text{Wf3}\) h5 24 g4
10...f6!? 11 \textit{De}4

11 \textit{b}3!? is an interesting possibility. The main idea is 11...b6 12 \textit{xd}5 exd5 13 \textit{e}5 with a white plus.

11...h6 12 \textit{d}3 \textit{a}5 13 \textit{b}5 \textit{d}7 14 \textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}7 15 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}8 16 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 17 \textit{e}3

White's attack does not lack potential, but still there is nothing but perpetual after the continuation 17...\textit{d}5 18 \textit{g}3 \textit{h}8 19 \textit{h}3 \textit{c}6 20 \textit{hx}6 gxh6 21 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}8 22 \textit{hx}6+ \textit{hx}6 23 \textit{hx}6+, Wirthensohn-Giertz, Swiech 1993.

C)

10...b6?! (D)

![Diagram](image)

This is a well-known mistake.

11 \textit{xd}5! exd5 12 \textit{b}5 \textit{d}7

12...\textit{b}7 is no better. 13 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}6 14 \textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 15 \textit{c}1 a6 16 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 17 \textit{e}5 \textit{b}7 18 \textit{g}4 \textit{ad}8 19 a3 a5 20 \textit{c}3 f6 21 \textit{g}3 \textit{e}7 22 \textit{d}3 \textit{c}7 23 \textit{ge}3 \textit{c}8 24 \textit{f}4 \textit{xf}4 25 \textit{xf}4 gave White a big plus in Comas Fabrego-Pomes, Barcino 1994.

13 \textit{a}4 \textit{b}8 14 \textit{f}4 \textit{xb}5 15 \textit{xb}5 a6 16 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}6 17 \textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 18 \textit{ac}1 \textit{a}7 19 \textit{c}2 \textit{e}7 20 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 21 \textit{c}7! \textit{xc}7 22 \textit{xc}7 \textit{f}6 23 \textit{f}1 \textit{f}7 24 \textit{c}8+ \textit{f}8 25 \textit{c}3

With a more or less winning endgame for White, Botvinnik-Alekhine, Amsterdam AVRO 1938.

D)

10...\textit{xc}3 11 bx\textit{c}3 b6 12 \textit{d}3 \textit{b}7 13 g4! \textit{a}5!

This seems to be the only possibility that has proved to be any good, though still White has many promising ideas. Instead:

a) 13...\textit{hx}4 14 \textit{hx}4 \textit{hx}4 15 \textit{e}3 is dealt with above in the introduction to this chapter.

b) 13...\textit{d}5?! only gives White a route for the queenside rook, which normally is totally out of play in these lines. 14 \textit{b}1! \textit{ac}8 15 \textit{b}5 \textit{d}6 16 \textit{h}5 g6 17 \textit{h}6 \textit{f}6 18 \textit{g}5 \textit{g}5 19 \textit{x}5 e5 20 h5 gave White a decisive attack in the game Bricard-Rausis, Paris 1995.

c) 13...\textit{f}6 14 \textit{g}5 g6 15 \textit{g}4 h5 16 \textit{g}3 \textit{e}7 17 \textit{a}3 \textit{c}8 (17...\textit{e}8 18 \textit{xe}6 \textit{d}7 19 \textit{c}7 led to a win for White in the game Mikhalchishin-Luczak, Cappelle la Grande 1989) 18 \textit{xe}6! fxe6 19 \textit{xe}6 (White's attack is irresistible) 19...\textit{c}7 20 \textit{ae}1 \textit{f}7 21 \textit{x}6 \textit{d}7 22 \textit{xf}7+ (now White has a rook and three pawns against two pieces, but he decides to return some of the material for a winning attack) 22...\textit{xf}7 23 \textit{xe}6+! \textit{xf}6 24 \textit{e}5+ \textit{f}7 25 \textit{e}6+ \textit{f}8 26 \textit{f}6+ 1-0 Cu.Hansen-Ki.Georgiev, Kiljava jr Wch 1984.

14 \textit{g}5
Both 14 h5!? and 14 ±c2 planning ²d1-d3 are good alternatives.
14...²xg5 15 ²xg5 ²wd5 16 ²g4 f5 17 ²g3 ²ac8 18 ²f1 ²wd7 19 h5
The game is unclear, Hernandez-Minguell, Vulca 1984.

E)
10...²e8!?
This is a very solid possibility, but still White has a little something after 11 ²b3 b6 12 ²xd5 exd5 13 ²f4
²g4 14 ±a4 ²c8 15 ²c1 ²d7 16 h3, Danielsen-Berend, Erevan OL 1996.

F)
10...²wd6!?
This is inventive but not so good. White's lead in development, though modest, soon makes itself felt.
11 ²e4 ²wd7 12 ²g5! ²d8 13 ²c1
h6 14 ²xd5 ²xd5 15 ²xe7 ²xe7 16 ²e5 f6
Black is close to having solved all his problems, but White continues to play very aggressively.
17 ²c7! ²d7
17...fxe5? 18 ²xe7 exd4 19 ²g4
²we5 20 f4 wins the house.
18 ²g4 ²h7 19 ²c3 ²wd6 20 ²xd7
²xd7 21 ²xd7 ²xd7
Now 22 ²xe6 led, in Stein-Tal, Pärnu 1971, to an endgame that Black should never have survived, but 22
²we6! is even stronger.

G)
10...a6 (D)
11 ²b3!?
11 ²we2!? is an interesting possibility. Black cannot win a pawn with 11...²b6 12 ²b3 ²xd4 13 ²xd4
²xd4 14 ±e3 ²d8 (14...²b4!? 15
²ad1 ±f6 16 ²wh5 gives Black a lot of problems, as he cannot play 16...g6? 17 ²wc5 losing the exchange) 15 ²ed1
²c7 16 ²ac1 and White has more than enough compensation. Instead, Black should play 11...b5 and what will happen is not easy to say. 11 a4 was played in Stein-Krogius, Tbilisi 1967, and definitely has potential. Still, 11 ²b3 is my recommendation.
11...²xc3
11...²e8 is not as good as it was on move ten, but still it is playable. 12 ²wd3 ²xc3!? (this does not seem to have any coherence with 11...²e8) 13 ²bxc3 ±f6 14 ²c4 (White decides not to sacrifice the pawn in the standard way, when he has this perfect square for his queen) 14...²d7 15 h4 ²e7 16
²g5 ²xg5 17 ²xg5 ²c7 18 ²xe7!
(exchanging the only piece that could defend the king) 18...²xe7 19 ²e3 ²ae8 20 h5 ²c6 21 ²wh4 (the white attack is very strong, and he is currently threatening 22 h6 smashing the black king's position) 21...h6 22 ²ae1 ±f8 23 ±g3 (g7 is hard to defend without further weakening) 23...²d5 24 ²g4
f5 25 ²g6 ²xb3 26 axb3 ²b6 27
²wh7 ²f7 28 d5! 1-0 A.Sokolov-Burger, Reykjavik 1990.
11...b5 is maybe the best move. White played the inefficient 12 \( \text{Qe}4 \) in L. Å. Schneider-Wessman, Swedish Ch 1992, but I think there is some advantage for White after 12 \( \text{Qxd}5 \text{ exd}5 \) 13 \( \text{Qe}5 \text{ Qxe}5 \) 14 dxe5, when one possible continuation is 14...\( \text{Qe}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qe}3 \text{ Ab}4 \) 16 \( \text{Qf}1 \text{ Ac}8 \) 17 f4 \( \text{Wh}7 \) 18 \( \text{Wd}3 \) with good prospects for White.

11...\( \text{Qf}6 \) 12 a3 \( \text{Qa}5 \) 13 \( \text{Qc}2 \text{ b}5 \) 14 \( \text{Wd}3 \text{ Ab}7 \) 15 \( \text{Qg}5 \text{ g}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qe}5 \text{ Ac}8 \) 17 \( \text{Wh}3 \) gave White good chances for a successful attack in Bruno-Devčić, Buenos Aires 1994.

12 bxc3 b5 13 \( \text{Qc}2 \text{ Ab}7 \) 14 h4!

This is similar to the line after 10...\( \text{Qxc}3 \).

14...\( \text{Qf}6 \)

14...\( \text{Qxh}4 \) 15 \( \text{Qxh}4 \text{ Wh}4 \) 16 \( \text{Qc}3 \) gives White a strong attack, but probably is better in this version than with the pawns on b6 and a7, since White now does not have plans including c3-c4 and d4-d5.

14...\( \text{Qa}5 \)?? is another possibility, but White has an attack after 15 \( \text{Wd}3 \) g6 16 h5 with the obvious threat 17 hxg6 hxg6 18 \( \text{Qxe}6 \)!

15 \( \text{Qg}5 \text{ g}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qg}4 \text{ Ac}8 \)

16...h5 17 \( \text{Qg}3 \text{ Qe}7 \) 18 \( \text{Qa}3 \text{ Qe}8 \) 19 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) wins as in Line D.

17 h5 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) 18 hxg6 fxg6

18...\( \text{Qxc}2 \) 19 \( \text{Wh}5 \) and 18...hxg6 19 \( \text{Wh}4 \) leave Black defenceless.

19 \( \text{Qh}7 \) \( (D) \)

19...\( \text{Qxc}2 \)

19...\( \text{Qxh}7 \) 20 \( \text{Wxg}6 \).

20 \( \text{Wxg}6+ \text{ Qh}8 \)

20...\( \text{Qg}7 \) 21 \( \text{Qh}6 \text{ Ac}7 \) 22 \( \text{Qg}5 \) wins.

21 \( \text{Qg}5 \text{ Qxg}5 \) 22 \( \text{Qxg}5 \text{ Wh}7 \) 23 \( \text{Qxe}6 \)!

White's attack is irresistible.

23...\( \text{Qc}6 \) 24 \( \text{Wh}5+ \text{ Qg}8 \) 25 \( \text{Qd}1 \text{ Wh}7 \) 26 \( \text{Qd}6 \)!

Keeping the control of the sixth rank.

26...\( \text{Qxd}6 \) 27 \( \text{Qxd}6 \text{ Qf}6 \) 28 \( \text{Qd}8+ \)!
1-0 A. Sokolov-Kharitonov, Moscow ECC 1990. A model game.
1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 Qf6
5 Qc3 e6 6 Qf3 Qe7 7 cxd5 Qxd5 8 Qd3 (D)

The strange thing about this chapter, compared to most of the other chapters in this book, is that there is no need for a practical section here. The Introduction has covered everything.

I have chosen an ambitious and aggressive approach, and followed some not-so-well-known games. I believe the line I suggest is just as good as the main line, which I have decided not to cover.

The Theory of 6...Qe7 7 cxd5 Qxd5 8 Qd3

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 Qf6
5 Qc3 e6 6 Qf3 Qe7 7 cxd5 Qxd5 8 Qd3 Qc6

8...b6! is not sufficient to equalize. White was better after 9 Qe5 0-0 10 Wh5 f5 11 0-0 Qb7 12 c4 in T.Petrosian-Bagirov, USSR Cht 1967.

8...Qd7? is very bad because of 9 Qxd5 exd5 10 Whb3 Qf6 11 Qb5+! with a better position. Black now lost a pawn by 11...Qd7? 12 Qxd7+ Qxd7 13 Qe5 Qe6 14 Qb5+ Qd7 15 0-0 f6 16 Qxb7 in Kuijf-Pearce, Thessaloniki OL 1988.

After 8...0-0 9 0-0 there are some independent options:

a) 9...Qd7? is very passive, and gives White good chances due to the undisturbed knight on e5. 10 Qe1 Qf6
11 Qe5 Qd7 12 Qg5 Qc8? (White is also allowed to transfer his queen to the ideal square, after which his attack is probably irresistible) 13 Wh3 Qxc3
14 bxc3 Qc6 15 Wh3 Qg6 16 Qh6 and White had a winning position in Banas-Beil, Czechoslovak Cht 1992.

b) 9...b6?! 10 Qxd5 exd5 (even worse is 10...Qxd5?! 11 Qc2 f5 12 Qc4 Qd6 13 Qe1 Qc6 14 Qb3 Qf6 15 Qd2 Qg6 16 d5 Qd8 17 Qad1 and Black is busted, Belikov-Kossov, Moscow 1996) 11 Qe5 Qa6 12 Qxa6 Qxa6 13 Qa4 Qc8 14 Qf4 Qb7 15 Qc6 Qab8 16 Qfc1 and White is much better, Larsen-Pomar, Spain 1978.

c) 9...Qa6?! 10 Qe1 Qac7 11 Qe5 leaves White better, Utemov-Zhelesny, Moscow 1995.
d) 9...\(\text{\&}xc3\) 10 \(\text{\&}xc3\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 11 \(\text{\&}e1\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 12 c4 b6 13 \(\text{\&}b2\), Sher-Ferguson, Hastings 1995/6, gives White a very pleasant position, comparable to Chapter 8.

e) 9...\(\text{\&}f6\) 10 \(\text{\&}e2\) b6 11 \(\text{\&}d1!\) (placing the rooks on c1 and d1 does not harmonize with a kingside attack; 11 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 12 \(\text{\&}ad1\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 13 \(\text{\&}fe1\) is the treatment I suggest) 11...\(\text{\&}c6\) 12 \(\text{\&}g5\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 13 a3 \(\text{\&}c8\) 14 \(\text{\&}ac1\) \(\text{\&}e8\) 15 \(\text{\&}b1\) g6 16 \(\text{\&}a2\) \(\text{\&}d5\) 17 h4 \(\text{\&}xg5\) 18 \(\text{\&}xg5\) \(\text{\&}ce7\) 19 g3 is slightly preferable for White, Øgaard-Fossan, Namsøs 1995.

9 0-0 0-0

9...\(\text{\&}cb4?\) is bad. First of all White gets control over e5, but secondly Black does not complete his development in time. 10 \(\text{\&}b1\) \(\text{\&}f6?!\) (10...0-0 11 a3 \(\text{\&}xc3\) 12 \(\text{\&}xc3\) \(\text{\&}d5\) 13 c4 \(\text{\&}f6\) 14 \(\text{\&}b2\) gives White the better game; Black’s pieces are misplaced and undeveloped) 11 \(\text{\&}e5\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 12 a3 \(\text{\&}bd5\) 13 \(\text{\&}xd5\) \(\text{\&}xd5\) 14 \(\text{\&}h5\) (preventing castling leaves Black in great difficulties) 14...g6 15 \(\text{\&}f3\) \(\text{\&}f6\) 16 \(\text{\&}h6\) and Black is not having any fun with his new idea, Karaklajić-Ellebracht, Dortmund 1988.

10 \(\text{\&}e1\) (D)

Now Black has the following options:

A) 10...\(\text{\&}f6\) 11 a3 (D)

Others are less satisfactory:

a) 10...b6? 11 \(\text{\&}xd5\) \(\text{\&}xd5\) (after 11...\(\text{\&}xd5\) 12 \(\text{\&}xh7+\) \(\text{\&}xh7\) 13 \(\text{\&}c2+\) Black has only slight compensation for the pawn, Krutti-Collas, Budapest 1993) 12 \(\text{\&}e4\) \(\text{\&}wd6\) 13 \(\text{\&}e5\) (White is winning) 13...\(\text{\&}b7\) (13...\(\text{\&}xe5\) 14 \(\text{\&}xa8\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 15 \(\text{\&}xc6\) \(\text{\&}xc6\) 16 d5, etc., Gaponenko-Tsiganova, Kishinev 1995) 14 \(\text{\&}f4\) \(\text{\&}e8\) (14...\(\text{\&}f6\) 15 \(\text{\&}g6\) \(\text{\&}xd4\) 16 \(\text{\&}xf8\) \(\text{\&}xf8\) 17 \(\text{\&}xd4\) \(\text{\&}xd4\) 18 \(\text{\&}ad1\) \(\text{\&}xd8\) 19 \(\text{\&}xc6\) 1-0 Brodsky-Kobelev, Russia 1997) 15 \(\text{\&}xh7+!\) \(\text{\&}xh7\) 16 \(\text{\&}h5+\) \(\text{\&}g8\) 17 \(\text{\&}xf7+\) \(\text{\&}h7\) 18 \(\text{\&}h5+\) \(\text{\&}g8\) 19 \(\text{\&}f7+\) \(\text{\&}h7\) 20 \(\text{\&}e3!\) with a winning attack, Osieka-Stenzel, Rheindorf-Pfalz Ch (Heimbach) 1987.

b) 10...\(\text{\&}d7\) (this is passive, and in no way prevents White from generating an attack) 11 \(\text{\&}c2\) \(\text{\&}f6\) 12 \(\text{\&}d3\) g6 13 \(\text{\&}b3\) \(\text{\&}c8\) 14 \(\text{\&}h6\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 15 \(\text{\&}xg7\) \(\text{\&}xg7\) 16 h4 and White is better, Larsen-Pomar, Costa Brava 1976.

c) 10...\(\text{\&}xc3\) 11 bxc3 b6 and now 12 \(\text{\&}e2\) gives White a little solid plus, e.g. 12...\(\text{\&}b7\) 13 \(\text{\&}e4\) g6 14 \(\text{\&}g4\) \(\text{\&}f6\) 15 h4 \(\text{\&}e8\) 16 h5 \(\text{\&}g7\) 17 \(\text{\&}g5\) with a strong attack in Thorhallsson-Lyberg, Gausdal 1994, but 12 h4!? is also possible. Black can use the fact that he has not yet played...\(\text{\&}b7\) by 12...\(\text{\&}xh4\) 13 \(\text{\&}xh4\) \(\text{\&}xh4\) 14 \(\text{\&}e3\) f5, although White has splendid compensation for the pawn after 15 \(\text{\&}e2\).

A) 10...\(\text{\&}f6\) 11 a3 (D)

Now:
A1: 11...\textbf{wd}6 124
A2: 11...b6 124

A1)
\textbf{11...wd6}

This attempt to disturb White's development by attacking d4 disturbs Black more than White.

12 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}}\textit{c2 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d8 13 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e3 b6 14 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d3 g6 15 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}ad1 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b7 16 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g5 \textit{\textit{Q}}c7}

Both players have wasted a tempo, but Black also put his rook on d8, where it is not at all certain it should be.

17 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b3 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd4!}?

This interesting attempt to take over the initiative is not completely correct.

18 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd4 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g4 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}h3 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xf2}

\textbf{Now:}

a) 20 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}h4? \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd1 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xe7 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd4 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd4 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xc3 23 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xe6 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d5!! (a strong novelty; previously known was 23...\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e8?? 24 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xg6+! hxg6 25 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xf7+ 1-0 Chekhov-Veselovsky, USSR 1980) 24 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd5 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd5 25 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xd5?! (25 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e2 to try to draw was the only real chance) 25...\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e8! 26 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e5 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d7 27 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d6 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xc7 and Black went on to win in Kurajica-Kutirov, Strumica 1995.

b) 20 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xf2 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xg5 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g1 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}f6 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}de2 gives White a clear edge, but still Black has a lot of play due to his two bishops.

A2)
\textbf{11...b6 12 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}c2 (D)}

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

With another branching-out:

A21: 12...\textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b7 124
A22: 12...\textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}a6! 125

A21)
\textbf{12...\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b7}

This is passive, and White soon has dangerous threats.

13 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d3 g6}

13...\textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}c8 14 d5! exd5 (14...\textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}a5 15 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g5 g6 16 d6 and White won in the game Coleman-Gilbert, British League (4NCL) 1996) 15 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g5 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e4 16 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xe4 dxe4 17 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xe4 g6 18 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}h6 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e8 19 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}ad1 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}c7 20 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b3 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d8 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d4 1-0 W.Schmidt-Imanaliev, Moscow OL 1994.}

13...\textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e8? 14 d5! exd5 15 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g5 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e4 16 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xe4 dxe4 17 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}xe4 g6 18 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}h4 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}c7 19 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b3 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d6 20 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}f6 h5 21 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}g5 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}h7 22 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}c2 1-0 Dizdar-Dizdarević, Sarajevo 1988 – see p. 8.

14 \textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}h6 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e8 15 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}ad1 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d6!}

15...\textbf{\textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}c8 16 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}b3 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}a5 17 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}a2 \textit{\textit{\textit{Q}}}d5 18 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}e4 \textbf{\textit{\textit{Q}}}f6 (Bezemer-Mooney,}
Holland 1995) 19 \( \text{Q} \times \text{f}6 + \text{Q} \times \text{f}6 \) 20 \( b4 \text{Q} \times \text{c}6 \) 21 \( d5 \) gives White a little edge.

15...\( Qf8 \) 16 \( Qg5 \text{Q} \times \text{e}7 \) 17 \( Qb3 \) ensures White the better position, Velimirović-Böhm, Amsterdam 1976.

16 \( Wd2 \)

16 \( Qb5!? \) might give White a better position after 16...\( Wd7 \) 17 \( Qe5 \text{Q} \times \text{e}5 \) 18 \( dx5 \text{W}x\text{d}3 \) 19 \( …Qx\text{d}3 \text{Q} \times \text{g}4 20 \text{Qf}4 \text{Qc}5 \) 21 \( Qg3 \), when both \( b2-b4 \) and invasions with the knight are threatened.

16...\( Qe\text{d}8 \) 17 \( Qf4 \text{W}d7 \) 18 \( Qg5 \text{Qc}8 \) 19 \( Qf4 \)

With an interesting position, in which I believe White has the better prospects, Brodsky-Labutin, Kstovo 1994.

A22)

12...\( Qa6! \)

This is more active and prevents White from attacking directly.

13 \( Qg5 \text{Qc}8 \) 14 \( Qc1 \)

14 \( Wd2 \) \( Qa5!? \) 15 \( Qad1 \) \( Qc \) 16 \( wc1 \text{Q} \) 17 \( d5 \text{Q} \times \text{b}2 \) gives Black the better chances, Novik-Vasiukov, Leningrad 1991. If Black did not have this knight manoeuvre, White would gain a strong attack with \( Wd2-f4-h4 \) with threats.

14...\( Qd5 \) 15 \( h4! \)

Black has some problems, Borge-Danielsen, Danish League 1997/8. See the Introduction for the rest of the game.

B)

10...\( Qf6 \) 11 \( a3 \) (D)

11...\( Qd7 \)

Other options:

a) 11...\( Q \times \text{c}3 \) 12 \( bxc3 \) \( b6 \) 13 \( h4 \). Compared with Chapter 10, this is an inferior sacrifice. The pawn should not be at \( a3 \), where the bishop belongs, and the black bishop is probably better placed on \( c8 \) than on \( b7 \), since Black has...\( f5 \) instead of...\( g6 \) after accepting the sacrifice. Nevertheless, it is so strong, that it should be played. Now:

a1) 13...\( Qb7!? \) 14 \( Qg5 \text{g}6 \) 15 \( \text{W}g4 \text{h}5 \) 16 \( \text{W}g3 \), Shabtai-Kataev, Tel-Aviv 1995. White has his compensation, but has not needed to sacrifice anything. Still, he would rather have his pawn on \( a2 \).

a2) 13...\( Q \times \text{h}4 \) 14 \( Q \times \text{h}4 \text{W}xh4 \) 15 \( \text{Qc}3 \text{f}5 \) 16 \( We2 \) with compensation, Vaiser-Meduna, Sochi 1983.

b) 11...\( Q \times \text{c}7 \) 12 \( Qc2 \text{b}6 \) 13 \( Qd3 \text{g}6 \) 14 \( Qh6 \) (14 \( h4!? \) is an option - less forcing, but still dangerous) 14...\( Qg7 \) 15 \( Wd2 \) \( Qb7 \) 16 \( Qe5!? \) (16 \( h4! \)) 16...\( Qf5 \) 17 \( Qx \text{f}5 \) \( exf5 \) 18 \( Qxg7 \text{Qx}g7 \) 19 \( Qa1 \) with equal play, Yagupov-Asian, St Petersburg Petrov mem 1996.

c) 11...\( g6 \) (it is difficult to say anything about this move, because the only practical example is kind of ridiculous) 12 \( Qh6 \text{Q}g7 \) 13 \( Qxg7 \) (perhaps 13 \( Wd2 \) is stronger, preparing \( h2-h4-h5 \), etc.) 13...\( Qxg7 \) 14 \( Qe5 \) (White has a slight advantage, but nothing special) 14...\( Wb6 \) 15 \( Qa4 \text{W}x \text{d}4 \) 16 \( Qe4 \) and, in Lößfler-Malachowski, Eppingen 1988, White went on to win.
d) 11...\( \Box xd4?! \) 12 \( \Box xd4 \) \( \Box xd4 \) 13
\( \Box xh7+ \) \( \Box xh7 \) 14 \( \Box wd4 \) (White is better developed and thereby has an
advantage; Black can also quickly get problems with his king, as we are
about to see) 14...\( \Box f6 \) 15 \( \Box e5 \) \( \Box xc3 \)
16 \( \Box xc3 \) \( \Box g8 \) 17 \( \Box g5 \) \( \Box g6 \) 18 \( \Box e7! \)
gives White a clear advantage due to
his attack on the dark squares, Zinn-
Marović, Zinnowitz 1966.

12 \( \Box c2 \) \( \Box c8 \) 13 \( \Box e4 \) \( \Box e7 \)
14...\( \Box b6 \) 14 \( \Box d3 \) is very dangerous
for Black.
14 \( \Box d3 \) \( g6 \) 15 \( \Box d2 \)
15 \( \Box h6! \) \( \Box e8 \) 16 \( \Box b3 \) must be a
little better for White. One example is
16...\( \Box a5 \) 17 \( \Box a2 \) a6 18 \( \Box e5 \) when the
white queen will join the attack if
Black is not extremely careful.

15...\( \Box b6 \)
15...a5! is an improvement, sug-
gested by Gulko, though White should
be a little better after 16 \( \Box b3 \).

16 \( \Box d4 \) \( \Box f6 \)
16...a5 17 \( \Box c5! \) would lead to a
white advantage.

17 \( \Box b3 \) \( \Box e8 \) 18 \( \Box ac1 \) a6?
18...a5 19 b5 \( \Box a7 \) 20 a4 was better,
but White possesses an advantage be-
dyond doubt.

19 \( h4 \) \( \Box a7 \)?
Still 19...a5 was required.
20 \( \Box c5 \) \( \Box c6 \) 21 h5 \( \Box a7 \)?
21...\( \Box g7 \) to protect g6 was men-
tioned by Gulko as the best move.
Now Black is lost.

22 \( \Box xg6 \) \( \Box xg6 \) (D)

23 \( \Box xe6! \) \( \Box xe6 \) 24 \( \Box xe6 \) \( \Box f7 \)
24...\( \Box g7 \) 25 \( \Box xd5! \) \( \Box xd5 \) 26 \( \Box e4 \)
\( \Box d7 \) 27 d5 opens up for the bishop and
decides the game.
25 \( \Box xg6+ \) \( \Box f8 \)
On 25...\( \Box xg6, \) 26 \( \Box xg6+ \) \( \Box h8 \) 27
\( \Box h6+ \) \( \Box g8 \) 28 \( \Box xd5+ \) \( \Box xd5 \) 29 \( \Box e6+ \)
wins easily.

26 \( \Box h6 \) \( \Box e8 \) 27 \( \Box e1 \)
1-0 Gulko-Kaidanov, USA Ch 1994.
Index of Variations

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 ²f6 5 ²c3
5...²c6 6 ²f3 ²g4 7 cxd5 ²xd5 8 ³b3 ³xf3 9 gxf3 e6: Chapter 1
5...²c6 6 ²f3 others: Chapter 2
5...²c6 6 ²g5 without 6...²e6: Chapter 3
5...²c6 6 ²g5 ²e6: Chapter 4
5...g6: Chapter 5
5...e6 6 ²f3 ²b4 7 cxd5: Chapter 6
5...e6 6 ²f3 ²b4 7 ²d3 miscellaneous: Chapter 7
5...e6 6 ²f3 ²b4 7 ²d3 dxc4 8 ²xc4 0-0 9 0-0 b6: Chapter 8
5...e6 6 ²f3 ²b4 7 ²d3 dxc4 8 ²xc4 0-0 9 0-0 a6: Chapter 9
5...e6 6 ²f3 ²c7 7 cxd5 ²xd5 8 ²c4: Chapter 10
5...e6 6 ²f3 ²c7 7 cxd5 ²xd5 8 ²d3: Chapter 11

1: The Classical Endgame
5...²c6 6 ²f3 ²g4 7 cxd5 ²xd5 8 ³b3 ³xf3 9 gxf3 e6 33 10 ³xb7
²xd4 11 ²b5+ ³xb5 12 ³c6+! ³e7
13 ³d5 ³d7 14 ²xd5+ ³xd5
A: 15 ³xd5 exd5 16 0-0 34
B: 15 ³xd5 exd5 without 16 0-0 35
C: 15 ²g5+! 36

B: 6...³a5?! 57 7 ³a3
B1: 7...³xc4 57
B2: 7...³e4 57

C: 6...³b6?! 57 7 cxd5 ²xd4! 8
³e3 e5 9 dxe6 ³c5 10 exf7+ ³e7
C1: 11 ³c4?! 58
C2: 11 ³d3! 58

D: 6...³g4?! 58
E: 6...³e4?! 59
F: 6...e6 59

2: Avoiding the Endgame
5...²c6 6 ²f3 43 6...²g4 7 cxd5
²xd5 8 ³b3 ³xf3 9 gxf3 ³b6?!
A: 10 d5 44 10...²d4 11 ³d1 e5 12
dxe6
A1: 12...fxe6 44
A2: 12...³e5?! 47

B: 10 ³e3 47 10...e6
B1: 11 ³g1 47
B2: 11 0-0-0 48

4: 6...³e6

5...²c6 6 ³g5 ³e6 66
A: 7 c5 66
B: 7 ³e2 66
C: 7 ³d2 67

D: 7 ³xf6 67 7...gxf6!
D1: 8 ³f3 67
D2: 8 ³h5 67
D3: 8 ³d2 68
D4: 8 c5 68

E: 7 g3 69
F: 7 ³f3 69
G: 7 \textit{Qge2 70}
H: 7 \textit{Bc1 70},
I: 7 a3 70

5: 5...g6
5...g6 78 6 \textit{Wb3 \textit{Qg7 7 cxd5 0-0 8}
\textit{Qe2 \textit{Qbd7 9 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qb6 10 \textit{Qge2}
A: 10...\textit{Qg4 80}
B: 10...\textit{Qf5 81

6: 5...e6 6 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qb4 7 cxd5}
5...e6 6 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qb4 7 cxd5 8\textit{Qxd5
A: 8 \textit{Qc2 84
A1: 8...\textit{Qd7 84
A2: 8...\textit{Qc6 85
A21: 9 \textit{Qe2 85
A22: 9 \textit{Qd3 85
B: 8 \textit{Qd2 86

7: 7 \textit{Qd3: Introduction and Unusual 9th Moves
5...e6 6 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qb4 7 \textit{Qd3 9/7...\textit{Qxc4 8
\textit{Qxc4 0-0 9 0-0
A: 9...\textit{Qd7!? 91
B: 9...\textit{Qbd7 92

8: 9...b6
5...e6 6 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qb4 7 \textit{Qd3 \textit{Qxc4 8 \textit{Qxc4}
0-0 9 0-0 b6 101

9: 9...a6!