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This book was jointly written by Jacob Aagaard and Esben Lund over the summer and fall of 2001. During the first weeks of the cooperation we were sitting face to face with our laptops in Jacob's flat, sweating as if we were doing physical labour. In this time we wrote the main lines of the Tarrasch together and revised each other's material. Later we divided the remaining material between us and finished it separately. We have chosen to use the pronoun 'we' during all of the book, as there is a lot of overlapping between who did what.

It is usually an assumption that when a titled player is working with a weaker player, it is the weaker player who does most of the work. Jacob would surely have loved it to be this way. Because even though Esben yet has to make his IM norms, he is not a weak player at all. He is, without doubt, the best prepared of the two and has a special affection for the Tarrasch Defence, which he has studied in great detail. Esben also puts pride in his work that seems insane to Jacob and would so to most people in this business. On the other hand, Esben needed to learn a lot about structuring work and how to present it. So, all in all, this was a logical co-operation, which worked out well. At least we think so!

It is our conviction that the different lines in an opening repertoire should be learnt differently. Some lines are critical and require some theoretical knowledge to be played, while others are less critical and require a more basic understanding of where the pieces belong. This difference becomes even clearer when you work with a repertoire book of this sort, where a third of a full tournament repertoire is explained in only 176 pages. In practice this means that we have been very theoretical in the handling of the Tarrasch Defence, which is our main defence against 1 d4, while we have been writing more generically about all the side-lines like the Reti, the Trompovsky and so on. It was our belief that this would be the best way for the reader to learn how to play against these systems as it is the way we, ourselves, learned to overcome our difficulties against exactly the same systems. We hope that neither our readers nor our publisher feels let down by this choice but we simply felt it was the right way.

We are aware that there will be some holes in the suggested variations when we choose to write like this. First of all, we have never met anyone who has bought repertoire books and then learned all the lines. Secondly, you cannot predict all the moves in the opening. Once, after Kasparov had lost a
game to Peter Svidler in a rather harmless sideline in the Sicilian, his second Dokhoian was asked if they had analysed the line in question. His reply was: 'If we analysed all these sidelines we would never have time to do anything else.' This is the spirit this book is written in. The Tarrasch is fully covered, the Reti and Trompovsky also quite well, while not very dangerous lines, less so. Personally, we try to follow a few key games when we fight these systems and this is the approach we have tried to champion here.

If anybody has any questions or wish to find more information about the authors, you may be lucky to find something at www.gmaagaard.com (Jacob is always an optimist!).

Jacob Aagaard and Esben Lund
Copenhagen and Berlin, January 2002
CHAPTER ONE

Tarrasch Defence: Main Line with 9 g5 cxd4 10 xd4 h6

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 c3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 f3 c6 6 g3 f6 7 g2 e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 g5 cxd4 10 xd4 h6

The lines considered the critical ones of the Tarrasch Defence start from the position given above. In this book we have decided to give two different defences against 9 g5 as this really is the most important line. In this way, we have tried to be open to different tastes and have left the possibility of changing between the two main lines open.

In this chapter we will go through different concepts occurring from the position given above, before we go on to the nitty-gritty of the theoretical lines. We start with the ideas we need to defend against when we play the Tarrasch, so that we do not get blinded by our own possibilities and forget about our opponent’s. But first let us take a look at the different pawn structures that often occur from the diagram above.

Different Pawn Structures
The basic structure is, of course, the structure in the diagram above. Black has an isolated pawn, but he also has good access to the centre via the half-open e-file and the e4- and c4-squares, both of which usually are very warm and welcoming for the black knights. White will, of course, have to choose between fighting or tolerating the black knights on these squares. He can take control over e4 with the move b2-b3, but that leaves c3 weakened. If we imagine that Black already has a knight on e4, then c3 can prove a very advantageous square for the knight. From here it can hit the pawns on e2 and a2, and take control over d1. So for White to play b2-b3, he needs to assure himself that he has control over c3. If he decides to take e4 away from Black with f2-f3, then both the e3-square and the e2-pawn can become weakened. Once more this is something both players will have to consider again and again.

Another pawn structure, that often comes about, occurs after White exchanges knights on c6.
This is the primary alternative to the main pawn structure given above. A standard theoretical position is as given above:

White has designed his play to circle around the occupation of c5 and the pressurising on c6, but this has come at a cost. Black can achieve active play along the b-file and the control over e4 has been strengthened, as Black no longer has to consider the d5-pawn as frail, and thus give it extra attention. As illustrated in the theoretical part of this chapter, there has been no final judgements passed on this position, and neither will there be over the following years.

White will normally play \( \text{c3-a4} \) with the idea of \( \text{e3-c5}! \), taking control over the dark squares by exchanging the toughest black defender of these. White would love to play a3 and b4 to further consolidate his grip on c5, but often Black can create counterplay along the b-file with \( \text{a8-b8} \) and \( \text{a7-a5} \). Black can also create counterplay against the e-pawn or take control over the e4-square.

Another pawn structure often occurs after White exchanges a knight for a bishop on e6 and Black recaptures with the f-pawn. The following position is a typical example:

![Chessboard diagram]

After the exchange White has a slight but long-lasting positional advantage. The black pawns are slightly weak on the light squares and will remain so for a long time to come. This, of course, is because of the light square domination White has due to his bishop.

But there are also plusses for Black. The d5-pawn has finally become stable and Black can concentrate on free piece play. It is true that e6 is somewhat weak, but White has difficulties in organising a direct attack on it. Still, this is an important concept in the position and will have huge influence on the way the game develops later.

White sometimes tries to break the centre open with c2-e4, which Black is forced to meet with \( \text{d5-d4} \). This can be both good and bad. Black gets a passed pawn in the centre, which should not be underestimated, but White also gets a pawn majority on the kingside, which he can use to create an attack against the king or the centre. A more cautious way of handling the black centre is to play c2-e3 and manoeuvre with the pieces. This is what Kramnik chose in his game from the diagram position against Matthew Sadler. The game was drawn after Black resisted a small pressure throughout.

Now let us turn to White's aggressive plans.

**White's Plans**

The Tarrasch does not invite White to perform bold kingside attacks but rather play on the lasting advantages. The overall statistical score for White is higher in games of over 50 moves compared to games with less than 50 moves. This is because the pawn structures are advantageous to White and the more pieces that are exchanged, the more important the pawn structure becomes. Only in the endgame, when there are few pieces left on the board, do the pawns have a tendency to drop like flies.

**Fighting for the c5-square**

The standard plan for White deals with manoeuvring the c3-knight to c5 and trying to dominate the queenside. Nimzowitsch wrote in his main work *My System* that isolated pawns should be blocked. Well, the c6-pawn has a lot of similarities with an isolated pawn
as it has no friends around it to help. So the c5-square is quite nice for White. But there are also some limitations to this. The knight does not attack a lot of key squares from c5, so as long there are minor pieces in the position, Black will be able to play around the knight. Still, as play progresses Black will have to make up for his weaknesses somehow by active counterplay, or he will have to pay the price.

This first example illustrates what happens if Black fails to create counterplay against this plan.

Seirawan-Piket
Merrillville 1997

14 \textit{\texttt{Exc6}}

14 \textit{\texttt{Exxe6}}! is a serious alternative, even though the path chosen is more standard.

14...\textit{\texttt{Bxc6}} 15 \textit{\texttt{Ea4}}

Now Black will first have to take care of the c-pawn. If he plays 15...\textit{\texttt{Bac8}}, then the rook will be passive after 16 \textit{\texttt{Ec5}}, taking control over the square.

15...\textit{\texttt{Wd7}}

This move is very natural but I feel that Black is just allowing a lot of exchanges over the next few moves, and that he should not do so. One chance to do something different here has been found by \textit{\texttt{Fntz}} and appears to be not so stupid: 15...\textit{\texttt{Wc8}}! 16 \textit{\texttt{Wh2}} \textit{\texttt{Wa6}}!. Here the queen is excellently placed. It protects c6 and hits at a2, a4 and e2. On 17 \textit{\texttt{Wc2}}, Black can reply with the cool 17...\textit{\texttt{Bab8}}!.

White should then enter the tactics after 18 \textit{\texttt{Wxc6 Wxc2}} 19 \textit{\texttt{Fe1 Wh5}}! 20 \textit{\texttt{Ax7 Ad7}} 21 \textit{\texttt{Wc7 Bbc8}} 22 \textit{\texttt{Wa5 Bxc1}} 23 \textit{\texttt{Bxc1 Bg4!}} 24 \textit{\texttt{Bg1 Dc5}} 25 \textit{\texttt{g4 Dc4!}} 26 \textit{\texttt{hxg4}} \textit{\texttt{Wxg4}} 27 \textit{\texttt{Df1 Df3}} 28 \textit{\texttt{Dxf5}} \textit{\texttt{Wxf5}} 29 \textit{\texttt{Wb5 Bc8}} and Black seems to get at least a perpetual here. All of these lines are, of course, to be improved upon but they illustrate a potential for tactics dwelling in the position.

16 \textit{\texttt{Wh2 Ef5}}

A reasonable move. The bishop is inactive on e6 and White’s kingside is, in the main, held together by the bishop on g2. So exchanging it is logical.

17 \textit{\texttt{Cc5 Ef4}}

17...\textit{\texttt{Dd8}}? is the alternative. White will occupy c5 with the knight after 18 \textit{\texttt{Dd4}}, but Black has not yet committed himself to the exchange of the dark-squared bishops and can thus later fight for control over the centre.

18 \textit{\texttt{Dxe7 Dxe2}} 19 \textit{\texttt{Dxe7 Wxe7}} 20 \textit{\texttt{Ee3 We4+}}

This check is more or less forced. If Black replies passively with 20...\textit{\texttt{Bac8}}, then White will take control with 21 \textit{\texttt{Wd4! Dc4}} 22 \textit{\texttt{b4}}, with some kind of an advantage. This is the typical kind of advantage White is playing for. Only one set of minor pieces needs to be exchanged, then we are in the fourth phase, a heavy piece endgame, where attack on the castled king is very unlikely.

21 \textit{\texttt{Wh2 Dac8}} 22 \textit{\texttt{Dc5 Wf5}}!?

Black is dreaming of attacking the white king but his pieces are simply not in position to do so.

Better was 22...\textit{\texttt{We5}} 23 \textit{\texttt{b3 Dc4}} to fight on the dark squares, after which White’s advantage is kept to an absolute minimum.

23 \textit{\texttt{Dg2 h5}}

Proceeding with the wrong plan.

24 \textit{\texttt{Wf3 Wg6}} 25 \textit{\texttt{Dfd1 h4}}?

This is not weakening the white kingside at all, but rushing the exchange of queens and extending the white control over the
dark squares. And the pawn will only prove to be weak on h4. 25...\texttt{b}b8 was much better.

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

26 g4 \texttt{b}b8 27 b3 \texttt{d}e4 28 \texttt{w}f5!

An extra option that White was handed on a silver plate. As we shall see, the well-placed white pieces make sure that the new f-pawn is not seriously weak.

28...\texttt{w}f5 29 gxf5 \texttt{d}d6

The alternative 29...\texttt{b}b6 30 \texttt{d}d4 \texttt{d}xc5 31 \texttt{d}xc5 \texttt{e}c5 32 \texttt{x}xh4 \texttt{w}xf5 33 \texttt{a}4 gives White good chances to win the rook endgame, as his rooks are more active and the Black queenside is very frail.

30 f6!

Creating weaknesses in the black position. The pawn cannot be taken due to \texttt{d}d7, winning an exchange.

30...\texttt{g}5 31 \texttt{d}4

White has a clear advantage in the endgame and he proceeded to make the most of it.

31...\texttt{h}7 32 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{c}8 33 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{h}6 34 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{d}6 35 \texttt{c}g1 \texttt{b}5 36 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}4 37 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{d}4 38 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{d}2 39 \texttt{x}g5+ \texttt{x}g5 40 \texttt{x}h4+ \texttt{g}6 41 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}2+ 42 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{e}4 43 \texttt{x}g5+ \texttt{x}g5 44 h4+ \texttt{h}5 45 \texttt{g}1 \texttt{g}3 46 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{x}h4 47 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{e}3 48 \texttt{h}2+ \texttt{g}5 49 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{f}5 50 \texttt{g}2+ \texttt{h}4 51 \texttt{g}4+ 1-0

We still believe that Black was more or less fine until he began his unassisted attack on the kingside. White had the very slim advantage, which he usually gets from almost any opening, but nothing more. Still, we would have liked Black to have tried some more active possibilities. Black is positionally worse in the Tarrasch, but this is compensated by the activity that always comes with having an isolated d-pawn.

The next example will take us to the same position on move seventeen, where the greatest player of all times takes a more dynamic path than Jeroen Piket. Obviously the white player is weaker than the multiple US Champion, and Kasparov does take some liberties on that account, but still it shows the potential in the position.

\begin{center}
Züger-Kasparov
Switzerland (simul) 1987
\end{center}

15 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{b}xc6 16 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{f}5 17 \texttt{c}5

So far so good. Now Kasparov decides to avoid the exchanges. In our opinion, this is the right path as all of White's pieces wants to occupy c5. The fewer the number of exchanges, the greater the pieces who will have to be satisfied with second best.

17...\texttt{d}8! 18 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{e}4 19 f3

This is the price White will have to pay for occupying the c5 squares with the knight. In our opinion it is too much. He is now committed to opening the centre with e2-e4 if he wants to prove an advantage and, as we shall see, Black is then much better prepared for this.

10
Tarrasch Defence: Main Line with 9 \( \text{g}5 \) cxd4 10 \( \text{xd}4 \) h6

19...\( \text{g}5 \) 20 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 21 e4 dxe4 22 fxe4 \( \text{g}6 \) 23 e5 \( \text{b}6 \) 24 h4 \( \text{ad}8 \)!!

A truly amazing concept.

25 \( hxg5 \)!

This is probably too risky. White should have tried 25 \( \text{xc6} \), with the idea of 25...\( \text{e}6 \) 26 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 27 \( \text{f}4 \) and Black is fine but nothing more. But who knows, maybe Kasparov had some acidic idea in his pocket.

25...\( \text{w}xg5 \)

Black's strategy is to take control over the dark squares and for this he is willing to sacrifice some material. Kasparov has always played like this. The importance is not the number of pieces or their static value, but rather their worth in the structure of the actual situation.

26 \( \text{wa4} \)

26 \( \text{e}1! \)? was possibly a better defence, even though the queen is very uncomfortable in the pin. Still, it is completely misplaced on the queenside.

26...\( \text{w}h5+ \) 27 \( \text{g}1 \)

27...\( \text{xe5} \)!

Black takes over the dark squares with this exchange sacrifice and maximises the power of his remaining pieces.

28 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 29 \( \text{wb4} \)

29 b4 \( \text{e}3+ \) 30 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{xg3} \) gives Black three pawns and a strong attack for the rook, which is a good trade as White is occupied over on the queenside for the time being and has bad co-ordination between his pieces.

29...\( \text{d}3 \)!

The rook was not a part of the attack so naturally Kasparov decides to bring it into play.

30 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{xg3} \) 31 \( \text{f}4 \)!

Probably a blunder, although even after the stronger 31 \( \text{e}4 \), there was not really any way for White to come out of all the pins and pressure.

31...\( \text{xc5} \) 32 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f5} \) 35 \( \text{g}4 \)?

This loses. 35 b4! was better, limiting the bishop, but we still feel that the unsafe white king gives Black excellent chances to win the game.

35...\( \text{e}5+ \) 36 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 37 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 38 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}1 \) 39 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 40 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}4+ \) 41 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 0-1

Sometimes White decides to play with the two bishops by exchanging the knight for bishop on c5. As we shall see, the validity of this idea has all to do with the activity of the black pieces. In the first example Black is inactive and thus stands much worse.

Karpov-Illescas Cordoba
Leon 1993

Black has not really played well here. He is
f firmly behind in development and White is about to obtain a firm grip on the queenside.

20 b4!

As Black cannot challenge the white pawn formation on the queenside, this is very powerful.

20...\text{\texttt{\textit{Qf8}}}

We find it hard to understand what Black is actually trying to do with this knight (going to e5 obviously, but then what?), but the position is rather hopeless altogether.

Still, we preferred 20...a5!? 21 b5! \text{\texttt{\textit{xax3}}}

bxc6 \text{\texttt{\textit{xc1}}} 23 \text{\texttt{\textit{xc1}}}, where White has a clear advantage according to Karpov. He might be right, but at least the black pieces begin to seem somewhat co-ordinated after 23...d6 and the a-pawn is a powerful asset. In the game Black is just passively awaiting his end.

21 a4 \text{\texttt{\textit{g6}}} 22 \text{\texttt{\textit{c3}}}!

A very powerful move. Karpov is the champion at preventing opponents’ plans and this game is no different. The black knight still needs to find a good square.

22...d7

Apparently sadly necessary.

22...a5!? 23 \text{\texttt{\textit{b6}}} axb4 24 axb4 \text{\texttt{\textit{a2}}} 25 \text{\texttt{\textit{xc6}}} and White is leading in material.

Also bad is 22...c5 23 \text{\texttt{\textit{d4}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{f5}}} 24 e4! a5?! (24...\text{\texttt{\textit{xe4}}} 25 \text{\texttt{\textit{xe4}}} dxe4 26 \text{\texttt{\textit{xe5}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{xe5}}} 27 \text{\texttt{\textit{xc6}}} and White wins material.) 25 \text{\texttt{\textit{c5}}} axb4 26 axb4 \text{\texttt{\textit{g6}}} 27 f4 and Black is busted.

23 \text{\texttt{\textit{c5}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{xc5}}} 24 \text{\texttt{\textit{xc5}}}!

The queen is ideally placed on c3 and White will have to play e2-e3 at some point to rid the bishop and the other pieces from the responsibility of guarding the e2-pawn. So, all in all, this is the perfect timing. White is using a simple tactic to un-tangle himself from his last co-ordination problem. Black can now choose to either sacrifice the exchange or just lose slowly. He chooses the first option, but that doesn’t really help him much.

If the game proceeded normally, Black would have to watch out for the pawn breaks b4-b5 and e2-e4 breaking up his centre, try to eliminate the pressure in the diagonal d4 to g7 and watch his own miserable pieces...

24...\text{\texttt{\textit{xe2}}}!? 25 \text{\texttt{\textit{d3}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{e7}}} 26 \text{\texttt{\textit{f1}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{xe3}}} 27 \text{\texttt{\textit{xe3}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{xe3}}} 28 \text{\texttt{\textit{xe3}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{xe8}}} 29 \text{\texttt{\textit{f2}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{e5}}} 30 \text{\texttt{\textit{c5}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{e7}}} 31 \text{\texttt{\textit{e4}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{e6}}} 32 \text{\texttt{\textit{b5}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{xb5}}} 33 \text{\texttt{\textit{exe5}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{d7}}} 34 \text{\texttt{\textit{d6}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{e6}}} 35 \text{\texttt{\textit{xb5}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{f6}}}+ 36 \text{\texttt{\textit{g2}}} 1-0

In the second example the black pieces are in good form and he does not have to suffer under the rule of the two bishops.

M.Gurevich-Ponomariov

Belfort 1998

We have already once visited this position, but this time the level of the two players is more similar.

17...\text{\texttt{\textit{d8}}}! 18 \text{\texttt{\textit{d4}}} \text{\texttt{\textit{e4}}} 19 \text{\texttt{\textit{e3}}}

This is probably more reasonable than 19 f3.

19...\text{\texttt{\textit{e7}}} 20 \text{\texttt{\textit{c5}}}!?

Gurevich chooses to have the two bishops. As we shall see, Black is not too impressed with this as his knight proves to be in great shape. Note that Black would never exchange both pairs of minor pieces on c5 as White would find good use in this square for the rook. From there it can attack the c-pawn and assist in breaking the centre apart with b2-b4-b5.

20...\text{\texttt{\textit{xc5}}}!

If Black exchanged with 20...\text{\texttt{\textit{xc5}}}, he would never get anything good out of his
bishop as it would constantly have to avoid exchanging itself for White’s dark-squared bishop.

21 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}}c5 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{w}}b7 22 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{d}}d4 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{a}}5!

The counterplay on the b-file is an important part of the Black’s activity in this position. He knows that White, if allowed, will stop this with b2-b3, so he pushes the a-pawn to dissuade White from this possibility.

23 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{a}}a4 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{d}}d7 24 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{w}}c2 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{a}}ac8 25 f3

White no longer feels that he can tolerate the knight on e4, mainly because of the threat of ...c6-c5.

25...\textcolor{green}{\texttt{g}}g5 26 h4 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{e}}6

Threatening the sequence 27...c5 28 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c3 d4! with a strong initiative.

27 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c3!

Avoiding it by hitting the a-pawn.

27...a4!

Black is trusting his active pieces and allows the a-pawn to hang for the moment. The reason he does so is that it is perfectly placed on a4, as long as it isn’t lost. Now White has problems with finding a really good square for the bishop.

28 f4!

White is inviting a sequence of tactics leading to a drawn endgame and Black accepts. After 28 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{w}}xa4 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{a}}a8 29 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{w}}b3 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{a}}7 Black would win the pawn back without slowing down the pace of his pieces.

28...c5 29 f5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d4! 30 exd4

White could chose to play for a win with 30 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{d}}d2?! but we doubt there is any advantage after 30...\textcolor{green}{\texttt{x}}xf5 31 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{xd}}5 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{w}}c7 32 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{xe}}f3 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{c}}c6! 33 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{xe}}6 fxe6.

30...cxd4 31 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{d}}d2 dxc3 32 bxc3 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{w}}b5 33 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}f2 d4!

Exchanging into a drawn ending by eliminating his only weaknesses.

34 cxd4 \textcolor{green}{\texttt{x}}xc1 35 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{x}}xc1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}e2 36 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{xe}}2 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{x}}e2 37 a3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}}xf5 38 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{w}}c6 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{h}}h7 39 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{w}}f3 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{xf}}3 40 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{xf}}3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d7 41 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}g2 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}g6 42 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d5 f5 43 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}f3 ½-½

As we have just seen in the game above, two bishops are no guarantee for an advantage for White. The black knight can be very strong at e6, where it is involved in the fight for the two primary squares in the position: c5 and d4.

The Knight Jump from d4 to f5

Another regular plan for White includes redirecting his knight from d4 to f5. It can go there for a number of reasons. One of them is to go back to e3 to put pressure on d5, another is to just vacate the d-file and allow more pressure on d5, and a third is to exchange the bishop on e7. The latter is normally good for White so Black should try to avoid this. The first of these three possibilities is illustrated in the game given below.

Portisch-Wilder
New York 1984
This is a theoretical position and will be dealt with as such in the theoretical part of this chapter. Here we will limit ourselves to investigate White's main idea, and not how Black should fight it.

14 \textit{\texttt{f5}} \textit{\texttt{b4}} 15 \textit{\texttt{d4}}!?  

This is really the idea. Black was threatening \[\texttt{xc3},\] wrecking the white pawn structure on the queenside. White thus decides to give up a pawn.

15...\textit{\texttt{c8}}?  

This is not good. Now White is permitted to regroup in his desired fashion. Black was forced to go into the tactics after 15...\texttt{xc3} 16 \texttt{xc3} \texttt{xe2}, which is dealt with later in this chapter.

16 \textit{\texttt{e3}}!  

Now White has the ideal positioning of his minor pieces. All of them are helping in the attack on d5 and soon the rooks will assist as well. Black now finds it impossible to keep his position together.

16...\textit{\texttt{e6}}  

Forced, due to the threat of \[\texttt{xf6}.\]

17 \textit{\texttt{a4}}! \textit{\texttt{xc3}}  

This is forced as the bishop would be hanging after 17...\texttt{xc6}? 18 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6} 19 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{xd5} 20 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{d4} 21 e3, as well as the difference of a pawn.

18 \textit{\texttt{xc3}} \textit{\texttt{c6}} 19 \textit{\texttt{fd1}}  

The d-pawn now proves to be impossible to defend.

19...\textit{\texttt{we7}} 20 \textit{\texttt{d2}}!  

White is defending his own piece before digesting his opponents'. The d-pawn might have a strong wish to fly, but it has nowhere to fly to...

20...\textit{\texttt{d4}}?  

This is an understandable decision. Black chooses to eliminate the strong bishop since he is going to lose the pawn anyway. But after the exchanges, the material will be identical except for the extra white pawn. So this is, all in all, a very bad idea.

Both of the alternatives seem better:  

a) 20...\texttt{cd8} 21 \texttt{xf6}! \texttt{xf6} 22 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 23 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5}! 24 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xe2} 25 \texttt{xf4} \texttt{xb2} 26 \texttt{xe1} \texttt{xa2} 27 \texttt{d7} looks very dangerous for Black, but it is still something most players would prefer over being a pawn down against such a great technical player as Portisch.

b) 20...\texttt{e4}!? 21 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{dxe4} 22 \texttt{xe4}.  

White is, of course, just a pawn up here but the opposite-coloured bishops might provide Black with some kind of counterplay, even though we have our doubts. The bishop on c3 looks very, very strong.

21 \texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 22 \texttt{xd4} \texttt{xc5} 23 \texttt{ad1}  

White is a pawn up for nothing and has no problems in achieving the full point.

23...\texttt{a5} 24 \texttt{xb7} \texttt{b8} 25 \texttt{f3} \texttt{xb2} 26 \texttt{d5} \texttt{f8} 27 \texttt{xf6+} \texttt{gx6} 28 \texttt{d8} \texttt{wb6} 29 \texttt{bd2} \texttt{xd2} 30 \texttt{xd2} \texttt{c8} 31 \texttt{g2} \texttt{g7} 32 \texttt{a3} \texttt{wb1} 33 \texttt{d5} \texttt{xd5+} 34 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{wb7} 35 \texttt{g4+} \texttt{f8} 36 \texttt{w3} \texttt{wa6} 37 \texttt{h5} \texttt{e8} 38 \texttt{e3} \texttt{c8} 39 \texttt{a4} \texttt{ac1} 40 \texttt{b5} \texttt{we6} 41 \texttt{wd5} \texttt{wg4} 42 \texttt{b7} \texttt{wg6} 43 \texttt{e4} \texttt{h5} 44 \texttt{b5} \texttt{ha1} 45 \texttt{wd8+} \texttt{g7} 46 \texttt{wd4} 1-0  

If White can get this kind of ideal set-up for free, there is really nothing Black can do about it. But, as we saw, Black could have made White pay a price for it. And that is again and again the story in this main line. White has a great long-term potential and Black has a good short-term potential. If Black does not somehow use his forces when
he has the chance and plays slow, he will have to pay the price later!

**Winning the d5-pawn/square**

This is, of course, something White would like to do and often he is allowed to do so. There is a typical sequence of moves, seen again and again, that we feel tends to favour White. But first we will show an example where it favours Black, just to illustrate why so many people tend to sacrifice the d-pawn.

**Game 1**

**Renman-Wessendorf**

Berlin 1984

1 d4 d5 2 əf3 c5 3 c4 e6 4 cxd5 exd5 5 g3 əf6 6 əg2 əe7 7 əc3 əc6 8 0-0 0-0 9 əg5 cxd4 10 əxd4 h6 11 əe3 əe8 12 a3 əa5 13 əd3 əc4!?

This is the move that usually starts the sequence. White will either have to enter a passive position with 14 əc1, which is really a non-option, or win the pawn.

14 əxd5 əxd5 15 əxc4 əxe3 16 fxe3

This is the typical position after the sacrifice. White has an extra pawn here – the e3-pawn – but this is really not the important thing. Rather, it matters that White has strong pressure against f7 and will be able to occupy d5 with his bishop, creating a really powerful piece. We shall see in the next game how smothering this can be for Black.

16...əf6 17 əd5 əxe3

Black naturally does not care for the f-pawn; defending it will only bring him suffering. His chances are on the dark squares.

18 əxf7+ əh8 19 əad1 əb6 20 əg2

20 əb4? is a strange move and we are sure that Black has enough for the pawn. Still, it is not so stupid.

20...əg4!

Attacking the weakest spot in the white position with a developing move. Nothing could be more right.

21 əf4

Also worth considering was the more defensive 21 əf3 əxf3+ 22 əxf3 əxf3 23 əxf3 əxb2 24 a4.

21...əc8 22 əa4 əxd4 23 əxg4?

Here was last call for Santa Claus! White should centralise his queen with 23 əxd4 əxe2+ 24 əfl, after which he will be able to exchange queens and make it into a drawn endgame as Black has nothing better than 24...əe7 with equality.

23...əxe2+ 24 əh3 əg1!

This might very likely be what White forgot about.

25 əe4 əxe4?!

Not really a mistake, but 25...əxh2+ 26 əg4 g6, winning on the spot, was even stronger.

26 əxe4 əf2 27 əe7

27 əd7? əxh2+ 28 əg4 əxb2 gives Black both material and positional advantages and leaves White with no real chances of salvation. Still, it was the toughest defence.

27...əxh2+ 28 əg4 h5+ 0-1

Now, that must be said to be appealing, right? Unfortunately, Black often gets a less than perfect position from this pawn sacrifice.

**Polugaevsky-Illescas Cordoba**

France 1991

In this position Polugaevsky reckoned he
had a small advantage and that Black was forced to reinforce his centre with 16...e6 (instead of 16...a5-c4). But this was not the judgement of Illescas Cordoba at the board.

17 \( \text{Qxd5!} \)

Polugayevsky gave this an exclamation mark and we do not feel that it is polite arguing with the dead about details. But White had no choice; 17 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qg4!} \) leaves White with nowhere near an advantage. In fact, he needs to look out or he will soon be worse.

17...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 18 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxe3?} \)

Now this is a real mistake. Black does not have the counterplay on the dark squares as in the previous game. Just for a start, his bishop is on the wrong diagonal on \( \text{f8} \). It belongs on \( \text{f6} \) or \( \text{g5} \), but with the pressure on \( \text{f7} \) there is no way it will get there in time.

Black had another move at his disposal, not even mentioned by ‘Pulu’: 18...\( \text{Qh3!} \) 19 \( \text{Qc6!} \) (The only test. 19 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 20 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 21 \( \text{Qfe1} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 22 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) gives Black excellent compensation on the light squares, and after 19 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 20 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Qxe3+} \) 21 \( \text{fxe3} \) \( \text{Qd5+} \) Black regains his pawn with a positional plus.) 19...\( \text{Qf6} \) 20 \( \text{Qxa7} \) \( \text{Qxf1} \) 21 \( \text{Qxf1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 22 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qcc8} \) 23 \( \text{b3} \) and White is somewhat better with his two pawns for the exchange and control over the light squares, but it is still a fight.

19 \( \text{fxe3} \) \( \text{Qh8} \)

Black could not accept the passive position he would get after 19...\( \text{Qc7} \) 20 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 21 \( \text{Qxf5} \) so he decides to enter a cascade of tactics. 19...\( \text{Qxe3} \) 20 \( \text{Qg6!} \) also does not work.

20 \( \text{Qxf7} \) \( \text{Qa4} \)

There is no time for 20...\( \text{Qxe3} \) as after 21 \( \text{Qg6!} \), White is threatening both \( \text{Qd5-e4} \) and \( \text{Qd1-f1} \).

21 \( \text{Qe6!} \) \( \text{Qb6} \)

There was nothing else. 21...\( \text{Qxe6} \) 22 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \) 23 \( \text{Qxh8} \) and White wins.

22 \( \text{Qg6!} \)

With the direct threat of mate in two moves.

22...\( \text{Qxe4+} \) 23 \( \text{Qh1} \) \( \text{Qe5} \)

Protecting g7 but that is not the only focal point.

24 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qg8} \)

24...\( \text{Qxe4+} \) 25 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) does not work as White has 26 \( \text{Qd5} \), saving the day.

25 \( \text{Qf3} \)

White could also have ended the game with 25 \( \text{Qdf1} \) \( \text{Qxe4+} \) 26 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 27 \( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 28 \( \text{Qxf8+} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 29 \( \text{Qxf8+} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 30 \( \text{Qxf8} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 31 \( \text{Qg2} \) and the pawn ending is effortlessly winning.

25...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 26 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \) 27 \( \text{Qxf8+} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 28 \( \text{Qxf8} \) 1-0

Black resigns as White has a check on either \( \text{f5} \) or \( \text{d5} \), depending on which recapture Black relies on.

The pure positional difference between the two examples was not only the bishop on
f6 and f8, but also that Black had time to exchange the pawn on e3 for the pawn on f7. If White gets the chance to play e3-e4 then Black is not only a pawn down, he is also somewhat worse positionally, as the following example will illustrate.

**Lautier-Grischuk**

*Enghien-les-Bains 2001*

Here Black decides to sacrifice the pawn but, as we shall see, he does not have the necessary time to create counterplay.

14...c4 15 dxc4 dxc4 16 xe3 f6 17 fxe3 f6 18 b3!

A strong move, protecting e3 and hitting at b7 and f7 simultaneously. Notice that the threat against f7 is not really lessened by the king’s rook being on d1 instead of f1; all the real danger is on the a2-g8 diagonal.

18...c7 19 e4!

Look at the bishop on d5 now. Probably Black should play ...c6 and accept a worse position a pawn down, although at least it’s not such a terrifying pawn.

19...g4 20 ac1 ed8

This is one of the rare situations where a bishop is completely dominating the position without being the only bishop on its colour. White is positionally superior and he even has an extra pawn.

21 f3!

After having achieved a full grip over the light squares, White begins to concentrate on the dark squares.

21...h5

This is very slow. Black wants to play ...g6 and put a little pressure on e4, but with White leading in development and the weakness on b7, it is not difficult to find a winning sequence.

22 e5!

Disrupting the little co-ordination there is in the black position.

22...xe5 23 xb7 xb7 24 xb7 xd1+

24...xf3 25 xa8!! would win directly.

25 xd1 b8 26 xe5 xb7 27 d2

And White won the endgame after a long fight.

As you probably have noticed, we are already discussing black possibilities without even announcing it. Actually, it is on purpose to punish the few people who will skip White’s ideas and look directly for the black ones...

**Regrouping**

We have already seen how Black can get a lot of benefits from regrouping his knight to e6 via e4 and g5 (or h7 and f8). We have also seen the manoeuvre ...c8-g4-h5-g6, even though not in the light it deserves to be seen. The following miniature is a good indication of how Black can regroup his bishops to better squares. White reacts rather foolishly...
in this game, but it does show the potential.

**Game 2**

*Summermatter-Zolnierowicz*

*Prague 1989*

1 c4 e6 2 c3 d5 3 d4 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 f3 c6 6 g3 f6 7 g2 e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 g5 cxd4 10 xg4 h6 11 b4 c4 12 a2 g4 13 cb5 d7 14 b3 a5!

The bishop is going to b6, where it will put pressure on d4 and, potentially, b2.

15 fd1 b6 16 f3 f8 17 c2?

This actually loses material but we are not that interested in that. We care more about how Black is placing his pieces. Look how well organised they are!

17...f5!

After the knight returns to f3, there is more going on, on this diagonal.

18 cd2 a5!

With tempo, the knight finds the excellent c4-square.

19 wb4 c4 20 xc4 dxc4 21 xd7 xd7 0-1

Black Plays ...wb2

In some positions, where White does not have full control over d4 because the bishop is not on e3, Black can play ...wd8-b6 with the idea of ...wb2. It is a standard idea and White should normally react as he does in the first example below. Sometimes White plays xd4-b5, in order to get to c7, but usually this is very dangerous for White, and Black should generally become optimistic when this happens.

**Lautier-Grischuk**

*Cannes (rapid) 2001*

13 wb6!? 14 e3!

Controlling the squares in the centre and threatening moves like 15 de6.

14...wb2 15 xd5

So it was all just an exchange?

15...xd5 16 xd5 ad8?

Grischuk recently said in *New In Chess* magazine that he liked to gamble. Surely this is also what he is doing here. He must have seen that White could come up with some strong threats with his rook along the seventh but he decided that the pressure along the d-file would prove more important. Well, actually, he was just wrong.

The right move was the prophylactic 16 wa3!, with the idea of 17 b1 xd4 18 xd4 c6 and the position remains more or less balanced.

17 b1 wa3 18 wc1?

White has no illusions. The queen on a3 is not in any kind of trouble and the pin on the d-file can prove annoying. But still this move is a disaster. The bishop on d5 is 'hanging loose' and loose pieces do have a tendency to drop off (Nunn's dictum).
The only move worth considering was the greedy 18 \textcolor{red}{\text{cxb7}! \text{cxd4} 19 \text{xd4}!}. Now White will end a pawn up after 19...\textcolor{red}{\text{axh3} 20 \text{xa7}!} (a very important intermediate move) 20...\textcolor{red}{\text{wx}d6 21 \text{axh3} \text{wx}d5 22 \text{axe}7}.

18...\textcolor{red}{\text{xc1}?}

18...\textcolor{red}{\text{xd4}! 19 \text{xd4} \text{axh3}} just wins a pawn. Nothing more and nothing less.

19 \textcolor{red}{\text{fxc1} \text{xd4} 20 \text{xd4} \text{f5}}

21 e4

White decides to call it a day and force a drawn endgame.

21...\textcolor{red}{\text{xe4}}

Black could be more aggressive with 21...\textcolor{red}{\text{xd5} 22 \text{exd5} \text{xb1} 23 \text{xb1} b6} but after 24 \textcolor{red}{\text{c1}!}, White would be in fine shape. He can create counterplay on the 7th rank or force the black bishop to the passive square d6, after which a2-a4-a5 would break up the queenside.

22 \textcolor{red}{\text{xe4} \text{xd4} 23 \text{xb7} \text{d2} 24 \text{g2} \text{xa2} 25 \text{d5} \text{d2} 26 \text{b7} \text{d8}}

26...\textcolor{red}{\text{a3} 27 \text{c3} \text{b2} 28 \text{cc7} \text{xd5} 29 \text{xb2} a5 30 \text{bb7}, followed by \text{bb7-a7}, would make an easy draw as well. The Black rooks are simply too passive.

27 \textcolor{red}{\text{d7} \text{b2} 28 \text{c3} a5 29 \text{xf7+} \text{xf7}} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}.

As mentioned above, sometimes the white player becomes greedy and wants to win material. For that he is usually punished (see the theoretical section).

Black Plays ...\textcolor{red}{\text{xe3}}

Ljubojevic-Bosch
Breda 1999

This is an excellent example of the exchange sacrifice when it is absolutely devastating. The idea behind the sacrifice is to wreck the pawn formation around the white king and then intrude with the queen and the minor pieces. Right here, White is in no way prepared to handle this kind of invasion. All his forces are solidly placed on the left side of the board, and his king is all alone on the right side.

18...\textcolor{red}{\text{xe3}! 19 \text{fxe3}}

With the only dark-squared bishop left on the board, Black has good chances to develop dangerous threats on e3 and g3. Note that the sacrifice is less dangerous when the h-pawn is still on h2, protecting g3, even though it can still be valid, as we shall see below.

19...\textcolor{red}{\text{wd6} 20 \text{f1}}

White tries to come to his king’s rescue but, as we shall see, it is already too late. The line 20 \textcolor{red}{\text{h2} \text{h5} 21 \text{xd5} \text{xg3+} 22 \text{h1} \text{axh3}} also gives Black an immediately-winning attack.

20...\textcolor{red}{\text{wg3} 21 \text{f3}}

Forced, as ...\textcolor{red}{\text{axh3}} was hanging in the air.

21...\textcolor{red}{\text{we5} 22 \text{wd1}?}

This does not defend against Black’s next move. Probably Ljubojevic had not even
seen it. The only way to defend was 22 \textit{\text{Q}}c1!!
\textit{\text{R}}xd4 (22...\textit{\text{Q}}h7 23 \textit{\text{B}}xf7 \textit{\text{B}}xe3+ 24 \textit{\text{Q}}h1
\textit{\text{R}}xd4 25 \textit{\text{Q}}xd5!! \textit{\text{B}}xb3 26 \textit{\text{Q}}e7+ \textit{\text{Q}}h8 27
\textit{\text{Q}}g6+ with a perpetual check) 23 exd4
\textit{\text{R}}xd4+ 24 e3 \textit{\text{Q}}c5.

\textbf{22...\textit{\text{Q}}h7!}
What Black was planning all along. On g5
the knight becomes an elephant. The f3-rook
has nowhere to go, h3 will fall and, with it, all
of White’s kingside. White really has no
choice but to return the exchange. Even that
does not give him any chances of saving the
game as many of his weaknesses remain.
23 \textit{\text{W}}d2 \textit{\text{Q}}g5 24 \textit{\text{Q}}d1 \textit{\text{Q}}e8
There’s no rush.
25 \textit{\text{W}}f2 \textit{\text{Q}}xf3 26 exf3 \textit{\text{W}}h5 27 \textit{\text{Q}}h1
\textit{\text{W}}h4+ 28 \textit{\text{Q}}f1 \textit{\text{R}}xd4 29 \textit{\text{R}}xd4 \textit{\text{R}}xd4 30
exd4 \textit{\text{Q}}d3 31 \textit{\text{Q}}g1 \textit{\text{Q}}xb2 32 \textit{\text{Q}}f2 \textit{\text{Q}}c6 33
\textit{\text{Q}}f4 \textit{\text{Q}}d3+ 34 \textit{\text{Q}}f3 \textit{\text{Q}}e1+ 35 \textit{\text{Q}}f2 \textit{\text{Q}}xg2 36
\textit{\text{Q}}xg2 \textit{\text{Q}}e3 37 \textit{\text{Q}}c1 \textit{\text{Q}}d3 38 \textit{\text{Q}}b5 \textit{\text{Q}}xb5 39
axb5 \textit{\text{R}}xd4 40 \textit{\text{Q}}c7 \textit{\text{R}}xf4 41 \textit{\text{Q}}xb7 \textit{\text{Q}}b4
0-1

The following example will show a more
positional version of the sacrifice.

\textbf{Vadasz-Pribyl}
\textit{\text{Trnava 1981}}

In this example White has not weakened
his kingside with h2-h3 so there are less
chances of creating an attack. Still, the sacri­
face makes perfect sense.
27...\( \diamond c2 \)?

An understandable decision. Black wins back the exchange and thus plays without any risk of losing. Unfortunately, he is also without any risk of winning!

28 \( \mathsf{xc2} \) \( \mathsf{xc2} \) 29 \( \mathsf{xc2} \) \( \mathsf{xc5} \) 30 \( \mathsf{d3} \) d4

Preventing \( \mathsf{xd3-c3} \).

31 \( \mathsf{d1} \) \( \mathsf{d6} \) 32 \( \mathsf{e1} \) \( \mathsf{e5} \) 33 \( \mathsf{c4} \) g6 34 \( \mathsf{a6} \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

The players agreed a draw as it is inevitable that White will regain his pawn and the endgame will prove very difficult to win for both players, even with a lot of help. Note how strong White's bishop on \( \mathfrak{f} \) is still is, and how important \( \mathfrak{e} \) is for White.

In these two examples Black had the possibility of winning one or both of the \( g3/e3 \)-pawns. We have seen countless examples in the database where this was not possible, and where Black sacrificed the exchange nonetheless. After this he rarely had any real compensation for the exchange, and only a miracle would help him. So, look before you leap! Are you sure that you have enough compensation?

Theory of the Main Line:

\[ \text{Tarrasch Defence: Main Line with 9 } \text{g5 cxd4 10 } \text{xd4 h6} \]

We have seen the various types of plans available to both sides. Now it is time to study the theory of this main line.

**Game 3**

**Gelfand-Iglesias Cordoba**

*Wijk aan Zee 1993*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 d4</th>
<th>d5</th>
<th>2 e4</th>
<th>e6</th>
<th>3 c3</th>
<th>c5</th>
<th>4 cxd5</th>
<th>exd5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 ( \text{df3} )</td>
<td>( \text{c6} )</td>
<td>6 g3</td>
<td>( \text{f6} )</td>
<td>7 ( \text{g2} )</td>
<td>( \text{e7} )</td>
<td>8 0-0</td>
<td>0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ( \text{g5} )</td>
<td>( \text{cxd4} )</td>
<td>10 ( \text{xd4} ) h6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10...\( \text{e8} \) 11 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 12 \( \text{ad1} \) h6 13 \( \text{f4} \) has been known for some time to give White an advantage and we have seen nothing that should change this assessment, so we will stay within the main line.

11 \( \text{f4} \)?

This variation has become fashionable over the last five years and has served great players like Mikhail Gurevich well. Still, it is our feeling that Black, with active play, should be able to achieve equality.

11...\( \text{g4} \)!

This is the active move here. Because of the indirect threat of \( \text{d4-b5-c7} \), Black is reluctant to trust on the usual developing move 11...\( \text{e8} \).

12 h3

Alternatives to this move are presented in the next game.

12...\( \text{h6} \)?

The idea behind this move, to sacrifice the \( d \)-pawn, was played for the first time in this game.

13 \( \text{f5} \)

The alternatives do not frighten us, even if they are perfectly valid options:

a) 13 \( \text{b3} \) a5! 14 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 16 \( \text{xd5} \) a4 17 g4 and now Black should play 17...axb3! (and not 17...\( \text{g6} \) as in Wiedenkeller-Ziegler, Sweden 1989, where White achieved a small advantage). Now after 18 gxb5 \( \text{d4} \) Black has two powerful threats: 19...\( \text{xe2} \) winning a piece and 19...\( \text{c2} \) 20 \( \text{ac1} \) bxa2 with strong play.

b) 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e8} \) 14 g4 \( \text{g6} \) 15 c3 \( \text{b4} \) 16 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{d7} \) and Black was already better in Rajkovic-Lekic, Kladovo 1994, but the white moves were also rather planless.
c) 13 \( \text{a4} \text{b6} 14 \text{\textit{d5}} \text{xb2} \) was played
now used his lead in development and his
more centralised pieces to start a strong at-
tack. However, if Black instead had relied on
14...\text{\textit{c5}}! 15 \text{c2} \text{\textit{d4}} 16 \text{\textit{xd4}} \text{\textit{xd4}} 17 \text{e3}
\text{g6} 18 \text{\textit{b3}} \text{xc3} 19 \text{\textit{bxc3}} \text{\textit{c6}}, he would
not have experienced any problems. After an
imminent \text{\textit{g6-e4}}, there is no reason why
the two bishops should provide White with
any kind of advantage.

13...\text{\textit{g6}} 14 \text{\textit{xe7}}+

This is the only move that makes sense.
The pawn on f5 would be a liability after 14
\text{\textit{g4?!}} \text{\textit{xf5}}! 15 \text{\textit{gxf5 d4}} 16 \text{\textit{\textit{e4}}} (16 \text{\textit{\textit{b5}}}
is more testing but also less good. One game
continued 16...\text{\textit{d7}} 17 \text{\textit{e4}} \{17 \text{\textit{xc6}} \text{\textit{bxc6}} 18
\text{\textit{xd4 c5}} 19 \text{\textit{b3}} \text{\textit{xf5}} \) gives Black a win-
ing position\} 17...\text{\textit{dxe3}} 18 \text{\textit{xd7}} \text{\textit{xf2+}}
and Black used his extra pawn to gain a full point
in the game Urzica-Glodeanu, Tusnad 2000.)
16...\text{\textit{a5}} 17 \text{\textit{xf6+}} \text{\textit{xf6}} 18 \text{\textit{d3}} \text{\textit{fe8}} 19
\text{\textit{dc1}} \text{\textit{b6}} 20 \text{a3} and the players agreed a
draw in Mandel-Arnold, Germany 1993,
even though Black is already preferable.

14...\text{\textit{xe7}}!

This pawn sacrifice is virtually forced.
14...\text{\textit{xe7}}?! 15 \text{\textit{b3}} \text{\textit{b6}} 16 \text{\textit{fd1}}, as in Ar-
landi-I1lescas Cordoba, Los Ye8enes 1990, is
very uncomfortable for Black. Remember, in
the Tarrasch Black must be active. These kind
of passive positions always favour White as
he has the long-term positional advantages.

15 \text{\textit{xd5}}

White also has to accept the sacrifice. Af-
ter something like 15 \text{\textit{e3?!}} \text{\textit{ad8}}, Black would
already have a strong position. He is threaten-
ing \text{\textit{d5-d4}} and, after \text{\textit{g6-e4}}, he is also
threatening to win a piece with \text{\textit{g7-g5}}. So,
all in all, White has a serious problem with
his co-ordination.

15...\text{\textit{xd5}} 16 \text{\textit{xd5}} \text{\textit{ad8}}!

We like this move as it is active. After
16...\text{\textit{xe2}} 17 \text{\textit{b3!}} \text{\textit{a6}} 18 \text{\textit{fd1}} \text{\textit{d8}} 19
\text{\textit{f1}} \text{\textit{b6}} 20 \text{\textit{xb6}} the players agreed a draw
in Garcia Paolicci-J.\text{Cooper}, Manila Olym-
piad 1992. But Black is also the clearly higher
rated of the two so that does not change the
fact that, in such a position with the two
bishops, White generally seems to be prefer-
able. Also, we do not like 19 \text{\textit{\textit{f1}}}. It was
clearly intended to exchange queens and
offer a draw, but a more normal move fol-
lowed by a draw offer would have most likely
worked too. There is nothing that supports a
draw offer like a good position.

17 \text{\textit{c4}} \text{\textit{d4}}

According to Boris Gelfand, this is the
only move. Still, White has tried to improve
on his play in this position several times:

a) 18 \text{\textit{e3?!}} \text{\textit{d3}}! just wins the exchange for
Black.

b) 18 \text{\textit{h2?!}} \text{b5} 19 \text{\textit{c3}} \text{\textit{xe2}} 20 \text{\textit{\textit{e1}}}
\text{\textit{d3}} 21 \text{\textit{e7}} \text{\textit{xc3}} 22 \text{\textit{bxc3}} \text{\textit{d6}} 23 \text{\textit{e3}}
\text{\textit{d3}} 24 \text{\textit{c1}} \text{\textit{e8}} 25 \text{\textit{f1}} \text{\textit{dxc3}} 26 \text{\textit{xc3}}
\text{\textit{xc3}} 27 \text{\textit{\textit{xb5 a5}} 28 \text{\textit{d7 e4}} ended with a
draw in the game Todorovic-Lekic, Nis 1995.
According to our analysis, Black played really
well here.

c) 18 \text{\textit{e3?!}} \text{\textit{b5}} 19 \text{\textit{xd4}} \text{\textit{xd4}} 20 \text{\textit{\textit{d4}}}
\text{\textit{d8}} 21 \text{\textit{e3 a6}} 22 \text{\textit{ac1}} \text{\textit{e4}} 23 \text{\textit{xe4} \text{\textit{xe4}}} and
Black was microscopically better in the
game Raceanu-Glodeanu, Miercurea Ciuc
1998. Perhaps 20...\text{\textit{xe2}} was worth a try for
something more. Anyway, in the game White
advanced his h-pawn without caution and
met his own fate.

18...\text{\textit{b5}}}
18...\( \text{x} \text{e} \text{4} \)? 19 \( \text{f} \text{e} \text{1} \) is naturally not relevant.

19 \( \text{W} \text{d} \text{3} \)

White is a pawn up but he has some problems with his co-ordination and he is slightly behind in development. All this adds up to Black keeping the balance if he succeeds in activating all of his pieces. The next move helps the bishop on g6 which, for the time being, seems to be a little stuck.

19...f5! 20 \( \text{a} \text{e} \text{1} \)

The move 20 \( \text{f} \text{e} \text{1} \)!? has its advantages but also disadvantages. It leaves the a-pawn protected, but it also creates the well known distance between the two rooks (...\( \text{d} \text{d} \text{4}-\text{c} \text{2} \) is an important concept in the position). Gelfand does not know what he prefers, and neither do we.

20...\( \text{W} \text{f} \text{7} \)

The alternative was perhaps more convincing: 20...\( \text{h} \text{5} \) 21 \( \text{h} \text{1} \) \( \text{f} \text{7} \) and now we have:

a) 22 exf5! is the correct way to fight for an advantage: 22...\( \text{f} \text{3} \) 23 \( \text{x} \text{b} \text{5} \) \( \text{x} \text{e} \text{1} \) 24 \( \text{x} \text{e} \text{1} \) \( \text{xf} \text{5} \) 25 \( \text{xf} \text{5} \) \( \text{xf} \text{5} \) 26 \( \text{c} \text{7} \) \( \text{f} \text{7} \). Gelfand thinks White is better, but we do not really agree. We think this endgame is rather level. Notice the following little trick: 27 \( \text{e} \text{5} \) \( \text{g} \text{6} \) 28 \( \text{d} \text{5} ? \) \( \text{x} \text{d} \text{5} \).

b) Also fascinating is the position arising after 22 e5? g5? (22...\( \text{x} \text{a} \text{2} \) with an unclear position looks far more logical) 23 \( \text{e} \text{3} \) \( \text{f} \text{4} \) 24 \( \text{x} \text{d} \text{4} \) \( \text{f} \text{3} \) and Black will end up winning ma-

terial according to Gelfand, but after 25 \( \text{g} \text{1} \) \( \text{fxg} \text{2} + \) 26 \( \text{h} \text{2} \) White seems to be winning: 26...\( \text{d} \text{5} \) 27 \( \text{d} \text{1} ! \), threatening g3-g4, is just one example.

21 exf5 \( \text{xf} \text{5} \) 22 \( \text{c} \text{3} \) b4?!

This is given an exclamation mark by Gelfand but we really think that Black would be better off with 22...\( \text{e} \text{6} \)!. Black’s ideas are ...\( \text{d} \text{3} \) / ...\( \text{d} \text{3} \), ...\( \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} \) and ...\( \text{x} \text{h} \text{3} \).

23 \( \text{c} \text{5} ! \)

23 \( \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) \( \text{c} \text{2} \) gives White two pawns for the exchange but no chance for an advantage.

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

There are no alternatives to this move. Black will end up in a bad way after both 23...\( \text{d} \text{3} \) 24 \( \text{e} \text{7} \) \( \text{xa} \text{2} \) 25 \( \text{d} \text{6} \) \( \text{f} \text{3} + \) 26 \( \text{xf} \text{3} \) \( \text{xf} \text{3} \) 27 \( \text{xa} \text{7} \) with an extra pawn for White and 23...\( \text{xa} \text{2} \) 24 \( \text{d} \text{6} \)!, winning material. Instead of 24 \( \text{d} \text{6} \), Gelfand here gives the line 24 \( \text{a} \text{1} ? \) \( \text{xb} \text{2} \) 25 \( \text{xa} \text{7} \) with a clear advantage. We understand nothing and prefer Black after 25...\( \text{e} \text{2} + \) 26 \( \text{h} \text{1} \) \( \text{xf} \text{4} \) 27 \( \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} \) \( \text{d} \text{4} \) – he has full control and the better co-ordination. This illustrates how \( \text{F} \text{r} \text{i} \text{t} \text{z} \) had had more influence on the level of analysis in books and magazines than it has had on the way people play in tournaments.

24 \( \text{x} \text{b} \text{4} \) \( \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} \) 25 \( \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} ! \)

25 \( \text{x} \text{f} \text{4} \) \( \text{d} \text{3} \) 26 \( \text{x} \text{f} \text{7} + \) \( \text{x} \text{f} \text{7} ! \) and the position is more or less equal.

25...\( \text{x} \text{a} \text{2} \) 26 \( \text{e} \text{7} \) \( \text{f} \text{7} \)!

26...\( \text{b} \text{8} \) was better according to Gelfand, but again we feel that his line can be improved upon: 27 \( \text{d} \text{4} \) (27 \( \text{b} \text{7} \) \( \text{a} \text{6} ! \), with the plan of ...\( \text{f} \text{6} \) and Black is alright – Gelfand) 27...\( \text{xb} \text{2} \) 28 \( \text{x} \text{g} \text{7} + \) \( \text{h} \text{8} \) 29 \( \text{xb} \text{2} \) \( \text{xb} \text{2} \) 30 \( \text{xa} \text{7} \) \( \text{a} \text{8} \) 31 \( \text{a} \text{6} ! \) (Gelfand just gives the passive 31 \( \text{h} \text{1} \) \( \text{b} \text{4} \) with equality) \( \text{h} \text{7} \) 32 \( \text{e} \text{1} \) \( \text{b} \text{4} \) 33 \( \text{e} \text{7} + \) \( \text{g} \text{7} \) 34 \( \text{xd} \text{7} + \) \( \text{g} \text{7} \) 35 \( \text{h} \text{2} \) \( \text{xf} \text{4} \) 36 \( \text{g} \text{3} \) and White will be able to annoy Black for a long time, even though he’s probably not winning. After the text, Black just loses.

27 \( \text{fe} \text{1} \) \( \text{exe} \text{7} \) 28 \( \text{xe} \text{7} \) \( \text{xa} \text{6} \) 29 \( \text{xd} \text{7} + \) \( \text{g} \text{6} \) 30 \( \text{w} \text{e} \text{7} + \) \( \text{g} \text{6} \) 31 \( \text{xd} \text{8} \) \( \text{a} \text{1} + \) 32
\[ \text{Meeting 1 \ d4} \]

\[ \text{\#h2 \ Wxb2 \ 33 \ We8+! \ Wg7 \ 34 \ We7+ \ Wg6 \ 35 \ Wxa7 \ Wg7 \ 36 \ Wc5 \ Wf6 \ 37 \ Wd5 \ h5 \ 38 \ We4 \ h4 \ 39 \ Wxf5+ \ Wxf5 \ 40 \ Wg8+1-0} \]

\[ \text{Game 4} \]
\[ \text{Rogozenko-Lehner} \]
\[ \text{Stockerau 1993} \]

1 c4 c5 2 \text{\#f3 \ f6} 3 \text{\#c3} e6 4 g3 d5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 d4 \text{\#c6} 7 \text{\#g2} \text{\#e7} 8 0-0 0-0 9 \text{\#g5} cxd4 10 Wxd4 h6 11 \text{\#f4} \text{\#g4} 12 Wa4

This is another way to play the position. White is not trying to prove that the black position is unsound in any way, but instead develops his pieces to natural squares, hoping for a lasting advantage.

12...Wd7

Somehow the queen seems natural here.

13 \text{\#fd1}

Against 13 \text{\#ad1} we recommend that Black develops his pieces in the same fashion as in this game. The rooks do not seem to be better placed like this so Black should not feel the need to change his play.

13...\text{\#ad8}

Some really strange moves have been played here, all with bad results. Well, we will not spend more time thinking negative thoughts, but rather proceed immediately!

14 \text{\#ac1} \text{\#fe8} 15 \text{\#ed2}!?

This move is not really in harmony with the last move. White should decide on either \text{\#d2} and \text{\#a1-d1}, or \text{\#ac1}. At the moment White is doing both. We are sure that his choice here was intended to protect the e2-pawn, but this could have been achieved in a better way with 15 \text{\#xc6?} bxc6 16 \text{\#e3}, with an interesting position ahead.

15...\text{\#h3} 16 \text{\#h1}

This seems a bit passive, but notice that White could not win a pawn with 16 \text{\#xh3} \text{\#xh3} 17 \text{\#xc6} bxc6 18 \text{\#xc6} because of 18...\text{\#g4}!

After 16 \text{\#xc6} bxc6 17 \text{\#e3}, Black would now have the possibility of 17...\text{\#xg2} 18 \text{\#xg2} c5 with an excellent position. Notice the problems White has with his bishop.

16...g5! 17 \text{\#xc6}

Black would also be in a good way after 17 \text{\#e3} \text{\#g4} 18 \text{\#xc6} \text{\#xe3}? 19 \text{\#xe7+ \#xe7}, when the knight is immune and ...\text{\#c4}, ...\text{d5-d4} and ...\text{\#g4}, followed by ...\text{\#xf2}, all hold interesting potential.

17...bxc6 18 \text{\#e3} \text{\#g4} 19 \text{\#d1}?

This move is, of course, completely useless. Better was 19 \text{\#xa7} \text{\#f5}, when Black has a very strong attack for his sacrificed pawn. Still, White is holding on.

19...\text{\#f6} 20 \text{\#xa7}

White needs to take this pawn. Not because of the pawn itself, more because of the fight for the dark squares in the centre.

After 20 \text{\#xc6?} d4! White is tied together in a very bad way. One line is 21 \text{\#b4 dxc3!!}

24
Tarrasch Defence: Main Line with 9 \( \text{g}5 \) cxd4 10 \( \text{xd}4 \) h6

22 \( \text{xd}7 \) \( \text{xd}7 \) 23 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 24 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{d}8 \) and Black wins.

20...\( \text{wf}5 \) 21 \( \text{f}3 \)?

21 \( \text{c}5! \) was much better. Black should probably continue with 21...\( \text{e}6 \), with the idea of ...\( \text{e}8 \) with strong pressure on the kingside. Notice that only the bishop on \( f6 \) is not directly included in the attack on the white king. Still, the outcome must be said to be rather unclear.

The text move just weakens the kingside without doing anything useful.

21...\( \text{e}7 \)! 22 \( \text{wb}6 \) \( \text{de}8 \) 23 \( \text{f}2 \)

This loses but Black can also count on taking home the full point after 23 \( \text{d}3 \) d4 24 \( \text{xc}6 \) dxc3.

23...\( \text{xe}2 \) 24 \( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 25 a4 \( \text{wd}3 \) 26 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{wd}2 \) 27 \( \text{hxh}3 \) \( \text{xc}1 \) 28 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{xd}1 \) + 29 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 30 \( \text{wb}8 + \) \( \text{g}7 \) 0-1.

Game 5

Smyslov-Kasparov

Vilnius (12th matchgame) 1984

\[ 1 \text{ d}4 \text{ d}5 2 \text{ f}3 \text{ c}5 3 \text{ c}4 \text{ e}6 4 \text{ cxd}5 \text{ exd}5 5 \text{ g}3 \text{ f}6 6 \text{ g}2 \text{ e}7 7 0-0 0-0 8 \text{ c}3 \text{ c}6 9 \text{ g}5 \text{ cxd}4 10 \text{ xd}4 \text{ h}6 11 \text{ e}3 \text{ e}8 12 a3 \text{ e}6 \]

12...\( \text{g}4 \) is the choice of ECO, based on the suggestion for White given by Kasparov on move eighteen in this game. We feel that this is a unacceptable reason. The line suggested continues 13 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 14 \( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \)

15 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 16 \( \text{fxe}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 17 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 19 e4 \( \text{c}6 \) 20 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 21 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 22 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xd}2 \) 23 \( \text{f}7+ \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 24 \( \text{xf}7+ \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 25 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) with compensation for the material, according to Kasparov. Well, we feel that Black can hope for a draw at best here, and that in practical play he would score no better than 30-40%.

13 \( \text{xe}6 \)

This is the main line. White will continue with f2-f4 in order to control the centre, before breaking with e2-e4. However, other moves have also been tried in this position:

a) 13 \( \text{h}1 \)!? (with this move White is preparing to exchange the bishop on \( e6 \) and play f2-f4) 13...\( \text{g}4 \)! (If White is not going to play f2-f4, then the king is actually worse placed on \( h1 \) than on \( g1 \). The line 13...\( \text{wd}7 \)!? 14 \( \text{dxe}6 \) fxe6 15 \( f4 \) \( \text{ed}8 \) 16 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) 17 \( \text{wa}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 18 \( \text{ad}1 \), as in Smyslov-Kasparov, Vilnius {2nd matchgame} 1984, is considered to be slightly better for White) 14 \( \text{f}3 \) (If White wants to fight for an advantage he will have to play 14 \( \text{wb}3 \) or something similar. But if we just compare this with the line given above as a note to Black's 12th move, we will see that Black is a move better off than with the king on \( g1 \).) 14...\( \text{h}5 \) 15 \( \text{g}1 \) (15 \( \text{xc}6 \) bxc6 16 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 17 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 18 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) was dynamically balanced in Smyslov-Kasparov, Vilnius {10th matchgame} 1984) 15...\( \text{wd}7 \)! (preventing 16 \( \text{h}3 \)! 16 \( \text{wa}4 \) (16 \( \text{dxe}6 \) bxc6 17 e4 \( \text{wb}7 \) is fine for Black) 16...\( \text{c}5 \) 17 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 18 \( \text{fe}1 \) (18 \( \text{d}2 \), with complete equality, has been suggested as an improvement) 18...\( \text{g}6 \)! and Black is very slightly better, Smyslov-Kasparov, Vilnius (8th matchgame) 1984.

b) 13 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{dxe}6 \) fxe6 15 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \)! 16 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{h}8 \) was about equal in the game Korchnoi-Kasparov, London (2nd matchgame) 1983.

c) 13 \( \text{wa}4 \) \( \text{wd}7 \) 14 \( \text{fd}1 \) a6 15 \( \text{xc}6 \) bxc6 16 \( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 17 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) was perhaps slightly better for White in the game Arlandi-Frois, Istanbul Olympiad 2000, but even
better was 14...\textbf{h}3! with an equal position.

d) Rather harmless is 13 \textbf{xc}6 \textbf{bxc}6 14 \textbf{a}4, when Black has time to play 14...\textbf{wd}7 15 \textbf{c}1 \textbf{h}3! 16 \textbf{c}5 \textbf{xc}5 17 \textbf{xc}5 \textbf{xc}2 18 \textbf{xc}2 \textbf{c}4 19 \textbf{a}5 \textbf{wb}7 and Black is no worse, Cividali-Nieus, Lombardia 1992.

13...fxe6 14 \textbf{wa}4 \textbf{c}8 15 \textbf{ad}1 \textbf{h}8 16 \textbf{h}1 \textbf{a}6 17 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{a}5!

18 f5

18 \textbf{d}4!? is probably the critical move around here. One line is 18...\textbf{c}4 19 \textbf{wc}2 \textbf{c}6 20 \textbf{g}1 and the idea of e2-e4 gives White some chances.

Another is 18...\textbf{c}4 19 \textbf{b}3 \textbf{e}5 20 e4?, with a small advantage according to Kasparov. Still, we believe that the Black position is trustworthy and that he has sufficient resources.

18...\textbf{b}5! 19 \textbf{wh}4 \textbf{g}8!

Forced. After 19...\textbf{c}4 20 \textbf{xh}6! \textbf{h}7 21 \textbf{wh}5 \textbf{gxh}6 22 fxe6 White has a very strong attack. Kasparov gives 22...\textbf{ce}3 23 \textbf{f}7! as absolutely winning.

20 \textbf{wh}3

Kupreichik suggested the following line: 20 \textbf{wg}4 \textbf{c}4 21 \textbf{c}1 \textbf{g}5! 22 fxe6 \textbf{xc}1 23 \textbf{xd}5 \textbf{b}6 24 \textbf{d}7 \textbf{g}5 25 \textbf{xe}5+ \textbf{f}6! 26 \textbf{f}5 \textbf{xc}7 27 \textbf{xe}5+ \textbf{f}6 and Black has successfully defended against the white attack.

20...\textbf{c}4 21 \textbf{c}1 \textbf{g}5!

Gaining control over the important e3-square.

22 fxe6 \textbf{xc}1 23 \textbf{xc}1

23 \textbf{xd}5? \textbf{b}6 24 \textbf{xc}1 \textbf{ab}2 was given as clearly better for Black by Kasparov but after 25 \textbf{d}2 \textbf{c}4 26 \textbf{d}5, with the idea of \textbf{f}4-g6, it does not appear to be that bad. Better is 23...\textbf{wa}5!. The line will be the same but now the c3-knight is hanging!

23...\textbf{xe}3 24 \textbf{xd}5

This move is given an exclamation mark by Kasparov, but White’s position never really seems okay after this. Instead White should play 24 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{f}6 25 \textbf{f}3 and accept the disadvantage.

24...\textbf{xf}1 25 \textbf{xf}1 \textbf{f}8 26 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{e}7 27 \textbf{g}4?

White wants to play h2-h4-h5, but Black has an intermediate move that puts an end to that. 27 \textbf{wh}5, with the plan h2-h4, was slower but more sensible.

27...\textbf{g}5! 28 \textbf{wh}3 \textbf{f}6 29 \textbf{d}3 \textbf{xf}1+ 30 \textbf{xf}1 \textbf{g}7

The king is a grown boy and does not need the queen to look after him.

31 \textbf{g}4 \textbf{d}5+ 32 \textbf{e}4

Or 32 \textbf{g}2 \textbf{c}1+! 33 \textbf{xc}1 \textbf{d}1+ 34 \textbf{f}1 \textbf{xf}1 mate!

32...\textbf{d}4 33 \textbf{h}4 \textbf{f}8 34 \textbf{e}2 \textbf{e}3 35 \textbf{g}2

35 \textbf{hxg}5? would lose on the spot to 35...\textbf{h}5!.

35...\textbf{g}6 36 \textbf{h}5?!

36 \textbf{hxg}5 was better but White is in a bad way no matter what.
36...\( \text{b}6 \) 37 \( \text{b}4 \text{h}7! \)
White is in zugzwang.
38 \( \text{h}2 \text{d}8 \) 39 \( \text{e}5 \text{x}d3 \) 40 \( \text{x}d3+ \text{b}xd3 \) 0-1.

Game 6
Beliavsky-Illescas Cordoba
Linares 1990

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{c}3 \text{c}5 \) 4 cxd5 exd5
5 \( \text{f}3 \text{c}6 \) 6 g3 \( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{g}2 \text{e}7 \) 8 0-0
0-0 9 \( \text{g}5 \text{c}xd4 \) 10 \( \text{x}d4 \text{h}6 \) 11 \( \text{e}3 \text{e}8 \) 12 \( \text{w}c2 \)

This line is not very testing. White develops his queen to a decent square but not one where it puts any kind of pressure on the black centre. This gives Black time to develop smoothly and create the necessary active opportunities.

12...\( \text{g}4! \)
This active move is often good when Black has the time to develop freely.

13 h3
This is only one out of a three options here. The others are:

a) 13 \( \text{f}d1 \text{f}8 \) and now White has the following opportunities:
a1) 14 \( \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 \) 15 \( \text{d}4?! \text{h}5 \) 16 \( \text{xd}2 \) was played in Krasenkow-Illescas Cordoba, European Team Ch., Batumi 1999. Now Black should have played something like 16...\( \text{b}4?! \) 17 a3 \( \text{a}5 \) 18 b4 \( \text{b}6 \) 19 e4 \( \text{xd}4 \) 20 \( \text{xd}4 \text{b}6 \) with equality.

a2) 14 \( \text{ac}1 \text{c}8 \) 15 \( \text{xc}6 \) (15 \( \text{a}4! \) is more critical) 15...\( \text{bxc}6 \) 16 \( \text{d}4 \text{b}4 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \text{e}7 \) 18 a3 \( \text{a}5 \), as in Beliavsky-Kasparov, Moscow 1983, gives dynamic equality.

b) Against 13 \( \text{ad}1 \) we recommend playing the same way as against 13 \( \text{fd}1 \). The rook is less logical on d1 as opposed to c1 so we feel there is no reason to change plans. It is also for this reason that 13 \( \text{ad}1 \) is rare in tournament practice.

13...\( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{ad}1 \)
14 \( \text{fd}1 \text{f}8 \) 15 \( \text{xd}5 \text{xd}5 \) 16 \( \text{xd}5 \text{xe}3?! \) 17 \( \text{xe}3 \text{g}5 \) gives Black good compensation for the sacrificed material, according to Kasparov. The young Kasparov, that is.

14...\( \text{wc}8 \) 15 \( \text{h}2 \text{f}8 \) 16 \( \text{fe}1? \)
This gives Black the chance to develop a quick kingside attack. The right approach was 16 \( \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 \) 17 \( \text{d}4 \text{f}5 \) with an approximately equal position, Neverov-Fernandez, Candas 1992.

16...\( \text{e}5 \) 17 \( \text{h}1 \)
It must have been a bitter moment for Beliavsky when he realised he had to just let go of the h-pawn. The following line illustrates the danger of the Black attack: 17 \( \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 \)
18 \( \text{d}4 \text{h}5 \) 19 \( \text{xf}6 \text{h}3!! \) 20 \( \text{h}4 \text{h}4! \)
21 \( \text{gxh}4 \text{d}6+ \) 22 \( \text{h}1 \text{g}2+ \) 23 \( \text{g}2 \text{g}4+ \) 24 \( \text{f}1 \text{h}3+ \) 25 \( \text{g}1 \text{h}2+ \) 26 \( \text{f}1 \text{h}1 \) mate!

17...\( \text{h}5 \) 18 \( \text{g}1 \text{h}3 \) 19 \( \text{f}3 \text{e}5 \) 20
\( \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 \) 21 \( \text{d}4 \text{f}5 \) 22 e4 \( \text{xe}4 \) 23
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\[ \text{Meeting 1} \]

\[ \text{Meeting 1} \]

Even though this is the main line, it is probably not the most testing. Other possibilities include:

a) 13 \( \text{h}1 \) (this move is actually quite interesting, as it gives White the chance to win the d5-pawn) 13...\( \text{b}4 \) 14 \( \text{b}3 \) a5 15 \( \text{xd}5! \) (the alternative 15 a4 \( \text{f}8 \) 16 \( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}6! \) gave Black equality in the game Peters-Bee, Germany 1991) 15...\( \text{xd}5 \) 16 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 17 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 18 \( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xa}8 \) 19 b3 \( \text{d}7 \) 20 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 21 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 22 \( \text{fl} \) \( \text{d}5 \) and active pieces and uncompromising play has given Black equality in Vukic-Lendwai, Vienna 1991. Still, it is normally more comfortable to have the extra pawn in these kinds of positions, as opposed to having to prove the compensation.

b) 13 \( \text{d}1 \) (This is Suba's pet line. The main idea is 13...\( \text{f}8 \) 14 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 15 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 16 \( \text{b}5 \) a6 17 \( \text{f}4! \) and White has a dangerous attack.) 13...\( \text{a}5 \) 14 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 16 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 17 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 18 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 19 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 20 \( \text{xc}8 \) \( \text{xc}8 \) 21 \( \text{ed}1 \) \( \text{ xd}4 \) 22 \( \text{xe}4 \) 23 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 24 \( \text{xa}7 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 25 \( \text{a}5 \) b6 26 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 27 bxc3 \( \text{e}7 \) 28 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 29 a3 \( \text{d}7 \) 30 \( \text{d}5 \) and the players agreed a draw in Suba-Vladimirov, Oviedo (rapid) 1993.

c) 13 \( \text{Wb}3! \) (just a waste of time) 13...\( \text{a}5 \) 14 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 15 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{c}4 \) gives Black a good position, Quinteros-Frey, Lone Pine 1977.

d) Black should also not fear 13 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 14 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{b}4! \) 15 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 16 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 17 \( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xd}8 \) and now:

d1) 18 \( \text{e}1 \) 19 \( \text{ad}1 \) 20 \( \text{g}2 \) 21 \( \text{d}4 \) 22 \( \text{d}4 \) 23 \( \text{xe}2 \) 24 \( \text{xe}2 \) and the players wisely agreed on a draw in Petkevich-Malevinsky, Yerevan 1977. With the opposite-coloured bishops, the extra pawn will not do White much good.

d2) 18 \( \text{fd}1 \) 19 \( \text{d}2 \) 20 \( \text{g}4 \) 20 \( \text{e}1 \). Now 20...\( a \)6, as in Benko-Masic, Vrsac 1969, was actually okay for Black, but even better was the immediate 20...\( \text{xd}4 \) 21 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xe}2! \) 22 \( \text{dx}e2 \) 23 \( \text{xe}2 \) 24
Tarrasch Defence: Main Line with 9 \(\text{g5} \text{cxd4} 10 \text{xd4} \text{h6} \) and Black should not lose this endgame, even though he managed to lose a slightly inferior version in the game.

13...\text{b4} 14 \text{wb3} \text{a5}!

As far as we know, this was introduced into tournament play by Garry Kasparov in the early eighties.

15 \text{d2}?!  

As the march forward with the a-pawn is very strong, White should have done something to prevent this. The main line goes 15 a4 \text{c8} and now:

a) 16 \text{c1} \text{c5} 17 h3 (This makes very little sense. Why would White want to weaken his kingside like this?) \text{b6} 18 \text{fd1}? gives us the position of Ljubojevic-Bosch, Breda 1999, from the beginning of this chapter.

b) 16 \text{c2}? b5! 17 \text{xb4} bxa4 18 \text{xa4} \text{xb4} 19 \text{c3} \text{xc3} 20 \text{bxc3} a4 21 \text{wa2} \text{c7}, with slightly better prospects for Black in the game Maiorov-Ehlvest, USSR 1983. We know that Informator tells you that this position is equal, but you should not believe everything you read.

c) 16 \text{d5} \text{e6} 17 \text{d4} \text{c4} 18 \text{xe4} \text{xb4} 19 \text{c3} \text{xc3} 20 \text{bxc3} a4 21 \text{wa2} \text{c7}, with an equal position in Fedorowicz-Lalic, London 1988.

d) 16 \text{d2} (this is apparently the only line where Black will have to be careful) 16...\text{c5} and now there are further branches:

1) 17 \text{fd1} \text{xe3}? (or 17...\text{b6}, with the idea of 18 \text{c2}? \text{xe3} 19 \text{xe3} \text{xe3}! 20 \text{fxe3} \text{xe3}+ 21 \text{h1} \text{g4} and Black is winning) 18 \text{fxe3} \text{e7} 19 \text{e4}? (19 \text{c5} would have been better, forcing Black to show his compensation. In our opinion White might be able to fight for an advantage here. But the exchange sacrifice was not forced, so Black should be fine in this line.) 19...\text{xe4} 20 \text{e6} \text{e6} and Black was just winning in Manor-Johansson, Lyon 1990.

d2) 17 \text{h3} \text{b6} 18 \text{g4} was Ruzele-Rashidian, Mainz 1995. Now we propose 18...\text{d6}?! as a good move. The key idea is 19 \text{fd1}? \text{xe3}! 20 \text{fxe3} \text{g3} and Black has a winning attack after the forced 21 \text{h1} \text{g4}!.

d3) 17 \text{c2} is critical:

d31) 17...\text{xc2} 18 \text{xc5} \text{xc5} 19 \text{xc2} \text{c8}?! 20 \text{fd1} \text{f5} 21 \text{wb3} and Black has achieved very little from his manoeuvre, Yrjola-Bjerke, Gaudsal 1984 and Kozul-Susnik, Ljubljana 1999.

d32) 17...\text{xe3}?! is an interesting alternative, which has yet to be tested in practical play: 18 \text{xe3} 19 \text{d4} \text{dxc3} 20 \text{bxc3} \text{c6} 21 \text{xb7} \text{c7} 22 \text{b5} \text{e7} with a complicated position. If anyone is to be favoured here, it must be White because of his better co-ordination but there is very little in it. 23 \text{xd7}? does not work by the way. After 23...\text{xd7} 24 \text{xc5} \text{c7} Black wins a piece and has the advantage.

15 \text{d5}? appears to be too risky, as the rook on f1 is trapped. After 15...\text{bxd5} 16 \text{b5} \text{d5} 17 \text{wxd5} \text{h3} White loses the exchange. Following 18 \text{xb7} (18 \text{xd8} \text{axd8} 19 \text{fe1} \text{b4} does not improve anything) \text{xf1} 19 \text{xf1} \text{b8} 20 \text{wa7} \text{xb2} 21 \text{c6} \text{d6} 22 \text{xe7}+ \text{xe7} 23 \text{a8}+ \text{h7} 24 \text{xa5} \text{xe6} 25 \text{a4} \text{xe2} Black went on to win the endgame in Bocharov-Bataev, Russia 2001.

15...\text{a6} 16 \text{d1} \text{a3} 17 \text{wb1} \text{f8} 18 \text{bxa4} \text{bxa3} 19 \text{wb2} \text{wa8}! 20 \text{db3}!

Beliavsky is playing a bit too passively in this game. Here he should have counted more on the play against the black pawns and
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sacrificed the a-pawn with 20 \( \text{Q}d5?! \text{Q}x\text{b}5 \) \( 21 \text{Q}x\text{b}5 \text{Q}x\text{a}2 22 \text{W}b3 \). One imaginable line is 22...\( \text{Q}x\text{d}2 \) 23 \( \text{Q}x\text{d}2 \text{W}a5 \) 24 \( \text{Q}d4 \text{Q}e4 \) 25 \( \text{Q}x\text{e}4! \) (White should not lose the momentum) 25...\( \text{Q}x\text{e}4 \) 26 e3 and White has better co-ordination and play against the b7- and d5-pawns to compensate for the pawn deficit.

\( 20...\text{Q}c6! 21 \text{Q}d4 \text{Q}e4 22 \text{Q}x\text{e}4 \text{dxe}4 \)

\( 23 \text{Q}a1? \)

This is a very passive decision and, as White has no lasting advantages, he now has no active play at all.

Better was 23 \( \text{Q}c5! \), even though Black will retain the better prospects after 23...\( \text{e}3! \) 24 \( \text{Q}x\text{c}6 \text{e}x\text{f}2+ \) 25 \( \text{Q}x\text{f}2 \text{Q}x\text{c}6 \), due to his preferable pawn structure.

\( 23...\text{Q}d5! \)

Kasparov has a great sense for dynamics and immediately puts pressure on the weak a2-d5 diagonal.

\( 24 \text{W}b1 \text{b}6! \)

Taking control over the dark squares on the queenside and threatening ...\( \text{e}4-\text{e}3 \) at the same time.

\( 25 \text{e}3 \text{Q}d3 \)

The knight is very strong here. White cannot eliminate it straight away with 26 \( \text{Q}c1 \) as Black then has 26...\( \text{Q}e1! \), messing with the white king’s safety.

\( 26 \text{Q}d1 \)

26 \( \text{Q}x\text{b}6? \), with the idea of 26...\( \text{Q}x\text{b}3 \) 27 \( \text{Q}x\text{d}3 \), does not work due to 26...\( \text{Q}b4! \), win-

\( 26...\text{Q}c6! 27 \text{Q}f1 \)

After 27 \( \text{Q}c1 \text{Q}c1 28 \text{Q}x\text{c}1 \text{b}4! 29 \text{Q}c2 \text{W}a4 \) White will find it impossible to keep his queenside together.

\( 27...\text{b}4 28 \text{Q}x\text{d}3 \text{ex}d3 29 \text{W}x\text{d}3 \text{Q}x\text{a}2 30 \text{Q}x\text{a}2 \text{W}x\text{a}2 31 \text{Q}c5 \text{Q}f3 32 \text{Q}a1 \text{W}d5 33 \text{W}b3! \text{W}h5 34 \text{Q}d3 \text{Q}d6 35 \text{Q}e1 \text{Q}b7 36 \text{Q}c1 \text{W}f5 37 \text{Q}d1 \text{Q}f8 38 \text{W}b1 0-1 \)

White lost on time.

---

**Game 8**

Kasparov-Illiescas Cordoba

Linares 1990

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{Q}f3 \) c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 g3 \( \text{Q}f6 \) 6 \( \text{Q}g2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 7 0-0 0-0 8 \( \text{Q}c3 \) \( \text{Q}c6 \) 9 \( \text{Q}g5 \) \text{cxd}4 10 \text{Q}xd4 \text{h}6 11 \( \text{Q}e3 \) \( \text{Q}e8 \) 12 \( \text{W}b3 \)

This move is slightly strange. Sometimes Black plays ...\( \text{Q}a5 \) all by himself; now he is forced to do so.

12...\( \text{Q}a5 \) 13 \( \text{W}c2 \) \( \text{Q}g4 \)

Again, this is the most active developing move.

14 \( \text{Q}f5 \)

Many other moves have been tried in this position:

a) 14 h3 \( \text{Q}d7 \) 15 \( \text{Q}ad1 \) and now:

a1) 15...\( \text{W}c8!? \) 16 \( \text{Q}h2 \) \( \text{Q}c6 \) 17 \( \text{Q}x\text{d}5?! \) (not the right approach – White is trying too hard) 17...\( \text{Q}x\text{d}5 \) 18 \( \text{Q}x\text{d}5 \) \( \text{Q}x\text{h}3 \) 19 \( \text{Q}x\text{c}6 \)
bxc6 20 £xh6 £xf1 21 £xf1 £d6 22 £a4 £xe3! 23 fxe3 £b8 24 £c4 £h8 25 £xf7 £b4 26 £d5 £h4+ 27 £g1 £xg3 28 £c5 £h1+! 0-1, Vukic-Novoselski, Kragujevac 1984.

a2) 15...£c8 16 £f5 £c5 17 £xd5 £xd5 18 £xd5 £xe3 19 £xe3 £c7 20 £h2 £e6 21 £d4 £xa2 22 £d3 £e6 and if anyone is better, it must be Black, who has a queenside majority and the bishop, Boer-Vladimirov, Tilburg 1994.

b) We all wish for days when our opponents play moves like 14 b3?, where Black did well for some time with 14...£c8 15 £d3 £c6 16 h3 £e5 17 £d2 £b4 in Ruzele-Bosh, Gelsenkirchen 2000. Now Black lost his way and, later, the game. Actually, he could have won after 18 £xh6 if he had played the cunning 18...£xc3 19 £xc3 £xh3, winning a pawn.

c) 14 £fd1 £c8 15 £f5 £b4 16 h3 £h5! 17 g4 £xc3 18 bxc3 £g6 19 £d4 £c6 was a little better for Black in the game Van Wely-Illiescas Cordoba, Amsterdam 1989.

d) 14 £ad1 is considered in the next game.

14...£b4 15 £d4

Another line that might be slightly dangerous for Black starts with 15 h3. It seems that Black can rely on the following sequence, but you never know for sure: 15...£xf5 16 £xf5 £xc3 17 bxc3 £xe3? 18 fxe3 £c4 19 £d3 £c8 20 £h2 h5 gives Black a very strong compensation for the sacrificed exchange. Just look at the three pawns on c3, e3 and g3. White now decided to return the exchange with 21 £xf6 £xf6 22 £f1 £e5 23 £d4 £g5 24 £xd5 £d8 25 £e4, after which the position was in dynamic equilibrium, Cifuentes Parada-Bronstein, Corrientes 1985.

15...£xc3 16 £xc3

Equally dangerous appears to be 16 bxc3. Black has to take up the challenge and dive into the unknown: 16...£xe2 17 £d3 £c4 18 £e3 £d2 19 £b1 was Tseitin-Malevinsky, USSR 1984, and now Black should be fine if he plays 19...£b2 20 £c1 £xe3 21 £xb2 £xf1 22 £xf1 £b6!, where White probably has nothing more than some compensation. He can win the exchange with 23 e4 £xc4! 24 £xf6 £xf6 25 £xa8 £xa8 but the passed pawns and the weaknesses around the white king give Black excellent chances.

16...£xe2 17 £d1!? This is the testing move. More peaceful and certainly not critical is 17 £d3 £c8 18 £e3 £e6 19 £b5 b6 20 £ad1 a6 21 £d3 £a7 22 £f5 £c6 23 £f3 £xf5 24 £xf5 £d7 25 £f4 £e4. Black has defended successfully and White is now on the verge of being worse, Portisch-Chandler, Amsterdam 1984.

17...£d4! This is the only move. Other examples include:

a) 17...£c5? 18 £xh6! gxh6 19 £f3 and White is more or less winning. One example of this is 19...£g5 20 fxg4 £xg4 21 £h4 £g6 22 £xd5 £b6+ 23 £h1 £f2+ 24 £xf2 £xf2 25 £f1, where Black has to give up the queen, resign or both, Osterman-Susnik, Ljubljana 1997.

b) 17...£xf2?? 18 £xf6! and White wins material.

c) 17...£b6?, as Fritz suggests, presents White with an almost winning endgame after 18 £xf6 £xf6 19 £c3! £xe3 20 fxe3 £xd1 21 £xf6 £xf6 22 £xd1.

So you can see why there is such a need...
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for 17...d4!.

18 ∆xd4 ∆xf2 19 ♞a4 ♞xg2+!

19...∆xf1?? loses a piece or something similar after 20 ∆xf1 b6 21 ∆c6!.

20 ∆xg2 ♞d5+

This was a new move in this game. Previously 20...b6 had been tried. Of course, it is in Black’s favour to centralise his queen with a gain of tempo.

21 ♞g1

21 ∆f3 ♞c4! 22 ∆ae1 ∆xf3+ 23 ∆xf3 ♞e4! and Black wins the exchange back without losing the pawn.

21...∆c4 22 ♞b5

This exchanges the queens, but does not keep the balance. Better was probably 22 ∆ae1! and now:

a) 22...∆e4?? 23 ∆xe4! 1-0 Farago-Miletto, Forli 1991.

b) 22...∆a6!, with compensation, is the right path. Black has nothing to fear here.

22...∆a6 23 ∆xd5 ♞xd5 24 ∆e1

Black was also fine, or maybe even slightly better, after 24 ∆ac1 ∆d8 25 ∆e1 h5 26 ∆e2 ♞h7, Øgaard-Rantanen, Oslo 1986.

24...h5 25 ∆e2 ∆xc3 26 bxc3 ♞e5

Kasparov thinks that Black is slightly better in this position. But, as so often in technical positions, the player ‘with the longer arms’ gets the upper hand.

27 ∆d4 f6 28 a4 ∆c8 29 ∆a3 ∆c7 30 ∆b3 ♞f7 31 ∆eb1 ∆c8 32 ♞f1 ∆c4 33 ♞e2 ♞a5 34 ♞a3 ∆c4 35 ∆ab3 ∆a5 36

Ha3 ♞c4 37 ∆a2 ♞g6 38 ∆d3 ♞e5+ 39 ∆d2 ♞c4+ 40 ∆c2 ♞h3 41 ♞b3 ♞d7 42 ∆c1 ♞e8 43 ♞e6 ♞c6 44 ♞f4+ ♞g5 45 ♞e2 ♞e5 46 ♞e4 ♞f7+ 47 ♞c2 ♞b5?

Just creating a weakness. Now Black is in trouble.

48 ∆d4 ♞c4 49 axb5 axb5 50 ∆a1 ♞c7 51 h4+! ♞f5 52 ∆xh5 ♞g6 53 ♞f4+ ♞f7 54 h5 ♞b7 55 ∆a8 g5 56 ∆d5 ♞f3 57 ∆d1 ♞d7 58 ∆e3 ♞e7 59 ∆xc4 bxc4 60 ∆d6 ♞g7 61 h6+ 1-0.

Game 9
Van Wely-Chandler
German Bundesliga 1996

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 ∆c3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 ∆f3 ♞c6 6 g3 ♞f6 7 0-0 0-0 8 ∆g5 cxd4 9 ∆xd4 h6 10 ∆e3 ♞e8 12 ♞b3 ♞a5 13 ♞c2 ♞g4 14 ♞ad1

Played often but not a real danger to Black’s position.

14...∆c8

15 ∆e1+?

Apparently only one move makes sense in this position:

a) 15 h3! ♞h5 (15...∆d7?! also seems perfectly reasonable) 16 ∆f5 ♞b4 17 g4 ♞g6 18 ∆d4 b6 (also interesting is 18...∆e4 19 ♞a4 ∆xc3 20 ∆xc3 ∆d4 21 ♞xa7 ♞xf5 22 gxf5 ∆xc3 23 bxc3 ∆xe2 with active counterplay, Majorovas-Dankert, Augsburg 1991; probably this line is okay, but the main suggestion
19\textit{f5} wa5!?

Neither of the players see the trick White now has at his disposal. Better was 18...\textit{xc3!} 19 bx\textit{c3} wa5 with a slight advantage.

19\textit{e3}?

White should have played 19 \textit{xd5}!, with the idea 19...\textit{xc3} 20 \textit{exh6}+!! with a perpetual check. But perhaps Black could still play for an advantage with 19...\textit{xc5} 20 \textit{xe5} \textit{cd8}, when all the black pieces are beautifully placed and the White pieces are just hanging around.

19...\textit{xe3} 20 \textit{xe3} \textit{xc3} 21 bx\textit{c3} \textit{a4} 22 \textit{wb2} \textit{xd1} 23 fl\textit{xd1} \textit{wc3} 24 \textit{wb7} \textit{xe3}!

Simple Chess. Black now has a winning endgame without any kind of compensation.

25 fxe3 \textit{wxe3}+ 26 fl\textit{h2} \textit{e2} 27 \textit{wa6} \textit{we2} 28 \textit{wxe2} \textit{xe2} 29 a3 \textit{ea2} 30 \textit{ed3} fl8 31 \textit{xc3} a5 32 g4 d4 33 \textit{eb3} a4 34 \textit{eb8}+ fl7 35 \textit{hb4} \textit{xa3} 36 \textit{xd4} \textit{e6} 37 \textit{h4} fl7 39 \textit{c4} \textit{d6} 40 \textit{hd4}+ fl7 41 \textit{c4} \textit{e6} 42 \textit{c6} fl2+ 43 \textit{g3} a3 44 \textit{ea4} \textit{c2} 45 \textit{e7}+ \textit{d6} 46 \textit{e4} \textit{cc3}+ 47 \textit{f2} \textit{c5} 48 \textit{h7} \textit{e6} 49 \textit{e2} \textit{h3} 50 \textit{g8} fl7 51 \textit{f2} \textit{e5} 52 \textit{a6}+ \textit{d5} 53 \textit{a5}+ \textit{d6} 54 \textit{a6}+ fl7 55 \textit{a5} \textit{xe4}+ 56 \textit{g2} \textit{xe4} 57 \textit{g3} 58 \textit{xf7} fl6 59 \textit{xa3} \textit{xe4}+ 60 \textit{g2} \textit{d6} 61 \textit{g6} \textit{cc5} 62 \textit{a3} \textit{e6} 63 \textit{f5} \textit{d4} 64 \textit{c8} fl4 65 \textit{h3} fl6 66
13  \textbf{\textit{x}c6}

This is the main line, but there are a multitude of other moves available for White here:

a) 13  \textbf{\textit{b}3}?! (White decides to take control over the c5-square without exchanging the knights. This is a less dangerous approach as there is no weak c-pawn to attack. Black will find it easier to create counterplay as the number of minor pieces on the board stays the same.) 13...  \textbf{\textit{e}6} 14  \textbf{\textit{d}4} (This move, attacking d5, is the only move fighting for an advantage. The alternatives show no signs of danger: 14  \textbf{\textit{c}5}  \textbf{\textit{x}c5} 15  \textbf{\textit{x}c5}  \textbf{\textit{e}8} 16  \textbf{\textit{x}e6}  fxe6 17  \textbf{\textit{e}3}  \textbf{\textit{d}7} 18  \textbf{\textit{a}4}  a6 19  \textbf{\textit{f}d1}

\textbf{\textit{f}7} 20  \textbf{\textit{d}2}  \textbf{\textit{e}5} didn’t lead to any significant advantage to White in the game Kramnik-Sadler, Monaco 1998, or 14  \textbf{\textit{b}5}?! a6 15  \textbf{\textit{d}5}d4  \textbf{\textit{e}5} 16  \textbf{\textit{x}e6}  fxe6 17  \textbf{\textit{d}4}  \textbf{\textit{d}6} 18  \textbf{\textit{c}3}  e5 and Black was already better in Radjabov-Bu Xiangzhi, New York 2000.) 14...  \textbf{\textit{d}4} 15  e3  \textbf{\textit{c}8} 16  \textbf{\textit{e}2} (16  \textbf{\textit{w}d3}  \textbf{\textit{d}4} 17  \textbf{\textit{w}e}2) 18  \textbf{\textit{x}c3} 18  \textbf{\textit{x}c}3  \textbf{\textit{d}6} was equal in Piket-Cifuentes Parada, Holland 1995)

b) 13 a3 didn’t make a lot of impact in the following game: 13...  \textbf{\textit{g}4}?! 14  h3  \textbf{\textit{e}6} (14...  \textbf{\textit{h}5}?!) 15  \textbf{\textit{w}xc6}  bxc6 16  \textbf{\textit{d}4}  \textbf{\textit{h}7}! (preparing for  \textbf{\textit{w}d7} and the manoeuvre  \textbf{\textit{h7}-f8-e6) 17  \textbf{\textit{a}4}  \textbf{\textit{d}7} 18  h4 (A move with advantages and disadvantages. It prevents  \textbf{\textit{h}7}-g5 and it brings the pawn out of danger, but it also weakens the light squares around the king. 18  \textbf{\textit{h}2} can be answered by 18...  \textbf{\textit{g}5} 18...  \textbf{\textit{f}5} 19  \textbf{\textit{e}1}  \textbf{\textit{e}4} and Black is no worse, Gelfand-Grischuk, Biel 2001.

c) 13  \textbf{\textit{a}4}! is an interesting move, leading to 14...  \textbf{\textit{g}4}?! in the game after the line we have chosen to propose (13...  \textbf{\textit{g}4}?! 14  \textbf{\textit{x}c6} bxc6). As far as we can tell, this is the only move that gives White a real chance to fight for an advantage and will be the battlefield where the verdict of the variation will be found.

d) 13  \textbf{\textit{w}a}4  \textbf{\textit{a}5} and now:

d1) 14  \textbf{\textit{d}b}5?! is very adventurous, but does not lead to an advantage: 14...a6 15  \textbf{\textit{c}7}!  \textbf{\textit{w}xc7} 16  \textbf{\textit{x}d5}  \textbf{\textit{d}7} 17  \textbf{\textit{w}d}4 and now Black should not play 17...  \textbf{\textit{d}8}?, as in Socko-M.Müller, Bydgoszcz 2000, but rather 17...  \textbf{\textit{d}6}, which leads to a good position after 18  \textbf{\textit{x}f6+}  gxf6 19  \textbf{\textit{w}xd6}  \textbf{\textit{x}d6} 20  \textbf{\textit{f}d1}  \textbf{\textit{e}6} 21  \textbf{\textit{d}5}  \textbf{\textit{e}5} 22  \textbf{\textit{x}c6}  \textbf{\textit{e}6}.

d2) 14  \textbf{\textit{c}b}5, as in Hernandez-Zhukova, Shenyang 2000, should be answered with 14...  \textbf{\textit{c}4}! 15  \textbf{\textit{f}4}  \textbf{\textit{d}7}, after which Black is no worse and may even be better.

d3) 13  \textbf{\textit{f}3} makes some sense, even
though the knight is awkward on this square. Black was probably fine after 14...\textit{d}7 15 \textit{w}d1 \textit{e}e6 16 \textit{e}e5 \textit{d}c6 17 \textit{d}cxd6 \textit{b}xc6 18 \textit{d}a4 \textit{w}a5 19 a3 \textit{d}d8 in Buckmire-Bradbury, Edinburgh 1985.

d4) 14 \textit{f}4 also didn't give Black a headache after 14...\textit{d}7 15 \textit{c}c2 \textit{e}c8 16 \textit{d}d3 \textit{g}4! Now White continued down a slippery path: 17 h3 \textit{d}h5 18 g4?! \textit{g}6 19 \textit{d}f5 \textit{c}c6 and he quickly found himself worse, Ferreira-Frois, Lisbon 1991.

d5) 14 \textit{c}c1 is the main line here as none of the alternatives give Black any real problems: 14...\textit{d}7 15 \textit{w}c2 \textit{c}8 16 \textit{b}1 (No other moves worry Black: 16 \textit{d}d3 \textit{c}4 17 \textit{d}c1 \textit{d}e5 18 \textit{b}1 \textit{g}4 19 h3 \textit{d}7 gave Black a good prototypical position in Marin-Skembris, Novi Sad 1990, while 16 \textit{b}3?! \textit{c}4 17 \textit{d}d4 \textit{d}e4 18 \textit{b}1 \textit{f}5 19 \textit{c}xe4 \textit{xe}4 20 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 21 \textit{w}d3 \textit{e}8 22 e3 \textit{w}e4 was also nice for Black in Kumaran-Rossiter, Plymouth 1992) \textit{d}c4 17 \textit{d}xd5 \textit{d}xd5 18 \textit{d}xd5 and now 18...\textit{h}3!, as proposed in the beginning of this chapter, was the right path for Black in this position (see the game Polugaevsky-Illescas Cordoba on page 15).

e) 13 \textit{e}1 doesn't look particularly trustworthy: 13...\textit{g}4 14 h3 \textit{h}5 15 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}7 16 \textit{g}4 \textit{e}ad8 17 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}xd4 18 \textit{w}xd4 \textit{g}6 and Black is fine here. Now White enters a web of tactics where the better placed Black pieces proves their worth. 19 \textit{x}h6+ \textit{g}7 20 \textit{g}5 \textit{d}e4 21 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 22 \textit{d}g4 \textit{f}5 23 \textit{w}xg5! 24 fx4 dx4 25 \textit{c}x4 \textit{w}g6 26 \textit{e}6+ \textit{h}8 27 \textit{f}2 \textit{g}xf6 28 \textit{w}xf6+ \textit{xf}6 29 \textit{c}x6 \textit{e}5 30 e4 \textit{d}2 and Black is better in this endgame, even though he is a pawn down. Peters-Altgelt, Germany 1991.

f) 13 \textit{g}2 doesn't bring harmony to the white camp. White doesn't need another major piece on the c-file: 13...\textit{g}4 14 \textit{d}d1!! (The only serious move here. 14 h3 \textit{d}7 15 \textit{c}d1 \textit{w}c8 16 \textit{c}h2 \textit{e}5! gave Black a strong attack after 17 g4 \textit{x}g4 18 hxg4 \textit{x}g4 19 \textit{g}1 \textit{xe}3 20 \textit{fx}e3 \textit{d}xe3 21 \textit{w}d3 \textit{d}xd1 22 \textit{h}3 \textit{w}c7 23 \textit{d}xd1 \textit{d}xd4 in Kishnev-Lalic, Cappelle la Grande 1993) \textit{e}8 15 h3 and now Black should play 15...\textit{e}6?? with a level position.

g) 13 \textit{c}2?!

This move is very strange and should not bring White any advantage. Still the set-up is remarkably fresh: 13...\textit{e}6 14 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{fx}e6 15 \textit{c}c1 \textit{w}d7 16 b3 \textit{d}ad8 17 \textit{c}b2 \textit{w}f7 18 \textit{d}d2 \textit{a}6 19 c3 \textit{c}c5 with equality in Cebalo-Ermeni, Biel 2000.

h) 13 \textit{c}b5?! is just bad. After 13...\textit{d}7 White probably has nothing better than 14 \textit{d}c3. In the game Nalbandian-Tourneur, Paris 1994, White continued with 14 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}xd4 15 \textit{d}xd4 \textit{w}b6! 16 \textit{b}3 \textit{g}4 17 \textit{c}2 \textit{a}6 18 \textit{e}3. Now Black should just take the pawn with 18...\textit{wxa}2! 19 \textit{w}d3 \textit{a}4, after which White has insignificant compensation, even though it remains a fight.

i) 13 \textit{c}2 doesn't demand too much respect. After 13...\textit{e}6 14 \textit{d}d4 \textit{e}8 15 \textit{w}d3 \textit{d}e4! Black was already on the way to being better, Morris-Gavrilakis, Thessaloniki 1984.

j) 13 \textit{w}b3 was successful in the following game, even though it should not frighten Black: 13...\textit{c}5 14 \textit{w}b5 \textit{a}6 15 \textit{w}d3 \textit{d}4? (15...b5! would have kept the balance without any problems; maybe Black is even a little better)16 \textit{d}xd5! \textit{c}xd5 17 \textit{w}c4 \textit{d}xe3 18 \textit{fx}e3 \textit{w}c7 19 \textit{w}h1 \textit{c}4 20 \textit{xf}7!! \textit{xf}7 21 \textit{d}5 and Black is finished. Peltola-Vatunen, Tampere 1988.
Meeting 1 d4

13...bxc6

14 Qa4

A plan first employed by Rubinstein almost a century ago. White wants to take control over the dark squares in the centre and try to limit Black's freedom. This is where the discussion is taking place these days. We believe that Black should do just fine, and the game material out there seems to support this view.

Other moves include:

a) 14 Qd4 Qf5 15 Wae6 16 Qd1 c5 17 Qxc5 Qxc5 18 Qxe4 19 Qb2 20 Qxd5 Wab8 with equality in Bernal Moro-Frois, Ponferrada 1992.

b) 14 h3!? seems a bit like a weakening move, as well as pure waste of time: 14...Qd7 15 Qd5 Wf6! (The perfect square for the queen. From here it dominates a large amount of dark squares.) 16 h4 (16 e4 dxe4 17 Wd2 Qb6 18 Qxe4 Qf5 19 Qd4 Wxf5, as in Fahnen-schmidt-Arnold, Germany 1999, looks more dangerous for White than it does for Black) 16...Qe4 17 e4 Qf5 18 ef5, as in Sosonko-Martens, London 1992.

14...Qd7

The main line, but not the only move worth paying attention to. Others include:

a) 14...Qw5?! is a famous inaccuracy. White now plays 15 Qxc6 Qd7 16 Qd2! Qb4 (This is forced. Black has lost many times after 16...Qb5? 17 Qxf6!!, for example 17...gx6 18 Qc3 Wxb2 19 Qxd5 Qae8 20 Qc3! Qxc3 21 Qxf6+ Qg7 {or 21...Qh8 22 Wxd7 Qe7 23 Wf5 Qg7 24 Qh5+ Qg8 25 Qg4+ Qh8 26 Qf6 Qg7 and Black resigned due to 27 Wf5!, Strauss-King, Brighton 1984} 22 Wd4 Qxe2 23 Qxd7+ Qg8 24 Qxf6+ Qh8 25 Qe4+ Qg7 26 Wd8+ Qh7 27 Qxc3 Qxc3 28 Wd7 Qg7 29 Wxf7 Qxa2 30 Qe4+ Qh8 31 Qd5 1-0, Volzhin-Grosar, Ljubljana 1992.) 17 Qc5! and White has the advantage, Greenfeld-Illlescas Cordoba, Thessaloniki 1988.

b) 14...Qg4?! is an interesting alternative (see note 'c' to the previous move). White should continue with 15 Qc5! (15 Qd4 Qd7 16 Qc5 Qf5 17 Qe1 was Robatsch-Anikaev, Sochi 1974. Now Black should be fine if he plays 17...Qw5 18 a3 Qe5.) 15...Qxc5 16 Qxc5 Wf6! (The perfect square for the queen. From here it dominates a large amount of dark squares.) 17 h3 (17 e4 dxe4 18 Qxe4 Qf5 19 Qxf5 Wxf5, as in Fahnen-schmidt-Arnold, Germany 1999, looks more dangerous for White than it does for Black) 17...Qe5 18 e4 Qb6 19 b3 Qb5 20 exd5 cxd5 and White held a very slight plus in Timman-Gligoric, Niksic 1978.

15 Qc5

Exchanging bishops and taking control over the dark squares on the kingside is the only idea that makes sense. Black is equal after 15 Qd4 Qe4 16 Qc5 (16 Qxe4?! is too risky as it leaves the kingside weakened: 16...dxe4 17 Qc2 Qg4 18 Qe3 Qw5 19 Qc5 Qxc5 20 Qxc5 Qxa2 and Black was already better in Thorfinnsson-Bezgodov, European Ch., Ohrid 2001) 16...Qxc5 17 Qxc5 Qxc5 18 Qxc5 Wb6 19 Qc2 Qf5 20 Qd2 Qe4, Sakhatova-Lalic, London 1992.

15...Qxc5 16 Qxc5

Obviously the knight should go here. 16 Qxc5 Qe4 17 Qc2 Qg5 and Black was already fine in Smejkal-Brunner, Germany 1989.

16...Qg4 17 Qe1

This is the natural way to protect the e-pawn. White cannot count on an advantage after 17 f3 Qf5 18 Wd2 Wb6 19 e3 Qxd7 20 Qd4 Wab8 21 b3 Qxc5 22 Qxc5 Qw6 23 Qf2 Qb6 24 e4 Qe6, as in Sosonko-Martens,
Holland 1993.

17...\wa5

Other moves have been tried here:

a) 17...\wb6?! 18 \wc2 \xad8 19 h3 \xe8 20 b3 gave White a small plus in Ljubojevic-Gligoric, Bugojno 1978.

b) More interesting is 17...\xc7?! 18 \xd4 \xad8 19 e3 h5. White perhaps is a little better, but still lost in a bad way after 20 \xc3?! \xc4! 21 \xcxe4 \xdxe4 22 \wc5 \xf6 23 \xc2? \xd1! 24 \xc1 \xd2 25 f4 \xb2 0-1 Goormachtigh-S.Lalic, Haarlem 1998.

18 h3

The only serious move. Black is better off after 18 \wc2? \xa2! 19 h3 (or 19 \xa1 \xe2! and Black is just a pawn up) 19...\hx5 20 \xa1 \xe2! 21 \xe2 \xa1 22 g4 \xa5 23 b4 \xb4 and Black has the advantage, Llanos-Garcia, Buenos Aires 2000.

18 a3 \bab8 19 \xd3 was C.Horvath-Weinzettl, Leibnitz 1990. Now the easiest way to equalise is probably 19...\xb6 20 b4 \xf5, followed by ...\xe4 or ...\xe4.

18...\xf5 19 \wd4!

This move was introduced by Kasparov and is clearly the most dangerous move. Other moves in this position are:

a) 19 \xa4?! \wd2! 20 \xf4 (the only move; 20 g4? \xe2 21 \ed1 \xb2 22 gxf5 \xf2 23 \xf1 and Black has the advantage) 20...\xf4 21 gxf4 \bab8 22 b3 and Black is on the verge of being better, Kramnik-Illescas Cordoba, Pamplona 1992.

b) 19 a3 \bab8 20 \db3 \xa6 21 e3 \xe4 22 \xc5 \xc8 23 b4 was Struza-Zulfugarli, Linares 2001. Black should now have equalised with 23...\xc2 24 \xcg2 \xb5!, with the idea of...a7-a5.

c) 19 \xa4 \xc8 20 \xd4 \xc4 21 f3 \xc6 22 \xc2 \xd7 23 b3 \xe8 eventually lead to a victory for White, even though at this stage Black is preferable, Sargissian-Akobian, Yerevan 1999.

19...\bab8 20 a3 \wb5

This is the main move here, but also the alternative seems to be fine. After 20...\wb6? White has:

a) 21 \xf4?! \xe4 22 b3 \bd8 was Bratchenko-Bezgodov, St Petersburg 2000, but Black is better off playing 22...\xa5! with the advantage. One example is 23 \xe4 \xe4 24 \xe4 \xe4 and White is in trouble.

b) 21 b4 (the natural move, but Black should be okay; 21 b3 should also be considered) 21...a5! 22 \xa5 \xa5 23 \xc3 (23 g4 \g6 24 \xc3?! was agreed drawn in Kuhlins-Schachranietz, Baden 1999, but why on earth shouldn’t Black play on here? His coordination seems to be better and White has more weaknesses.) 23...\xc3 24 \xc3 \xb2 25 g4 \g6 26 \f1 \xa2 with equality and a draw in Borovikov-Bezgodov, Alushta 1999.

21 b3!

Kasparov gives the following analysis to support his decision. 21 b4 a5! and now:

a) 22 \f1 \xb6! 23 \f4 (23 \db3?! does not work: 23...\xb4 24 \xb6 \xb6 25 a4 \d7 26 a5 \d7 27 e3 \xe4 and Black is much better) 23...\g6 and Black is no worse with his counterplay against b4 and with ...\xf4-e4 coming.

b) 22 \xf4 \g6 23 \db3 \xb4 24 \xd4 \xb7 25 \xc6 b3! 26 \xb8 \xb8 and Black has counterplay – Kasparov. We do not agree with this evaluation. We like the white position after 27 \xd2!. Black cannot go for the immediate promotion, as White is better after 27...b2 28 \b1 \xb1 29 \xb1. Still, we feel that Black should be alright if he counted
on 22...\(\text{\texttt{h}}e4\)! 23 \(\text{\texttt{h}}xe4\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}xe4\), with ideas like...e4-e3 and simply...\(\text{\texttt{b}}8\)-d8.

21...\(\text{\texttt{f}}e4\)?

After this Kasparov can force an advantage. The alternatives were:

a) 21...\(\text{\texttt{xe}}2??\) would lose a piece to 22 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}2\) 23 \(\text{\texttt{f}}4\)!

b) 21...a5! takes control over the important b4-square and allows Black to fight for c5. 22 \(\text{\texttt{f}}1\) (Other possibilities do not scare us: 22 \(\text{\texttt{f}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{e}}4\) 23 e3 \(\text{\texttt{b}}6\) is equal. 22 \(\text{\texttt{f}}4\) was played in Campos Moreno-Frois, Santiago 1995, and now it is important that Black does not lose the momentum but plays 22...\(\text{\texttt{d}}d7!\), winning the fight for c5 and cracking open the white defence of the queenside. Finally, 22 e3 \(\text{\texttt{e}}4\) 23 g4 \(\text{\texttt{g}}6\) 24 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\) was equal in Relange-Daurelle, Montpellier 1999.) 22...\(\text{\texttt{e}}4\) 23 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\) was Vera-Salazar, Moscow 1994. Now 23...\(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\), keeping the bishop as active as possible, makes most sense. The position is about equal.

\[\text{\texttt{d}}4\]

22 \(\text{\texttt{b}}4\)!

Threatening to close the queenside down on the dark squares so the Black reply is forced.

22...a5! 23 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\) 24 \(\text{\texttt{c}}5\) \(\text{\texttt{b}}6\) 25 \(\text{\texttt{bxa}}5\) \(\text{\texttt{wb2}}\) 26 \(\text{\texttt{wxb}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xb}}2\) 27 \(\text{\texttt{xc}}6\)

Kasparov reckons that 27 \(\text{\texttt{f}}1!\) was stronger. See the reasoning below.

27...\(\text{\texttt{a}}2?\)

Black loses his chance to get back into the game. Illescas does not realise that his bishop is potentially inferior to the white bishop, as we shall in the game.

Correct was 27...\(\text{\texttt{xg}}2!\) 28 \(\text{\texttt{g}}xg2\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}2\) 29 \(\text{\texttt{c}}3\) d4 30 \(\text{\texttt{d}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}8\) 31 \(\text{\texttt{xd}}4\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}}3\) 32 \(\text{\texttt{b}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}}5\) 33 \(\text{\texttt{b}}7\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}7\), where the position is objectively a draw, even though White has good practical chances with two sets of rooks on the board.

28 \(\text{\texttt{ec}}1!\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}}3??\)

Once again Black had to exchange on g2. Yet he would still be in trouble after 28...\(\text{\texttt{xg}}2!\) 29 \(\text{\texttt{c}}8!\) \(\text{\texttt{xc}}8\) 30 \(\text{\texttt{xc}}8+\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}7\) 31 \(\text{\texttt{g}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}}3\) 32 \(\text{\texttt{c}}5\) d4 33 h4! d3 34 exd3 \(\text{\texttt{xd}}3\) 35 h5 and White has serious winning chances – Kasparov.

29 \(\text{\texttt{c}}8\) \(\text{\texttt{xc}}8\)

Kasparov loves to prove his intuition with long variations. Even his greatest fans cannot truly believe that he saw the following line over the board: 29...\(\text{\texttt{f}}8\) 30 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}8+\) \(\text{\texttt{xe}}8\) 31 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}4\) \(\text{\texttt{dxe}}4\) 32 \(\text{\texttt{c}}5\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}7\) 33 e3 \(\text{\texttt{d}}6\) 34 \(\text{\texttt{f}}5\) f6 35 g4! \(\text{\texttt{a}}1+\) 36 \(\text{\texttt{g}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{e}}6\) 37 \(\text{\texttt{g}}3\) g5 38 \(\text{\texttt{b}}5\) \(\text{\texttt{g}}1+\) 39 \(\text{\texttt{h}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}1\) 40 \(\text{\texttt{b}}6+\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}7\) 41 \(\text{\texttt{a}}6\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}2\) 42 \(\text{\texttt{g}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}3\) 43 \(\text{\texttt{a}}8\) \(\text{\texttt{g}}6\) 44 a6 \(\text{\texttt{g}}7\) 45 h4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}5\) 46 h5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}3\) 47 a7 \(\text{\texttt{h}}7\) 48 f3! \(\text{\texttt{g}}7\) 49 fxe4 \(\text{\texttt{xe}}3+\) 50 \(\text{\texttt{f}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}3\) 51 \(\text{\texttt{c}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}7\) 52 \(\text{\texttt{d}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{g}}7\) 53 \(\text{\texttt{c}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}7\) 54 \(\text{\texttt{b}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}6\) 55 \(\text{\texttt{c}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{g}}7\) 56 \(\text{\texttt{b}}4\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}7\) 57 \(\text{\texttt{b}}5\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}1\) 58 \(\text{\texttt{c}}6\) \(\text{\texttt{c}}1+\) 59 \(\text{\texttt{d}}7\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}1\) 60 \(\text{\texttt{e}}6\) \(\text{\texttt{g}}7\) 61 \(\text{\texttt{d}}8\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}6+\) 62 \(\text{\texttt{d}}6\) \(\text{\texttt{xa}}7\) 63 \(\text{\texttt{d}}7+\) \(\text{\texttt{xd}}7\) 64 \(\text{\texttt{xd}}7\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}7\) 65 \(\text{\texttt{d}}6\) and White wins.

30 \(\text{\texttt{xc}}8+\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}7\) 31 f3!

31...\(\text{\texttt{f}}5?!\)
Black leaves the b1-h7 diagonal, which is catastrophic as d3 is the best square the white bishop could ever think of. 31...g6 32 c5 d4 33 g4 still gives White good winning chances, even though it isn’t altogether completely clear.

32 Ec5 ±e6 33 ±f2 g5 34 f4 gxf4 35 gxf4 d4 36 ±e4+ ±g7 37 f5 ±a2 38 ±d3! ±f6 39 a6 ±e7 40 ±c6 f6 41 ±c7+ ±d6 42 ±h7 ±a4 43 ±xh6 1-0

Points to Remember

1) The battle for the c5-square is often of vital importance. This is especially so after White carries through an early exchange of knights with ±xc6.

2) Naturally White aims to put pressure on Black’s isolated d-pawn. If White can win this pawn and occupy the d5-square, often this leads to a winning advantage.

3) Both sides should always be on the lookout for possible exchange sacrifices from Black involving a rook capturing a bishop on e3.

4) Possible regrouping plans for Black include ...±g4-h5-g6 and sometimes ...±f6-e4-g5-e6.
CHAPTER TWO

Tarrasch Defence:
Main Line with 9 \textit{g}5 c4

1 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{d}5 2 \texttt{c}4 e6 3 \textit{c}3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5
5 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 6 g3 \textit{f}6 7 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}7 8 0-0
0-0 9 \textit{g}5 c4

9...c4 is Black’s second main reply to 9 \textit{g}5. The positions that arise from this move give several possibilities for different pawn structures, depending on how White breaks up the Black pawn formation and how Black responds to this.

Pawn Formations
The basic structures occur after White exchanges knights with \textit{c}5xc6. Then the typical black pawn formation c4, d5, c6 arises. White can then deal with this formation in two ways. The most common pawn break is with b2-b3 but e2-e4 is also frequently seen as another attempt to undermine the black centre.

Breaking with b2-b3: Black doesn’t exchange on b3
A typical position if Black avoids exchanging on b3 is the following:

\textit{see following diagram}

In this position White is dreaming of a pawn exchange on c4 followed by e2-e4, gaining full control over the centre and always threatening to break through with d4-
d5. At the same the Black’s counter-break ...c6-c5 is prevented, as d4-d5 follows for sure.

To complete this plan White has to protect d4 and he usually does so with a rook after \texttt{c}2 (at the same time protecting the a2-pawn and releasing the a1-rook) and \texttt{fd}1. The a1-rook is usually placed on the c-file, pointing at Black’s passed pawn.

Black, on the other hand, has to avoid White completing this plan. Usually he uses two methods: either pressure against d4 or a quick pawn break with ...c6-c5, after which the centre is often blown away. This last opportunity sometimes involves a pawn sacrifice but in return Black get some air for his bishops. Black usually places his queen on a5
and plays ...Nfd8 and ...Nc8 (or sometimes ...Nab8).

Often Black must recapture with the g-pawn when White exchanges his dark-squared bishop for the black knight on f6. This is shown in an example later. Black then has to seek counterplay to compensate for his damaged pawn formation.

**Breaking with b2-b3: Black takes on b3**

If Black exchanges on b3, a totally different pawn structure arises. The following position is standard:

This type of position has some similarities with the positions arising in the main line with 9...cxd4. The white knight wants to occupy the c5-square very much. Black has two soft spots: the c6-pawn and the a7-pawn are both weak. However, White has a similar weakness on b3. Both sides have half-open files for their rooks to operate against these pawn weaknesses.

White has the better pawn structure. He has only one weakness to worry about. Still, Black has a lot of play in this position to compensate for this, as is shown in some examples later in this chapter.

At this stage it should be mentioned that we generally prefer Black to let White capture on c4. Still, Black has to know about these positions. In some positions we believe it's okay for Black to exchange on b3, for instance in positions where he has not yet developed his bishop on c8. If White has not exchanged knights on c6, it is usually okay for Black to exchange on b3 as well, as there will be no weakness on c6 to worry about.

When White challenges the c4-pawn with b2-b3 Black has to make a choice, whether or not to exchange on b3. In the special cases, we constantly return to this important question.

Black's light-squared bishop is often activated on the b1-h7 diagonal with ...Bf5. Sometimes Black even offers the exchange with a well-timed ...Rh3.

It should be mentioned that in this type of position it is bad for Black to recapture on f6 with the g-pawn at any time. The position is more closed and the isolated doubled pawns on the f-file are simply weak.

**Breaking with e2-e4: White takes on c6**

White does without the move b2-b3 and instead plays the pawn break e2-e4. A typical position is the following:

The difference between this pawn structure and the one previously described is that White now is left with a b-pawn instead of an e-pawn. It seems to be a bad exchange for White as the d-pawn is now isolated, plus the pawn on b2 is an object of attack for the Black rooks along the half-open b-file. In fact, the White pawns on b2 and d4 are often just as exposed as Black's on c4 and c6.

It is important to notice that in the posi-
tion above Black is not forced to seek dynamic counterplay at any price. He can allow play to take a more quiet path as he does not have the damaged pawn formation around his king.

He also does not have to worry about White gaining full control over d5 as he is unable to support an eventual pawn break with e2-e4. Black also controls c5 with the knight on d7.

All in all, White does not have the lasting advantages in the pawn structures as in the previous examples. This allows Black to let play develop along more positional lines. Still, the position contains a lot of potential but Black is not worse.

Here is an example of how play can develop:

Volkov-Kiriakov
Ekaterinburg 1999

15...a6b8 16 a3c1 d5!?  
16...a6f8 looks better, putting pressure on d4 and taking further control of d5, preparing the pawn break ...c6-c5. Also, instead of 15...a6b8, we would have preferred 15...a6c8 in connection with this plan.

After the exchange of bishops the c4-pawn is more vulnerable. Besides, Black should be in no hurry with this exchange as the black bishop is no worse than its white counterpart.

17 a6c3 d6xg2 18 d6xg2 d6b4 19 d6c2

White now has a lasting structural advantage due to his better pawn structure.

19...a6f6 20 a6d1 a6f8 21 a6wxb4 a6xb4 22 a3 a6a4 23 a6ac1

A temporary pawn sacrifice.

23...d6x4 24 d6e3 g6 25 d6xc4 d6d7 26 a6c3 c5 27 a6c1 a6a6

It seems better to play 27...a6b6 28 d6e5 c4 to prevent White from entering the position with his rook as in the game. Then White only has a minimal advantage.

28 a6b3! a6e6 29 a6b7 a6a6 30 a6c7 h5 31 h4 a6g7

Black has built up a kind of fortress, but White manages to enter it.

32 a6a5 a6b6 33 a6e2 a6f6 34 a6c6 a6d1 35 a6a4 a6b3 36 a6e5 a6d6 37 a6e7 a6b8?!

Until now Black has defended well but here he fails. 37...a6b3 is better, with the intention of meeting 38 a6c8 with 38...a6c6.

38 a6c8 a6d1 39 a6c6+ a6g7 40 a6d6 a6f6 41 a6e7 a6f8 42 a6xa6

White has a winning position.

42...d6x4 43 a6b3 a6g4 44 a6e4 a6a2 45 a6a7 a6e3+ 46 a6g1 a6a1+ 47 a6h2 a6g4+ 48 a6g2 a6a2 49 a6a6 a6g8 50 a6xc5 a6xf2+ 51 a6g1 a6a1 52 a6d7 a6c8 53 a6b4 a6c6 54 a6a7 a6a1+ 55 a6g2 a6f6 56 a6e2 a6g7 57 a6e6+ a6h7 58 a6g5+ a6g7 59 b5 a6ff1 60 a6f3 a6fb1 61 a6b7 a6b3 62 a6g5 a6e3+ 63 a6h3 a6h1+ 64 a6h2 a6f1 65 a6xf7+ a6h6 66 a6h7 Mate!

Breaking with e2-e4: White does not take on c6

If White avoids the exchange of knights on c6, yet another pawn structure arises. White often advances his f-pawn instead, to protect e5. Thereby he constantly threatens to win the pawn on d5 by chasing the black bishop on e6 away with the further advance f4-f5.

If Black at some point captures on e5, a pawn formation like the following can arise:

see following diagram

White has the pawn majority in the centre
and the pawn break e2-e4 is obvious and natural. Black has full control of d5 and he can choose to maintain the tension in the centre for a while.

At some point Black would like to make use of his queenside majority and play ...b7-b5-b4 (eventually supported by the a-pawn) but the price he must reckon on paying for this is to invite the white knight to a marvellous outpost on c5 after exd5 and \( \text{c5-e4} \). Black would again be happy to exchange the light squared bishops and soon ...\( \text{e6-h3} \) will be coming.

White’s Plans
In positions where the black pawn structure is damaged (say, after \( \text{xf6, gxf6} \)), White has a structural advantage and development of play along quiet paths usually favours him. Also, exchanges often favour him as he has the better pawn structure in the endgame. Following only one plan usually doesn’t suffice, as play against only one of Black’s weaknesses is often not enough. White has to combine his plans.

With this in mind, we now turn to those single plans.

Exchange of the light-squared bishops
This plan has relevance for White in positions where Black, for the price of some pawn weaknesses, seeks counterplay. In more closed positions, where play develop more quietly, it is often Black who would like to exchange the light squared bishops.

Our theme also involves at least two other plans: the fight for the control of c4 and an attack on the black king. In fact, Black’s light-squared bishop is his best minor piece as it protects the king position, especially the f5- and g4-squares. Without it, \( \text{d1-g4} \) with check often turns out to be annoying.

Black’s light-squared bishop not only has defensive tasks, it also offers a lot of aggressive potential. It supports the c4-pawn and should this pawn advance, the bishop is directed towards the white queenside, often hitting the white a-pawn.

Comparing Black’s and White’s light-squared bishops is important when trying to understand the positions we are facing. When is one stronger than the other?

One way of achieving the exchange of light-squared bishops is with ...\( \text{Wh5} \) followed by ...\( \text{h3} \). A second possibility is if Black lacks protection of the d5-square and White seizes his chance to play \( \text{g2-d5} \). A third possibility of achieving the desired exchange of light-squared bishops is connected with the move \( \text{g2-e4} \): White can play then manoeuvre with \( \text{e4-f5} \). This is one of the most dangerous plans for Black and he should be especially aware of it.

Not always does White seek to exchange the bishops. With the move \( \text{g2-e4} \), his bishop is able to create threats against the black king. Usually these threats are created in connection with the queen, which may be placed on, say, c2 or h5. White can also try to force Black to play ...f6-f5 to weaken the dark squares around his king.

A good illustration of these ideas is shown in the next example:

Kirov-Wedberg
Eksjo 1980

see following diagram

\text{20 bxc4}
20 \( \text{cxd5} \) is also possible but the text move is even stronger.

20...\( \text{dxc4} \) 21 \( \text{\&e4} \) \( \text{\&f8} \) 22 \( \text{\&f5!} \)

After the exchange of light-squared bishops the black king is even more exposed. The white bishop has done its best so far, first creating threats against the black king and then offering the exchange to weaken the black king even further. In this case it is not important whose bishop is stronger. The point is that black is left with a stripped king.

22...\( \text{\&e4} \) 23 \( \text{\&d4} \) \( \text{\&xd4} \) 24 \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{c3} \) 25 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c2} \)

Desperation.

26 \( \text{\&h6+} \) \( \text{\&e7} \) 27 \( \text{\&xe6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 28 \( \text{\&g7+} \) \( \text{\&d6} \) 29 \( \text{\&xc2} \) \( \text{\&xc2} \) 30 \( \text{\&xa7} \) \( \text{\&c7} \) 31 \( \text{\&b6+} \) \( \text{\&e7} \) 32 \( \text{\&d7} \) 33 \( \text{\&b4+} \) \( \text{\&f7} \) 34 \( \text{\&b1} \) \( \text{\&e2} \) 35 \( \text{\&xh7+} \) \( \text{\&e8} \) 36 \( \text{\&g8+} \) \( \text{\&e7} \) 37 \( \text{\&g7+} \) \( \text{\&e8} \) 38 \( \text{\&xf6} \) \( \text{\&f7} \) 39 \( \text{\&d4} \) e5 40 \( \text{\&e3} \) \( \text{\&b2} \) 41 \( \text{\&e1} \) 1-0.

The justification for the destroyed black pawn structure is his passed pawn on the c-file. In the example shown above, White's strategy turned out to be the most dangerous and this was because Black never really created any active counterplay. Pushing the c-pawn was never really dangerous, but rather a sign of the desperate state Black found himself in.

The fight for c4

This is a theme in positions where the pawn skeleton c4-d5-c6 is seen. Just like White's knight would very much like to occupy the c5-square, the black counterpart would find itself comfortable on c4.

Often White wins the fight for c4 and if Black is forced to exchange pawns on b3, an already-examined pawn formation can arise.

Black can play the position differently as he can go for the control of c4 at any price. He can recapture with his pawn (...d5xc4), but then he has a destroyed pawn structure. He is often forced to seek immediate counterplay in the centre to compensate for this.

How White can fight for c4 is shown in the following example:

\[ \text{Renman-Ekstroem} \]
\[ \text{Eksjo 1980} \]

15 \( \text{\&xf6} \) \( \text{gx f6} \)

Here White, without being forced to do so, gives up his dark-squared bishop to destroy the pawn formation around the black king. Often this exchange happens immediately after Black has played the pawn break ...c6-c5, when Black is forced to recapture with the g-pawn or else he would be a pawn down after \( \text{\&a4xc5} \). Anyway, the odd looking recapture with the pawn has to be reckoned with every time, and this is no exception. In this game, after 15...\( \text{\&xf6?} \) 16 \( \text{\&c5} \) White has the double threat of 17 \( \text{\&b7} \) and 17 \( \text{\&xe6 fxe6} \) 18 \( \text{bx c4 dxc4} \) 19 \( \text{\&c2} \), winning a pawn.
16 bxc4 dxc4 17 ₩c2 c5 18 d5

This is a typical scenario of which Black should be wary. This is yet another possibility of achieving the desired exchange of light-squared bishops. White immediately regains his pawn and, at the same time, gains control of c4. Both a knight and a rook would very much like to occupy this square. The rook then has the possibility of switching to the kingside to participate in an attack on the black king.

19...£xd5 19 £xd5 Sxd5 20 Wxc4

White has won the fight for the c4-square and, at the same time, he has achieved the desired exchange of light squared bishops. But White gets nothing from simply either blocking the c5-pawn or trying to capture it, as it can be protected by all the black pieces. Attacking the black king also doesn’t seem like a successful mission, so White has to try to combine all these ideas.

But Black has his chances too. The c-pawn is, after all, a passed pawn and White should be wary that it does not advance. Also, after the exchange of bishops, the light squares around the white king has been weakened as well.

20...£cd8

White threatened 21 Wg4+.

21 Hab1 Wc7 22 Oc3 £d2 23 Hfc1 £d7
24 Oe4 £d5 25 Oc3 £d2 26 £d1 Wc6
27 Wxe6 £xd1+ 28 £xd1 fxe6

This endgame should not cause Black any trouble. Even though White has the better pawn structure, the bishop and the passed c-pawn compensate for this.

29 f1 Wf7 30 £xd8 £xd8 31 We2 £e7
32 £d3 £d6 33 £c4

Again White enters the c4-square but it is not enough for a win.

33...£c6 34 g4 f5 35 gxf5 exf5 36 e4
£d6 37 exf5 £e5 38 Wxc5 £b6+ 39 £c6 £xf5 40 f3 £g1 41 h3 £g5 42 £d5 h5 43 f4+ £f5 44 a4 £f2 45 a5 a6
46 £b7 £e1 47 £xa6 £e4 48 £f6+ £xf4 49 £hx5+ £g5 50 h4+ £hx5 51 £b7 £xa5 52 £a8 £xh4 53 £b8 ½-½

Black’s Plans

The plans for Black depend upon the type of position. Usually Black has the inferior pawn structure and has to compensate with active counterplay. This is a general tendency in the Tarrasch, but there are still differences in the degree of the importance of the dynamic counterplay Black has to create.

Knight Manoeuvring

Typical knight manoeuvres are ...£e8-d6 and ...£d7-b6 to protect the c4-square. From d6 the knight sometimes goes to e4 or even b5. The following is a typical example of Black’s manoeuvring:

Spraggett-Rogers

Szirak 1986
11...\( \text{e8} \) 12 \( \text{xc6 bxc6} \) 13 \( \text{xe7 wxe7} \)
14 \( \text{wa4 xc8} \) 15 b3 \( \text{d6} \)

The black knight has reached its desired square just in time to fight for the c4-square.
16 \( \text{ac1 fd8} \) 17 \( \text{fe1 wd7} \) 18 \( \text{b1} \)

White is fighting for c4. He wants to force Black to give up this square by putting extra pressure against it.

18...\( \text{h3} \)

Black exchanges the light-squared bishops to gain more control over the central light squares and also to weaken the light squares around the white king.
19 \( \text{d2 xg2} \) 20 \( \text{xg2 cxb3} \) 21 axb3 \( \text{b5} \)

From here the knight protects the a7-pawn and thus releases the queen from that duty.
22 \( \text{f3 f6} \) 23 \( \text{c5 zb8} \) 24 \( \text{e4!} \)

A serious attempt to win the game? White radically changes the pawn structure to set his opponent new problems.

The straightforward try to attack the c6-pawn by 24 \( \text{ec1} \) is answered by 24...\( \text{b6} \) and, despite the fact that White is slightly better here, it seems hard for him to break through.
24...\( \text{dxe4} \) 25 \( \text{xe4 d6} \) 26 \( \text{e2 zb6} \) 27 \( \text{ec2 b5} \) 28 \( \text{wc4}+ \text{f8} \) 29 \( \text{a2} \)

Or 29 \( \text{xc6 xc6} \) 30 \( \text{xc6 wc6} \) 31 \( \text{xc6 xd4} \) 32 \( \text{xd4 xd4} \) with a drawish rook ending.
29...\( \text{g6} \) 30 \( \text{wc1 gc7} \) 31 \( \text{a4 we6} \) 32 \( \text{wc2 ad5} \) 33 \( \text{a1 xc5} \) 34 \( \text{xc5 xb3} \)
35 \( \text{e1 zb7} \) 36 \( \text{wc6 cc7} \) 37 \( \text{wa8 zd7} \) 38 \( \text{h4 wf7} \) 39 \( \text{eb4 ec3} \) 40 \( \text{e1} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

There is still a lot of play here, but a draw somehow seems reasonable.

Here is yet another way of treating the position:

\begin{center}
\textbf{Dorfman-Lputian}

CSKA-Trud 1986
\end{center}

Here Black has exchanged his dark squared bishop for the white knight on c3. The game continued...

18 \( \text{a4 ea4} \) 19 \( \text{a5 wb7} \) 20 \( \text{f3} \)

This is the price White has to pay if he wants to chase away the annoying knight on e4: his light squared bishop is limited and his pawn formation, especially e3, is weakened.
20...\( \text{d6} \) 21 \( \text{g4} \)

21...\( \text{f5} \) was annoying, hence the text move.
21...\( \text{e8} \) 22 \( \text{b4 b5} \) 23 \( \text{c5 wd7} \) 24 \( \text{a6 f5}! \)

With this and the next move Black wants to open up the white kingside. White dominates play on the queenside and Black now seeks counterplay on the other side of the board.
25 \( \text{h3 h5} \) 26 \( \text{gxf5 ef7} \) 27 \( \text{e4 dxe4} \) 28 \( \text{fxe4 xd4} \)

Things have developed quite sharply. In what follows White has a slight initiative but Black is okay.
29 \( \text{wd3 ed8} \) 30 \( \text{xd4 xd4}+ \) 31 \( \text{xd4 xd4} \) 32 \( \text{xf5 xb3} \) 33 \( \text{g5 zd1}+ \) 34 \( \text{h2 zd7} \)

Protecting the seventh rank and freeing the rook on a8. Now White can win a pawn with 35 \( \text{xc6} \) but then Black gets good counterplay by pushing his passed a-pawn with 35...a5.

In general there are simply too few pieces left for White to really cause Black any serious problems.
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35 e5 $\text{d}2 \text{g}3 \text{c}4 36 \text{d}4$

- Not 37 $\text{xc}6? \text{g}2! 38 \text{g}2 \text{d}5+ and Black wins the exchange.

37...d3+ 38 $\text{h}2 \text{d}5 39 \text{d}5+ \text{d}5$
40 $\text{h}6 \text{d}7 41 \text{ag}4 \text{e}8 42 \text{hg}7 \text{e}e7
43 $\text{g}3 \text{d}3+ 44 \text{h}4 \text{e}3 45 \text{g}6 \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}$

Black advances his queenside pawns
In positions where White has not exchanged knights on c6, Black often has a pawn majority on the queenside. To use this majority fully, Black wants to push his b-pawn forward.

Summermatter-Balashov
Lenk 1991

27 $\text{we}4$?

- 27 $\text{d}3$ is better, when White is still fighting. The queens are kept on the board and White can force Black to weaken his kingside with 27...g6. White can at some point hope to create threats against his opponent’s king. The black c-pawn is blockaded and Black has a lot of work to do if he wants to advance it further.

After the text move White loses his central pawn without any compensation.
27...$\text{xd}4+ 28 \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 29 \text{xd}4$
30 $\text{f}3 \text{c}4 31 \text{a}3 \text{c}5 32 \text{f}2 \text{g}5
33 \text{h}4 \text{g}4 34 \text{e}3 \text{a}4$

White is totally tied up.
Meeting 1 $d4$

$35 \text{xe}1 \text{xb}3\ 36 \text{xd}1\ h5\ 37 \text{c}1\ \text{f}8\ 38 \text{xe}4\ \text{e}7\ 39 \text{e}1\ \text{e}6\ 40 \text{e}3\ \text{xc}2\ 41\ \text{xc}2\ \text{f}5\ 0-1$

Even though White played inaccurately at an early stage of the game it still shows what Black is able to do, and what White should be aware of.

The next example is a fight between two strong grandmasters.

Onischuk-Nenashev
Alushta 1994

21 \text{xf}7 \text{xf}7\ 22\ e4\ \text{sad}8\ 23\ \text{exd}5

White takes up the challenge. Another interesting possibility is $23\ e5$, which leads to rather complicated play. The line $23...\text{b}4\ 24\ \text{xe}2\ \text{b}6\ 25\ \text{e}6\ \text{e}5$ gives chances for both sides, but White can play $24\ \text{exf}6\ \text{gxf}6\ 25\ \text{a}4$ and gain the better prospects because of Black’s damaged pawn structure.

$23...\text{d}6\ 24\ \text{fe}1\ \text{wd}7\ 25\ \text{we}3$

White could have played $25\ \text{e}6\ \text{b}4\ 26\ \text{xe}4\ \text{xc}4\ 27\ \text{xe}4\ \text{xd}5\ 28\ \text{xd}5\ \text{xd}5\ 29\ \text{xd}5\ \text{xd}5\ 30\ \text{c}6$ with an edge in the endgame.

$25...\text{fe}8\ 26\ \text{we}6+\ \text{f}8\ 27\ \text{wd}7\ \text{xd}7\ 28\ \text{e}6\ \text{ec}8!\ 29\ \text{de}1\ \text{ed}8!$

The knight on $d6$ has travelled a long and rather awkward route to reach the ideal square in this kind of position. From $d6$ the knight supports the advance with the b-pawn.

$18...\text{b}5!\ 19\ \text{ad}1\ \text{wd}7\ 20\ \text{de}5!$

Black’s threat was ...$b5-b4$ as after his last move he has protected the $a4$-square and thus White is unable to manoeuvre his knight via $a4$ to $c5$. After ...$b5-b4$ White’s knight would have to settle for an inferior square.

The line $20\ \text{e}4\ \text{xe}4\ 21\ \text{xe}4\ \text{dxe}4\ 22\ \text{xe}4\ \text{d}5$ only seems to help Black. The decision made in the game seems reasonable.

$20...\text{wb}7$

After $20...\text{fxe}5\ 21\ \text{dxe}5\ \text{db}7\ 22\ \text{e}6\ \text{xe}6\ 23\ \text{fxe}6\ \text{xe}6\ 24\ \text{d}4$ White has good compensation for the pawn. Instead of going for this line, Black himself sacrifices a pawn.

A remarkable situation! White is a pawn up but his bishop is very inactive at the moment and the knight on $d6$ is doing a great job. The position is very unclear.

$30\ \text{h}4\ \text{db}6\ 31\ \text{a}3\ \text{a}4\ 32\ \text{le}2\ \text{b}8\ 33\ \text{h}3\ \text{xe}3\ 34\ \text{xc}3\ \text{a}5\ 35\ \text{g}5!\ \text{b}4\ 36\ \text{axb}4\ \text{axb}4$

At last the $b$-pawn advances but in the meantime White has succeeded in creating serious threats on the kingside.

$37\ \text{cxb}4$

Another possibility is $37\ \text{gx}f6\ \text{b}3\ 38\ \text{b}2\ \text{a}8$, when Black has compensation because of the protected passed pawn on $b3$ and the active pieces. The white rook is rather passive on $b2$.

$37...\text{db}5$

White now sacrificed the exchange with
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38 \( \text{c2}?! \text{xd4} \) 39 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 40 \( \text{dxe6} \)

but after

40...\( \text{dxb7} \) 41 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 42 \( \text{xb4} \) \( \text{xb4} \)

Black was better and he eventually won this interesting endgame.

Here is yet another example where Black gets a chance to push his passed c-pawn forward.

Polugaevsky-Pfleger
Montilla Moriles 1975

15...\( \text{fd8} \)

White threatened to play 16 \( \text{xd5!} \) \( \text{xe1} \)
17 \( \text{xc7} \) and 18 \( \text{xe1} \), winning a piece.

16 \( \text{bxc4} \)

Much better for White was 16 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a6} \)
17 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{ac8} \) with equal play. After the text move White opens both the d-file and the fifth rank, which clearly favours Black.

16...\( \text{dxc4} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \)

Or 17 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{ab8} \) 18 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xe5} \) and Black is better due to his passed pawn on the c-file and his more active pieces.

17...\( \text{d3} \)

The c3-pawn is very weak.

18 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a3} \) 19 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 20 \( \text{wb1} \) \( \text{f5} \)
21 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{f8} \) 22 \( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{xe1} \) 23 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{c3} \)

Now the c-pawn advances.

24 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c8} \) 25 \( \text{g4?} \)

Even without this desperate move, White was in serious trouble. Black plays ...\( \text{a3-b2} \) to advance the pawn further. Or he can cap-

ture the weak a-pawn and thus gain another passed pawn.

25...\( \text{c5+} \) 26 \( \text{h1} \) c2 27 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{xc4!} \)
28 \( \text{wb3} \)

28 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{e3} \) and White is unable to hold the Black pawn back as he cannot protect c1.

28...\( \text{c4} \) 29 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e2} \) 30 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xc3!} \)
0-1

Theory of the Main Line: 9 \( \text{g5} \) c4

Using the illustrative games below, we shall now take an in-depth look at the current state of theory of the main line 9 \( \text{g5} \) c4.

Game 11
Salo-Raaste
Finnish Team Ch., 1995

1 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 2 \( \text{c3} \) d5 3 \( \text{d4} \) c4 4 \( \text{cxd5} \) exd5
5 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 6 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 7 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 8 0-0
0-0 9 \( \text{g5} \) c4 10 \( \text{e5} \)

10...\( \text{e6} \) 11 \( \text{xc6} \)

White has other options here:

a) 11 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 12 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{a3} \) 13 \( \text{xc6} \) bxc6
14 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 15 \( \text{bxc4} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 16 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{b4} \)
and White has some compensation for the sacrificed material, but we're not sure if it is enough.

b) On 11 \( \text{c1} \) we recommend 11...\( \text{c8} \) to recapture with the rook if White exchanges knights on c6. Two moves have been played in this position:

b1) 12 \( \text{d2} \) h6 13 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14 \( \text{xc6} \)
bxc6 15 d4 f5 with equal chances in Ager-Rotstein, Austrian League 1998. Also possible is 14...exd4 15 e4 dxe4 16 d5 again with equal play.

b2) 12 e3 a6 (This is a flexible move. Black wants to advance his queenside pawns. Besides that he waits to see what White comes up with.) 13 f4 e8 14 exd6 bxc6 15 xe7 xe7 16 f5 d7 17 e4 dxe4 18 xe4 f6 19 c5 and here Black’s pieces are just placed on the wrong squares. The black bishop was chased away from e6 and is not to well placed on d7. Furthermore, Black has no real counterplay against d4 and b2. White had the advantage in J.Horvath-Monin, Zalakaros 1993.

Instead we recommend Black to play 13...g6. The plan with this move is shown in Game 14 (see note to Black’s 11th move). One of the points with 13...g6 here is that, if White wants to move on, he has to play a centre break with e3-e4 and thus he has lost a tempo compared to the normal lines, because he has pushed the e-pawn twice.

c) 11 e4 xe4 12 xe7 dxc3 13 xe6 bxc6 14 xd8 xd1 15 e7 xb2 16 xf8 xf8 was played in Misiuga-Antoshik, Moravia 1997. This is the same position as in the Roods-Marrero game below, but with a different move order. Black has an edge in the endgame.

d) On 11 e3, again we recommend 11...c8 with the idea of recapturing on c6 with the rook. This position was analysed above, but with the moves dxe1 and ...a7-a6 and if anything this minor difference favours Black.

Otherwise, 11...e8 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 xe7 xe7 14 b3 d6 reaches a position from the introduction of this chapter, while 11...d7 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 xe7 xe7 14 b3 d6 leads to similar positions. As shown in the introduction, Black usually has to exchange on b3 and after axb3 he has weaknesses on both a7 and c6. If Black can avoid this, he should do so. Therefore we recommend 11...c8.

c) Another option is 11 dxc4? dxc4 12 xf6 (Notice that 12 d5?? is bad as after 12...xd5, the White bishop on g5 is unprotected. Following 13 xe7 dxe7 White remains a piece down.) 12...xf6 13 d5. Black’s best line is 13...b6 14 a4 a5 15 dxc6 ad8 16 c2 d2 17 c1 xe2 and Black is better, Csizsar-Dupsky, Zalakaros 1993. Even stronger for Black is 17...bxc6 18 xc3 xb2 19 xb2 xc3 20 c2 xa1 21 xa1 d8 with a clear lead in the endgame because of the passed c-pawn and more active pieces.

11...bxc6

12 e3

The main line 12 b3 is treated in Game 12. Besides the text move, White has tried a number of other moves:

a) 12 f4 a5 13 c1 fd8 14 h3 c5 15 e3 f5 16 dxc5 d3 with unclear play in Brondum-Sorensen, Copenhagen 1989. We’re sure that improvements can be found for White, but Black should not be afraid at all in this line.

b) 12 d2 b8 13 xf6 xf6 14 a4 f5 15 b3 cxb3 16 axb3 1/2-1/2 C. Flear-Nepeina, Leconte 1999, but in fact Black missed the opportunity to get an advantage with 16...xb3 17 c5 b5 18 xa7 xd4! 19 xd4 b6.

c) 12 a4 d7 13 xe7 xe7 14 e4 dxe4 15 xe4 d5 16 xd5 cxd5 17 e1
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\( \text{wb}4 \). Here again an early draw was agreed in Satta-Ciuffoletti, Caorle 1981, but both sides still have a lot to play for.

d) 12 \( \text{wc}2 \) h6 13 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 14 \( \text{d2} \) f5 15 e3 \( \text{f6} \) 16 f3 c5 17 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 18 \( \text{c3} \) and White has the better chances in Schell-Seeger, Germany 1998, due to his control over d4. In this line 13...\( \text{xd7} \), with the plan ...\( \text{xh5} \), is worth a try. A possible continuation is 14 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{f5} \) 15 e4 dxe4 16 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 17 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 18 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{f6} \) with equal chances. The white pawns on b2 and d4 are just as vulnerable as the black on c4 and c6.

e) Bad for White is 12 e4?! \( \text{xe4} \) 13 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd1} \) 15 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 16 \( \text{xf8} \) \( \text{xf8} \), as seen in Roods-Marrero, Las Vegas 1996. Black has better prospects in the endgame due to his passed pawn on the c-file.

12...\( \text{b8} \)

Another possibility for Black here is 12...\( \text{de8} \) 13 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 14 b3 \( \text{d6} \) but, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, we prefer the more dynamic positions like the one arising in this game. After 14...\( \text{xd6} \) Black is often at some point forced to exchange pawns on b3, after which he has two weaknesses (a7 and c6) to take care of against White’s one weakness on b3.

Instead of the text move, there is another interesting option which we would recommend: 12...\( \text{f5} \). The idea is to occupy the d3-square before the white knight completes its route to f4. This move also makes it difficult for White to break out with b2-b3 immediately, as 13 b3 is met with 13...\( \text{xd3} \) 14 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{b4} \) with good counterplay.

13 b3 \( \text{a5} \)

After the moves 12...\( \text{b8} \) 13 b3 Black does not have quite the same options with ...\( \text{f5} \) as he had a move earlier. Now 13...\( \text{f5} \) 14 bxc4 dxc4 15 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{d3} \) 16 \( \text{fc1} \) is better for White.

14 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{fc8} \) 15 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 16 bxc4 dxc4 17 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 18 e4

This is the pawn structure that White has been aiming for. Giving White the chance to build up his centre is often an indication that something has gone wrong for Black. We give White the better chances as Black does not have the desired counterplay for his weakened pawn structure.

18...\( \text{g6} \) 19 e5 \( \text{e7} \) 20 \( \text{xg6} \) hxg6 21 \( \text{wc2} \) c3 22 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{b4} \) 23 e6!

White wants to open up the black kingside. As White has the more secure king’s position, he will have the advantage of the opposite-coloured bishops. The attacking side is able to create threats on squares not available for the defensive bishop.

23...\( \text{fxe6} \)

23...f5, to keep the position closed, looks like a better defence.

24 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 25 \( \text{fe1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 26 \( \text{we4} \) e5 27 dxe5 \( \text{gg8} \) 28 \( \text{xc6} \)

Decisive was 28 \( \text{f1} \), after which it is hard to see a defence against 29 \( \text{c4} \).

28...\( \text{xe5} \) 29 \( \text{e6+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 30 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 31 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g8} \) 32 \( \text{e6+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 33 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g8} \) 34 \( \text{e6+} \) 1/2-1/2.

The players agreed a draw here, even though White still has the advantage.

Game 12
Pelletier-Weinzettl
Pula 2000

1 d4 \( \text{f6} \) 2 \( \text{f3} \) d5 3 c4 e6 4 \( \text{c3} \) c5 5
cxd5 exd5 6 g3 0-0-0 0-0 9 0-0 10 dxe5 e6 11 dxc6 bxc6 12 b3 Wa5

13 Qa4

Other White moves are:

a) 13 Wc2 Qd8 and now:

a1) 14 Qxd1 bxc8 15 bxc4 dxc4 16 Qe4 Qd7. Both players have their chances here, but an early draw was agreed in Grivas-Marjanovic, Pucarevo 1987.

a2) 14 e3 c5 15 bxc4 exd4 16 Qxf6 Qxf6 17 Qxd5 Qxd5 18 Qxd5 dxe3 19 Qab1 exf2+ 20 Qxf2 with equal chances in Hege-ler-Blauert, Germany 1997.

a3) 14 bxc4 dxc4 15 Qxf6 Qxf6 16 e3 Qac8 17 Qac1 Qc7 18 Qfd1 Qb4 19 Qxc2 c5 20 d5 Qd7 21 Qd3 Qa3 22 Qb1 Qb4 23 Qbc1 Qa3 with equal play, Yakovich-Haag, Bergen 2000.

a4) 14 Qd2 Wa6 15 Qfd1 and now:

a41) 15...Qac8 16 bxc4 dxc4 17 Qg5 Wa5 18 Qce4 Qf5 19 Qxf6 gxf6 20 Qc3 Qg7 21 Qxh3 Qb8 26 e4 and White has the advantage, Cosma-Dumitrache, Romanian Ch. 1992.

a42) Instead we suggest 15...c5!? with following possibilities:

a421) 16 bxc4 Qxc4 is good for Black.

a422) 16 dxc5 d4 17 Qxc4 exb3 18 axb3 Qxe2 19 Qxf6 Qxf6 20 Qxa8 d3 with very complicated play.

b) 13 Qc1 Qfd8 (13...Qa3!? 14 Qa4 Qac8 15 Qc2 c5 16 Qxc5 Qxc5 17 dxc5 Qxc5 18 Qxf6 gxf6 19 Qfd1 Wa3 with good counterplay for Black in Lerner-Weinzettl, Graz 1995.

c) 13 Qd2 Wb6 14 bxc4 Qxd4 15 Qxd5 cxd5 16 e3 Qd3 17 We2 Qg6 with equal play, as in the game Löffler-Zagema, Leewarden 1994.

d) 13 Qd2 Qb4 14 Qxf6 gxf6 15 Qf1 Qac8 16 bxc4 dxc4 17 a3 Qe7 18 Qe3 Qfd8 19 Qd1 Qg7 with complicated play, Ristic-Sinadinovic, Belgrade 1989.

Black does not have to worry about 17 e4 in this particular situation as after 17...Qfd8 18 We3 Qd7, he just build up his forces against d4.

Yet another interesting possibility is 15...Qa3 16 Qc2 Qf5 17 c4 dxc4 18 Qf1 Qe8 19 bxc4 Qh8 with complicated play, Anic-Pecot, France 2000.

13...Qfd8 14 e3

Again White has a wide range of possibilities:

a) On 14 Wc2 we recommend 14...c5 15 dxc5 Qac8 16 Qd2 Qb5 17 bxc4 Qxc4 18 Qf4 Qxc5 19 Qab1 Qa5 20 Qxc5 Qxc5 21 Qfd1 Qxd1+ 22 Qxd1 Qc8 and play is equal, Bayer-Müller, Germany 1995.

b) 14 Qc1 Qac8 15 Wc2 c5 16 Qxc5 Qxc5 17 dxc5 Qxc5 18 bxc4 dxc4 19 Qxf6 gxf6 again with equal play. Kecskes-Müller, Budapest 1995.

c) 14 bxc4 dxc4 15 Qxf6 Qxf6 16 e3 Qd5 with chances for both sides. The game Miralles-Miljanic, Vrnjacka Banja 1987 concluded 17 Qc2 Qe7 18 Qfd1 Qab8 19 Qab1 Qb4 20 Qxb4 Qxb4 21 e4 Qc6 22 h3 c5! 23 dxc5 Qxd1+ 24 Qxd1 Qxc5 25 Qxc5 Qxc5 26 Qd8+ Qf8 27 Qc7 g6 28 f4 Qb4 29 f5 gxf5 30 Qd8+ ½-½. Note that 23 d5? is bad because of 23...Qd7 24 Qdb2 Qa2, with an advantage to Black.

d) 14 Qd2 Wa6 15 bxc4 dxc4 16 c3 Qab8 17 Qc2 Qd5 18 Qfb1 Qb4 19 Qxb4 Qxb4 20 Qe4 g6 with equal play in Rey-Cranbourne, Buenos Aires 1989. Another
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option is 15 \text{c}5 \text{xc}5 16 \text{dxc}5 \text{e}4, but again Black was doing fine in Mlynek-Vecera, Brno 1995.

14...\text{Eac}8

More common is 14...\text{c}5. After three further moves we enter the main line anyway, but the move order chosen by Weinzeil is quite smart as at least two other positions are avoided for Black:

One type of position arises after 15 \text{x}f6 \text{gxf}6 16 \text{bxc}4 \text{cxd}4 17 \text{exd}4 \text{ab}8.

After 18 \text{c}5 Black is a pawn down, but his pieces are active. In general we believe that Black is okay here. However, White has another promising option: 18 \text{cxd}5!. The game Tringov-Marjanovic, played at Nis 1979, ended in a draw after the further moves 18...\text{xd}5 19 \text{g}4+ \text{h}8 20 \text{h}5 \text{b}4 21 \text{h}3 \text{xa}4 (after this the next few moves are completely forced) 22 \text{f}5 \text{g}7 23 \text{xh}7+ \text{f}8 24 \text{fe}1 \text{xe}1 25 \text{xe}1 \text{e}6 26 \text{xe}6 \text{fxe}6 27 \text{xe}6 \text{xd}4 28 \text{e}4 \text{d}7 29 \text{h}8+ \text{f}7 30 \text{h}7+.

Still, White could have caused his opponent much more trouble with 26 \text{d}5!. White creates serious threats against the black king. Bad, for instance, is 26...\text{b}4 27 \text{e}4 \text{b}1+ 28 \text{g}2 \text{xd}5? 29 \text{xe}6! and White is winning.

Another type of position arises after the moves 15 \text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 16 \text{dxc}5 \text{xc}5 17 \text{xf}6 \text{gxf}6 18 \text{bxc}4 \text{dxc}4 19 \text{xa}8 \text{xd}1 20 \text{fxd}1.

After 20...\text{c}3 White has a choice:

a) 21 \text{dc}1 \text{f}5 22 \text{e}4 \text{g}4 (interesting is 22...\text{d}7 with the idea 23 \text{c}2 \text{a}4) 23 \text{e}1 \text{c}2 24 \text{d}5 \text{c}5 25 \text{ac}1 \text{a}5 26 \text{b}3 \text{h}3 27 \text{e}3 \text{d}2 28 \text{e}1 \text{c}3 with a draw in Schmidt-Migl, Germany 1991.

b) 21 \text{e}4 \text{c}2 22 \text{d}8+ \text{g}7 23 \text{c}1 \text{h}3 24 \text{xc}2 \text{c}6 25 \text{e}4 \text{c}3 26 \text{d}3 \text{b}2 27 \text{dd}1 \text{xa}2 and Black was doing fine here in Janjgava-Novikov, Lvov 1987. Also worth a try is 21...\text{b}4?!, in order to chase the bishop away from e4.

In general this second type of position should not cause Black problems. The two rooks are stronger than the queen, but the passed pawn on the c-file, plus the fact that the light squares around the white king are weakened, is enough to secure Black equal play. Still, we recommend the move order played in the game by Black, as the option 18 \text{cxd}5! from the Tringov-Marjanovic game seems to give White the better prospects.

15 \text{xf}6

White also has other options:

a) 15 \text{c}2 \text{c}5 16 \text{dxc}5 \text{xc}5 17 \text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 18 \text{xf}6 \text{gxf}6 19 \text{fd}1 \text{d}4 20 \text{exd}4 \text{xd}4 21 \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 22 \text{dd}1 \text{b}6 23 \text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 24 \text{d}2 \text{g}7 25 \text{d}5 and a draw was agreed in Kopjonkin-Dupsky, Zalakaros 1995.

b) After 15 \text{bxc}4 \text{dxc}4 16 \text{xf}6 \text{gxf}6 17 \text{c}2 \text{c}5 18 \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 19 \text{xd}5 \text{xd}5 20 \text{xc}4 \text{cd}8 21 \text{ab}1 \text{c}7 we have reached...
the position from the game Renman-Ekstroem in the introduction to this chapter.

15...gxf6 16 Wh5

16 bxc4 dxc4 17 Wc2 is another option. After 17...c5 18 d5 Axd5 19 Axc4 Axd5 20 Wxc4 Acd8 we again have the Renman-Ekstroem game from the introduction of this chapter.

In the game Yusupov-Lputian, Frunze 1979 Black instead played 17...Ab4. Play continued 18 a3 Ac7 19 Ab2 c3 20 d4 d5 21 d5 Axd5 22 Axd5 Axd5 23 Afe and now with 23...Ac8, Black now forced the draw: 24 Wxe7 c2 25 Ab2 Axc3 26 Wb7 (26 Ac4 is met with 26...Axa1! 27 Axa1 Ad1+) A5d7 27 Wb5 a6 28 Axb6 A6d6 29 Wb7 A6d7 30 Wb6 A6d6 with a draw by repetition.

After 23 Axc3 (instead of 23 Wc4)

23...Ab5 we have a position very similar to the Renman-Ekstroem game, but here Black controls the c4-square after 24 Ad1 c4.

16...c5 17 dxc5 Axc5 18 Ad1 c3 19 Ac1

Another option is 19 Ac5 Wxc5 20 Ac1 to exchange the dark-squared bishop before playing Ac1. In the game Hoffmann-Dittmar, Germany 1998, play continued 20...c2 21 Ad2 Wc3 22 Axc2 Wxc2 23 Wxc2 Axc2 24 Ac3 Axc3 25 Ac1 Wxc2 with a draw being agreed.

19...Ab4 20 Ad4 c2 21 Ah4

Bad is 21 Ac3? Axc3 22 Wxh3 Aa3 as Black controls the promotion square. The white attack was refuted after 23 Ag4+ Af8 24 Wxh7 Bd2 25 Ag7 Wxh1+ 26 Ac2 Ad7 27 Axf7+ Ae6 0-1, Bagirov-Lputian, USSR 1980.

21...Af8!?

This move is new. Earlier examples include:

a) 21...d4 22 Wxh7+ Af8 and now:

a1) 23 exd4 Axf5 (that was the idea behind the pawn sacrifice 21...d4 – Black holds on to his passed pawn on c2) 24 Wh6+ Ac7 25 Ac4 Wg5 26 Ac2. We feel that White is better here, but after the further moves 26...Ad4 27 Ac8 Ac8 28 Ac3 Wxh6 29 Ah6 Ad7 30 Ab2 Ad2 31 Ac4 Axh5 32 Ac3 Ae6 33 Ad5+ Axd5 34 Ac5 Ac5 35 Ah7 Axh2 the game was equal and eventually ended in a draw, Jelen-Blauert, Budapest 1998.

a2) Better for White is 23 Wxc2 Wxc2 24 Ac3 d3 25 Ac1 Ac2 26 Ac3 Ac2 27 Ac3 and White is better, Li Wenliang-Dittmar, Gyula 2000.

In the text game, Weinzettl has yet another way of treating this position.

22 Wxh7 Aa7

After 22...f5 23 Wh8+ Ae7 24 Wb2! the White queen is back in the game.

23 Ac2 f5

That was the point. White has eliminated the dangerous c-pawn but the White pieces are temporarily misplaced. In particular, White's major pieces on the kingside are far from action on the queenside. Despite the fact that Black is two pawns down, the position is unclear.

24 Ac2 Ac3

A smart move that brings the bishops back into the game. If White now plays 25 Ac3 Ac3 26 Ad4 Qa1+ 27 Ac1 then
Black gets excellent play. Here is yet another point with the sacrifice of the c-pawn: instead of this pawn, the c-file is now at Black's disposal for his rooks.

25 Wh6 iLf6 26 Ed4 Ec1 + 27 &f 1 Wc7
Better than 27...JLxd4 28 exd4 when all the dynamic play in the position disappears for Black.

28 Edd2
The threat was ...a1 followed by ...wc1.

28...f4!
Black seizes his chance to muddy the waters.

29 Wxf4??
29 exf4! Hh8 30 Axe6+ fxe6 31 Wg6 was much better. After 31...Wc6 the position still remains unclear. White has three pawns for the exchange sacrifice but his knight is still misplaced and the black pieces are very active.

29...Exf1+! 30 &g2
The rook is not to be touched. 30 xf1 Wc1+ 31 Wc1 Wxd2 is better for Black, while after 31 Wg2 Wh3+! 32 Wh3 Wfl+ White is mated in few moves.

30...Ag1+ 31 @f3 Wxf4+ 32 Wxf4
Black should win this position but he manages to throw it all away. Maybe he was in time trouble.

32...Ah8 33 e4 dxe4 34 Axe4 Axe2 35 Ac5 Ag7 36 Axe6 fxe6 37 Ade2 Ah6 38 Ac4 e5+?
After 38...a6 Black is still in the lead.

39 Ag5 a6 40 Axe5+! Axe5 41 Axh6 Ag2 42 Axe6 Axe2 43 g4 Ag2 44 Ag5 Ad6 45 a4 Ac5 46 Ae5 Ad7 47 Ac5 Ac3 48 Ad5+ Ac6 49 Ab5 ½-½

Game 13
Delitzsch-Seitaj
Hania 1995

1 c4 e6 2 g3 Df6 3 g2 c5 4 f3 d5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 d4 Dc6 7 0-0 Df7 8 Ac3 0-0 9 Ag5 c4 10 b3 Ab5 11 Ac2

Many other moves have been played in this position:

a) 11 Ac2 Ab4 12 Ac2 wb6 13 e3 g6 14 Hb4 Dc7 15 bxc4 Wxc4 16 Df1 Ac3 17 Wxc3 and White was better in Spulber-Mircov, Bucharest 1992. Better is 13...Ab8 14 bxc4 dxc4, when White puts pressure on d4 to prevent White from playing e2-e4. Play is very like that in the game and Black is not worse.

12 Be1 (instead of 12 Ac2) looks harmless but Black should take care. The idea behind the move is to point towards b4. Then 12...wb6 13 e3 Dc8 14 An5? (that was the point) 14...Dxe5 15 dxe5 Axe5+! (15...Dxc3 16 Dxc3 Dc4 with equal chances is better) 16 Dxd5 Ox5d5 17 Ab4 Ac5 18 Ac3 Dxc3 19 Wxc3 Ac5 20 b4 Ac6 and, if anyone, White has a minimal advantage because his pieces are placed more harmoniously, Haik-Miralles, Marseille 1987.

b) 11 An6 12 An6 12 Ac2 13 e3 b5? (13...Af5 is a more natural move as it develops a piece and takes control over the important b1-h7 diagonal). Here White could have seized the initiative with 14 bxc4 bxc4 15 Ab1 a6 16 e4! dxe4 17 Dxe4. Instead, Jimenez-Clemente, Spain 1991 continued 14 b4!? Wb6 15 a4 Ac6 16 axb5 Ab5 17 Ac5 with equal chances.

c) 11 Ac1 Ac3 12 An6 Ac1 13 Wxc1 gxf6 14 bxc4 dxc4 15 d5 Dc7 16 Ad1 Ag6 17 Ac4 Ag7 18 Wxc4 Ad7 19 Wd4 Ab6 with complicated play. Still, White has to
prove that the exchange sacrifice is correct, Zlotnikov-Delaune, Washington 1990. Worse is 15 \( \text{Qe}4 \text{g}7 \) 16 \( \text{Wf}4 \text{f}5 \), when Black is better, Hase-Jostes, Germany 1997.

d) After 11 \( \text{Wd}2 \) Black achieves good play by 11...\( \text{Ad}8 \), pressuring against d4:

  d1) 12 \( \text{Af}c1 \text{a}3 \) 13 \( \text{Af}x6 \text{gxf6} \) 14 \( \text{Ad}1 \text{b}4 \) with equal play in Dolezal-Juarez 1992.

  d2) After 12 bxc4 dxc4 13 e4 h6 14 \( \text{Af}x6 \text{xf6} \) White has problems protecting the d4-pawn, Saladino-Cranbourne, Buenos Aires 1986.

11...\( \text{xe}6 \) 12 \( \text{Af}d1 \)

12 bxc4 dxc4 13 e4? is bad in view of 13...\( \text{Qxd}4 \) and the bishop on g5 is hanging. 13 \( \text{Af}x6 \text{xf6} \) does not help White to play e2-e4 because Black then has extra pressure against d4.

12...\( \text{Af}d8 \)

Black is putting pressure on d4, not allowing White to exchange pawns on c4 and play in the centre with e2-e4.

13 \( \text{Ab}1 \text{h}6 \) 14 \( \text{Af}x6 \text{xf6} \) 15 bxc4 dxc4

16 \( \text{Ab}5 \)

16 \( \text{Ab}7 \text{xd}4! \) is good for Black, for instance 17 \( \text{Qxd}4 \text{xd}4 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) (18 \( \text{Wb}2 \) loses to 18...\( \text{Wc}3! \) 19 \( \text{Wxc}3 \text{xe}2+ \) 18...\( \text{Qxd}4 \) and now 19 \( \text{Ab}5? \), trying to equalise material, is refuted by 19...\( \text{Wxc}3!! \) 20 \( \text{Wxc}3 \text{d}1+ \) 21 \( \text{Af}1 \text{h}3 \).

16...\( \text{Wa}3?! \) 17 e3

Possible is 17 \( \text{Ab}7? \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}4 \text{xd}4 \) as there is a small difference from the position before: White can now play 19 \( \text{Qxd}4 \text{xd}4 \) 20 \( \text{Ab}5 \).

However, Black is okay after 20...\( \text{Wc}5 \) 21 \( \text{Qxd}4 \text{xa}4 \) as White cannot win a pawn with 22 \( \text{Wx}f7?? \); after 22...\( \text{Wf}a1!! \) 23 \( \text{Af}1 \text{h}3 \) it's game over.

17...\( \text{Ab}8 \) 18 \( \text{Ab}1 \text{b}6 \) 19 \( \text{Af}2 \)

Again the white knight is heading for the f4-square.

19...\( \text{e}7 \) 20 \( \text{Af}4 \text{d}7 \) 21 \( \text{Af}5 \)

Of course not 21 \( \text{Wxc}4? \text{a}5 \) and White loses the exchange.

21...\( \text{Af}8 \)

Cool play!

22 \( \text{Ab}5 \text{b}8 \) 23 \( \text{Af}2 \)

This allows the following combination. 23 \( \text{Wxc}4? \) is met by 23...\( \text{h}5 \) 24 \( \text{Ab}3 \text{xa}2 \).

Stronger, however, is 23 \( \text{Qc}3 \), although Black is still slightly better because of the bishop pair.

23...\( \text{Qxd}4! \) 24 \( \text{ex}d4 \text{c}3 \) 25 \( \text{Ab}3 \text{xd}2 \) 26 \( \text{Wxd}2 \text{wa}6 \)

Now Black has the bishop pair and the better pawn structure.

27 \( \text{Af}3 \text{a}4 \) 28 \( \text{Ab}3 \text{b}5 \) 29 \( \text{a}3 \text{wg}6 \) 30 \( \text{Af}1 \text{a}5 \)

31 \( \text{Af}5 \)

Stronger for White is 31 \( \text{Ah}3 \text{b}8 \) 32 \( \text{Af}5 \) to activate the bishop.

31...\( \text{b}4 \) 32 \( \text{Ah}3 \text{d}7 \) 33 \( \text{Qxd}7 \text{xd}7 \) 34 \( \text{a}4 \text{e}7 \) 35 \( \text{Ab}1 \text{d}6 \) 36 \( \text{We}2 \text{dc}7 \) 37 \( \text{Ab}4 \text{c}1 \) 38 \( \text{Wa}6 \text{b}3 \) 39 \( \text{Wb}7 \text{xd}1+ \) 40 \( \text{Wxd}1 \text{b}8 \) 0-1
This move is the most common and also the one that we recommend. Many players have been tempted to play 11...Wb6 but we cannot recommend it, as the following line shows:

a) 11...Wb6 12 f5 £xe5 13 fxe6! fxe6 14 £a4 £c7 15 dxe5 £xe5 16 £f4 and White has a clear advantage. White should, however, avoid 13 £a4?! £c7 14 dxe5 £xe5 15 £xf6 gxf6! 16 fxe6 £xe6. The main idea behind the recapture on f6 with the g-pawn is to play ...f6-f5. There is not much White can do about this plan, as 17 e4? is simply met with 17...d4. After ...f6-f5 the white bishop on g2 will be totally locked up and the white knight is also not too well placed at the moment. Black has brilliant compensation for the piece.

b) 11...£e8, with the idea 12...£d6, fails because White plays f4-f5 and again disorganises the black forces: 12 £xc6 bxc6 13 £xe7 £xe7 14 £f5 £c8 15 £e4 with better prospects for White.

c) Of course not 11...£d7?? 12 £xc6 bxc6 13 £xe7 £xe7 14 f5 and Black loses, Liardet-Eschmann, Biel 1998.

d) A useful alternative is 11...£g6.

We still recommend 11...£g4 but the positions arising after 11...£g6 are still instructive and it is helpful for Black to know these positions as he sometimes plays ...£g7-£g6 to prevent White from playing f4-f5. In the two previous examples it was precisely this move that was so annoying for Black.

Notice that after the immediate pawn break 12 e4 Black gets a good position: 12...£xe4 13 £xe4 dxe4 14 £xc6 bxc6 15 £xe7 £xe7 16 £xe4 £d5.

Another line for White is 12 e3 £e8 13 h3 £d7 14 £xe7 £xe7 15 £h2 a6 16 a4 £f6 17 £f3 £f5 with equal play in Schmidt-Horther, Erlangen 1994.

12 £xe7

White has a lot of other moves to choose between:

a) 12 £xg4 £xg4 with further possibilities:

a1) 13 £xd5 £xg5 14 fxg5 £xg5 15 £f4 £e6 16 £g2 16...£ad8 17 £h1 £e7 18 £c1 £b5 19 £e4 £g6 20 £c5 £g4 and play is unclear. Sherbakov-Egin, Russia 1996. Another try is 17 d5 £b4 18 e4 £d3 19 £e2 £xf4 20 £xf4 £xf4 21 £f1 £e5 22 dxe6 £c5+ 23 £f2 £xf2+ 24 £xf2 £xe6. In this endgame both sides have chances, Vadasz-Schmidt, Budapest 1997.

a2) 13 £xd5 £xg5 14 fxg5 £xg5 15 £f4 £ad8 16 £d2 £f8 17 e4 £c6 with unclear play, Timoscenko-Halkias, European Ch., Ohrid 2001. Again White has problems pushing his central pawns because of the pressure against the d4-pawn.

a3) 13 £xe7 £xe7 14 £d2 £d7 15 b3 £ac8 16 b4 £fe8 with equal play in McKay-Peek, Edinburgh 1988.

b) Instead of the exchange of knights with 12 £xg4, White can play 12 f5. The game Novikov-Lputian, Tashkent 1984 continued 12...£xc6 13 £xe7 £xe7 14 £xe6 £f6 15 £xe5 £c5+ 16 £h1 £f2 17 £e1 £xf1+ 18 £xf1 £f2+ 19 £g1 £h3+ with a perpetual
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c) 12 g6 xe7 13 f5 15 h3 weak+ 16 xe3 fxe3 17 f3 xe2 18 xg2 e8f8 19 g4 c2 and Black had the better endgame in Euler-Seitaj, Germany 1994.

12...xe7 13 f6

Or 13 g6 xe4 14 xe2 xd7 15 e4. In this balanced position the players agreed a draw in Kharitonov-Shaboian 1984.

Instead of 14...xd7, Black can play 14...f5 to hinder White’s break in the centre if he prefers more closed positions. After 15 b3 c8 16 bxc4 xe4 17 c3 e6 18 xe1 d7 19 f5 e8f8 play was even in Van Esch-Schiffer, Groningen 1994.

13...xe5 14 fxe5 f6 15 e4

In Summermatter-Balashov, Lenk 1991 White played the weaker 15 c2?! See the introduction for the rest of this game.

15...xd8 16 d1

Or 16 exd5 xe5 17 d1 xd7 18 xe2 d5 with equal play in the endgame, Szymanski-Antoshik, Karvina 2001. The game continued 19 f5 xe3 20 bxc3 d5 21 b1 b5 22 b2 a6 23 a4! White now created a weak spot on b5 and, at the same time, opened up the a-file. White is better here and he eventually won the game. Better is 19...b5 20 c4 a5 21 c5 e7 and Black has a good position.

16...h3 17 h3 xe3 18 xe3 e7 19 f2 h6 20 e3 e6

21 f1 dxe4

Another possibility is to keep the tension in the centre and play 21...b6. This move also protects the important c5-square. It is hard to see how White can proceed without exchanging on d5 and then Black is one or two tempi up compared to the game continuation.

22 xe4 d5 23 de7 24 c5

This was the only possibility to remove the queen from the blockaded pawn on e5. White now has the initiative.

25 e6 xd7

The cool move 25...f6 is better. A possible continuation is 26 c1 b6 27 d7 e8 with complicated play. Now Black loses a pawn.

26 xe7 xe7 27 xe7 xe7 28 ef7+ xe7 29 xe4 b6 30 wa4 wd6 31 xd5+ xe6 32 c4 and Black starts checking the white king.

31...c7 22 b7 b1+ 33 g2 xxb2+ 34 h3 we2 35 d8+ ½-½

Points to Remember

1) White’s main pawn breaks in the early middlegame are b2-b3 and e2-e4.

2) Another plan for White involves an early c5-e5. This is sometimes followed up by the supporting advance f2-f4.

3) Black can fight for the c4-square in many ways, including the manoeuvres...f6-e8-d6, ...f6-d7-b6 and ...c8-e6 (a6).

4) Using his pawn wedge on c4, Black can sometimes utilise his queenside pawn majority, beginning with the advance ...b7-b5-b4.

5) Tactics often dictate that Black is forced to recapture on f6 (after xf6) with ...gxf6. This gives Black structural weakness, but he is often compensated with dynamic counterplay.
CHAPTER THREE

Tarrasch Defence: Main Line with 9 dxc5

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 c3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 f3 c6 6 g3 f6 7 g2 e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 dxc5

This line was considered harmless for decades until Jan Timman came up with a new idea, which we shall look at below. Actually, after the logical 9...xc5 a bulletin gave the most natural move in the position, 10 g5, a question mark in 1970. Back then the move 10 a4 was considered the right approach for White.

Well, in 1977 things changed when Timman had some success with a new idea. The following game is an illustration of the difficulties that Black was now facing.

**Game 15**

Timman-lvkov

Geneva 1977

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 c3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 f3 c6 6 g3 f6 7 g2 e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 dxc5 xc5 10 g5 d4 11 xf6 xf6 12 d5 wd8 13 d2!

This is the key to playing for an advantage in this line. White is trying to play on the light squares and is thus sending the f3-knight to the queenside, where it can do some good. As it was, it was only blocking the control over the long h1-a8 diagonal.

13...e8 14 c1 d6?!

The key to understanding this variation is, as we shall see, to treat the dark-squared bishop in a proper way. In this game Black does not have any idea whatsoever about what to do.

14...b6 is the right move.

15 b3 e5

Can you explain to us what the bishop is doing here? Oh, threatening d4-d3 with an exchange of pawns. Well, I am sorry sir, that is just not enough.

16 c5 b8 17 a4 d6 18 e1

White has a clear advantage due to his lead in development.

18...xc5 19 xd5 wd6 20 b4 d7 21 f4 a6 22 d5 e7 23 a3 ed8 24 c2
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\[ \text{\textit{A}e8 25 \text{\textit{W}}d2 \text{\textit{x}}d5 26 \text{\textit{Q}}xd5 \text{\textit{W}}e5} \]

Now Black can decide between opening up the position, after which White can start exploiting his lead in development, or letting White have a strong pawn majority in the centre and on the kingside with f2-f4 and e4-e5.

27 e4!

Now Black can decide between opening up the position, after which White can start exploiting his lead in development, or letting White have a strong pawn majority in the centre and on the kingside with f2-f4 and e4-e5.

27...dxe3 28 Exe3 Wd4 29 We1 \textit{a}d7 30 \textit{Q}f4 \textit{W}f6 31 \textit{W}d2 \textit{Q}e6 32 \textit{We1}

32...\textit{Q}f8??

A most mysterious breakdown. After 32...\textit{Q}d7 White still has some pressure but Black is by no means in a catastrophic situation.

33 \textit{Q}xe6+ \textit{Q}g8

Or 33...\textit{Q}xe6 34 \textit{Q}f3.

34 \textit{Q}c5 \textit{Q}f8 35 \textit{Q}e8+ 1-0

When White is going for this line, he is, as said above, playing for light-squared control.

Lerner-Vera
Bratislava 1983

20...\textit{Q}e5?

A dubious decision and we are sure Black was not too pleased with this after the game. By exchanging the knights Black accepts an almost prototypical endgame where the bishop will forever be limited by the d4-pawn, and where the white knight will be extremely powerful on d3. Still, the issue is not so clear cut. Black can sometimes exert strong pressure on e2 and be able to limit the possibilities of the white knight, but Black is in for a rough fight. Had Black played the more standard 20...\textit{Q}b8 21 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}d6 he would not have been much worse, if worse at all. The white knights look very nice but they cannot really do any harm to the black position. And with still some pieces left on the board, Black will have a fair chance to create some active possibilities.

21 \textit{Q}xe5 \textit{Q}xe5 22 \textit{Q}fc1 \textit{Q}b6 23 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{W}g4 24 h3 \textit{W}d7 25 \textit{W}f3 g6 26 \textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}e7 27 \textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}g7 28 \textit{Q}f1c2 \textit{W}f5 29 \textit{Q}d3

The position is more or less ideal for White. All his pieces are well placed and Black has not been able to create any counterplay against c2. Still, the position is difficult to win but it is one of these positions where doing nothing will often make the opponent crack at some stage, or make a
minor slip inviting destruction into his house.

29...\text{\texttt{M67}} 30 \text{\texttt{Hb4}} \text{\texttt{Wd6}} 31 \text{\texttt{Df4}} \text{\texttt{Mdd7}} 32 \text{\texttt{Bbc4}} \text{\texttt{Me5}} 33 \text{\texttt{Cc8}} \text{\texttt{Ld8}} 34 \text{\texttt{Wb3}} \text{\texttt{h5}}

We are not all too convinced by the strategy chosen by Vera in this game. As it is hard to see how White should break down the black defences, we think Black should have remained passive and prevented the white ideas even before he thought of them. Still, this can be emotionally difficult and only a technical addict like Ulf Andersson can be able to find pleasure in Black’s position.

35 \text{\texttt{Dd3}} \text{\texttt{Mb5}} 36 \text{\texttt{Wc4}} \text{\texttt{h4}} 37 \text{\texttt{g4}} \text{\texttt{b6}} 38 \text{\texttt{a4}} \text{\texttt{Md5}} 39 \text{\texttt{Wb4}}

39...\text{\texttt{Wxb4}}

Black is forced to exchange queens. At the same time, all his threats to the white king fall away and White can concentrate on his positional advantage. 39...\text{\texttt{Wf6}} 40 \text{\texttt{Wf8+}} is not permissible.

40 \text{\texttt{xb4}} \text{\texttt{M5d6}} 41 \text{\texttt{Me8}} \text{\texttt{Md8}} 42 \text{\texttt{Me5}} \text{\texttt{M8d7}} 43 \text{\texttt{Dd3}} \text{\texttt{Md5}} 44 \text{\texttt{Me8}} \text{\texttt{Md8}} 45 \text{\texttt{Me4}}

The exchange of rooks would only limit the white possibilities as White has two active rooks and Black has two passive ones.

45...\text{\texttt{Wf8}} 46 \text{\texttt{f4}} \text{\texttt{M5d6}} 47 \text{\texttt{g5}} \text{\texttt{Cc6l?}}

An understandable decision but nonetheless one that can be criticised. After the exchange of rooks Black will have permanent isolated and backward weaknesses on the queenside, which can later be impossible to defend, as is the case in the game. Again a patient defence was necessary.

48 \text{\texttt{Mxc6}} \text{\texttt{bxc6}} 49 \text{\texttt{Me5}} \text{\texttt{c5l?!}}

Black is pleading for mercy and is trying to sacrifice a pawn.

50 \text{\texttt{b3l!}}

But White knows that weaknesses do not go away. His plan is to win the pawns without paying the price of allowing Black’s pieces to become active.

After 50 \text{\texttt{Dxc5}} \text{\texttt{Mxc5}} 51 \text{\texttt{Mxc5}} \text{\texttt{d3}} 52 \text{\texttt{exd3}} \text{\texttt{Mxd3}} 53 \text{\texttt{Ma5}} \text{\texttt{Mg3+}} 54 \text{\texttt{Wh2}} \text{\texttt{Mb3}} 55 \text{\texttt{Mxa6}} \text{\texttt{Mxb2+}} Black has drawing chances.

50...\text{\texttt{Lal7}} 51 \text{\texttt{f5}} \text{\texttt{gxf5}} 52 \text{\texttt{Mxf5}} \text{\texttt{Wg8}} 53 \text{\texttt{Mf6}} \text{\texttt{Md7}}

53...\text{\texttt{Me8}} 54 \text{\texttt{Oe2}} \text{\texttt{Me6}} 55 \text{\texttt{Mxc6}} \text{\texttt{fxe6}} 56 \text{\texttt{Wf3}} \text{\texttt{Mg7}} 57 \text{\texttt{Me6}} \text{\texttt{Me7}} 58 \text{\texttt{Mxc5}} \text{\texttt{Me3l}}

Black now has achieved some activity, but the price has been too high.

59 \text{\texttt{Wg4}} \text{\texttt{Me4+}} 60 \text{\texttt{Wh5}} \text{\texttt{Ma4}} 61 \text{\texttt{Dd3}} \text{\texttt{Mg3}}

62 \text{\texttt{Mc2}} \text{\texttt{f5}} 63 \text{\texttt{gx6+}} 64 \text{\texttt{xf6}} \text{\texttt{Me6}} 65 \text{\texttt{Wf5}} \text{\texttt{Wf5}} 66 \text{\texttt{Dd6}} 67 \text{\texttt{Lc1}} \text{\texttt{Ma4}} 68 \text{\texttt{Wf3}} 69 \text{\texttt{Mxc1}} \text{\texttt{f5}} 70 \text{\texttt{Wh4}} \text{\texttt{f4}} 71 \text{\texttt{Mf1+}} \text{\texttt{Me3}} 72 \text{\texttt{Ma1}} \text{\texttt{Ma8}} 73 \text{\texttt{Mb2}} \text{\texttt{1-0}}

All in all, Black should always keep in mind that his knight on c6 is holding his position together. To exchange it in the way Black did in the game above is pure madness. But Black should also be aware that White himself can stage this exchange with \text{\texttt{Dd2-b3}} followed by \text{\texttt{Wd1-d2}}, with the idea of \text{\texttt{Mb3-a5l}} undermining the black control over the
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centre. For this reason Black often keeps the queen on d8 as long as possible. If b7 is attacked, it is often more logical to play ...a8-b8, as the rook is just as well placed on b8 as it is on a8.

Handling the c8-bishop

Another piece that has a very prototypical way to be handled is Black’s c8-bishop. Here is our suggestion.

Rytkonen-Velitshko
Helsinki 1990

16...g4!

This is played to irritate White. He now has to choose between playing something passive like 17 e1 in order to keep e2 over-protected, or play the natural...

17 h3 f5

Now the bishop is much better placed here than just the move before. When the bishops are exchanged, the weakening of the kingside with h2-h3 will tell.

18 wb3 wd7

This is, of course, perfectly possible but usually we would prefer the rather prosaic 18...b8! as we believe the queen is just as well placed at d8 for the moment. And after ...b8 it retains its freedom as it does not have to keep a constant eye on b7.

19 db6?!

This is, of course, not directly bad, but it is also not very ambitious. Now Black does not have to worry about ending up with a bad bishop anymore.

19...xb6 20 xb6 e4!

This is the standard move. Now the bishops will be exchanged, which is good for Black on several levels. First of all, the pressure in the g2-c6 diagonal is gone. Secondly, the white king’s position is now slightly unsafe.

21 xe4 xe4

The position here is at least completely equal. Black has good mobility on the e-file and no problems protecting his queenside. After ...a8-e8 he can start to speculate about aggressive ideas like ...g7-g5 and ...e4xf4, exposing the white king. By good play White will be capable of maintaining the balance, but it is now he who has to be careful.

22 e3?

Now this is very careless, not careful. Actually Black just wins on the spot. The right move was something like 22 fd1 and it is still a fight.

22...dxe3 23 fxe3 b4

Had White overlooked this? Perhaps. But what had he wanted to play on the natural 23...a8-e8, which also leaves Black in a strong position?

24 xc6?!
Desperation, but who cares.

Desperation, but who cares.

24...\( \text{exb6} \) 25 \( \text{axb6} \) \( \text{gxe8} \) 26 \( \text{gxf2} \) g5 27 \( \text{gxe2} \) \( \text{whx3} \) 28 \( \text{exb7} \) \( \text{we6} \) 29 \( \text{zd3} \) \( \text{we4} \) 30 \( \text{zh2} \) \( \text{we6} \) 31 \( \text{zd4} \) \( \text{zh6}+ \) 32 \( \text{zh1} \) \( \text{mate} \)

After the exchanges of the bishop for knight and the remaining two bishops, we ended up with a very standard position in this line of the Tarrasch. A position that basically is completely equal, but can be played for a win by both players. Unfortunately, it is often the one who plays for a win that loses! In the 32 games of somewhat high level we have investigated, White has a score of 58%. This might seem inferior to Black but when one investigates the ways Black has lost these games, one has to attribute it completely to chance. The following game is one of these examples. Van Wely is doing the right thing, not trying to win, but just maintaining some kind of pressure. Lobron is trying to eliminate this pressure, but fails.

Van Wely-Lobron
London (rapid)1995

This is a slightly inferior version of this standard position for Black. The white queen and rook are very active and Black obviously has some problems with b7. The main problem is that \( \text{zdc1} \) is coming, threatening to win a piece with \( \text{zxc6} \). Also, Black cannot free himself with \( \text{we7} \), as \( \text{zxc6} \) would exploit the weakness of the back rank once again. As this is a rapid game it is really uncomfortable to be Black. The white moves are not difficult as all moves that improve the position are swell, while Black will have to eliminate the white pressure before it becomes too strong.

26...\( \text{a6} \) 27 \( \text{wb6} \) \( \text{wd8} \)

A fine move. Equally good was trying to ease the pressure by exchanges with 27...\( \text{we5} \)?!. Probably White should play 28 \( \text{zdc1} \), but then the exchange is in Black’s favour. If White tries 28 \( \text{zd2} \), then Black has 28...\( \text{zb5} \) 29 \( \text{zc7} \) \( \text{wd8} \) 30 \( \text{xd8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) with an endgame very close to full equality. Remember that the knight on c6 is very well placed and rock-solid at the same time. Still, it is White who has the main winning chances here, but they should remain purely academic.

28 \( \text{wb3}! \)

White is not accepting any exchanges that would ease the pressure. Black still needs to find a solid way of co-ordinating. 28 \( \text{xd8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) 29 \( \text{zf1} \) is close to nothing once again. It is hard to really find the pawn on d4 weak as it is very hard to form a real attack on it.

28...\( \text{we8} \)

Protecting both c6 and b8 and, at the same time, putting pressure on the e-file. Still, it is a rather awkward square for the queen so we must presume that White remains slightly better.

29 \( \text{zdc1}! \)

This is where the rook belongs.

29...\( \text{h6}! \)

Before trying to free his position, Black ensures that he will not be back rank mated. We normally compare these kind of moves to the actions of a world class soccer goalkeeper who is not too proud to kick the ball over the sidelines and in to touch if he feels pressured.

30 \( \text{a3} \)

White is also making small improvements, and now what should Black do?
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30...d8??

Anything but this, one feels like crying out. In our opinion, the best would be 30...e5! to ease the pressure. White cannot avoid the exchange as 31 e5 would be met with the sneaky 31...d3! 32 d3 d8 33 c3 d4 34 d2 c2+ 35 c2 c2 36 e2 d4 34 c2 e2 with complete equality.

31 b7

Now it is just over. The Black knight has no reasonable place to go.

31...b8 32 c8 h7 33 c8 c8 34 c8 1-0

Ideas involving ...h3

One idea is common and logical but should only be used with care. This is undermining the knight on d5 with the tactical twist ...c8-h3. Mostly it is not advisable at all, but there is an exception. But before we investigate this special case, let us take a look at when not to execute the idea, which is basically most of the time. The following game illustrates well the lasting positional advantages White can gain:

Game 16

Ivanchuk-Marjanovic

Yerevan 1989

1 d4 d5 2 c3 c5 3 c4 e6 4 cxd5 exd5 5 g3 f6 6 g2 e7 7 0-0 0-0 8 c3 c6 9 dxc5 c5 10 g5 d4 11 xf6

This creates a position where White has a lasting positional advantage. The pawn on d4 is heavily limiting the possibilities for the Black bishop, while every diagonal is open for the white bishop.

14 xh3 xd5 15 b3!

Immediately fighting for full control over the light squares.

15...h5!

Black can now choose between a terrible endgame or losing a pawn. Out of respect for his opponent, Marjanovic chose the latter. Probably it was also very difficult to eye any chances for equality after 15...xh3 16 xh3 b6 17 d1!, followed by g1-f1, and White has everything under control.

16 xh7 e5

All exchanges, of course, favour White as the chances for compensation would then
diminish.
17 We4!
Centralising. 17 g2? ab8! would give Black the better game as all his pieces are playing.
17...aae8 18 g2

18...Cc4?
This just loses the d4-pawn by force. Black could have escaped into an only slightly worse endgame if he had held his patience and played 18...b6! 19 f3 d4 20 f3 xf3+ 21 xf3 xb2 22 db1 a4 23 d7 c3 24 xe8 xb1 25 xb1 xe8. The knight is still superior to the bishop as well as the d-pawn is slightly weak. All in all, White will have good chances to win the game if he manages to bring his knight to a good square. Not necessarily d3, but this would be ideal.
19 f3 xf3+ 20 xf3 xb2
Black cannot go for the complications with 20...xe2 21 fc1 e3+ 22 g1 c2 23 f1 e8 24 xe2 xe2 as after the blow 25 b4!!, all chances of counterplay against f2 are basically gone as 25...b6 loses to 26 e1!.
21 ac1 ae7
Black needs to keep the c-file open. After 21...b6 22 ac2 a4 23 d7 White wins an exchange.
22 ab2 ab8 23 xd4
White is winning and the interest in this game is gone.

23 af6 24 c6 hb7 25 f4 e8 26 f3 g6 27 e4 g7 28 e5 a4 29 fc1 b6 30 a5 be7 31 f1 f6 32 b5 a8 33 dc6 e6 34 d4 e7 35 dc6 e6 36 a4 a5
36...a6 37 a5! is a nice little touch.
37 b1 b8 38 d3 a4 39 f5 gxf5 40 xf5 ae8 41 c4 1-0

But as we said, there is one exception. Basically it is when White has played d2-e4 and Black has a rook on e8. This is because White cannot return to the diagonal or immediately fight for the light squares as the knight on e4 will be hanging. The following example actually says it all.

Jonasson-Chandler
Reykjavik 1984

Here the English hero and defender of the Tarrasch defence declined from playing:
16...h3!?
Chandler played 16...e5. This move was actually also quite strong, which is the reason why ...h3 is not given an exclamation mark. The game ended a draw.
17 xh3!
17 df6+?! gxh6 18 wh6 xg2 19 xf6+ xf6 20 xf6 e6! and White has to choose between having a queen against two minor pieces and a rook, or going for the endgame after 21 xe6 fxe6 22 xg2, which can never bring him full satisfaction, even though
there are clearly drawing chances.

17...\textit{W}xd5 18 \textit{Q}g5 h6 19 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}ad8!

Remember to always play with all your pieces. Black is now threatening ...d4-d3!. What should White do?

20 b3!

The only move. White cannot allow ...\textit{W}xa2. It would just be a pawn for nothing.

20...d3 21 \textit{W}xd3 \textit{W}h5 22 \textit{W}f5 \textit{W}xf5 23 \textit{Q}xf5 \textit{Q}xe2 24 \textit{Q}c2 \textit{Q}de8 25 a4 g6 26 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}xc2 27 \textit{Q}xc2 \textit{Q}e2

and Black has good play in the endgame due to the weakness of f2, even though nothing is decided yet. All of this, however, would have required Chandler’s lower rated opponent to find all the best moves. And in order to avoid being in a tight situation here, he would have had to do so without using too much time. All in all, a difficult task.

A more clear-cut example of this tactical twist is to be found in the theoretical section. There are also some examples of White playing h2-h3, allowing Black to win a pawn on the spot with ...\textit{C}c8xh3. For some reason the black players always mess up their advantage after this, even though there is only very little compensation for such a valuable pawn.

There is another trick that is often included in the thought processes at the board, and in a few cases it actually occurs. It is very straightforward actually, but the tricky thing about it is that black players sometimes believe they can obtain compensation for the pawn deficit. The following example shows how over-optimistic we consider this.

\begin{game}
\begin{lt}
  \textit{D}4 \textit{D}5 2 \textit{C}4 \textit{E}6 3 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{C}5 4 \textit{C}xd5 \textit{C}xd5 5 \\
  \textit{G}3 \textit{D}6 6 \textit{Q}g2 \textit{G}f6 7 0-0 \textit{E}7 8 \textit{C}c3 9 \textit{C}xc5 \textit{C}xc5 10 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{D}4 11 \textit{Q}xf6 \\
  \textit{W}xf6 12 \textit{Q}d5 \textit{W}d8 13 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{A}6 14 \textit{C}c1 \\
  \textit{A}a7 15 \textit{M}f4
\end{lt}
\end{game}

This is a main theoretical position where we believe 15...\textit{Q}g4! to be the right move. Here Black plays the inaccurate

15...\textit{Q}e8?!

16 \textit{C}xc6!

This might look dangerous at first glance as Black gets two bishops and the weakness on the light squares on the kingside as compensation. But actually there is very little to celebrate. Too many pieces have been exchanged to create any serious threats and White does not have a lot of difficulties covering the holes in his position.

16...\textit{B}xc6 17 \textit{C}xc6 \textit{D}d7

17...\textit{Q}g4 is the alternative but then White plays 18 \textit{Q}xe8 instead, and Black remains some moves away from full co-ordination.

18 \textit{Q}xa8 \textit{W}xa8 19 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{C}c6?

Now this is just too optimistic. An interesting position would have occurred after
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19...±b5! 20 e1 e4 21 d3

where Black has some play for his pawn, but probably not enough. The main problem is that the bishop on a7 has no way to join what is supposed to be an attack. The precise verdict over this position is 'slightly better for White'.

20 ¤xd4

Now White is just cruising.

20...±d8 21 e3 ±xd4 22 exd4 ±f3 23 ±d3 g5 24 d5!

A very important intermediate move.

24...±g4 25 ±g2 ±xd5 26 ±e4 ±e6 27 h4 ±d8 28 h×g5 ±d4 29 ±e5 ±d5 30 ±e3 ±xg5 31 b3 ±a5 32 ±f4 ±g4 33 a4

Black has nothing to show for the missing pawn.

33...±d6 34 ±e1 ±c5 35 ±d3 ±c8 36 ±e5 ±h5 37 ±c4 ±f6 38 ±b6 ±d8 39 ±d7 ±g6 40 ±d4 ±c8 41 ±f6+ ±f8 42 ±xh5 1-0

Now that we are moving more and more away from the absolutely prototypical positions, there is one last twist we want to consider before we turn to the theory of the variation.

16...±xa2 17 b3 ±a5 18 ±d5?

Not the best. 18 ±c2! is considered in the following game.

18...±d3!?

Perhaps this is not the strongest as it gives White the chance to exchange a lot of pieces. We suggest something like 18...±c3!, with a total domination of the white position, as more or less winning for Black.

19 e3?

This only gives White a whole lot of problems. The right line was 19 exd3 ±xe1+ 20 ±xe1 ±xd4 21 ±c4 ±xd2 22 ±xd2 ±xd5 23...
Wxa2 and White is somewhat worse, but he still has a lot to be happy about in his position, so there is no reason for tears just yet. 19...£e5 20 £f1

This move does very little good for the white position, besides preventing the ...£xd2 followed by ...Wxd5 trick. But even after 20 £e4 Black wins with 20...£xb3! 21 £xb3 d2, winning the exchange and everything.

20...Ec8

Not a bad move but 20...£b4, with the idea ...Wxa5, was an even simpler way to exploit the weaknesses on the a5-e1 diagonal and win the game.

21 £a1 £c2 22 £xa2 £xa2 23 b4 £xb4 24 £xa2 £a5

25 £xd3?

The final mistake. 25 £b3 £xd2 26 £d1 £d8 27 £b1 was the only way for White to defend. After regaining the d-pawn there are a few drawing chances, even though they do not spring to the eye.

25...£xd3 26 £b3

26 £xf7+ £xf7 27 £b3+ £f8 28 £xd3 £d8 also does not help White.

26...£f5 27 £e2 £c1

A fork like this is always a pleasure.

28 £c4

28 £xb4 £h3+ 29 £e1 £d3+ is equally devastating.

28...£c8 29 g4 £xc4 0-1

So Black’s risky adventure was blessed with a full point, but probably it was not a good strategy at all, as Karpov illustrated in the following game:

**Game 19**

**Karpov-Chandler**

**London 1984**

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 £f3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 £g3 £f6 6 £g2 £e7 7 0-0 0-0 8 £c3 £e6 9 dxc5 £xc5 10 £g5 £d4 11 £xf6 £xf6 12 £d5 £d8 13 £d2 £e8 14 £c1 £b6 15 £e1 £e6 16 £f4 £xa2 17 £b3 £a5 18 £c2!

This is clearly stronger than 18 £d5. Black now decides that the bishop will never get home safe and thus decides to get the best possible price for it.

18...£xb3 19 £xb3 d3

19...£e7

The point. White cannot take the pawn, as after 20 £xd3 £xe1 21 £xe1 £xd3 Black is winning. Therefore he must play

20 £xc6! £xe1

20...bxc6 21 £xa5 £xa5 22 £xd3 gives White a comfortable positional plus as the strong control over the light squares prevents Black from supporting his a-pawn in the best possible way.

21 £c1!

With the simple idea of £xd3 with an advantage, so Black is forced to trap his own bishop on the eighth rank.
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21...d2 22 h1 a5 23 d3 g5 24 bc5

White is now perfectly co-ordinated. Black has no realistic chances to create any threats against the white king or to push his a-pawn. All in all, he is lost.

24...ad8 25 f6+ f8 26 wxh4 wd8 37 eb7! 1-0

There is no way the black king is going to escape this time.

Theory of 9 dxc5

In Games 20-23 we deal with the current state of the theory of 9 dxc5.

Game 20
Sanchez Guirado-Rodriguez Vargas
Barcelona 1989

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 c3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 f3 c6 6 g3 f6 7 g2 e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 dxc5 xc5 10 g5

Many alternatives have been tried here. Some are more critical than others:

a) 10 wb3 a6 11 g5 d4 12 dxe4 dxe7 13 xf6+ xf6 14 xf6 xd1 xd8 16 d2 b8! (Black is just protecting the b-pawn in order to develop his bishop. His rook is no worse on b8 compared to a8.) 17 ad1 g4 was good enough for equality in Herstein-Bengtsson, Buenos Aires 1978.

b) After 10 f4 e6 11 c1 b6 12 g5 it looks like White might get a small advantage with the two bishops, but Black has 12...g4! 13 xd5 xd4 14 c3 e8 with great counterplay. Now White played 15 f3?! xe2+! 16 xe2 xe2 17 xdx8 xd8 18 xe2 xe2 and ended up being slightly worse in Djuric-Nogueiras, Sombor 1980.

c) 10 b3 g4 11 b2 is a well known main line, considered in the Chapter 4.

d) 10 d4!? is probably the most dangerous idea here. 10...e7 and now:

d1) 11 b3! actually appears to make a lot of sense. After 11...e8 12 b4 g4 13 c1 c8 Black should nevertheless be fine, Gelfand-Illiescas Cordoba, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

d2) 11 d4 d4 12 xc6 bx6 13 h3 f5 14 c3 d7 15 h2 f6 looks like a good version for Black of the main line, Stanec-Weinzeitl, Moesern 1997.

d3) 11 e3 g4 with a further split:

d31) 12 xd4! e8 13 xc6 bx6 14 e1! b4 15 d2 d6 16 c1 c8 17 a3 d4 was already slightly better for Black in Tsamrnik-Vaganian, USSR 1967.

d32) After 12 h3 f5 13 d4 (Partos-Hennings, Sofia 1967), 13...e4 with equality would have been the best choice.

d33) 12 c5 e8 13 c1 d4 14 c7 we7 15 h3 (15 xd5? runs into 15...ad8! 16 b5 xf5 17 xf5 d2 18 e1 d4 and Black has several ways to prove an advantage) 15...xf3 16 xf3 ad8 with equality in Anikaev-Lein, Grozny 1968.

d34) 12 c1

12...e8 13 c5 (13 a3 d7 14 c5 ac8 15 e1 d4 16 d4 xd4 17 xd4 were apparently the moves to Panno-Araya, Buenos Aires 1987, but it feels hard to believe when Black now played 17...g5??, instead of 17...xe1! winning a piece. That is
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the problem you sometimes face going through databases. Some of the games cannot be what happened in real life...)

13...c5 14 c5 d7 15 d1 c8 16 d4 e4 and Black had equalised in Pugsov-Lputian, Sochi 1985.

10...d4

10...c6?! 11 xf6 x f6 12 d5 x f2 13 c7 d8 14 w c1 15 d1 c6 16 dxe6 fxe6 17 c4 is known to give Black an uncomfortable endgame with no real winning chances.

10...x f6 w x f6 12 d4 13 e7 w d8 14 c1 w x c1 15 b6 w d7 16 c2 is 14thc is known to give Black an uncomfortable endgame with no real winning chances.

11...d4 12 e4

The main line move 12 d5! is investigated in the next game.

12...w e7 13 d5 w c5 14 c1

This is one of the two serious moves in the position; the other one is 14 w d2. Other moves involve somewhat slow regroupings, which give Black time to develop some active ideas:

a) 14 d1 e8 15 d3 w d6 16 w d2 f5 17 w c1 e4 18 c2 x g2 19 x g2 w e7 20 w e1 w e8 gave Black a good position in Foerster-Bartelborth, Germany 1984.

b) 14 d2 g4 15 b3 b5 16 e1 d8 17 h3 e6 18 e1 d3 gave Black a better position in the game Seegers-Terhorst, Germany 1990.

c) 14 w d2 g4 (14...e6 is less convincing now, as the a-pawn is not hanging) and now:

   a) 15 ac1 b6 16 g5 d8! (the most natural developing move, supporting the d-pawn without abandoning the kingside) 17 w f4 (17 d4 is met by 17...d3 or 17...e8, both with fine positions for Black, while 17 c3 g6 18 w x e4 f5 19 w d2 x e4 20 x e4 d5 is about equal) 17...h5 18 wh4 g6 19 e4 e5! (Ivkov-Keres, Belgrade 1970). Black is already better according to Keres.

   b) 15 a3 d8 16 b4 w h5 17 w d3 f8 18 d1 h6 gave Black a pleasant position in the game Perez-Rich, California 1993.

   c) 15 w f4, as in Szirmaj-Por, Budapest 2000, is best answered with 15...w f5! with the idea of 16 w x f5 d5 f5 17 f1 d8 18 d2 e8 19 d1 f6 20 w f1 e4! and Black has achieved complete equality.

c4) 15 h3! (this is the only real try White has for an advantage) 15...h5?! (This is somewhat inferior. Better was 15...f3 w x f6 16 d1 e8 18 w x e8 and we do not think White can claim an advantage.) 16 d1 w b6 17 d4 w e8 18 f1 d8 (Kron-Bezgodov, Pavlodar 1991). White has a small advantage. He will soon play g3-g4 and weaken Black's kingside by giving him doubled pawns on the g-file. This can prove significant later.

14...w b6

15 w c2

The alternatives are:

   a) 15 w d2. This is not as good now as on move fourteen. The main difference is the weakening of the a-pawn. Now Black has time to play 15...e6! and then:

   a1) 16 g5 d5 17 d1 d8 18 g4 g6 19 d2 d3 20 exd3 b4 and the position was equal in Elsner-Rudolph, Germany 1992.

   a2) 16 a3 d8 (16...d8! is more normal; now White can attack f7) 17 g5 d5 18 w d4 g6 19 b4? (19 e4! w b3 with a slight plus for White) was Simon-Chartier, Paris 1993. Now Black could have kept the balance with 19...h6.

   a3) 16 b3 d8 17 d1 e8 18 f4 h6 19 h4 d5 20 e2 e4 with an active posi-
tation for Black in the game Rippinger-Liemann, Stetten 1988.

b) 15 \(\texttt{Wd3}\) (Roos-Clarke, Bordeaux 1964) should have been answered with 15...h6.

15...h6

15...\(\texttt{Le6}\) is no longer so interesting because of 16 \(\texttt{Ag5}\) with a clear advantage.

16 \(\texttt{Kfd1} \texttt{Le6} 17 \texttt{Wa4} \texttt{Lad8} 18 \texttt{Ld2} \texttt{Ob4}\)

18...\(\texttt{Ld7}\)? would be the calmer choice. We believe that Black would still be completely okay.

19 \(\texttt{Lcd1} \texttt{d3!}\)

Black has already committed himself to this line of action. Luckily for him, he has many resources.

20 \(\texttt{exd3} \texttt{Oxa2} 21 \texttt{Aa1}\)

This must have been the position both players were aiming for. If Black now moves his knight, he will lose the a-pawn for no compensation whatsoever. But Black had probably seen this and had his reply ready.

21...\(\texttt{Lc8}!!\)

Now White can let Black escape from his escapades, or test him. He chose the latter. We believe that a move like 22 \(\texttt{Af1}!!\) would probably have given White a better chance to fight for an advantage, even though Black seems to be okay.

22 \(\texttt{Lxa2}?! \texttt{Lc1+} 23 \texttt{Af1} \texttt{Wc6}!!\)

White must have overlooked this move. The queen is threatening the knight on f3 and Black also threatens ...\(\texttt{Lh3}\). White is probably forced to exchange queens now:

24 \(\texttt{Lg2}?\)

24 \(\texttt{Lxc6}\) was forced.

24...\(\texttt{Lxf1}??\)

24...\(\texttt{Lxa2}!\) 25 \(\texttt{Lxa2} \texttt{Lxf1}\) secures Black an advantage.

25 \(\texttt{Lxc6} \texttt{bxc6} 26 \texttt{Lxa7} \texttt{Lb1} 27 \texttt{Le5} \texttt{Ld5+} 28 \texttt{f3} \texttt{Lb8} 29 \texttt{Lc4} \texttt{Lxc4} 30 \texttt{dx4} \texttt{Lxb2} 31 \texttt{Lxa8+} \texttt{Lh7} 32 \texttt{Lad8} \texttt{Lxd2+} 33 \texttt{Lxd2} \texttt{Lc1} 34 \texttt{Ld4} \texttt{Lc2+} 35 \texttt{Lh3} \texttt{g5} 36 \texttt{g4} \texttt{c5} 37 \texttt{Le4} \texttt{Lg6} 38 \texttt{Lg3} \texttt{h5} 39 \texttt{h4} \texttt{gxh4+} 40 \texttt{Lxh4} \texttt{hgx4} 41 \texttt{Lxg4+} 42 \texttt{Lg3} \texttt{f6} 1/2-1/2.

Game 21
Kasimdzhanov-Mallahi
Teheran 1998

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \(\texttt{Lc3}\) c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \(\texttt{Le3}\) \(\texttt{Lc6}\) 6 g3 \(\texttt{d6}\) 7 \(\texttt{Lg2}\) \(\texttt{Le7}\) 8 0-0 0-0 9 dxc5 \(\texttt{Lxc5}\) 10 \(\texttt{Lg5}\) d4 11 \(\texttt{Lxf6}\) \(\texttt{Wxf6}\) 12 \(\texttt{Ld5}\) \(\texttt{Md8}\) 13 \(\texttt{Ld2}!!\)

This is the only move that truly harmonises with 12 \(\texttt{Lbd5}\). The key idea is to bring the knight to b3 or c4 and, in some cases, even e4. Other moves make less sense in this position:

a) 13 \(\texttt{Le1}\) (now both the knights would like to come to d3) 13...\(\texttt{Lxe8}\) (13...a6? 14 \(\texttt{Ld3}\) \(\texttt{Lb7}\) looks very logical to us) 14 \(\texttt{Ld3}\) \(\texttt{Lf8}\) 15 a3 \(\texttt{Lh3}\) 16 \(\texttt{Lxh3}\) \(\texttt{Wxd5}\) 17 \(\texttt{Lg2}\) \(\texttt{Lb5}\) 18 b4 a5 19 a4 \(\texttt{Lb6}\) 20 b5 \(\texttt{Lb4}\) has been known as equal for a long time, Remon-Hernandez, Havana 1983.
b) 13 \( \texttt{d4} \) (this move is slightly inaccurate as White would like to keep the knight in its central position as long as possible) 13...\( \texttt{\texttt{b6}} \)!

(This is now natural as White no longer can exchange this bishop. 13...\( \texttt{e6} \)? 14 \( \texttt{\texttt{c1}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{a7}} \) does not seem to be worse for Black either, even though it makes less sense now. The only differences are that the bishop comes back into the game from \( \texttt{b8} \) instead on \( \texttt{c7} \), and that White now cannot attack \( \texttt{b7} \) as easily.)

14 \( \texttt{\texttt{c1}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{g4}} \) 15 \( \texttt{\texttt{d2}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{e8}} \) 16 \( \texttt{\texttt{d3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{e8}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{x}} \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\texttt{x}} \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{d5}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\texttt{a3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{c7}} \) 20

\( \texttt{\texttt{c2}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{c8}} \) and Black is probably already slightly better, as in Donchev-Lukov, Pernik 1983.

13...\( \texttt{a6} \)!

This is what we would like to play ourselves, but as we cannot back it up with a lot of grandmaster games, we have decided to include the more standard 13...\( \texttt{\texttt{c8}} \) in this chapter as well. The main idea with 13...\( \texttt{e6} \) is to save the bishop from an exchange. Not that this exchange is always in favour of White. It is just a matter of taste.

14 \( \texttt{\texttt{c1}} \)

14 \( \texttt{\texttt{e4}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{a7}} \) 15 \( \texttt{\texttt{d2}} \) is a fresh idea presented recently in a New In Chess magazine.

The idea is to attack the black king, but we managed to find a clear refutation: 15...\( \texttt{f5} \) 16 \( \texttt{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \texttt{f4} \) 17 \( \texttt{\texttt{xf4}} \) (17 \( \texttt{\texttt{d4}} \) \( \texttt{f3} \) 18 \( \texttt{\texttt{x}} \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{xf3}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\texttt{xf3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{xd5}} \) clearly favours Black) 17...\( \texttt{h6} \) 18 \( \texttt{\texttt{e4}} \) a5!! (removing the knights only escape route) 19 \( \texttt{\texttt{g3}} \) (19 \( \texttt{f5} \)?) trying to get the knight home, loses violently to 19...\( \texttt{\texttt{xf5}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\texttt{d4}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{h4}} \) 21 \( \texttt{x} \texttt{\texttt{d3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{b8}} \) 22 \( \texttt{\texttt{g3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{h5}} \) 23 \( \texttt{h3} \) \( \texttt{x} \texttt{\texttt{h3}} \)!! 24 \( \texttt{\texttt{xf5}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{g2}} \) 25 \( \texttt{\texttt{g2}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{h2}} \) 26 \( \texttt{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{xd5}} \) and the white king is in deep trouble) 19...\( \texttt{\texttt{e6}} \) 20 \( \texttt{e4} \) \( \texttt{dxe3} \) 21 \( \texttt{\texttt{fxe3}} \) 22 \( \texttt{\texttt{g4}} \) 23 \( \texttt{\texttt{dxd5}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{d5}} \) 24

\( \texttt{\texttt{xd5}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{xd5}} \) 25 \( \texttt{\texttt{d5}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{x}} \texttt{\texttt{xf5}} \) 26 \( \texttt{\texttt{g2}} \) \( \texttt{\texttt{xf4}} \) and Black has a slightly better endgame. Only slightly because White is quite active and the rook on \( \texttt{a8} \) still needs to join the action. Probably White will be able to draw somehow.

14...\( \texttt{\texttt{a7}} \)
could have exploited the different pins with the spectacular 23 Qe3!!, with a winning advantage.

b) 15 b1 is actually a good move, but Black should be fine after 15...g4! (note that 15...e8 16 d4 g4 is dangerous for Black due to 17 Qxe6! and there is insufficient compensation for the pawn).

c) 15 d4 e8 16 d4 g4 17 h3 f5 18 wb3 d7 (18...b8!? seems even more in tune with the position, even though the move played in the game is not bad) 19 b6 xb6 20 wb6 e4 21 xe4 xe4 (the position is equal) 22 e3?? dxe3 23 fxe3 b4 24 xe6 xb6 25 e6 e8 26 f2 g5 27 d2 xe3 28 xb7 e6 29 b3 e4 30 d2 e6 31 d4 h6+ 32 d1 h1 mate, Rytko-Velitchko, Helsinki 1990.

d) 15 b3 e8 16 d2 d6 was agreed drawn in Graf-Reeh, Bad Lauterberg 1981. But actually we do not like Black's last move. 16...g4 was more in our taste. The problem is that after 17 b1 White is threatening the positional b3-a5 and Black is now forced to do something about that.

15...g4!

This is the natural developing move. Black wants to put pressure on e2 to irritate the white development and force White to play h2-h3.

16 h3 f5 17 b3 b8 18 g4 wg5 19 wg3 e6?

This is an outright mistake. We have spent a lot of time analysing the following line: 19...b7 20 c4 d4 21 d5 d6 22 b4 f6 23 g5 fxg5 24 xg5 wh6! 25 xh6 gxh6 26 e4 h8. Black has good play, with the rooks on open g- and f-files and with the two bishops.

20 c5 xe6 fxe6 21 c4 b5 22 b3 e5 23 h1 f4 24 g3 a5?!

This does not do a lot of good for the black position.

25 d3 h8 26 e4

White has a clear advantage. Look at the a5-knight and the a7-bishop.

26...g6 27 g2 b8 28 f3 c6 29 wb3 f6

Black has finally achieved some counterplay. Now...c5 is threatened.

30 xxc6! bxc6 31 c1

Now the black rooks are useless and White can reap what he has sown.

14...g4

4...a6 15 c1 a7 is quite popular, but we cannot really recommend this line. We believe that...b8-e8 is a less important move than...c8-g4, and for that reason we recommend 13...a6. If you want to keep the bishop, that is the way to do it.

15 b3

Or:

a) 15 c1 b6 16 c4 a5 just transposes.

b) 15 h3? xh3 16 xh3 xd5 17 g2
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18...\texttt{c}c1 was Santos-Frois, Lisbon 1991. Now Black should have prevented \texttt{c}c1xc6 with 18...\texttt{a}c8 and just be a pawn up. Instead he just messed up badly and even lost in the end.

15...\texttt{a}b6 16 \texttt{c}c1

Alternatively:

a) 16 \texttt{d}xb6 axb6 is not dangerous for Black. The doubled pawns cannot be attacked.

b) 16 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{c}e6 17 \texttt{d}xb6 axb6 18 \texttt{x}x6e6 19 \texttt{x}d4 c5 20 \texttt{c}c3 h5 21 a3 \texttt{d}d5 gave Black good compensation for the pawn in Miles-Klinger, Biel 1986. Notice that, besides all the weak light squares, Black is also better co-ordinated. This is very important when one must prove compensation.

16...\texttt{a}5 17 \texttt{d}xa5 \texttt{w}xa5 18 b4

18...\texttt{d}xb4!

Black must have seen his resources in order to play this.

19 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{c}6 20 \texttt{w}xa5 \texttt{d}xa5 21 f3

Or 21 \texttt{c}c7 d3! with equality.

21...d3 22 \texttt{a}a1 \texttt{d}d7 ½-½

The players agreed a draw. Black is not worse, but maybe he is better.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 23}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Smirin-Grischuk}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{FIDE World Ch., New Delhi 2000}
\end{center}

1 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{d}5 2 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{e}6 3 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{c}5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \texttt{f}f3 \texttt{c}c6 6 g3 \texttt{f}f6 7 \texttt{g}g2 \texttt{e}7 8 0-0 0-0 9 dxc5 \texttt{x}xc5 10 \texttt{g}g5 \texttt{d}4 11 \texttt{x}xf6 \texttt{w}xf6 12 \texttt{d}d5 \texttt{w}d8 13 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}e8 14 \texttt{c}c1

The alternatives are:

a) 14 \texttt{d}b3 \texttt{b}6 15 \texttt{d}xb6 (15 \texttt{e}e1 \texttt{g}4! transposes to the previous game) 15...\texttt{w}xb6 (after 15...axb6? Black cannot be worse either) 16 \texttt{c}c1 \texttt{g}4 17 \texttt{x}c6? (17 \texttt{e}e1 \texttt{ad}8. with equality, still keeps some life in the position) 17...\texttt{x}e2 18 \texttt{x}d4 bxc6 19 \texttt{f}f1 \texttt{c}c3 with a dead draw in Li Zunian-Chandler, Chicago 1983, where White just chopped off everything.

b) 14 \texttt{f}f4?! (We do not appreciate this move when White is doing it unprovoked. The knight is still a thorn in Black’s flesh on d5.) 14...\texttt{g}4 15 h3 (15 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{x}f3 16 \texttt{x}f3 \texttt{d}d6 17 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{w}e7 gave Black at least equality in Martinovic-Koenig, Passau 1997) 15...\texttt{e}5 16 \texttt{c}c1 \texttt{d}d6 17 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{c}c8 with a good position for Black in Lerner-Novik, Moscow 1991.

c) 14 h3? \texttt{x}h3, as in Inkiov-Abarca Aguirre, Lucerne 1982, speaks for itself.

14...\texttt{d}b6 15 \texttt{c}c4

Alternatively:

a) 15 \texttt{c}c1 \texttt{g}4! (the most natural place to develop the bishop) 16 h3 (16 \texttt{d}xb6 axb6 17 h3 \texttt{e}6 was equal in Ljubojevic-Illescas Cordoba, Linares 1990) 16...\texttt{f}f5! 17 a3 \texttt{e}8 18 \texttt{c}c4 was Gabriel-Koenig, Bad Wiessee 1997. If Black now plays 18...\texttt{c}7! he is fine. Notice that 19 \texttt{d}xc7?! \texttt{x}xc7, followed by ...\texttt{c}7-e7 (or d7) would only give Black a good position.

b) 15 \texttt{d}b3 \texttt{f}5 16 \texttt{d}xb6 (16 \texttt{c}c5 \texttt{x}c5 17 \texttt{x}xc5 \texttt{w}d6 18 \texttt{b}5 was Frias-Lein, New York 1984. Now Black would be completely level after the natural 18...\texttt{c}4! 19 \texttt{x}xe4 \texttt{x}xe4 20 \texttt{d}f4 \texttt{e}7, ) 16...axb6 17 a3 \texttt{e}4 18 \texttt{x}xe4 \texttt{x}xe4 19 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}6 and the players agreed a draw in Hort-Petursson, Reykjavik 1985.

c) 15 a3? (this move exposes the weakness of e2 in a bad way and we cannot recommend it) 15...\texttt{g}4! 16 \texttt{e}4 (16 \texttt{e}1, as in Rakhmangulov-Nadanian, Kiev 1997, is best
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met with 16...d3! 17 Qxb6 dx2 18 Qb3 axb6 with an advantage for Black) 16...h8! (16...d3?! 17 Wxd3 Qd4 18 Afe1 Qxe2+ 19 Axe2 Axe2 20 Wxe2 Wxd5 21 Qf6+ gxf6 22 Wxe8+ Qxe8 23 Axd5 Ae2 must be drawn, even though both players can still play for a loss!) 17 Qxb6 (17 Qf4 is more in harmony with the position of the knight on e4, but we still like Black's position) 17...axb6. This does not make much sense for White, especially not when the next move was 18 h3? in Cooke-Halkias, Pardubice 2000.

d) 15 Qe4?! was played in Paehitz-Lobron, Bad Zwesten 2000. We are surprised that the German idol did not know how to react in such a position:

e) 16 Qf3 ±c5 was equal in Zeller-Michaelsen, Germany 1995.

15...A3h3!! 16 Qxb6 (16 Axb3 Wxd5 17 Qd2 Wb5 18 Ag2 Wxe2 with a clear black advantage as well) 16...Ag2 17 Aeg2 axb6 and the a2-pawn will be hanging.

e) 15 Ag4 and now:

e1) 16 h3 A5f 17 Aac1 (17 Axc6?! bxc6 18 Axc6 Ac7! would make White more aware of how he has weakened his kingside, while 17 Ab3 Ac4 18 Axc4 Axe4 19 Wd3 Aa5 was equal in Seirawan-Frey, 1980) 17...Axd7 ½-½ Smekal-Brunner, Germany 1990.

e2) 16 Aa1?! has been played several times at the top level, even though Black can play 16...d3!. Now White only has 17 Axd3 as other moves just lose material:

e21) 17 Axf3 Axf3 18 Axf3 Aa5! wins the exchange.

e22) 17 Axf3 Axf3, followed by ...d3-d2.

e23) 17 Axc6? bxc6 18 Axc6 Axf2+ 19 Axf2 Wb6+ and Black wins.

e24) 17 Axd3 Axc2 (17...Axd4? 18 Aa3 Axf3+ 19 Axf3 Wd5 is unclear) 18 Axe2 Wxd3 19 Aexe8+ (19 Aa4 Wb6 20 Ad2 Ad8) 19...Axe8 20 Ac4 Axe1+ 21 Axel Ac5 with an equal position.

e3) 16 Aa4 Ac8 17 h3 Aaf 18 Aa5 Axc5 19 Axc5 Ac4 20 Aa4 Axc4 21 Ac3 Ac7 was equal in Zeller-Michaelsen, Germany 1995.

e4) 16 Aa3 Ad8 17 Ac1 ±c5 18 Axc6 Ac6 20 Ac1 Ac7 was equal in Ovchinikov-Moskvin, Yaroslavl 1995.

15...A4g4 16 Aa1 Ac5

This is what Grischuk plays and probably the main line here. Basically, this move just illustrates the sense in 13...a6 as Black is planning to keep the bishop with ...a7-a6 anyway.

16...Aa6? is an interesting alternative. After 17 Axf4 Axc4! 18 Axc4 Ae5 19 Aa1 Wd7 20 Ac3 Ad8 Black was only a little bit worse in Psakhis-Palatnik, Berlin 1991.

17 a3 a6 18 b4 Ac7 19 Aa4

This is definitely not critical. The alternatives are:

a) 19 Wd2 (this is the only move that might give White an advantage) 19...Ac8 20 Aa4! (The most dangerous. 20 Wf4 Ac6 21 Ac6 Ab8 22 Wd6 Ac8 23 Wc7 was equal in Browne-Chandler, Bath 1983, while 20 Ab2 Ac5 21 Aa4 Ac4 22 Ab3 Axg2 23 Ag2 Ac7 gave equal chances to both players in Vaiser-Frey, Havana 1985.) 20...Ac6 (20...Aa5 21 b5 Ac7 22 Aa5 axb5 23 axb5 is better for White. So is 20...b5 21 axb5 axb5 22 Aa3! and both b5 and the c6-knight are in trouble.) 21 Aa4 Axc4 (This is probably forced. After 21...Aa5? 22 b5 Aa5 23 Aa5! White has some pressure on the black queenside.) 22 Axc4 Aa5 23 Axc8 Wxc8 24 Ac1 Wd7 25 Ac2 and White had a very slight plus in van Wely-Grischuk, France 2001. Now Black sacrificed a pawn with 25...d3?
26 exd3 \textit{d}4 and managed to defend without too many problems. But probably this is easier when you have an Elo rating of around 2670. We would suggest that improvements are needed for Black. Unfortunately, we do not have any ourselves right now. Sorry!

b) 19 \textit{d}b2!? \textit{e}f5 (We dislike this move as the a8-rook is still not developed. 19...\textit{e}8?! 20 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}5 gives Black an active and equal position.) 20 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}4 21 \textit{x}e4 \textit{x}e4 22 \textit{d}3 \textit{c}7 23 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}7 24 \textit{d}5 was unclear in Milov-Grischuk, Biel 1999. Milov prefers 24 \textit{d}bd3 \textit{ae}8 25 \textit{c}2 in his annotations but we do not think White has any advantage after 25...\textit{b}8!, when all Black’s pieces are well placed and White pieces are aiming at different targets.

19...\textit{c}8 20 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}8 21 \textit{d}5

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\caption{Chessboard setup for the position described in the text.}
\end{figure}

21...\textit{x}e2!?

Black sacrifices the exchange as the d-pawn provides him with sufficient compensation.

22 \textit{c}b6 \textit{d}3 23 \textit{a}2

23 \textit{x}e8?! d2! and Black is probably a little better.

23...\textit{c}7 24 \textit{x}c7 \textit{xc}7 25 \textit{d}5 \textit{b}8

26 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}4 27 \textit{c}3 \textit{a}7 28 \textit{f}4?

This just loses. White had to force a draw with 28 \textit{c}7 \textit{e}7 (note that the clever 28...\textit{b}3, with the idea of ...\textit{x}f2, does not work because of 29 \textit{xd}3!! and suddenly White wins) 29 \textit{d}5 \textit{e}8. Of course, Black can play for compensation with 28...\textit{e}5? but there is nothing direct.

28...\textit{b}3!

Now White has to return the exchange but he will still be a pawn down.

29 \textit{xd}3 \textit{xd}3 30 \textit{xe}8+ \textit{xe}8 31 \textit{xd}3 \textit{e}1+ 32 \textit{f}1 \textit{xf}2+ 33 \textit{h}1 \textit{xf}1+ 34 \textit{xf}1

Black is much better in this endgame, but there were some technical difficulties to overcome before he could cash in the full point.

34...\textit{f}8 35 \textit{g}2 \textit{b}6 36 \textit{b}7 a5 37 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}2 38 \textit{b}xa5 \textit{b}xa5 39 \textit{g}2 \textit{d}4 40 a4 \textit{e}7 41 \textit{d}3 f5 42 \textit{g}8 \textit{h}6 43 \textit{a}2 g5 44 \textit{g}8 \textit{d}6 45 \textit{a}2 \textit{e}3 46 \textit{f}4 \textit{f}4 47 \textit{gxf}4 \textit{gx}f4 48 h4 \textit{e}7 49 \textit{a}5 \textit{d}6 50 \textit{f}7 \textit{e}7 51 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}6 52 \textit{h}3 \textit{f}5 53 \textit{c}6 \textit{b}1 54 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}3 55 \textit{d}6 \textit{e}2 56 \textit{b}7 \textit{d}4 57 \textit{d}5 \textit{c}2 58 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}4!

Allowing White to exchange into a pure opposite-coloured bishops endgame, but at the cost of providing Black with another passed pawn. White chooses to do so as he has no good squares for the knight otherwise but, at the same time, this seals his fate.

59 \textit{xb}4 \textit{xb}4 60 \textit{c}2+ \textit{e}5 61 \textit{g}4 \textit{h}5+ 62 \textit{f}3 \textit{b}6 63 \textit{g}6 b3 64 \textit{hx}5 \textit{f}6 0-1

The bishop cannot get back anymore.

\textbf{Points to Remember}

1) White’s strategy in this line is very much based around control of the light squares. After an early exchange on f6, White moves the f3-knight around to the queenside and unleashes the power of the fianchettoed bishop.

2) One of Black’s active plans is to pressurise White’s backward e2-pawn. This can be achieved by moves such as ...\textit{f}8-e8 and ...\textit{d}8-g4.

3) Black should be on the lookout for tricks involving ...\textit{h}3 (or ...\textit{xh}3). These can arise in some lines where Black plays ...\textit{f}8-e8 and White reacts with \textit{f}3-d2-e4.
In this chapter we take a look at other ninth move alternatives for White. These include developing the dark-squared bishop with 9 $\text{f}4$ and 9 $\text{e}3$, and preparing a fianchetto with b2-b3.

White plays 9 $\text{f}4$

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 $\text{c}3$ c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 $\text{f}3$ $\text{c}6$ 6 g3 $\text{g}2$ 7 $\text{e}7$ 8 0-0 0-0 9 $\text{f}4$

Compared to the other bishop moves 9 $\text{e}3$ and 9 $\text{g}5$, this move seems to give Black fewer problems as it is not threatening anything in particular. White ‘just’ develops a piece.

However, Black should be aware. In the first game we give our recommendation of what Black should play. In Games 25 and 26 we would like Black to notice the differences in the positioning of the bishop on f4. To do this we investigate what happens if Black plays the position with 9 $\text{f}4$ along the same lines as the main lines 9 $\text{g}5$ cxd4 and 9 $\text{g}5$ c4.

Game 24

Djuric-Adianto
San Francisco 1987

1 c4 $\text{f}6$

If Black does not want to give White a possibility to avoid the Tarrasch, he should always play the moves ...e7-e6 and ...d7-d5 in the first place, followed by ...c7-c5.

In general, if Black plays ...$\text{f}6$ too early, White can often pin the knight with $\text{g}5$ and thus make it difficult for Black to play ...c7-c5.

In the move orders we recommend, Black usually develops his queenside knight before the kingside knight.

2 $\text{c}3$ c5 3 g3 e6 4 $\text{f}3$ d5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 d4 $\text{c}6$ 7 $\text{g}2$ $\text{e}7$ 8 0-0 0-0 9 $\text{f}4$

This is our recommendation in this line as it is more active than 9...$\text{e}6$. Instead of
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protecting the d-pawn, Black increases the pressure against the white centre. If the Black bishop on g4 gets too annoying, and White plays h2-h3, Black can retreat his bishop to e6 anyway.

10 dxc5

If 10 £te5, then Black plays 10...£e6.

10...£xc5 11 £e5

White has a choice:

a) 11 Wb3 £b6 12 £e5 £e6 13 £ad1 d4 14 Wa4 £d5 15 £xd5 £xd5 16 e4 £e6 17 £xc6 bxc6 18 £xc6 £xa2 19 £a4 £e6 with equal play. Michenka-Orsag, Czech Team Ch., 1992.

b) If White plays 11 £c1 we suggest 11...£e7 12 h3 £e6, with play very similar to the main line 9 £g5 cxd4.

11...£e6 12 £xc6 bxc6 13 £c1 £d6 14 £xd6 £xd6

Again the position has many similarities to the main line 9 £g5 cxd4.

15 a3?!

White can try to occupy the c5-square with 15 £a4. Black replies 15...£f5 16 £d4 £f8 17 e3 £g4!, planning both a queen manoeuvre to h6 and a knight manoeuvre to e5. In both cases Black achieves good counterplay.

15...£e5

Black wants to play ...c6-c5. White could prevent this by playing 16 b4, but Black achieves good counterplay after 16...a5. This shows that 15 a3? was simply a weakening move.

16 e3 c5 17 £e1 £ab8 18 f4!?

This move gives White play in the centre, but it is also risky as it weakens the pawn formation around the white king.

18...£f5

This is the only move. If 18...£d6, then White has the reply 19 e4! and after 18...£c7 White has the annoying 19 b4!, again gaining an advantage.

19 e4 dxe4 20 £xe4 c4

20...£xb2 21 £xc5 £g6 22 £d4! gives a big advantage to White, who threatens to play 23 £g5. After the text move Black has a good position. The white b-pawn is weak and the white king is less safe than his black counterpart.

21 £d4 £fd8

22 £xa7

After 22 £xf6+ £xf6 23 £xf6 gxf6 24 £c2 £b6 Black has an edge in the endgame due to his more active pieces. The position has similarities to some positions arising from the main line 9 £g5 c4. The doubled f-pawns are hard for White to attack, so they are no weakness. On the other hand, White has a weakness on b2 and, besides that, the black rooks are very active.

Instead of playing this White allows the black rook to enter the seventh rank.

22...£xb2 23 £f2 h6?!

23...£b5 is safer (see the next note).

24 £e5?
White could win a pawn here with 24 \textit{h}3 \textit{wb}5 25 \textit{x}xe6 \textit{fxe6} 26 \textit{xe}6. But after the further 26...\textit{dd}2 27 \textit{f}1 \textit{c}3 Black's passed pawn fully compensates for the small material disadvantage. Still, this was a better chance for White than the text move.

24...\textit{b}1!

25 \textit{f}1

White has another possibility here: 25 \textit{w}e3 \textit{wc}2 26 \textit{xb}1 \textit{xb}1+. However, both 27 \textit{f}1 \textit{f}5 28 \textit{g}2 \textit{d}3 29 \textit{xd}3 \textit{c}d3 30 \textit{d}2 \textit{g}4! 31 \textit{c}5 \textit{b}7+ 32 \textit{g}1 \textit{a}7 and 27 \textit{e}1 \textit{b}2 28 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}2 lead to a black advantage.

25...\textit{wc}2 26 \textit{a}4

Desperation.

26...c3 27 f5 \textit{c}4 28 \textit{c}7 \textit{d}4! 29 \textit{c}5 \textit{xf}1 30 \textit{xf}1 \textit{wc}1! 0-1

Besides our suggestion of 9...\textit{g}4, Black can continue along the ideas from the main lines and play 9...c4. The following game shows what difference it makes when the white bishop is placed on f4 instead of g5.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 25}
\end{center}

\textit{Luce-Mozny}

\textit{Prague 1992}

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{c}3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 6 g3 \textit{f}6 7 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}7 8 0-0 0-0 9 \textit{f}4 c4 10 \textit{e}5 \textit{e}6

Interesting here is 10...\textit{f}5. On 11 \textit{g}5? Black can transpose into the main line 9 \textit{g}5 c4 with 11...\textit{e}6!? but he can also play 11...\textit{e}8, not fearing 12 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 13 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xe}5.

11 \textit{xc}4! \textit{xc}4 12 d5!

With the bishop on g5, White would have to exchange it on f6 before playing d4-d5 as after ...\textit{f}6\textit{xd}5 his bishop on g5 is hanging. With the bishop placed on f4 this is not the case and White does not have to give up the bishop pair. In fact, Black will have to give up his bishop pair if he wants to get rid of the annoying knight on d5. That is unless he continues...

12...\textit{d}7?!

After 12...\textit{xd}5 13 \textit{xd}5 White's pieces are more active. White may also soon acquire the bishop pair as he can play both \textit{d}5-c7xe6 or \textit{xe}7 if Black doesn't exchange on d5.

13 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 14 \textit{xc}6 bxc6

This was the price Black had to pay to avoid giving up the bishop pair: a destroyed pawn formation.

15 \textit{wa}4 \textit{wb}6 16 \textit{ab}1 \textit{wc}5

Black has succeeded in protecting his weak pawns in the c-file, but only for a while.

17 \textit{bc}1 \textit{ac}8 18 \textit{d}1 \textit{wh}5 19 f3 \textit{dd}5

Black cannot hold on to his weak pawn on c4 and instead seeks active counterplay.

20 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xf}4 21 \textit{xf}4 \textit{gg}5 22 \textit{c}c5 \textit{xf}4 23 \textit{hx}h5 \textit{cc}7

White has won a pawn but, since Black
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has a bishop against a white knight in the endgame, he has prospects of saving the game.

24 Ï¿2 Ï¿d8 25 Ï¿c5 Ï¿d2 26 Ï¿f1 Ï¿e2 27 Ï¿c5c2 Ï¿e3 28 Ï¿g2 h5 29 Ï¿xc6 Ï¿b6 30 Ï¿c1c2

To win, White has to create a passed pawn on the queenside but this is not easy as the black pieces are very active. In fact, all the way through the game, White doesn’t push either of the two pawns!

30...Ï¿f8 31 Ï¿c8 Ï¿xc8 32 Ï¿xc8+ Ï¿h7 33 Ï¿c2 Ï¿e1 34 f4 f6 35 Ï¿d3 Ï¿d1 36 Ï¿f2 Ï¿e1 37 Ï¿d3 Ï¿d1 38 Ï¿c1 g5!

Black seeks counterplay on the kingside. Despite the fact that he is a pawn down, the position is unclear. 39 fxg5 fxg5 40 Ï¿f3 Ï¿g6 41 Ï¿e4 h4 42 gxh4 Ï¿d4+ 43 Ï¿f3 Ï¿xh4 44 Ï¿g3 Ï¿f5 45 Ï¿e2 Ï¿e4 46 Ï¿c1 Ï¿e3 47 Ï¿e2 Ï¿d4 48 Ï¿b3+ Ï¿d3 49 Ï¿g2 Ï¿f4+ 50 Ï¿f3 Ï¿xh2 51 Ï¿c5+ Ï¿c4 52 Ï¿xh2 Ï¿xh2 53 Ï¿e6 Ï¿e5 54 Ï¿xg5 Ï¿xb2 55 Ï¿e2 Ï¿b4 56 Ï¿d3 Ï¿a3 57 Ï¿c2 Ï¿xa2 58 Ï¿e4 Ï¿e5 59 Ï¿c3+ Ï¿a3 60 Ï¿b5+ ½-½

In the next game Black captures on d4.

Game 26  

Gulko-Lputian  
Riga 1985

1 d4 e6 2 Ï¿f3 d5 3 c4 Ï¿f6 4 g3 c5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 Ï¿g2 Ï¿c6 7 0-0 Ï¿e7 8 Ï¿c3 0-0 9 Ï¿f4 cxd4

In this game Black plays for the patterns in the 9 Ï¿g5 cxd4 main line. This is a perfectly playable alternative.

10 Ï¿xd4 Ï¿b6 11 Ï¿xc6

White has other options:
a) 11 Ï¿c3 Ï¿xb2 12 Ï¿xd5 Ï¿xd5 13 Ï¿xd5 Ï¿h3 14 Ï¿b1 Ï¿a3 15 Ï¿c1 Ï¿a5 16 Ï¿b3 Ï¿a6 17 Ï¿e1 Ï¿b4 18 Ï¿d2 Ï¿ad8 with equality, Soln-Susnik, Ljubljana 1993.
b) 11 Ï¿b3 Ï¿d8 12 Ï¿c1 d4 13 Ï¿a4 Ï¿a6 14 Ï¿bc5 Ï¿xc5 15 Ï¿xc5 Ï¿xa2 16 Ï¿c7 Ï¿c8

17 Ï¿c2 d3 18 Ï¿xd3 Ï¿xb2. Black has a pawn, but White is better developed and has pressure against the black queenside. Play is unclear, Piasetski-Findlay, Ottawa 1984.

11...bxc6 12 Ï¿a4

This is not the best move as in this line White does not have full control over the c5-square as he usually does in the main line 9 Ï¿g5 cxd4.

12...Ï¿a5 13 Ï¿c2 Ï¿g4 14 Ï¿c3

White realised that he could not occupy the c5-square, so now the knight returns. Black has a good position.

14...Ï¿a6!?

It looks more natural to play 14...Ï¿f8 as this rook usually occupies the half-open e-file. Moving rook is more flexible; Black has not yet decided where to put his dark-squared bishop, and he is not sure whether the a8-rook should be placed on c8 or d8. Likewise, Black does not know for sure where to place his queen.

15 Ï¿fd1 Ï¿f8 16 Ï¿d3 Ï¿xd3 17 Ï¿xd3 Ï¿b4

Black has equalised.

18 Ï¿f1 Ï¿d8

This is a rather passive move to protect the c-pawn. 18...Ï¿ad8, immediately threatening 19...d4, looks more active.

19 Ï¿c1 h6

Both players are in no hurry.

20 Ï¿e3

This allows the following combination, af-
ter which Black gets a slight initiative.

20...£f5 21 £dd1

21...£xe3! 22 fxe3 £c5 23 £d4!

This is the best move. By offering back the exchange, White hopes to consolidate his position. After 23 £g2 £xe3 24 £a1 £c2 25 £e1 £b8! Black would hold a clear advantage.

23...£g4 24 £a4 £e7!?

After 24...£txd4 25 exd4 White has the active rook and Black, the passive one. So Black keeps the tension.

25 £f4 £g5 26 £c3 £xf4 27 exf4 £f6

The king is on its way to the centre.

28 £c5 £b8 29 b3 £f8

The conclusion to this section on 9 £f4 is that, besides our recommendation of 9...£g4, Black has other perfectly playable alternatives.

White plays 9 £e3

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 £c3 £c6 4 cxd5 exd5
5 £f3 £c6 6 g3 £f6 7 £g2 £e7 8 0-0
0-0 9 £e3

For White this move means that d4 is now overprotected. On the move 9...£g4, he just plays 10 £f4 and the black knight looks funny on g4 and the black knight looks funny on g4. Still, this line has been played many times by strong players, so it can't be that bad.

If Black exchanges on d4 now with 9...£xd4 10 £xd4, we get a position from the main line 9 £g5 cxd4 without Black having played the move ...h7-h6. This is both an advantage and a disadvantage for Black, depending on what position he is aiming for. The move ...h7-h6 is often useful for Black as he now both protects the g5-square and has air for his king. On the other hand, with the pawn structure arising in lines where Black plays ...£c8-e6 and recaptures with the f-pawn when White exchanges on e6 with the knight, it is often useful for Black not to have played ...h7-h6 as it weakens the light squares around his king.

Anyway, we do not recommend Black playing 9...£g4 or exchanging on d4 with 9...£xd4. Instead we prefer Black to continue play along the other main line with 9...c4. There is a major difference here between this position and the position from the main line 9 £g5 c4. Both White and Black profit from this difference, but weighing them up against each other, we think that Black's gains are bigger.

With the bishop posted on e3 instead of g5, White doesn't have the same pressure
towards d5. With the bishop on g5 he immediately threatened the d5-pawn after 10 ëe5, thus forcing Black to play his bishop to e6. In the 9 ëg5 line White controlled play for at least another couple of moves, but in the 9 ëe3 line Black has free hands to do what he wants.

One of the tenth moves Black can come up with is an idea that Kasparov has played with great success: 9 ëe3 c4 10 ëe5 h6. One idea is to protect the g5-square. Another plan with this move is to keep Black’s light-squared bishop on the important b1-h7 diagonal.

Here is one of his games that shows these themes.

Game 27
Hort-Kasparov
Cologne 1988

1 c4 ëf6 2 ëc3 c5 3 g3 ëe6 4 ëf3 d5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 d4 ëc6 7 ëg2 ëe7 8 0-0 0-0 9 ëe3 c4 10 ëe5 h6 11 h3

Other moves for White are:

a) 11 b3 cxb3! (In this position we suggest this pawn exchange. In the main line 9 ëg5 c4 we generally avoided this exchange because, as a main rule, Black has two weaknesses on c6 and a7 in his pawn formation, whereas White has only one on b3. But in this position Black has not yet moved his bishop on c8 and that makes the difference.) 12 ëxc6 (if White recaptures with the queen, the position quickly becomes equal: 12 ëxb3 ëa5 13 ëd1 ëe6 14 ëd2 ëc8, L.Hansen-Sorensen, Denmark 1988) 12...bxc6 13 axb3 ëb8! 14 ëc2 ëa6! (Here is the difference: the bishop has not yet gone to e6. Instead it is heading for b5.) 15 ëa4 ëb5 and the position is equal.

b) 11 ëa4 a6 12 ëxc6 (or 12 ëad1 ëd7 with equal play) 12...bxc6 13 b3 (13 ëxc6 ëd7 14 ëb7 ëb8 15 ëxa6 ëa8 16 ëb7 ëb8 is a draw by repetition) 13...ëb8! 14 bxc4 ëb4 15 ëd1 (15 ëxc6?? ëb7) 15...ëxc4 16 ëa4 (16 ëd3 a5! 17 ëd1 ëb6! 18 ëb1 ëb4) 16...ëf5! 17 ëb2 ëc3 (Larsen-Kasparov, Brussels 1987) 18 ëd2! ëc2 19 ëd3 ëxd3 20 exd3 ëb2 21 ëc3 ëb5 22 a4 ëb7 with equal play. Here the game could have ended in a draw twice, if White did not feel like playing that day. We suggest that Black immediately plays 11...ëd7 in response to 11 ëa4.

11...ëb4 12 ëa4 ëxc3 13 bxc3 ëf5

14 g4
White does not win a pawn after 14 ëxc6 ëd7!.

14...ëh7 15 ëf4
After 15 ëxc6 Black plays 15...ëd7. White can then try the wild move 16 g5? but after 16...ëe4 17 ëfc1 (17 ëxe4?! ëxe4 is too dangerous as it weakens the kingside position) 17...hxg5 18 f3 ëd6 19 ëxg5 bxc6 Black has a good position here. His bishop controls the b1-h7 diagonal, especially the e4-square. The pressure on the e-file can turn out to be annoying and the white bishop on g2 looks rather awkward.

15...ëe8 16 ëad1 a6
Black is planning to push his queenside pawns.

17 ëg3
On 17 ëxc6 ëd7 18 ëe5 Black can go for a good ending after 18...ëxc6! (18...ëe4 19 ëa3 ëxc6 20 f3 ëf6 21 e4 ëad8! with slightly better chances in the middlegame) 19 ëxc6 bxc6 20 ëxf6 gxf6 21 ëd2 f5 22 ëf3
In this position White wants to make use of his extra pawn in the centre. But the pawn break e2-e4 is hard to achieve as Black fully controls this square.

Black’s plan is to play ...a6-a5 to support the ...b5-b4 pawn break and this is hard for White to hinder as Black’s light squared bishop controls the b1-square. All in all, the position is easier to play for Black, but in the next few moves White plays very actively.

19 Wc1
This threatens 20 g5.
De4 20 Dxe4 Dxe4 21 Dd7
White wants to transfer his knight to c5 and then try to play e2-e4.
21...Dd8 22 Dc5 De6 23 Dd2 a5 24 f3 b4 25 e4
The critical position of the game.
25...b3!?
With this move Black totally changes the structure of the position. The game now opens up and play becomes more dynamic. This type of position suits Kasparov very well!

Another possibility is the more straightforward 25...Dxe4 26 fxe4 Dxe4 27 Dxe4 Dxe4 28 d5 De5 29 Dg2! Db6+ 30 Dh1 De3 31 Df2 Dxd3 32 Dxe3 Dxe3 with unclear play. Black has excellent positional compensation for the sacrificed material: a strong knight and a dangerous passed pawn.

26 axb3
Until now White has played very forcefully but this is a rather vague move. Better is 26 Db7! Dc7, forcing Black to sacrifice the exchange after 27 Dd6 Dd8 (27...Dxe4 28 fxe4 Dd8 29 e5 is clearly better for White) 28 exd5 Dxd6 29 Dxd6 Dxd6 30 Dxc6 Dxc6. Black has lost the exchange but his passed pawn on the queenside is more dangerous than White’s as it further advanced and Black’s bishop controls the b1-square. All in all, the position is unclear.

26...Dxb3 27 Dxb3 Dxe4 28 fxe4 Dxe4 29 c4
The white centre looks impressive but White has problems pushing his central pawns forward because of his awkward knight.

29...Db6 30 Dc5 Dd8 31 Df2
31 Dxe4 Dxe4 32 c5 Db3 is bad for White.

31...Dxd4 32 Dxe4 Dxe4 33 Dxf7+ Dh7 34 Dh2

34...Dc6!
Black takes control over the light squares on the h1-a8 diagonal. He has the advantage due to the exposed white king.

35 Df2
The threat was 35...Dc2.

35...Dd7 36 Df8 Dxc4
Meeting 1 d4

Black is winning now.

37 \text{\textit{f1}} \text{\textit{e2}} 38 \text{\textit{x42}} \text{\textbf{Wxe2+}} 39 \text{\textit{f2}} \text{\textit{W4}} 40 \text{\textit{f4}} \text{\textit{W2e2+}} 41 \text{\textit{f2}} \text{\textit{W6e6}} 42 \text{\textbf{W8}} \text{\textit{W5d5}} 43 \text{\textbf{Wf8}} a4 44 h4 \text{\textit{Wb7}} 45 \text{\textit{W3a3}} \text{\textit{W4}} 46 \text{\textit{Sh3}}

Not 46 \text{\textbf{Wxa4?}} \text{\textit{Wf3+}}.

46...\text{\textit{eb3}} 47 \text{\textbf{Wf8}} a3 48 g5 \text{\textbf{Wh1+}} 49 \text{\textit{g4}} h5 + 50 \text{\textit{f14}} \text{\textit{e6+}} 0-1

Another idea for Black is the following: Black uses his ‘extra move’ to immediately play the useful move 10...\textit{Be8}. The idea is to move the bishop and thus force White to either exchange knights on \textit{c6} or to play \textit{f2-f4} to protect the knight. The latter move weakens both the e4-square and the e-file, and Black can fight by playing ...\textit{Be7-b4} and moving his knight from \textit{f6} to play ...\textit{f7-f6} at some time.

These ideas were played in the following game. However, Black still played ...h7-h6 on the tenth move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mohr-Brunner
Altensteig 1989

| 1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{Qc3} c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \textit{Qf3} \textit{Qc6} 6 g3 \textit{Qf6} 7 \textit{Qg2} \textit{Qe7} 8 0-0 0-0 9 \textit{Qe3} c4 10 \textit{Qe5} h6 11 h3 \textit{Qe8}! |
| With similar ideas to the ones described above. |

12 f4?!

In the main line 9 \textit{Qg5} c4 10 \textit{Qe5} \textit{Qe6} the move \textit{f2-f4} makes sense as White threatens to play \textit{f4-f5} to chase the black bishop away. In this line the move \textit{f2-f4} is rather compromising as it weakens \textit{e4}, and here White does not have active play to compensate for the structural weaknesses.

12...\textit{Qb4}

Like in the Hort-Kasparov game, Black is fighting for \textit{e4}, but in this case the move makes even more sense as White has now weakened the central square even more.

13 \textit{Qc2} \textit{Qxc3}

Black consequently plays his plan.

14 bxc3 \textit{Qe7} 15 g4

White takes control of \textit{f5} and, at the same time, threatens \textit{g4-g5}.

15...\textit{Qh7}!

The next step in the black plan is to play ...\textit{f7-f6} to chase the White knight away so that he can make use of the half-open e-file. Notice that 16 \textit{Qxf7}? is refuted by 16...\textit{Qxf7} 17 \textit{Qf7} \textit{Qg6} 18 \textit{Qf8} 19 \textit{Qh8} \textit{Qxe3}.

16 \textit{Qf2} f6 17 \textit{Qf3} \textit{Qe6} 18 \textit{Qd2}?

White wants to play \textit{e2-e4} but it would have been more active to play it immediately with 18 \textit{Qf5} \textit{Qf7} 19 \textit{Qab1} \textit{Qc7} 20 \textit{e4}, although even here Black gets control over the d5-square after 20...\textit{dxe4} 21 \textit{Qd2} \textit{Qg5} 22 \textit{Qxe4} \textit{Qxe4} 23 \textit{Qxe4} \textit{Qd5}, with a good position.

Now Black manages to obstruct White’s plans with...

18...\textit{f5}! 19 \textit{Qh4}!? \textit{Qc8}

After 19...\textit{fxg4} 20 \textit{Qf5} \textit{Qxh3} 21 \textit{Qxh3} White gets good play for the sacrificed pawn.

20 \textit{Qxe7} \textit{Qxe7} 21 \textit{Qf2}

After the more aggressive 21 \textit{gxf5} \textit{Qxf5} 22 \textit{Qxd5+} \textit{Qh8} 23 \textit{e4} \textit{Qxh3} Black is better due to the vulnerable white king.

21...\textit{Qf6} 22 g5 \textit{hgx5} 23 fxe5 \textit{Qe4} 24 \textit{Qxe4} fxe4

In this position Black is better because of his space advantage and his more active bishop.

25 \textit{Qa1} \textit{Wd7} 26 h4 \textit{Wd6} 27 \textit{Qf4}

White is planning to play \textit{e2-e3} followed
by \text{c2-f2}.

27...\text{xf7} 28 \text{xf7} \text{xf7} 29 e3 \text{e6} 30
\text{f2} \text{f8} 31 \text{e1} \text{g4} 32 \text{xf8+} \text{xf8}
33 \text{f2+} \text{e7} 34 \text{f1} b5 35 \text{g2}

White just has to wait to see what Black
comes up with.

35...a5

36 g6?!

Desperation.

36...\text{xf6} 37 \text{g3} \text{f7} 38 \text{c7+} \text{g8}
39 \text{d8+} \text{h7} 40 \text{h2}

40 \text{xa5?} \text{f3} and White is mated.

40...\text{f5} 41 \text{g3} \text{h5} 42 \text{xa5} \text{g4+}
43 \text{h2} \text{hxh4+} 44 \text{g1} \text{e1+} 45 \text{h2}
\text{xe3} 0-1.

We can conclude that the line 9 \text{e3} does
not cause Black any serious problems. He
can choose between the two options shown
above, both of them giving him equal
chances.

White plays 9 b3

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \text{c3} c5 4 cxd5 exd5
5 \text{f3} \text{c6} 6 g3 \text{f6} 7 \text{g2} \text{e7} 8 0-0
0-0 9 b3

Now we recommend the move

9...\text{g4}

The difference between the move we sug-
gest and 9...\text{e6} is that with 9...\text{g4}, Black is
forcing White to give up the centre immedi-
ately because Black puts d4 under pressure.

The response 10 e3? is illogical after White
has already played b2-b3. After the further
10...cxd4 11 exd4 \text{b4} Black has already
equalised.

If White at some time plays the h2-h3 to
chase away the annoying bishop on g4, Black
can sometimes exchange on f3, or he can
retreat the bishop to e6. Then he can play
along the 9...\text{e6} line with the extra move
h2-h3, which is in Black’s favour. Firstly, the
pawn on h3 is a weakness that White has to
protect. Secondly, after an eventual \text{f3}>
dxe6 or \text{f3-g5xe6} it is often useful to have
the possibility of playing \text{g2-h3} to put pres-
sure against the remaining Black pawn on e6.
This possibility is out of the question after
h2-h3.

\textbf{Game 29}

\textbf{G.Horvath-P.Horvath}

\textit{Hungarian League 1998}

1 c4 e6 2 \text{c3} d5 3 d4 c5 4 cxd5 exd5
5 \text{hf3} \text{c6} 6 g3 \text{f6} 7 \text{g2} \text{e7} 8 0-0
0-0 9 b3 \text{g4} 10 \text{b2}

Alternatively:

a) 10 dxc5 \text{xc5} 11 \text{b2} a6 transposes to
the note to White’s 11th move below.

If White avoids to capture on c5 at all, fol-
lowing lines are possible:

b) 10 \text{e3} \text{e4} 11 \text{xe4} dxe4 12 \text{e5}
\text{xe5} 13 dxe5 \text{f5} 14 f4 \text{exf3} 15 \text{exf3} \text{c7}
16 f4 \text{ad8} 17 \text{f3} \text{d3} 18 \text{fd1} \text{fd8} and
play is even, Peev-Todorovic, Pancevo 1989.

c) 10 $\text{cxd4}$ 11 $\text{bxc6}$ $\text{bxc6}$ 12 $\text{wxh4}$

13 $\text{d2}$ d4 14 $\text{a4}$ (dubious is 14 $\text{a8}$ $\text{xa8}$ 15 $\text{d1}$ $\text{h3}$ 16 $\text{f3}$ $\text{xf1}$ 17 $\text{xf1}$

$\text{d5}$ and Black was better in Olivieri-Giacco, Buenos Aires 1993 because of the weaknesses in the white camp) 14...

$\text{e8}$ 15 $\text{a3}$ $\text{e8}$ 16 $\text{fe1}$ $\text{d7}$ 17 $\text{b2}$ (not 17 $\text{a1}$? $\text{c4}$! 18 $\text{xe7}$ $\text{xe7}$ 19 $\text{c3}$ {the c4-pawn is poisoned, as the knight on a4 would then be unprotected}) 19...

$\text{xe3}$ 20 $\text{xd7}$ $\text{xf2}$+ 21 $\text{xf2}$ $\text{xd7}$ and Black has the advantage in the endgame – the move...

$\text{d2}$+ is threatened) 17...

$\text{h3}$ 18 $\text{f3}$ $\text{g4}$ 19 $\text{d4}$ h6. With the plan of...

$\text{g5}$, Black is better, Manakova-Moskalenko, Alushta 1994.

10...$\text{a6}$

This is the move that we recommend Black should play in this position.

For some reason the move 10...

$\text{e8}$ is more common here. After 11 $\text{dxc5}$ $\text{xc5}$ 12 $\text{c1}$ the move 12...

$\text{a6}$! has been played several times in this position. This allows White to enter the following sharp line: 13 $\text{xd5}$

$\text{xf2}$ 14 $\text{xf2}$ $\text{d5}$ 15 $\text{e5}$ $\text{xe5}$ 16 $\text{xd5}$

$\text{g5}$.

Theory claims unclear play, but we think that White is slightly better due to the bishop pair in this rather open position.

Anyway, if Black wants to play along these lines, he can just as well play ...

$\text{a7}$-$\text{a6}$ before he plays $\text{e8}$. Still, we recommend the text line as Black achieves exactly the tense, dynamic position that he wants. All the pieces are kept on the board, and the dark-squared bishop is even placed on the a7-g1 diagonal, pointing towards d4 and the white king's position. Why let White get the chance to muddy the waters with the tactical blow 13 $\text{xd5}$?

11 $\text{c1}$?

White insists on not capturing on c5. If he does so, the following lines are possible:

11 $\text{dxc5}$ $\text{xc5}$ and now:

a) 12 $\text{c1}$ $\text{a7}$ 13 $\text{h3}$ $\text{h5}$ (13...

$\text{e6}$ is perfectly playable as well, as mentioned in the beginning of this section) 14 $\text{e3}$ $\text{e8}$ 15 $\text{d2}$

$\text{e4}$ 16 $\text{d4}$ $\text{xf3}$ 17 $\text{xf3}$ d4 with equal play in Wallinger-Niedermaier, Bayern 1989.

b) After 14 $\text{h4}$ $\text{e8}$ 15 $\text{f3}$ $\text{xf3}$ 16 $\text{xf3}$ d4 17 $\text{d4}$ $\text{wd6}$ Black has a good position, Banas- Jasný 1998.

c) The move 12 $\text{c1}$ is considered in the next game.

d) 12 $\text{a4}$!?. This is the critical move in this line. If White does not take the offered pawn, play develops peacefully and Black is usually okay. Now the critical position is reached after 12...

$\text{a7}$ 13 $\text{xf6}$ $\text{xf6}$ 14 $\text{xd5}$ b5!

Here White has to step carefully as the following lines show:

d1) Bad is 15 $\text{b2}$ $\text{d4}$! and White loses material.

d2) 15 $\text{g5}$ $\text{gxg5}$ 16 $\text{dxg5}$ $\text{ac8}$ 17 $\text{b2}$

$\text{d4}$! 18 $\text{e3}$ $\text{c2}$ 19 $\text{xc1}$ $\text{xe3}$ and Black is slightly better.

d3) 15 $\text{d5}$ $\text{ad8}$ 16 $\text{g5}$ $\text{xf5}$ 17 $\text{xf5}$

$\text{xc5}$ 18 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{xe2}$ and Black has a minimal edge due to the bishop pair.

d4) 15 $\text{ac1}$ $\text{c7}$ 16 $\text{g5}$ $\text{xf5}$ 17 $\text{xf5}$

$\text{bxa4}$ 18 $\text{c7}$ $\text{h6}$ 19 $\text{xa4}$ $\text{xa8}$ 20 $\text{xe7}$

$\text{hxg5}$ 21 $\text{xa4}$ $\text{f8}$ also brings White no joy. Black is better in the endgame due to his bishop pair, which fully compensates for his small loss of material.

d5) The best move is 15 $\text{c3}$ $\text{xc3}$ 16

$\text{ac1}$ $\text{b2}$ 17 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{xa2}$, with complicated play.

11...

$\text{xf3}$ 12 $\text{xf3}$ $\text{cxd4}$ 13 $\text{a4}$
Notice that after ...a7-a6 the manoeuvre \( \text{c}3-\text{b}5 \) is impossible.

13...\( \text{c}8 \) 14 \( \text{x}d4 \) \( \text{a}3 \)

The position is equal.

15 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}2 \)

16 \( \text{c}5 \) gives White nothing after

16...\( \text{xc}1 \) 17 \( \text{xf}8 \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 18 \( \text{xc}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \).

16...\( \text{b}4 \)?

16...\( \text{e}5 \) is another option which looks more natural than the text move. A possible continuation is 17 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{xc}2 \) 18 \( \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 19 \( \text{dc}2 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 20 \( \text{wc}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) with unclear play.

16...\( \text{xc}8 \) 17 \( \text{xc}8 \) 18 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{wb}5 \) 19 \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{e}4 \)

The black pieces are placed awkwardly. The knight on \( b4 \) is tied up because the bishop is unprotected on \( a3 \). However, there is no way White can make use of this.

21 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{h}6 \)

Black is creating some air for his king and, at the same time, freeing the rook from protecting the eighth rank.

22 \( \text{d}1 \)

22 \( \text{c}3 \)?! with the plan of 23 \( \text{b}1 \), does not work in view of 22...\( \text{we}5 \) 23 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 24 \( \text{xa}3 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 25 \( \text{xe}3 \) (or 25 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \)!) 25...\( \text{xe}3 \) 26 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) with a better endgame for Black.

22...\( \text{c}2 \) 23 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \)!! 24 \( \text{xe}4 \)

Or 24 \( \text{b}8 \)?! \( \text{h}7 \) 25 \( \text{xa}3 \) (25 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) is disastrous) 25...\( \text{xe}2 \) 26 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{c}3 \) and White is mated.

24...\( \text{xe}2 \) 25 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 26 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xe}7 \)

In this endgame Black is better because he has a bishop against White’s knight, with pawns on both sides of the board.

27 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 28 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}1 \) 29 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \)

30 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 31 \( \text{d}8 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 32 \( \text{d}3 \)

With this move a draw was agreed but it is Black who has the best chances for a win after, for example, 32...\( \text{g}6 \).

Game 30

Flohr-Spassky

Sochi 1965

1 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 2 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 3 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 4 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \)

5 \( \text{g}3 \) 0-0 6 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 7 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{exd}5 \) 8 \( \text{d}4 \)

From the Catalan we have now reached the Tarrasch.

8...\( \text{c}6 \) 9 0-0 \( \text{g}4 \)

White has chosen a different move order in the opening to the one leading to the diagram position at the very beginning of this line. White has not yet developed his queenside knight. It doesn’t make a difference in that we still recommend 9...\( \text{g}4 \), putting pressure on the white centre, especially \( d4 \), and forcing the exchange on \( c5 \) immediately or within the next couple of moves.

Black can also play 9...\( \text{e}4 \) against either move order. After 10 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) (or 10 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) from the normal move order) White has a choice (of which 11 \( \text{a}4 \) seems best): a) 11 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{dxe}4 \) 12 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \)
Meeting 1 d4
cxd4 14 Qxe4 f5 15 Wd2 cxe8 16 Qc5 w7 17 Qac1 Qac8 18 Qe1 b6 19 Qe3 Qe4 20 w4 f5 and Black has seized control of the e4-square. If anyone, he is slightly better here, Mestel-Nunn, London 1984.

In the game Tregubov-Magerramov, Montpellier 1998 White instead played 18 w4 g6 19 a3 a5 20 h4 h6 21 Qe1 Qe5 22 wxd4 b6 23 Qa4 Qxc1 24 Qxc1 wa3 and Black had a good position.

b) Not good is 11 Qa1?! Qxd4 12 Qxd4 Qxd4 13 e3 Qxc3 14 Qxc3 f5 15 Qb2 b6 16 h4 w7 17 Qh2 w6 18 w5 g6 and Black holds on to his extra pawn, Hahn-Teschner, Germany 1991.

c) 11 e3 Qg4 and now:

1) In the game Lipp-Bach, Germany 1991 White played 12 h3 c5 13 g4 Qg6 14 Qxe4 dxe4 15 Qe5 Qxe5 16 dxe5 Qb4. The White bishops both look rather funny. Now White opened up the position, but the price was a bad pawn structure: 17 f4 exf3 18 wxf3 Qb8 19 f1 Qc7 and Black was better.

c2) 12 Qxe2 wa5 and all Black's pieces are active. In both of the following games he had a good position:

c21) 13 Qe5 Qxe5 14 dxe5 w4! (Forcing the queen exchange. 14...Qd2? is bad in view of 15 Qc3.) 15 w8 Qxe2 16 Qf1 Qf3+ 17 Qh1 Qg5 18 Qe1 Qb4, Kuchle-Satonen, Tampere 1988.

c22) 13 Qe1 Qfe8 14 h3 Qxf3 15 Qxf3 Qad8, Gesos-Halkias, Athens 1999.

c) 11 Qa4 b6 12 Qxc1 Qa6 with the following options:

d1) One idea is to overprotect e2 before easing the tension in the centre. The following game shows this: 13 Qe1 Qe8 14 Qf1 c4 15 e3 b5 16 Qc3 Qxc3 17 Qxc3 Qc8! (after Black closes the centre, the bishop has nothing more to do on a6, so instead Black transfers it to the kingside) 18 bxc4 dxc4!? (18...bxc4 is good as well, but Black goes for the non-symmetrical pawn structure) 19 Qg2 Qb8 20 a3 Qg4 with very complicated play,

Ianov-Dupsky, Szeged 1998.

d2) 13 dxc5 Qxb2 14 Qxb2 bxc5.

In this position White has played three moves:

d21) 15 Qd3 Qe8 16 Qe1 w6 17 e3 Qad8 18 Qf1 c4 and Black had excellent play in Larsen-Petursson, Gausdal 1985.

d22) 15 Qd2 Qe7 16 Qd3 Qfd8 17 Qf4 Qac8 18 Qe1. Instead of the nasty 18...c4, played in the game Ac-Lamser, Bratislava 1989, Black can consolidate his knight in the centre with 18...f5 and thereby obtain equal chances.

d23) 15 Qa4 (again this move is the most critical) 15...Qa6 16 Qe1 c4 17 Qh4 wa5 18 Qf5 g6 19 Qd4 Qac8 20 h4 Qe5 21 Qh3 Qc7 with very complicated play in Larsen-Kasparov, Niksic 1983.

More testing is 17 Qd2. In the game Lucko-Nadanian, Kiev 1997 play continued 17...wa5 18 Qxe4 dxe4 19 Qxc4 Qxc4 20 Qxc4 Qad8 21 wa1 Qd4 22 Qc3 and White holds on to his extra pawn, Black has some compensation for the pawn, but we feel it isn't enough.

In conclusion, maybe some improvements can be made to the 9...Qe4 line.

Anyway, with the recommended text move 9...Qg4, play develops more quietly. Black simply goes for a solid development of his pieces.

10 dxc5 Qxc5

Notice that it does not matter for Black if
White delays the move \( \text{c}1-\text{c}3 \); White cannot win the d5-pawn with 11 \( \text{x}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 12 \( \text{x}d5? \) because of 12...\( \text{xa}1 \).

11 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 13 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 14 \( \text{d}3 \)

The knight has reached the desired destination. White has a beautiful outpost here in front of Black's isolated d-pawn, but the price he has to pay is the lack of protection of the d4-square.

14...\( \text{a}7 \) 15 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 16 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \)

Black has equalised.

17 \( \text{ac}5 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 18 \( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{d}5+ \) 19 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 20 \( \text{xe}4 \)

Or 20 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 21 \( \text{xb}7?! \) \( \text{b}5 \) 22 \( \text{f}3 \) (the only move) 22...\( \text{g}3 \) with advantage to Black.

20...\( \text{xe}4 \) 21 \( \text{c}2 \)

In positions like this White would like to exchange his bishop for the black knight, after which the white knight would be superior to the black bishop in the endgame. But, of course, this is not even about to happen as the Black knight on c6 is untouchable. In fact, Black has a slight initiative here.

21...\( \text{ae}8 \) 22 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 23 \( \text{f}3?! \)

This move weakens the white pawn structure and should on principle be avoided. On the other hand, it seems difficult for White to make progress without this move, and he does not want to wait for Black to strengthen his position further.

23...\( \text{e}7 \) 24 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{f}7 \)

24...\( \text{e}3 \) 25 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 26 \( \text{a}3 \) gives a repetition.

25 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{xb}4 \) 26 \( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 27 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \)

White's kingside is weakened after both h2-h3 and f2-f3; with 27...\( \text{h}5 \) Black tries to create further weaknesses. The immediate threat is 28...\( \text{h}4 \).

28 \( \text{d}3?! \)

If White plays 28 \( \text{h}4 \), Black can start an attack with 28...g5. Still, the text move is dubious as White now enters an inferior endgame.

28...\( \text{xd}3 \) 29 exd3 \( \text{e}3 \) 30 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \)

Black has a clear edge in this endgame and it is instructive how Spassky manages to break through.

31 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 32 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 33 \( \text{cd}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \)

34 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 35 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}5 \)

The Black king reaches the ideal square d5.
36 \text{\textit{xc}6} \text{\textit{bxc}6} 37 \text{\textit{f}2} \text{\textit{c}5} \\
Now the bishop is activated. Notice how good the black bishop is compared to its white counterpart.
38 \text{\textit{d}1} \text{\textit{b}4} 39 a3 \text{\textit{d}6} 40 \text{\textit{c}1} \text{\textit{e}7} 41 \text{\textit{d}2} \text{\textit{b}7}

This is the price White now has to pay for playing the weakening pawn move a2-a3: b3 is vulnerable now. So White has to push his b-pawn forward after which Black has an object for attack on b4.

42 b4 a5 43 bxa5 \text{\textit{b}2!} 44 f4 \\
Or 44 a6? \text{\textit{a}2} and White loses both his a-pawns.

44...\text{\textit{a}2} 45 \text{\textit{e}2} \\
White has now freed his king from the protection of the g3-pawn but...

45...h4 46 gxh4 \text{\textit{x}f}4 47 a6 \\
White has no reasonable moves. Black is winning now.

47...\text{\textit{x}d}2 48 \text{\textit{xd}2} \text{\textit{xa}3} 49 \text{\textit{b}2} \text{\textit{xa}6} 50 \text{\textit{b}7} \text{\textit{a}2+} 51 \text{\textit{f}3} \text{\textit{d}2} 52 \text{\textit{xg}7} \text{\textit{xd}3}+ 53 \text{\textit{g}4}

53...f5+ \\
This is the last intermediate move. After the h3-pawn is eliminated, the black rook is able to get behind White's passed pawn on the h-file.

54 \text{\textit{xf}5} \text{\textit{hx}3} 55 \text{\textit{d}7+} \text{\textit{c}4} 56 \text{\textit{g}5} \text{\textit{c}5} 57 h5 d3 0-1

Points to Remember

1) Against 9 \text{\textit{f}4}, we recommend either the active 9...\text{\textit{g}4} or 9...\text{\textit{cxd}4}.

2) After 9 \text{\textit{e}3} we like the move 9...\text{\textit{c}4}. When compared to the main line 9 \text{\textit{g}5} \text{\textit{c}4}, the bishop is not so well placed on e3.

3) After 9 b3 we prefer simple and active development with 9...\text{\textit{g}4}.
In this chapter we will study alternatives to the normal fianchetto with 6 g3. These include early development of the dark-squared bishop with 6 ™g5 and 6 ™f4, plus the super-solid 6 e3. In most variations Black ends up with the isolated queen’s pawn, but can rely on piece activity to compensate for the structural weakness.

White plays 6 ™g5

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 ™c3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 ™f3 ™c6 6 ™g5

White delays the fianchetto of the f1-bishop and develops his dark-squared one, attacking the black queen in the process. The most natural move for Black is 6...™e7. After the logical 7 ™xe7 ™gxe7 White then has to decide what to do.

The idea of 6 ™g5 is to exchange the dark-squared bishops, even though the price is a tempo or two.

Usually exchanges favours White. He has the better pawn structure, and it’s easier to profit from this with less pieces left on the board. In the opening and the middle game the isolated d-pawn is a dynamic force, whereas in the endgame it can turn out to be a static weakness.

But Black profits from this exchange as well. The exchange simply costs precious time for White as after 6...™e7 7 ™xe7 ™gxe7 Black’s pieces are very dynamically placed. He is ready to castle kingside and complete his development.

Game 31
Grünberg-Brunner
Berlin 1989

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 ™f3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 ™c3 ™c6

Notice that White developed the kingside knight before the queenside knight. It doesn’t matter now after 5 ™c3 ™c6, but White can avoid the development of the queen’s knight in the first place. For these particular lines,
Meeting 1 d4

see Chapter Eight.

6 d5 e7 7 dxe7 Qxe7 8 e3

For 8 dxc5, see the next game.

8...cxd4

8...c4 is a good alternative to the text move:

White now has a range of possibilities:

a) 9 g3 0-0 10 g2 f5 11 0-0 d3 12 e1 Qb4 13 c1 f5 14 e2 a5 15 d2 d3 16 d1 f8 17 b1 Qc6 18 b3 Qxe1 19 Qexe1 Qac8 20 bxc4 dx4 21 d5 b2 22 e4 g6 23 f4 b4 with complicated play, Van Kay-Southam, Toronto 1990. White has the pawn majority in the centre, whereas Black’s majority is on the queenside.

b) On 9 b3, Kasparov suggests 9...a5. With a further split:

al) 11 d3 0-0 12 0-0 f8 13 e2 d4 14 f3 dxe3+ 17 f2 a5 18 a6 b6 19 f3 White was better in Sveshnikov-Nunn, Hastings 1977/78. Instead of 11...dxe5, Black can avoid the opening of the centre and instead play 11...c4. With e6 13 a4 f5, with a good position.

Still, the text move 8...cxd4 is an easy way to achieve equality.

9 Qxd4 Wb6 10 a5

Other possibilities are:

a) 10 d5 e6 with a further split:

a1) 11 d3 0-0 12 0-0 f8 13 e2 d4 14 Qd4 Qxd4 15 exd4 Wxd4 16 Wxd1 Wbd8 17 Qe4 f5 and a draw was agreed in Aronson-Polugaevsky 1957.

a2) 11 e2 0-0 12 0-0 b5 13 e4 b4 14 f3 a5. This is a good queen manoeuvre and Black was doing fine in Fries Nielsen-Larsen, Denmark 1979.

a3) 11 Qb5 has similarities to the game: 11...0-0 12 0-0 f8 13 a4 c7 14 c1 b5. This is a good queen manoeuvre and Black was doing fine in Fries Nielsen-Larsen, Denmark 1979.

b) 10 dxc6 bxc6. These kinds of positions have many similarities to the main line Tartasch but here the black knight protects the c6-pawn which sometimes turn out to be weak. Most importantly, Black is far more developed in this line than he usually is in the main line. Again, this is the price White is paying for the time he lost when he exchanged the dark-squared bishops in the opening. 11 Wd2 Wb4 12 c2 b8 13 b3 0-0 14 a4 Wd4 and Black was doing fine in Philip-Huber, Calgary 1996. Still, it seems more logical to us to play either 11...a8 or 11...0-0 as these moves have to be played anyway.

b1) On 10 d5, the move 10...Qxd4 11 Wxb6 axb6 12 exd4 leads to a slight white plus due to Black doubled pawns, Stojnic-Potocnik, Ljubljana 1993.

Instead we recommend the simple 10...Wxb6 11 Qxb6, for instance 11...b5 12 0-0-0 0-0-0 13 d3 d4 14 exd4 Qxd4 15
Tarrasch Defence: Sixth Move Alternatives

\[ \text{Qxd4 Qxd4 16 He1 Qxd3 17 Qxd3 Qxd3 18 Qxe7 f8.} \]

This endgame is approximately even. At the moment the white rook is active on the seventh rank. On the other hand, Black has the advantage of the bishop. The game Johannessen-Smisik, Szeged 1994 ended in a draw after a further twenty moves.

\[ \text{10...0-0 11 0-0 Qxd4 12 Qxd4 Qxd4 13 exd4 e6} \]

Black has already equalised. You can say that White has the slightly better bishop here because the black bishop is placed on the same colour as the d5-pawn, but it is not important in this position. The d5-pawn is easy to protect and White’s d4-pawn needs protection too.

\[ \text{14 a4} \]

Prophylaxis against ...a7-a6 followed by ...b7-b5. Other moves have been played here:

a) 14 fxe5 Qxe5 15 Qad1 h6 16 Qa4 Qac8 17 Qc2 Qd6 18 Qb3 Qc4 19 Qxc4 Qxc4 ½-½ Simagin-Minev, Moscow 1960. The endgame is equal.

b) 14 Qac1 Qf5 15 Qe2 Qac8 16 Qd3 Qxc1 (16...Qxd6 is a more ambitious move. The following knight vs. bishop ending is a dull draw.) 17 Qxc1 Qc8 18 Qxc8+ Qxc8 19 Qxf5 Qxf5 20 Qc3 Qe6 21 Qf1 Qf8 22 Qe2 Qc7 23 Qe3 Qd6 24 h3 f6 25 h4 Qd7 ½-½ Trubman-Cunningham, Philadelphia 1993.

\[ \text{14...Qac8 15 Qfd1} \]

Another move is 15 Qb3 to prevent the following black rook manoeuvre: 15...Qfd8 16 Qac1 Qf6 17 Qfd1 Qf8 18 a3 Qe7 19 h3 Qe6 20 a2 g6 21 Qf4 Qh5 22 Qe2 Qc7 23 Qb1 Qg7 24 Qf3 h4 25 Qc2 Qf5 and here a draw was agreed in Marshall-Burn, San Sebastian 1911.

\[ \text{15...Qfd8 16 Qac1 Qc4 17 Qb3 Qb4} \]

The Black rook is taking an active part in the game from this square, pointing at the pawns on b2 and d4. It is not easy for White to get rid of it.

\[ \text{18 Qe2} \]

Protecting the d4-pawn and, at the same time, planning to play Qe2-f4xe6. Black prevents this by threatening the d4-pawn and thus tying the white knight to the defence of that pawn.

\[ \text{18...Qc6} \]

White also threatened to enter the seventh rank with Qc7.

\[ \text{19 Qc5} \]

White prevents the black knight manoeuvre ...Qc6-a5xb3.

\[ \text{19...Qd6} \]

Black is planning to chase the white rook away with ...b7-b6 some time in the future. 19...a5?! threatening to chase the White bishop away with ...a5-a4, is answered by 20 Qd2 a4 21 Qd1. Pushing the a-pawn just weakens the pawn structure and Black cleverly avoids moves like that.

\[ \text{20 f3} \]

White could here have chased the annoying rook away with 20 Qd3 Qf5 21 Qe3 Qf8 22 a3 Qb6 but this is, at the same time, a weakening of the position. Now both the white bishop and the white rook on e3 are tied up as both b2 and b3 are in need of protection.

\[ \text{20...g5} \]

Black is giving his king some air and, at the same time, he takes control over some dark squares on the king side, especially the f4-square. This seems like a logical strategy as his bishop does a good job protecting the light squares.
Black has achieved his goal. Now there’s an exchange.

There is no need to exchange immediately, as \( \text{24 } \text{d1?!} \) loses the b-pawn to \( \text{24...c4} \).

An interesting scenario is taking place. It turns out that the White d-pawn is more exposed as the Black. During the last 5-10 moves it has been the white pawn that has been under attack whereas the black one has been easy to protect. Notice that the knight manoeuvre \( \text{c1-d3} \) is not possible as the d4-pawn then lacks protection from the rook on d2.

Not good is \( \text{25 a3?! d3} \). The white rook on d2 is threatened and White must play \( \text{26 c3} \), with better prospects for Black in the endgame as his bishop is superior to the white knight.

This move involves a sacrifice which leads to very unclear play. Still, more safe is a move like \( \text{25...h5} \). Black keeps the tension in the position and gains more space on the kingside.

White can win the exchange with \( \text{26 a3} \) (26...\( c5 \) 27 a4 is bad for Black as he loses the exchange without compensation) 27 \( c2+ \) f6 28 axb4 \( d4 \) 29 \( d2 b5 \) 30

This is a brilliant square for the black king. Notice that the similar square for White (\( d3 \)) is not available for the white king as it can be chased away by Black’s light-squared bishop. Black is slightly better after the text move. All of his pieces are more active than the White’s. White now decides to ease the tension with...

Not better is \( \text{25 a3?! c3} \). The white rook on d2 is threatened and White must play \( \text{26 c3} \), with better prospects for Black in the endgame as his bishop is superior to the white knight.

Not good is \( \text{25 a3?! b5} \). The white rook on d2 is threatened and White must play \( \text{26 c5} \), with better prospects for Black in the endgame as his bishop is superior to the white knight.

This move involves a sacrifice which leads to very unclear play. Still, more safe is a move like \( \text{25...h5} \). Black keeps the tension in the position and gains more space on the kingside.

White can win the exchange with \( \text{26 a3} \) (26...\( c5 \) 27 a4 is bad for Black as he loses the exchange without compensation) 27 \( c2+ \) f6 28 axb4 \( d4 \) 29 \( d2 b5 \) 30
protection of the g5-pawn with 42...f6. The point is that after 43 h4 h5, Black does not allow g3-g4.

In the game, after a few more moves, White achieves some pawn exchanges and he only has to take care of the f3-pawn, which is easy to protect.

43 h4 f6 44 g4 \!d7 45 hxg5 hxg5 46 \!d1 \!b5 47 \!d2 \!a8 48 \!c1

White has built up a fortress which is very hard to enter. All his pawns are easy to protect. Now he wants to transfer his knight to c5.

48...\!c4

This move prevents 49 \!b3 but allows the following exchange combination.

49 b3 \!a3 50 \!a2! \!xa2 51 \!xa2 \!xb3 52 \!xb4

After the exchange of rooks and the b-pawns the position is a dead draw.

52...\!c4 53 \!d2 \!e6 54 \!c2 f5 55 \!e3 f4 56 \!d1 \!f1 57 \!f2 \!f6 58 \!d3 \!e6 59 \!e5

The knight has reached the desired outpost but White is unable to proceed from here.

59...\!a6 60 \!c3 \!f1 ½-½

In the first game White played 8 e3 and Black seized the opportunity to exchange on d4. The text move is the other option if White wants to avoid this.

8...d4

The other main line for Black in this position is the more positional move 8...\!a5, to recapture the c5-pawn immediately. Still, this costs time so that White can complete his development peacefully. We prefer to play the more active text move, going for the initiative.

9 \!e4

Of course not 9 \!b5?? \!a5+ and White loses the knight.

9...0-0 10 g3

This is an important moment in this line. White has a lot of other options here, many of them involves trying to hold on to the c5-pawn:

a) 10 \!fd2 seems like the most clever move in the attempt to hang on to the c5-pawn. Now 10...\!d5 is answered by 11 \!b3! The White knight on d2 is protecting the Queen on b3, thus avoiding a double pawn in the b-file, and the annoying Black queen on d5 is immediately chased away from the centre.

Instead Black plays 10...\!e6 11 a3 a5 12 \!c2 \!d5. It is not easy for White to complete his development. In the game Marshall-
Leonhardt, Hamburg 1910 he tried the wild
13 g4!? hxg4 14 fxg4 d6 15 e5
and play was very complicated.

More dubious is 12 e3?, as seen in For-
gacs-Perlis, Ostend 1907. The line 12...dxe3
13 fxe3 $g5 14 wxe2 $d5 15 g3 $e5
(15...$xe3 16 $xe3 f5 is met with 17 0-0-0)
16 $c1 $xe3 17 $xe3 $f5, with complicated
play, is not unfavourable for Black.

b) With 10 a3, White wants to play b2-b4.
After 10...wxd5 11 $fd2 $f5 12 $d6 $xc5
13 $xf5 $f6 14 $c1 $d5 15 $d3 $b5
with a good position for Black in Lputian-Xu Jun, Beijing

c) 10 $ed2 $d5 11 $b3 $d8 12 g3 a5!
13 $c1 $xc5 14 $d3 $b5 with a good
position for Black in Fau-

d) 10 $a4 $d5 11 $ed2 $xc5 12 $b3
$c2 13 $fxd4 $xb2. In Kincs-Stabolewski,
Budapest 1993 Black was clearly better after
the further moves 14 e3 $c3+ 15 $e2 $d5
16 $dxc6 $bxc6 17 $d4 $c2+ 18 $e1 $f5.

e) 10 $c1 $d5 11 $ed2 $xa2 12 $b3
$a5 13 e4 $xe3 14 $xe3 $g4 15 $f2 $ad8,
Chepukalnis-Vunder, St Petersburg 1997.
Despite the fact that Black later lost
the game, he has a good position here.

10...$d5

We think that this is Black's best move.
He immediately regains the c5-pawn.

11 $ed2 $xc5 12 $g2 $b6

We like this move. Black threatens the b2-
pawn, forcing White to consider how to react
this. Depending on how White responds,
Black can develop his bishop.

13 $b3

If White plays 13 $c4, Black responds
13...$b4 14 $fd2 $c6 15 a3 $b5 with
good play.

In Condie-Motwani, Troon 1984 White
played 13 $b3. The game continued:
13...$a5 14 0-0 $e6 15 $a3 $b6 16 $b3
$d8 17 $fd1 $f5 18 $d2 $d6 19 $c5
$e4 20 $xb6 axb6 21 $dd1 $xb3 22 axb3
$t8 with equal play.

This is a good blockading square for
the knight. White now very much would like to
occupy the c5-square with one of his knights.
Hence Black's next move.

Notice the differences in these positions
with the Black knight on e7 as opposed to f6.
The fight for e4 is more difficult to carry out
with the knight on e7, which also obstructs
the rook from operating on the e-file. On
the other hand, e6 is well protected with
the knight on e7. Often the knight occupies
this square later, as in this game.

16...$b4! 17 $xb4 $xb4 18 $d3?

A better move was 18 $c1. Black now
gets nothing from 18...$xc1 19 $xc1
$xb3? 20 axb3 $xb3 as after 21 $c7 White
regains his sacrificed material. Also, after
20...$c8 21 $f4 White suddenly is very ac-
tive. His damaged pawn structure on
the queenside is fully compensated by the piece
activity.

With the text move White now somehow
pays the price for the time he used in the
opening to achieve the exchange of the dark-
squared bishops.

The position has many similarities to the 9
dxc5 in the main line Tarrasch. Still, here
Black is far more developed than he usually is
in the main line. His rooks are already operat-
ing in the c- and d-file, whereas the white
rooks are still passive.
18...\texttt{c4}

Black has the initiative.

19 \texttt{Wf3} \texttt{Qc6} 20 \texttt{Wfc1} \texttt{a5}!

Threatening \ldots\texttt{a5-a4}. The text move is logical as White has some problems with the knight on b3 and along the b-file. In other positions Black would like to play this move as well, but he often doesn’t have the time.

White now turn to tactics to keep up with the Black initiative.

21 \texttt{Wh5!?} \texttt{g6} 22 \texttt{Wg5}

On 22 \texttt{Wc5}, Black simply replies 22...\texttt{xe2}.

22...\texttt{xe2}

White has lost a pawn and now has to give up his light-squared bishop to win it back. But the price is that the light squares around his king is weakened.

23 \texttt{xc6?!} \texttt{bxc6} 24 \texttt{xa5}

Not 24 \texttt{xa5?} \texttt{xa5} 25 \texttt{xa5} d3 26 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{xc6} 27 \texttt{xc6} d2, when White has to give up his rook to stop the black pawn. The connected passed pawns on the queenside do not compensate for the black bishop and this is a technically winning endgame for Black.

24...\texttt{h6}!

The queen must be chased away. On g5 it protects both the knight on a5 but also points at the d8-square. If Black plays 24...\texttt{f3}? immediately, White responds 25 \texttt{xc6!} with the point of 25...\texttt{xc6} 26 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{xc6} 27 \texttt{xd8+}.

25 \texttt{We5}

If 25 \texttt{xc6?}, Black responds with 25...\texttt{hxg5} 26 \texttt{xb4} \texttt{xc1+} 27 \texttt{xc1} d3 28 \texttt{xc6} d2 and Black wins.

25...\texttt{f3} 26 \texttt{c4} d3 27 \texttt{We3} \texttt{xe2} 28 a3

It is important for White to chase the black queen away from the protection of the d2-square. On the other hand, the text move weakens the b3-square.

28...\texttt{Wb5} 29 \texttt{Wxb6} \texttt{d4}

Black has temporarily sacrificed a pawn, but White cannot hold on to it.

30 a4 \texttt{Wb4} 31 \texttt{d2} \texttt{Wxb2} 32 a5

White seeks counterplay by pushing his passed a-pawn.

32...\texttt{xa4}!

The pawn is stopped!

33 \texttt{a6} 34 \texttt{Wg5} \texttt{Wb8} 35 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{xc6} 36 \texttt{Wxe5} \texttt{We5} 37 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{xe5} 38 \texttt{f4} \texttt{xe4} 39 \texttt{xe4}?

Much better is 39 \texttt{b2} \texttt{a2} 40 \texttt{ec6} and White holds on to the important d2-square, which makes it more difficult for Black to win the game.

39...\texttt{xe4} 40 \texttt{we3}?

This loses on the spot.

40...\texttt{xe4}+ 41 \texttt{e4} \texttt{xe4} 0-1

White plays 6 \texttt{f4}

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{c3} c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \texttt{f3} \texttt{c6} 6 \texttt{f4}

With this move, White wants to develop his bishop before he playing e2-e3. This is a
very solid opening choice. If play develops along quiet lines as after ...\( \text{f}6 \), ...\( \text{c}7 \) and ...0-0, the game often transfers to positions known from the Queens Gambit Declined (see the note to Black’s seventh move in Game 34).

6...\( \text{f}6 \) 7 e3 cxd4 8 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{b}4 \) is the Tarrasch idea, and of course we recommend that Black plays this. Besides that, it’s more active than 7...\( \text{c}7 \). Black immediately puts pressure on c3. Often Black follows up with the moves ...\( \text{e}4 \) and ...\( \text{a}5 \).

**Game 33**

Damaso-Frois

Porto 2000

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{c}3 \) c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 6 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 7 e3 cxd4 8 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{b}4 \)

9 \( \text{e}2 \)

The move 9 \( \text{b}5 \) is considered in the next game.

Other possibilities for White are:

a) 9 \( \text{db}5 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 11 \( \text{db}5 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 12 \( \text{c}7 \) with a draw by repetition, Znosko Borovský-Forgacs, Nuremberg 1906.

b) 9 \( \text{xc}6 \) bxc6 with further branches:

b1) 10 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 11 \( \text{d}3 \) 0-0 (interesting is the following knight manoeuvre: 11...\( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 13 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 14 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{a}6 \) with equal play, Rufer-Koelle, Germany 1988) 12 0-0 \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 14 a3 \( \text{f}8 \) 15 \( \text{c}2 \) c5 16 b3 \( \text{ac}8 \) 17 \( \text{ab}1 \) g6 18 \( \text{ac}1 \) a5 with a slightly better position for Black in Balduan-Engel, Cologne 1994. His space advantage gives him the possibilities of controlling the game. The b3-pawn is weak and the pawn breaks ...a5-a4, ...c5-c4 and maybe ...d5-d4 constantly threaten.

In the game Lombardy-R.Hernandez, Tallinn 1975, Black tried the rather dubious idea 10...\( \text{a}5 \)? (instead of 10...\( \text{b}6 \)) 11 \( \text{xc}6+ \) \( \text{d}7 \), offering both his rooks to attack the white king, who is stuck in the centre. Whether Hernandez actually believed in the correctness of this move or if it was played as a surprise weapon, we cannot tell, but White did not dare to check it out at the board. After 12 \( \text{xa}8+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13 \( \text{xb}8 \) \( \text{xc}3+ \) 14 \( \text{e}2 \) it is not at all clear if Black has enough compensation for the huge material sacrifice. Practical play has to prove this.

Instead the game continued 12 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 13 \( \text{xc}7 \) d4 14 a3? (better is 14 exd4 \( \text{c}8 \) 15 \( \text{f}4! \) with the point 15...\( \text{xc}3 \) 16 \( \text{d}2 \), or 14...\( \text{xd}5 \) 15 \( \text{d}6! \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 16 \( \text{xd}5 \) and White has the advantage in both cases) 14...\( \text{xc}3 \) 15 axb4 \( \text{cxb}2 \) 16 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 17 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 18 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 19 \( \text{d}2 \) 26 20 \( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 21 \( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 22 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 23 \( \text{xb}5 \) axb5 24 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 25 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{hc}8 \) 0-1.

b2) 10 \( \text{d}3 \) 0-0 11 0-0 \( \text{d}6 \) (Black prepares ...c6-c5) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) (12 \( \text{g}5 \) is met by 12...\( \text{b}8 \) 13 b3 \( \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \) and Black is slightly better) 12...\( \text{g}3 \) 13 hgx3 \( \text{c}5 \) 14...
Tarrasch Defence: Sixth Move Alternatives

\[ \text{c1 c6 15 Wa4 Wa6 and Black was fine in Rubinstein-Nimzowitsch, Karlsbad 1907.} \]

c) 9 Wa4 Wa5 10 Bxa5 Bxa5 equals immediately.

d) 9 Bc1 looks harmless, but the move still contains some points of which Black should be aware. The automatic move 9...Bd4?! is met with 10 Bb5! and now the standard move 10...d6 is problematic, as after 11 Bxe2 the d5-pawn lacks protection from the knight on f6.

Instead we recommend 9...Wa5, putting pressure against c3 and waiting to see what White will do next.

9...Bd4 10 Bc1

Another possibility is 10 Bdb5 0-0 11 0-0 Bxc3 12 Bxc3 Bxc3 13 Bxc3 Bc6 14 Bb1 Bb6 15 Wa4 Bc5 16 Bfd1 Wc8 17 Ad6 Bd8 18 Wf4 f6 19 Bbc1 Bc4 with equal play in Psakhis-Ehlvest, Lvov 1984.

10...0-0

Another interesting option is the wild 10...g5!? 11 Bg3 h5 12 Bxc6 Bxc6 13 Wd4 Bxc3+ 14 Bxc3 Bb6 with very complicated play, Sentongo-R.Hernandez, Novi Sad 1990. Hernandez really takes some liberties in these positions!

11 0-0 Bxc3 12 Bxc3 Wa5 13 c4 Bc3!

This is Speelman’s improvement for Black. In another game with Speelman playing White, Black chose the unconvincing 13...dxc4, and after the further 14 Bxc4 Bxd4 15 Wxd4 Bdd2 16 Bd6 Bh3?! (Black was in trouble, but still 16...Bd8 was a better move. The text move simply loses the exchange.) 17 Bfc1 Bxc4 18 Bxf8 Bxf8 (or 18...Bg5 19 Wxg7+! Wxg7 20 Bxg7 and again White wins the exchange) 19 Bxc4 Bg5 20 We4 Black gave up, Speelman-Illescas Cordoba, Barcelona 1989.

14 Bxc3?!

This move seems to create more problems for Black than the more straightforward 14 Bb3 Bb4 15 Bd2 Bxe2+ 16 We2 Bc6, when Black has a good position.

14...Bxc3 15 Bb5 Bb2!

Black must be careful here. 15...Wa5 leads to a White advantage after 16 cxd5 Bc7 17 Bc7 Bb8 18 Bb6. The idea behind the text move is to close the annoying h2-b8 diagonal with the knight.

16 cxd5 Bc7 17 Bc7 Bb8 18 Bb5?!

This is an interesting attempt to close the black bishop out of the game. The move is directed against 18...Bd7 and now the queen manoeuvre d1-h5 is possible. Unfortunately for White, Black has many good options here and developing the bishop is one of them.

18...Bd8

After 18...Bf5 the move order 19 e4? Bxe4 20 Wc1 f5 21 f3 does not have the desired effect following 21...Bd3 22 Bd2 Bxd2 23 Bxd2 a6!. Wherever the white bishop retreats, it is threatened by the black knight, after which the trapped black bishop on e4 gets out.

Also possible is 18...Bd7 19 Bxe5? Bxe5 20 Bxd7 Bxc7. There is nothing wrong with the text move either, but we like the idea of completing the piece development.

19 Ba4 Bd7 20 Wh5?!

Another, more quiet, approach to the position is 20 Bc2 Bg6 (21 Bxh7+ Bxh7 22 Wh5+ and 23 Wxe5 was threatening) 21 Bxg6 hxg6 22 Bb1!, not fearing the endgame despite the reduced material, and the fact that White has lost the exchange. The position is still unclear.

20...Bg6 21 Bc6?
White had to play 21 \textit{b}3 but after 21...\textit{x}f4 22 exf4 \textit{f}6 Black has the advantage. White's dark-squared bishop is exchanged and his pawn structure is destroyed.

\begin{itemize}
    \item 21...\textit{b}5?
    \item 21...\textit{x}f4 22 exf4 \textit{f}6 23 ...x\textit{d}7 \textit{x}d7 24 dxe6 \textit{e}7 wins on the spot.
\end{itemize}

22 \textit{x}d8

Now White is better.

22...\textit{xf}1?!

22...\textit{xe}8 has to be played. After 23 \textit{xb}5 \textit{xb}5 24 \textit{xd}1 \textit{xf}4 25 exf4 White is a pawn up, but Black is still fighting as the extra pawn is doubled and he can create a passed pawn on the queenside.

23 \textit{f}5?

There is no need to be afraid of ghosts. 23 \textit{xb}8 \textit{c}2 24 \textit{f}3! protects the queen and gives the white king an escape route via \textit{f}2.

23...\textit{xd}8 24 \textit{xf}1 \textit{c}1+ 25 \textit{e}2 \textit{b}2+

25...\textit{c}4+ 26 \textit{e}1 \textit{xa}4 gives Black a winning material advantage. Instead the game ended in a perpetual. Maybe there was time trouble here.

26 \textit{f}1 \textit{c}1+ 27 \textit{e}2 \textit{b}2+ 1/2-1/2.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{game34.png}
\caption{Game 34 \textit{Lukacs-Blauert} \textit{Budapest 1999}}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
    \item 1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{f}3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 6 \textit{f}4 \textit{f}6 7 e3 cxd4
\end{itemize}

7...\textit{e}7 is possible as well, but the position usually transfers to those arising from the Queens Gambit Declined, for instance 8 \textit{e}2 0 9 dxc5 or 8 \textit{d}3 0-0.

8 \textit{xd}4 \textit{b}4 9 \textit{b}5 \textit{d}7 10 0-0 0-0

11 \textit{de}2

Other possibilities:

\begin{itemize}
    \item a) 11 \textit{a}4 \textit{xd}4 12 cxd4 \textit{xc}3 13 bxc3 \textit{a}6 14 \textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}7 15 \textit{xd}7 16 \textit{xe}f1 b6 17 \textit{e}1 \textit{fe}8 with equal play in the endgame, Vignato-Farina, Italy 1997.
    \item b) 11 \textit{d}3 \textit{xd}4 12 exd4 \textit{c}6 13 \textit{b}3 \textit{a}6 14 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}7 15 \textit{a}e1 \textit{e}8 16 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 17 \textit{xe}8+ \textit{xc}8 18 \textit{f}5! (Black now loses a pawn as he cannot play 18..g6?? 19 \textit{xf}6) 18...\textit{f}8 19 \textit{xd}5, Mamedyarov-Gokhale, Dubai 2000. Instead 13...\textit{eb}8 14 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}7 15 \textit{a}e1 \textit{d}4 16 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xc}7 is a clever idea, when the position is unclear.
    \item c) 11 \textit{g}5 \textit{xc}3 12 bxc3 \textit{xd}4 13 \textit{xd}7 \textit{d}2+ 14 \textit{xe}2 \textit{xd}7 15 \textit{xf}6 \textit{gf}6 16 \textit{ad}1 and White is better. Black's pawns are weak and his king is exposed, Husari-Bock, Budapest 2000.
    \item d) Interesting is 11 \textit{c}1 \textit{c}8, when White has a choice:
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
    \item d1) 12 \textit{d}3 \textit{xd}4 13 exd4 \textit{c}6 and, compared to the Mamedyarov-Gokhale game shown above, the extra moves \textit{c}1 and \textit{c}8 do not make a big difference.
    \item d2) 12 \textit{g}5 \textit{xc}3 13 \textit{xc}3 (the difference with the extra moves \textit{c}1 and \textit{c}8 is that White can recapture on c3 with the rook and thus avoid the isolated c-pawn) 13...\textit{xd}4 14
\[ \text{Tarrasch Defence: Sixth Move Alternatives} \]

\[ \text{Rx8} \text{Wx8} 15 \text{xd7} \text{Wxd7?!} \text{. Now White is} \]

slightly better after 16 \text{xd4} \text{e4} 17 \text{f4}. Compared to the line shown above, the Black knight is more awkwardly placed on e4 and Black does not have the same play along the c-file, as the d-pawn now needs protection from Black's major pieces. Instead, Reinemer-Raasch, Cologne 1998 continued 16 \text{xf6} \text{e6}, with an equal position.

11...\text{e6} 12 \text{h3}

12...\text{b6?!}

In the game White creates play on the queenside with \text{c3-a4} and the pawn moves a2-a3 and b2-b4, trying to occupy the c5-square with the knight. Therefore the text move only seems to help White and instead we suggest 12...\text{c8} as an improvement.

13 \text{d3} \text{a6}

Or else the black queen has to retreat to d8 after White's next move. This was maybe a better choice, but it is always difficult to admit that you are wrong.

14 \text{a4} \text{wa7} 15 \text{a3} \text{e7} 16 \text{c1} \text{ac8}

17 \text{b4} \text{b6}

The black queen is a bit misplaced and he has weakened his queenside pawns. White is slightly better.

18 \text{b1} \text{e4} 19 \text{d4} \text{xd4} 20 \text{xd4}

\text{f6} 21 \text{e5}

Or 21 \text{xb6} \text{xb6} 22 \text{xb6} \text{xc1} 23 \text{xc1} \text{b2}, with approximately equal chances in the endgame.

21...\text{xe5} 22 \text{xe5} \text{d2} 23 \text{fd1} \text{c4}

24 \text{d4} \text{a5}

If Black plays 24...\text{xa3} White can enter a better endgame with the forced move order 25 \text{xb7}! \text{xb7} 26 \text{d3}+ \text{g8} 27 \text{xa3}. White's knight is clearly better than the Black bishop.

25 \text{b5} \text{we7}

26 \text{c3}

Even better is the transfer of the White bishop to the f1-a6 diagonal with 26 \text{d3}!. From here the bishop also points at the b5-pawn. After 26...\text{xa3} 27 \text{a1} \text{we7} 28 \text{xb6}

\text{xb6} 29 \text{xb6} White has the better endgame. His bishop is superior to Black's and his passed b-pawn is far more dangerous than the black one on a5.

26...\text{xa3} 27 \text{xc8} \text{xc8} 28 \text{xb6} \text{bd8}

29 \text{d3}

The Black knight is a bit misplaced and the d5-pawn is soon coming under attack. White is better here as well, but Black has some counterplay.

29...\text{b4} 30 \text{a1} \text{b8?!}

30...h6 was preferrable, to maintain the tension and at the same time avoid any unpleasant surprises on the back rank.

31 \text{xd5} \text{xd4} 32 \text{exd4} \text{xb5} 33 \text{e7}+

\text{f8} 34 \text{c6} \text{b6} 35 \text{xa5}

White has ended up with a pawn more. Still, it is very difficult to win as the black pieces now become very active.

35...\text{xc6} 36 \text{xb5} \text{c1}+ 37 \text{h2} \text{d1}

38 \text{a4} \text{e7} 39 \text{g3} \text{d5} 40 \text{e2} \text{d2}
41 \( \mathcal{E}f3 \mathcal{E}d3 \)

Black enters a rook endgame with very good chances of saving the game.

42 \( \mathcal{D}f4 \)

42...\( g5+! \)

This forces the draw. If White wants to get rid of the \( g5 \) pawn, he cannot avoid further simplification.

43 \( \mathcal{G}g4 \mathcal{E}xf3+ \) 44 \( \mathcal{G}xf3 \) \( \mathcal{H}6 \) 45 \( f4 \mathcal{F}f6! \)

Not 45...\( \mathcal{G}xf4?! \) 46 \( \mathcal{H}4! \) \( f3 \) 47 \( \mathcal{G}f4 \) and the white king is activated. It reaches the e4-square, from where the active black rook is chased away. White can hope to push his passed d-pawn and activate his rather passive-looking rook on a4. White has good winning prospects.

46 \( f3 \mathcal{E}d1 \) 47 \( \mathcal{F}xg5+ \) \( \mathcal{H}xg5 \) 48 \( \mathcal{A}a6+ \mathcal{E}e7 \)

More forcing is 48...\( \mathcal{G}g7 \) 49 \( \mathcal{E}d6 \mathcal{G}g1+ \) 50 \( \mathcal{F}f5 \mathcal{G}g3 \), for instance 51 \( \mathcal{A}d5 \) \( f6 \) 52 \( f4 \) \( gxf4 \) 53 \( \mathcal{A}d7+ \) \( \mathcal{H}h6 \) 54 \( \mathcal{G}xf4 \mathcal{A}xh3 \) with a drawn rook ending.

49 \( \mathcal{G}xg5 \mathcal{E}xd4 \) 50 \( f4 \mathcal{E}d3 \) 51 \( h4 \mathcal{G}g3+ \) 52 \( \mathcal{F}f5 \mathcal{E}e3 \) 53 \( h5 \mathcal{A}b3 \) 54 \( \mathcal{G}g4 \mathcal{F}f8 \) 55 \( \mathcal{H}6 \mathcal{G}g8 \) 56 \( f5 \) \( h7 \) 57 \( \mathcal{G}g5 \mathcal{A}b7 \)

Black has built up a fortress.

58 \( \mathcal{A}a8 \mathcal{E}e7 \) 59 \( \mathcal{H}b8 \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

White plays 6 \( e3 \)

1 \( d4 \) \( d5 \) 2 \( c4 \) \( e6 \) 3 \( \mathcal{D}c3 \) \( c5 \) 4 \( cxd5 \) \( exd5 \) 5 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( \mathcal{D}c6 \) 6 \( e3 \)

White decides to consolidate his centre with the e-pawn. Naturally, he now develops his bishop along the f1-a6 diagonal.

As Black always plays the similar moves ...\( e7-e6 \) and develops his king bishop along the f8-a3 diagonal, 6 \( e3 \) gives the most symmetrical positions. And because of the symmetrical structure, you often see the same position arising with reversed colours.

If Black, for instance, exchanges on \( d4 \) at an early stage of the game and White recaptures with the pawn, we get the diagram position above with reversed colours.

In the Panov-Botvinnik Attack in the Caro-Kann Defence White gives Black no choice at all: 1 \( e4 \) \( c6 \) 2 \( d4 \) \( d5 \) 3 \( exd5 \) \( cxd5 \) 4 \( c4 \) \( \mathcal{D}f6 \) 5 \( \mathcal{D}c3 \) \( e6 \) 6 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) and we have the pawn structure above with reversed colours.

It is useful to compare the positions from the Tarrasch with the ones from the Panov-Botvinnik attack, to see what difference a tempo makes. We will try to do this in the following game:

---

**Game 35**

**Petursson-Aagaard**

**Copenhagen 1997**

1 \( c4 \) \( \mathcal{C}f6 \) 2 \( \mathcal{D}c3 \) \( c5 \) 3 \( \mathcal{D}f3 \) \( e6 \) 4 \( e3 \) \( d5 \) 5 \( cxd5 \) \( exd5 \) 6 \( d4 \) \( \mathcal{D}c6 \)

With another move order we have now reached the diagram position above. Usually it doesn’t matter what move order White chooses; the position after 6...\( \mathcal{D}c6 \) is easy to achieve. However, White can play along the
3 $f3 line and obtain a different position, for instance 1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 $f3 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 c3 $f6 6 $b5+. Here White refrains from playing $c3. This particular line is considered in Chapter Eight.

7 $e2

The more aggressive approach 7 $b5 is treated in the Games 36 and 37.

7...cxd4 8 $xd4 $c5!

8...$d6 is the main line, but we prefer the more active text move (see the notes to White’s tenth move).

9 0-0 0-0 10 $xc6

Somehow the exchange on c6 has become the main line. We can’t see how this move can cause Black serious problems. Here is an overview of other possibilities for White, compared with the same moves in the line with 8...$d6:

a) 10 b3 $xd4! 11 exd4 $b4! (The last two black moves are part of a plan. After b2-b3 the knight on c3 is unprotected and Black forces the white bishop to b2, which is a rather passive square, especially after White has recaptured with the pawn on d4, thus blockading the a1-h8 diagonal. Notice that with the bishop on d6, White could have recaptured with the queen on d4.) 12 $b2 $f5 13 a3 $a5 14 b4 $c7 15 $f3 $d6 16 g3 a6 17 $e1 $fe8 18 $b3 $c4 19 $xe4 $xe4 20 $w3 an in this balanced position the players agreed for a draw, Trifunovic-Lengyel, Sarajevo 1965.

b) 10 $a4!? (it’s hard to see what the knight is doing here) 10...$d6 11 b3 $xd4 12 exd4 $e4 13 $f3 $f5 14 $e3 $c8 15 $xc5 b6 16 $xd3 $e8 $b5 16 Donner-Tringov, Havana 1965. The players agreed a draw here, but in fact Black is slightly better.

c) 10 a3 is a passive move: 10...$xd4 11 exd4 $e7 (11...$b6 is good as well; Black has nothing to fear) 12 $f3 $e6 13 $e1 $d7 14 $g5 $fe8 15 $d2 b6 16 $f4 $xd8 17 h3 $c8 18 $c1 $f8 19 $e5 $d6 20 $e2 and a draw was agreed in Filip-Tringov, Lugano 1968.

d) 10 $f3 (It is worth noticing that this move is common in the 8...$d6 line. Then Black has frequently played 10...$e5 to put pressure on d4. But the bishop is already pointing at d4 in the 8...$c5 line!) 10...$e5 11 $ce2 $xf3+ 12 $xf3 $g4 13 b3 $c7 14 $b2 $fd8 15 $g3 $e4 16 $w3 $f6 17 $c1 $h8 with an equal position in Danner-Kucera, Hradec Kralove 1994.

10...bxc6 11 b3 $e8 12 $b2 $d6

This position is well known with reversed colours from the Panov-Botvinnik Attack in the Caro-Kann Defence. The extra tempo doesn’t mean much. In the text game Black has his a-pawn on a7 (a2) whereas White has normally played a2-a3 (...a7-a6) in this position. It is better to have the pawn on a2 (a7) because $a3 (...$a6) can come in handy. Besides that, the a-pawn is less exposed on a7(a2).

The last two black moves are both natural and logical. Other move constellations have been played, one example is Cebalo-Portisch, Sarajevo 1986. If anything, this game has served as a proof that this line was favourable for White, which is not the case in our opinion: 11...$d6 12 $b2 $c7 13 g3 $h3 14 $e1 $fe8 15 $c1 $d7 (White threatened to play 16 $b5. The Black queen has now moved twice, but it does not matter that much in this rather closed position.) 16 $d3 $ac8 17 $f3 $g4. Black is planning ...$e5 and is better in this position.
13 \text{c}1 \text{h}5!?

This move is also well known with reversed colours. Here White has the extra move \text{c}1. What this move means, we shall see.

14 \text{x}h5

This is the principal answer, but now White’s extra move really doesn’t mean much, as Black plays his rook to the third rank with tempo (...\text{e}6, threatening \text{h}6). From here, the rook – directly or indirectly – protects the c6-pawn.

If you follow the ‘normal’ line from the Panov-Botvinnik attack in the Caro-Kann Defence, the best Black response to 13 \text{h}4! is 13...\text{e}5. That means that White should try 14 \text{a}4 in the text game. It does seem logical to put pressure along the c-file, profiting from the ‘extra’ white move.

After 14 \text{a}4 Black should play 14...\text{g}4!.

No games have reached this position, so we are still following practical experience with reversed colours. The knight move 14...\text{g}4 still works out in the position with reversed colours, for example:

a) 15 \text{h}3 \text{h}2! 16 \text{e}1 \text{g}5 17 \text{h}1 \text{g}4 18 \text{f}1 \text{x}e3! 19 \text{x}e3 \text{g}3 20 \text{f}4 \text{xe}3 and Black is winning.

b) 15 \text{x}g4 \text{x}g4 16 \text{d}4 \text{e}5 17 \text{c}5 \text{xb}2 18 \text{xb}2 \text{g}5 19 \text{h}1 \text{f}6, followed by ...\text{ac}8 with equal chances. White has a firm grip of the dark squares on the queenside, whereas Black has a good bishop and chances on the kingside.

c) On 15 \text{g}3 Black can go for the draw with 15...\text{x}h2 16 \text{h}xh2 \text{h}4+ 17 \text{g}1 \text{g}3 18 \text{f}xg3 \text{g}3+ 19 \text{h}1 \text{h}3+ with perpetual check. Another possibility is 15...\text{d}7 to simply protect the c6-pawn, but this still has to be carried out in practical play.

Only in the last line did the extra move \text{c}1 make a difference, but it’s still okay for Black.

14...\text{x}h5 15 \text{w}xh5 \text{e}6 16 \text{f}4?!

White is avoiding passive defence but the idea is dubious.

16...\text{xe}3 17 \text{d}1

17 \text{xd}5!? \text{cxd}5 18 \text{w}d5 does not work out well: 18...\text{a}6 19 \text{d}4 \text{f}6 20 \text{xe}3 \text{xb}2 21 \text{f}2 \text{f}6 with better chances for Black. His bishops are worth more than a rook and two pawns in this open position.

17...\text{e}4

Better is 17...\text{e}6!, for example 18 \text{xc}6 \text{a}6! 19 \text{g}4 (19 \text{f}5? loses the exchange: 19...\text{h}2+ and 20...\text{xe}6) 19...\text{e}6 20 \text{yg}6 \text{fxg}6 21 \text{xa}6 \text{c}5+ and Black is better.

18 \text{xc}6 \text{xf}4 19 \text{e}3!?

Petursson himself writes that he completely overlooked Blacks’ next move.

19...\text{e}8!

Threatening both c6 and e3.

20 \text{e}1!!

This is the only move that keeps the balance in the position – and what a move! 20 \text{c}3? \text{d}4 21 \text{d}3 \text{e}4! (threatening not
only the rook on d3, but also the manoeuvre ...\textit{h}4) 22 \textit{b}5 dxe3 23 \textit{x}d6 \textit{b}7 24 \textit{c}e2 \textit{g}4 and White is unable to protect g2 further.

Bad for Black in this line is 21...dxe3? in view of 22 \textit{x}g7!! \textit{xf}1+ 23 \textit{xf}1 e2+ 24 \textit{e}1 \textit{x}g7 25 \textit{g}5+ \textit{f}8 26 \textit{h}6. White's attack is more worth than Black's extra piece.

20...\textit{xc}6

Or 20...\textit{f}8 21 \textit{xd}5 \textit{b}7 22 \textit{g}5 with a white advantage. Black has nothing better than the text continuation.

21 \textit{xd}6! \textit{xd}6

Here the players agreed for a draw in view of the following lines:

a) 21...f5 22 \textit{g}5 \textit{f}7 23 \textit{f}6+ \textit{g}8 24 \textit{g}5 with repetition of moves.

b) 21...\textit{x}g7 22 \textit{g}5+ \textit{f}8 23 \textit{d}8+ \textit{g}7 24 \textit{g}5+ again with repetition, as 23...\textit{e}8?? loses to 24 \textit{xd}6+ \textit{g}8 25 \textit{xf}4.

Now we turn our attention to the move 7 \textit{b}5. The next game is an all time classic and should be known by anyone who plays the Tarrasch.

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

\begin{center}
\textbf{Sunye Neto-Kasparov}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{Graz 1981}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
1 \textit{d}f3 \textit{d}f6 2 c4 c5 3 \textit{c}c3 e6 4 e3 \textit{c}c6 5 d4 d5 6 cx\textit{d}5 ex\textit{d}5 7 \textit{b}b5
\end{center}

Again we have reached the desired position, but with another move order.

7...\textit{d}6 8 \textit{xc}5

8 0-0 is played in the next game.

8...\textit{xc}5 9 0-0 0-0 10 b3

Another way of developing the dark-squared bishop is the with plan a2-a3 and b2-b4: 10 a3 \textit{g}4 11 \textit{e}2 \textit{c}8 12 b4 \textit{d}6 13 \textit{b}2 \textit{e}8 14 \textit{c}1 \textit{b}8 15 g3 h5 16 \textit{c}2 \textit{d}7 17 \textit{d}2 \textit{cd}8 with equal chances in Berg-Emms, Gausdal 1993.

10...\textit{g}4

A good alternative here is 10...a6. For example, 11 \textit{xc}6 bxc6 12 \textit{b}2 \textit{d}6 13 \textit{c}1 \textit{b}7 with the idea of ...\textit{c}6-c5. If White retreats his bishop with 11 \textit{e}2, again we have a well known position with reversed colours. In both cases Black has a good position.

11 \textit{b}2 \textit{c}8 12 \textit{c}1

Another option for White is 12 \textit{e}2. This move is somehow more testing than the one in the text game, but it should not cause Black any trouble. After 12...\textit{d}6 White has the following possibilities:

a) In the game Wirthensohn-Scherrer, Lenk 1992 White now won a pawn after 13 \textit{b}5 \textit{b}8 14 \textit{xf}6?? \textit{xf}6 15 \textit{xd}5. Still, Black has good compensation after 15...\textit{fd}8 16 \textit{e}4 \textit{h}5. The game continued 17 \textit{h}3 \textit{e}8 18 \textit{a}4 a6? 19 \textit{hxg}4 ax\textit{b}5 20 \textit{xb}5 with a white advantage, but much better was 18...\textit{xf}3 19 \textit{xf}3 \textit{e}5 with a dangerous attack (20 g3 is met with 20...h4! and White has problems protecting g3).

b) Another idea is 13 \textit{d}4. White plays this move before Black gets the opportunity to play \textit{b}8 and \textit{d}6 (see the note to White's 14th move in the main game). Then 13...\textit{e}6 14 \textit{cb}5 \textit{b}8 15 \textit{c}1 \textit{e}8 was played in Wirthensohn-Wilder, Lugano 1989. Still, Black has a good position here as well.

12...\textit{d}6

13 \textit{e}2!?

13 h3! is more testing, for example:

a) Seirawan gives 13...\textit{h}5 14 \textit{e}2 \textit{b}8 15 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}6 16 g3 \textit{xe}2 17 \textit{xe}2 with a slightly better position for White.
b) That is why we prefer the retreat 13...\(\text{a}6\), as the bishop protects the f5-square from here, and also White has difficulties in playing g2-g3 as the h3-pawn is exposed: 14 \(\text{e}5\) (it looks natural to exchange the bishop before Black plays ...\(\text{b}8\) and ...\(\text{d}6\)) 14...\(\text{b}8\). Black plays this move in almost all these positions, so why not here? Sometimes he exchanges his bishop on f3 after h2-h3, so why not let White exchange on e6 instead? Black is doing fine here.

13...\(\text{b}8\) 14 \(\text{b}5\)

If White plays 14 \(\text{d}4\), then Black can play 14...\(\text{d}6\) 15 g3 \(\text{h}3\), thus avoiding the exchange of his light-squared bishop.

On 14 h3 Black can play 14...\(\text{f}5\), not fearing 15 \(\text{h}4\) ? \(\text{d}6\) and White must retreat his knight to f3.

14...\(\text{e}4\) 15 \(\text{bd}4\) \(\text{e}8\)

The immediate attack 15...\(\text{d}6\)! 16 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{x}f3\)? is too hasty: 17 \(\text{e}5\) gives White an advantage.

16 h3 \(\text{xf}3\) 17 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 18 \(\text{wd}3\)

\(\text{g}5\)!

This move is a bit too early. Better is 18...a6 (preventing \(\text{b}5\)) 19 \(\text{fd}1\) \(\text{cd}8\), to strengthen the position further before attacking.

19 \(\text{fd}1\) \(\text{cd}8\)

19...d4?! is met with 20 \(\text{f}1\) ! \(\text{xf}3\) 21 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{h}2\) 22 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 23 \(\text{xd}4\) with a white advantage, but not 20 \(\text{xd}4\)? \(\text{xf}3+\) 21 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{h}2+\) 22 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{xd}4\) 23 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xc}1\) 24 \(\text{xc}1\) \(\text{h}1+\) 25 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{xc}1\) and White is a rook down.

20 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}4\)

Whoops! Back again.

21 a3 a6 22 \(\text{wc}2\) \(\text{a}7\) 23 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 24 \(\text{e}1\)

Prophylaxis against sacrifices on f2? Better was 24 b4 to gain space on the queenside.

24...\(\text{d}6\) 25 b4 \(\text{e}6\) 26 b5 \(\text{axb}5\) 27 \(\text{xb}5\) h6 28 \(\text{cd}1\) \(\text{d}8\) 29 \(\text{wb}3\) \(\text{wd}6\)

The black isolated d-pawn needed protection.

The position is very tense. In the following moves the players manoeuvre with their pieces, trying to make small improvements in their position.

30 a4 \(\text{c}5\)

Black improves the position of his bishop.

31 \(\text{e}2\)

Prophylaxis against ...\(\text{b}4\) and, at the same time, protecting the second rank.

31...b6 32 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{e}7\) 33 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{g}6\) 34 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{wd}7\) 35 \(\text{h}1\)

After 35 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}3\) 36 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xe}2+\) 37 \(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{xe}6\) play is even.

35...\(\text{f}5\) 36 \(\text{xe}4\)

Better is the double exchange 36 \(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{xf}5\) 37 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}4\). With a knight each left on the board White now gets into trouble.

36...\(\text{xe}4\) 37 \(\text{ed}2\) \(\text{h}4!\)

This move involves a sacrifice.

38 \(\text{xe}6?!\)

38 f4?! to keep the kingside closed and to protect g2 along the second rank, was worth a try here. Of course, not 38 \(\text{f}3??\) \(\text{xf}3\) 39 \(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{xg}2+\) 40 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{f}3\) mate!

38...\(\text{xd}4\) 39 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xd}2\) 40 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}5\) 41 \(\text{g}1\)

The f-pawn had to be protected.

41...\(\text{xf}3+\) + 42 \(\text{f}1\)

If 42 \(\text{h}1\), Black has the brilliant 42...\(\text{xe}3!!\) 43 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{xd}g2!!\) 44 \(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{g}3!!\) and White is mated! He cannot protect h3 and he cannot move the knight either, as he would then be mated on g1. A very beautiful idea.
**Tarrasch Defence: Sixth Move Alternatives**

42...\texttt{\textbf{x}e3}!! 43 \texttt{fxe3}

The only move. Again 43 \texttt{Wxe3} \texttt{Sdl}+ 44 \texttt{Sel}
is mate.

After 43 \texttt{£te2} more mating patterns appear: 43...\texttt{£h2}+ 44 \texttt{£e1} \texttt{£xg2} 45 \texttt{Wxe3} \texttt{£f3}+ 46 \texttt{£f1} \texttt{£g1}+!! 47 \texttt{£xg1} \texttt{£d1}+ and White is mated again.

43...\texttt{£dxdg2}! 44 \texttt{Wc3}

Or:
- a) 44 \texttt{Wxb6} \texttt{Sh2} 45 \texttt{£e2} \texttt{£gg2} and White cannot protect \texttt{f2}.
- b) 44 \texttt{£xg2} \texttt{£d2}+ loses the queen.

44...\texttt{£h2} 45 \texttt{£e2} \texttt{£h7}!

Not 45...\texttt{£gg2}?? 46 \texttt{£c8}+ \texttt{£h7} 47 \texttt{£f3}+ \texttt{£h8} 48 \texttt{Wc8}+ with a perpetual check.

46 \texttt{Wc8} \texttt{£h1}+ 47 \texttt{£f2} \texttt{£d2}! 0-1

White gave up in view of 48 \texttt{£e3} \texttt{£h2}+ 49 \texttt{£c1} \texttt{£f3}+ 50 \texttt{£f1} \texttt{£xb2} with further losses to come.

---

**Game 37**  
**Kharlov-Berelovich**  
**Minsk 1998**

1 \texttt{d4} \texttt{£f6} 2 \texttt{c4} \texttt{e6} 3 \texttt{£c3} c5 4 e3 d5 5 \texttt{£f3} \texttt{£c6} 6 \texttt{cxd5} \texttt{exd5} 7 \texttt{£b5} \texttt{£d6} 8 0-0

This move has become popular lately. White maintains the tension in the centre for a while.  
8...0-0 9 h3 a6

We play the most logical move in the position, to ease the tension in the centre.  
10 \texttt{£xc6}

The bishop retreat to d3 was seen in one game so far: 10 \texttt{dxc5} \texttt{£xc5} 11 \texttt{£d3} \texttt{£d6} 12 \texttt{£e2} \texttt{£e6} 13 \texttt{£ed4} \texttt{£ad8} 14 a3 \texttt{£a7} 15 \texttt{£d2} \texttt{£b8} 16 \texttt{£c1} \texttt{£e4} 17 \texttt{£e2} \texttt{£e5} 18 \texttt{£xe5} \texttt{£xe5} 19 \texttt{f4} \texttt{£xb2} and Black was better in the game Bilciu-Zagema, from Groningen 1994.

**10...bxc6**

11 \texttt{dxc5}

Other moves:
- a) 11 \texttt{Wc2} \texttt{cxd4} 12 \texttt{exd4} \texttt{£h5}!!? (12...\texttt{£e8} is simple and good. Now play develops very sharply.) 13 \texttt{£e2} \texttt{£e8} 14 \texttt{Wxc6} \texttt{£xh3} 15 \texttt{£g5} f6 16 \texttt{£e3} \texttt{£g4} 17 \texttt{Wxd5}+ \texttt{£h8} 18 \texttt{£c3} \texttt{£c8} 19 \texttt{£h1} \texttt{£xc3} 20 \texttt{fxe3} \texttt{£xc3} 21 \texttt{bxc3} \texttt{£g3}+ 22 \texttt{£g1} \texttt{£e2}+ 23 \texttt{£h1} \texttt{£g3}! and all this mess ended up in a draw by repetition of moves, Servat-Rosito, Buenos Aires 1995.
- b) 11 \texttt{£a4} \texttt{£e4} 12 \texttt{dxc5} \texttt{£xc5} 13 \texttt{£xc5} \texttt{£xc5} 14 \texttt{Wc2} \texttt{£c7} 15 b4 \texttt{£xb4} 16 \texttt{Wxc6} \texttt{£d7} 17 \texttt{Wc2} (17...\texttt{£xb5} is bad: 17...\texttt{£b5} 18 \texttt{£d1} \texttt{£e2} and White loses the exchange) 17...\texttt{£xf8} 18 \texttt{£b3} \texttt{£b5} 19 \texttt{£d1} \texttt{£e2} and again Black won the exchange. Volzhin-Fogarasi, Budapest 1996.
- c) 11 b3 \texttt{£b8} 12 \texttt{£a3} \texttt{cxd4} 13 \texttt{£xd6} \texttt{£xd6} 14 \texttt{Wxd4} \texttt{£e8} 15 \texttt{£fd1} \texttt{£b4} and Black has an active position, Paulovic-Snorek, Czech League 1997.

11...\texttt{£xc5} 12 \texttt{b3}
In the game De Souza-Rodrigues, Bello Horizonte 1997 White played the move 12 \( \text{d}4 \) instead. Play then continued with 12...\( \text{d}6 \) 13 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 14 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 15 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 16 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 17 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 18 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{ad}8 \), when the strong central pawns plus the bishop pair offers Black slightly better chances.

**12...\( \text{d}6 \) 13 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \)**

We are now facing a position with a hanging pawn couple (\( \text{c}5, \text{d}5 \)). The judgement of these positions often depends on these pawns. The game shows that the pawns are strong rather than weak, as White can hardly attack them.

**14 \( \text{Ec}1 \)**

Of course not the careless capture 14 \( \text{xd}5? \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 15 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{h}2+ \) and White loses the queen.

In Kaidanov-De Firmian, USA 1994, White played 14 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 15 \( \text{fd}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) (We like the idea of 15...\( \text{we}7 \) to meet 16 \( \text{f}5 \) with 16...\( \text{we}6 \). This idea was carried out in De Souza-Rodrigues — see note to White’s 12th move. Even so, the text move is absolutely okay.) 16 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 17 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 18 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{d}4? \) (In the main game Black first completes his development before he starts actions in the centre. This seems reasonable here too, so we suggest 18...\( \text{ad}8 \). If White now wants to follow up on his previous move with 19 \( \text{g}4?! \) he ends up in trouble after 19...\( \text{xd}4 \) 20 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{d}4! \)!. This pawn is poisoned: 21 \( \text{ed}4? \) \( \text{e}1+ \) and mate in the next move.) 19 \( \text{exd}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 20 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{cx}d4 \) 21 \( \text{e}2 \) and play got very complicated.

**14...\( \text{b}7 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{fd}1 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 17 \( \text{a}4 \)**

White has until now placed his pieces optimally to fight the black pawn couple. After Black has decided where to put his rooks (after...\( \text{ad}8 \) he is obviously planning to occupy the d- and e-files), White now takes action against one of the central pawns: the \( \text{c}5 \)-pawn.

**17...\( \text{e}4 \) 18 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 19 \( \text{c}2 \)**

**19...\( \text{d}4! \)**

The idea to put pressure on \( \text{c}5 \) has failed. Maybe White’s idea was that Black had to play 19...\( \text{c}8 \) to protect the \( \text{c}5 \)-pawn. Then, after 20 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{cd}8 \) (Black has to protect the \( \text{d}5 \)-pawn.) 21 \( \text{a}4 \) we have the game position once again.

Still, Black can also play along more quiet lines instead of the text move: 19...\( \text{a}5 \) with the point 20 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) and the black a-pawn prevents White from playing \( \text{b}3-\text{b}4 \) to protect the knight. White loses the exchange.

Even so, the text move is strong and also very logical. Black has developed all his pieces, and they are placed on optimal squares. The white knight and bishop are at the moment placed on the side of the board, so it’s logical to open up the centre. Besides that, the a8-h1 diagonal is now opened up for Black’s light-squared bishop.

**20 \( \text{we}2 \)**

20 \( \text{exd}4?! \) \( \text{g}5! \) is bad for White, for instance 21 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{xf}3+ \) 22 \( \text{gf}3 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 23 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) and Black has a winning advantage. Or even worse: 21 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{xb}3! \) 22 \( \text{hx}3 \) \( \text{g}5+ \) 23 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{h}2 \) and White is mated.

**20...\( \text{g}5 \)**

We saw the same idea in the previous game.

**21 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}5! \)**

Now 21...\( \text{xb}3+ \) 22 \( \text{hx}3 \) \( \text{g}5+ \) does not work because of 23 \( \text{g}4 \). The idea 21...\( \text{e}6! \), however, seems like a good move all round:
Black protects both c5 and d4 and at the same time threatens 22...\(\text{Q}f4\). If 22 exd4, then Black plays 22...\(\text{W}f6\) threatening both ...\(\text{Q}xd4\) and ...\(\text{Q}f4\) without exchanging queens.

After the text move there seems to be a forced draw.

\begin{align*}
22 & \text{f}4 & & \text{\(\text{Q}xh3+\)} & & 23 & \text{gxh3} & & \text{\(\text{We4}\)} & & 24 & \text{\(\text{Q}g2\)} \\
\text{\(\text{fxf4}\)}
\end{align*}

25 \(\text{Qxc5?!}\)

White should play 25 \(\text{Qxf4}\) \(\text{Wh1+}\) 26 \(\text{Qf2}\) and Black seems to have nothing better than repetition of moves with 26...\(\text{Wh2+}\), as after 26...dxe3+ 27 \(\text{Qg3}\) the white king is safe.

25...\(\text{Qxe3+}\) 26 \(\text{Qh1}\) \(\text{Wf5}\)

For the small exchange sacrifice, Black has a very dangerous attack.

\begin{align*}
27 & \text{Qg4} & & \text{\(\text{Qxg2+}\)} & & 28 & \text{Qxg2} & & \text{\(\text{Wf2+}\)} & & 29 & \text{\(\text{Qh1}\)} \\
\text{\(\text{Qxc1}\)} & & 30 & \text{\(\text{Qd3}\)}
\end{align*}

White has to protect the e1-square: 30 \(\text{Qxc1}\) \(\text{Qc1+}\) 31 \(\text{Qxe1}\) \(\text{Qxe1+}\) 32 \(\text{Qg1}\) \(\text{Qe8!}\) and White loses a minor piece whatever he does, for example 33 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Qc3}\), with threats against e1 and c5, and 34...\(\text{Qf3+}\) is also threatened.

\begin{align*}
30...\text{Qxa2} & & 31 & \text{Qxc1} & & \text{\(\text{Qxb3}\)} & & 32 & \text{\(\text{Qh6}\)} & & \text{\(\text{Wd5+}\)} \\
33 & \text{\(\text{Qg1}\)} & & \text{g6} & & 34 & \text{\(\text{Qf2}\)}
\end{align*}

White's last chance is to profit from the weaknesses of the dark squares around the black king.

\begin{align*}
34...\text{f5} & & 35 & \text{\(\text{W}h4\)} & & \text{\(\text{Qd7}\)} & & 36 & \text{\(\text{Qg5}\)} & & \text{a5} & & 37 & \text{\(\text{Qf6}\)} \\
\text{\(\text{Qf7??}\)}
\end{align*}

This move looks rather strange. We think that something was wrong with the notation, and that Black instead played 37...\(\text{Qf7}\). If you compare the rest of the game, this seems like a logical solution. Black has a winning advantage, and it is hard to believe that, even in time trouble, he could make a terrible mistake like 37...\(\text{Qf7}\).

38 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qed8}\) 39 \(\text{Qh2}\) \(\text{Wc4}\) 40 \(\text{Qb2?!}\)

The very last chance?!

40...\(\text{Qxh4}\) 0-1

Points to Remember

1) After 6 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 7 \(\text{Qxe7}\) \(\text{Qxe7}\) White exchanges the dark-squared bishops but accelerates Black's development. This crucial factor gives Black a comfortable position.

2) After 6 \(\text{Qf4}\) we recommend development with 6...\(\text{Qf6}\) 7 c3 \(\text{cxd4}\) 8 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qb4!}\), putting pressure on the knight on c3.

3) In 6 e3 lines, typical Isolated Queen's Pawn (IQP) positions are reached. Black has many attacking possibilities in this variation (see Game 36 as a clear example of Black's prospects).
Here we study alternatives to 5  

White plays 5 dxc5

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3  

5 dxc5 d4

Tarrasch saw this move as the tactical justification of the whole Tarrasch Defence.

6  

The other move, 6  

6...b5!?

Black sacrifices the pawn to get active play. The a-file and the a3-f8 diagonal are now being opened. Not so good is the immediate recapture of the pawn with 6... 7  

7 cxb6 axb6 8  

With this move White is testing Black right from the outset. Black must be prepared to sacrifice a pawn in these positions.

5 dxc5 d4

Tarrasch saw this move as the tactical justification of the whole Tarrasch Defence.

6  

The other move, 6  

6...b5!?

Black sacrifices the pawn to get active play. The a-file and the a3-f8 diagonal are now being opened. Not so good is the immediate recapture of the pawn with 6... 7  

7 cxb6 axb6 8  

With this move White is testing Black right from the outset. Black must be prepared to sacrifice a pawn in these positions.
8...\textit{Qc}6 has frequently been played, but we like the text move because it doesn't allow White to play the move 9 e4.

\textbf{9 e3}

White has other possibilities here. Often it leads to the main line:

a) 9 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qc}6? (more precise is 9...b5 10 \textit{Qb}2 \textit{Qc}6 with a transformation to the main line after 11 e3 – see later note). Now White has a choice:

a1) 10 e3 b5 with a further split:

a11) White has the chance to get the better position after the move 11 \textit{Ax}b5!, not fearing 11...\textit{Wa}5+ because of 12 \textit{Qc}3! \textit{Qd}7 (or 12...\textit{Qxc}3+ 13 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qc}5 14 \textit{Qxd}4 \textit{Qd}7 15 \textit{Qc}1 and White wins back his sacrificed piece) 13 \textit{Qxc}3 \textit{Qe}4 (13...\textit{Qb}4 14 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}3+ 15 \textit{Qd}2 is better for White) 14 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}6 15 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qxd}2 16 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}3 17 \textit{Qc}1 \textit{Qf}3+ 18 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{Qd}2+ 19 \textit{Qe}1 \textit{Qf}3+ 20 \textit{Qf}1 and it's a draw by repetition of moves, Bakic-Kostic, Cetinje 1990. However, 14 \textit{Qd}3 secures White a clear advantage: 14...\textit{Qxc}3 15 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxc}3 16 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Qxa}2 17 \textit{Qxa}2 \textit{Qxa}2 18 \textit{Qd}7+ \textit{Qxd}7 19 0-0.

If White plays 11 \textit{Qb}2, we get the position from the note above to White's 9th move.

a12) After 11 \textit{Qb}2 Black has two choices: 11...\textit{Qe}4 and 11...\textit{Qb}4+. The latter option is the one we prefer, as it is the most logical one. Still, we suggest both options as 11...\textit{Qe}4 seems to be okay for Black too:

a121) 11...\textit{Qb}4+ has only been played in one game so far (Beck-Koenig, Austria 1991), and the players agreed a draw here! After 12 \textit{Qc}2 dxe3 13 fxe3 \textit{Qb}6 14 \textit{Qxd}4 \textit{Qxb}4 the position is unclear as Black has active counterplay for the pawn.

a122) 11...\textit{Qe}4 12 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qb}4+ 13 \textit{Qf}1! (White would not have had this move at his disposal if Black had given the check a move earlier) 13...\textit{Qc}3 14 \textit{Qc}2 \textit{Qd}5 was seen in Kindl-Hoensch, Germany 1989. Black has compensation for the pawn as his pieces are very active. In the game things developed quite sharply: 15 \textit{Qd}1 \textit{Qh}3! 16 \textit{Qxc}3 \textit{Qxf}3 17 \textit{Qe}4 \textit{Qxg}2+ 18 \textit{Qg}1 \textit{Qg}4 19 \textit{Qxg}2 \textit{Qxc}3 20 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qe}6 21 \textit{Qb}2 \textit{Qb}4 22 \textit{Qb}1 \textit{Qc}8 23 a3 \textit{Qc}6 24 \textit{Qxc}3 \textit{Qxc}3 25 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qxb}3 26 \textit{Qb}1 \textit{Qxa}3 27 \textit{Qxc}6+ \textit{Qxc}6 28 \textit{Qxb}5 \textit{Qa}8 29 \textit{Qc}5+ \textit{Qd}7 30 \textit{Qf}5+ \textit{Qe}7 31 \textit{Qe}4+ \textit{Qd}7 32 \textit{Qf}5+ with a draw by repetition.

a2) Another move is the more quiet 10 g3, as seen in Garcia Vicente-Haag, Malaga 1998. Play continued 10...b5 11 \textit{Qb}2 \textit{Qd}4 12 \textit{Qg}2 \textit{Qc}3 13 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qxa}2 14 \textit{Qxa}2 \textit{Qxa}2 15 0-0 \textit{Qb}6 16 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qxc}1 17 \textit{Qxc}1 and White is better here. He is better developed and his pieces occupy very strong attacking positions.

An interesting idea (instead of 11...\textit{Qc}4) is 11...\textit{Qb}4+ 12 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qc}3!. This still has to be tested in practical play. If White exchanges on c3, Black will have a protected passed pawn on c3, but until then White cannot move either the knight or the rook on a1 (as then a2 would be lost). A possible continuation is 13 \textit{Qc}1 \textit{Qd}4 14 \textit{Qg}2 0-0 15 0-0 \textit{Qxd}2 16 \textit{Qxd}2 \textit{Qd}7 with unclear play.

\textbf{9...\textit{Qc}6}

9...\textit{Qd}7 has been played too. Here is a short overview of the possibilities in this position:

a) 10 \textit{Qxd}4 \textit{Qc}6 11 \textit{Qb}2 \textit{Qd}4 and now:

a1) 12 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qxa}4 13 bx\textit{a}4 \textit{Qb}4+ 14 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{Qf}5 15 \textit{Qe}2 \textit{Qc}3 16 \textit{Qb}5 \textit{Qf}6 17 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qxa}1 18 \textit{Qa}3 \textit{Qd}7 19 \textit{Qxb}6 and White has some compensation for the minor piece as the Black king is still in centre, unable to castle kingside. Still, Black was better in Vogel-Kreuscher, Dudweiler 1995. However, 15 \textit{Qc}2 \textit{Qc}3 16 \textit{Qb}5 \textit{Qc}5 17 \textit{Qxc}6+ \textit{Qd}7 18 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{Qxa}1 19 \textit{Qa}3 seems to give White the better chances.

a2) 12 a3 \textit{Qc}7? (this is too passive) 13 \textit{Qc}2 f5 14 \textit{Qb}2 0-0 15 \textit{Qd}1 and, besides being a pawn up, all the white pieces work well together, Tennstedt-Muhameragic, Germany 1994.

The move 12...b5 was more active: 13 \textit{Qc}3 \textit{Qxc}3 14 \textit{Qxc}3 \textit{b}4 and Black has excel-
lent counterplay.

b) 10 £f3 b5 11 £b2 £b4+ 12 £d2 £a3 13 £d3 dxe3 14 fxe3 0-0 15 £c2 £e8 16 £d4 £b6 17 0-0 £c6 again gives Black counterplay, Villeneuve-Salaun French Ch., 1989.

10 £b5!?

In our opinion 10 £f3, transposing to 9 £f3, is a better move.

10...£d5 11 £e2 £a5!

Black wants to get rid of the white bishop so that the knight on c6 is not pinned. At the same time he has neutralised the threat £xb6. The text move includes yet another pawn sacrifice.

12 exd4+ £d8 13 £xc6

Despite the fact that Black is two pawns down here, his chances are not worse thanks to the threat ...£b4+ and ...£e8.

14 £d2

White already has the slightly inferior position. After 14 £f3 £b4+ 15 £f1 £a6+ 16 £e2 £xf3 17 gxf3 £e8 18 £e3 £d5 we have quite a funny position. The black bishops are very dominant and White can hardly move any of his pieces.

14...£a3!?

More straightforward was 14...£xa4 15 bxa4 £xg2 16 £f3 £b7 17 £xg2 £xg2 18 £f3 £xh1 19 £f2 £d6. Black has to give up his extra piece, but in all the endgames he is better because of his superior pawn structure. Maybe Black didn’t want to exchange queens, and so he holds on to the threat of ...£e8.

15 £f3

After 15 £xa5 bxa5 16 £f3 £e8 17 £e5 £xg2 we have the game position.

15...£e8 16 £e5 £xg2 17 £xa5 bxa5

Only computers play 17...£xh1+!? 18 £d2 £xa1 19 £xb6+ £e7 and claim a winning advantage. The more ‘human’ text move is good as well.

18 £d2 £e4+ 19 £e3

On 19 £c2, 19...£f5 is a killer.

19...£d6

White can do nothing to prevent Black’s next move.

20 £d2 f6

21 £f3? £b4+ 0-1

White loses his queen.

**Game 39**

**Bareev-Lobron**

**Dortmund 1995**

1 c4 e6 2 £c3 d5 3 d4 c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 £xc5 d4 6 £e4!? £c6!

This is the best choice. Other moves include:

a) 6...£f6? 7 £g5!. That is a move that Black should always be aware of. Now it seems that he cannot avoid double pawns, for example 7...£c7 8 £xf6 £xf6? 9 £d6+ and Black cannot castle.

b) 6...£d5 is too early: 7 £d6+ £xd6 8
Tarrasch Defence: Fifth Move Alternatives

cxd6 (if Black now plays 8...Wxd6, then he has lost an important tempo) 8...Qc6 9 e3 Qd6 10 Qf3 Qg4 11 Qc2 and White has the advantage. He is better prepared for the opening of the centre as he has the bishop pair, for instance 11...0-0-0 12 0-0 dxe3 13 hxe3 Qxd6 14 Wa4.

7 Qf3

Other moves:

a) 7 e3 Qf6 (Black does not have to consider Qg5 in this line) 8 Qxf6+ Wxf6 9 exd4 Qxd4 (Black has equalised) 10 Ke3 Qb4+ 11 Qd2 Qxd2+ (or simply 11...Qxc5) 12 Qxd2 Qe6 13 Qb5 0-0-0+ 14 Qe2 Qd4+ 15 Qd4 Qxd4 16 Qd3 Qxc5 and White was at least equal in the game Thorsteins-Johannesson, Iceland 1995.

b) 7 Qg5? is just bad: 7...Qd5 8 Qc2 Qf5 9 f3 Qxe4 10 Qxe4+ Wxe4 11 fxe4 Qxc5 and the white pawns look awful.

But the move 8...Qc6 has a point, which is seen in the note to Black’s ninth move.

9 Qc2

After 9 h3 Black can return his bishop with 9...Qc6. The more logical 9...Qxf3 10 exf3 Qxc5 is possible as well, with a good position for Black. White has the bishop pair, but Black has a strong passed pawn in the centre. In the game Radjabov-Potkin, Liptohoto 1999 play continued 11 Qd3 Qf6? (Again this move fails to Qg5. Better is 11...Wa5+ 12 Qd2 Qb4 with equal play) 12 0-0 0-0-0 13 Qg5 h6 14 Qh4! and White was better, as the pinned knight on f6 causes Black trouble. Bad is 14...g5?! 15 Qf5 gxf4 16 Wc1 with threats against both c5 and h6. Black has to give back the piece, as 16...Qb6?? 17 Wxh6 Qe8 18 Qd7 is mate.

9...Qf6

Here the attempt to get back the pawn immediately with 9...Wa5+!! 10 Qd2 Wxc5 fails to 11 Wc4+ Qe6 12 Qg5 Qf6 13 Qxe6 Qxe4 14 Qxc5 Qg3 15 hxg3 Qxc5 16 Qc1 Qb6 17 g4. White is slightly better here due to the bishop pair and better pawn structure. His rooks are more active too on the c- and h-file, whereas Black’s are rather passive at the moment.

This is the point of 8...Qc6 immediately (instead of 8...Qg4): White does not have the option Wc2-e4+! followed by Qg5. After 8...Qc6 Black does not have to answer 9 Wc2 with 9...Qf6 (to protect e4). He can instead play 9...Wa5+ 10 Qd2 Wxc5, regaining his pawn with equal play.

10 h3 d3?!

Again Black has the option of 10...Qxf3 11 exf3 Wa5+ 12 Qd2 Wxc5 13 Wxc5 Qxc5 14 Qb5 0-0 15 Qc1. White now wins a pawn, but Black gets good counterplay after 15...Qe8+ 16 Qd1 Qf7 17 Qc4 Qf8 18 Qxc6 bxc6 19 Qxc6 Qe5 20 Qc2 Qd3.

11 Wxd3 Wxd3 12 exd3 Qxf3 13 gxf3 Qxc5.

Or 13...Qd4 14 Qe3! Qc2+ 15 Qd2 Qxa1 16 d4 and White has very good compensa-
tion for the exchange sacrifice.

14. $e3 \&d4$

On 14...$d4$ White can play 15 $c1$ $b6$ 16 $d1$ and, after the further $g3-e4$, he has the upper hand.

15 0-0-0 $d5$ 16 $f5$ $f6$

Bad is 16...$x3e+? 17 fxe3 $g6$ 18 $h4!$ (the knight is heading for $g2$) 18...0-0 (of course not 18...$x3e? 19 $c1$ and the knight is pinned) 19 $g2$ with a white advantage.

17 $c5!$

After this move Black cannot castle queenside. The move 17 $d6+$ $e7$ 18 $xb7?$ is too hasty: 18...$hb8$ 19 $ce5$ $xb2+$ and the white king is under attack.

If White plays 17 $g1$ Black can castle queenside: 17...0-0-0! 18 $c5$ $e5$ and the vital $d6$-square is protected. Then 19 $xg7?$ allows $hg8$, pinning the knight.

17...$b6$

17...0-0-0? is answered with 18 $d6+$ $b8$ 19 $xf7$, winning the exchange.

18 $a3$ $d4$ 19 $e1+$

If 19 $d6+$ Black can play the cool 19...$f8!$, not fearing the discovered check.

19...$d7$ 20 $xd4$ $xd4$ 21 $e4$ $ac8+$

21...$xf2$ fails to 22 $d4$ $ac8+$ 23 $c2$ $g3$ 24 $b5+$ $c7$ 25 $g1$ $f4+$ 26 $xf4$ $xf4$ 27 $xg7$. After the exchange sacrifice White is clearly better. The Black f-pawn is lost as well, and the white bishops totally control the board.

22 $d2$ $c5$ 23 $xc5$ $xc5$ 24 $e2$

A very interesting endgame has arisen. White has an extra pawn but at the same time his pawn formation is damaged. If Black could somehow transfer his knight to $d4$, he would be okay, but it seems difficult. The bishop is superior to the knight in this position, and a pawn is, after all, a pawn, so we bet on White here.

24...$f5$?

This move only weakens the black position. 24...$h8$ is better, after which White plays 25 $d1$, protecting the c2-square and transferring the bishop to the queenside.

25 $d4$

25 $d4$! looks very convincing: 25...$a5$ 26 $e5$ $d6$ 27 $c4$ $c8$ 28 $b3$ and, compared to the position before 25 $d4!$, the white pieces are now very active and White has the advantage.

25...$d6$ 26 $d1$ $e4$?

The pin on the knight was uncomfortable. But worth considering was the rook manoeuvre ...$c8-c7$ to protect the a7-pawn.

27 $a4$ $c7$ 28 $b3$ $d8$ 29 $f4+$ $f6$ 30 $c1!$

After this move Black has troubles protecting his a-pawn.

30...$xc1$ 31 $xc1$ $g6$

Not good is 31...$d7$? 32 $d4$, as after 32...$e6$ 33 $d2$ Black cannot move and soon finds himself in zugzwang. Another cute line is 32...$c7+$? 33 $d2!$ and the Black knight is caught in the middle of the board,
as 33...<b>c</b>7 34 <b>d</b>d6 is mate!

Much better, however, was 31...<b>c</b>7 32 <b>x</b>a7 <b>x</b>d3 33 <b>b</b>7 <b>d</b>6 - Black is still fighting but the White pawn majority on the queenside should decide the game in his favour.

Bad is 31...<b>a</b>5?! 32 <b>d</b>4 <b>c</b>8+ 33 <b>d</b>2 <b>c</b>7 34 <b>d</b>d6+ and Black loses the b-pawn.

32 <b>d</b>2 <b>f</b>6 33 <b>x</b>a7 <b>e</b>4+ 34 <b>e</b>2 <b>c</b>5 35 <b>c</b>4 <b>b</b>8 36 <b>b</b>4 <b>b</b>7 37 <b>a</b>4 <b>d</b>6 38 <b>d</b>d7 <b>e</b>8+ 39 <b>f</b>3 <b>x</b>c4 40 <b>d</b>c4 

The Gambit Line 5 e4

1. d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 <b>c</b>3 c5 4 cxd5 cxd5 5 e4!

White sacrifices a central pawn at an early stage of the game. After 5...dxe4 he can choose between two different continuations.

a) 6 d5 - White is going for a long lasting initiative for the sacrificed pawn.

b) 6 <b>c</b>4?! - White has stopped counting pawns. He is trying to profit immediately from his more advanced development.

The two ideas are shown in the two games below.

7 <b>f</b>4

Alternately:
a) Maybe 7 <b>h</b>3 is more precise than the one played in the main game. At this stage of the game, White still has to choose where to put his bishop: on f4 or maybe g5. Perhaps he wants the knight to occupy this square, so it seems logical to make the obvious move <b>h</b>3 first. After 7...<b>d</b>6 8 <b>b</b>5+ <b>f</b>8 9 <b>f</b>3 a6 10 <b>e</b>2 <h>4+ 11 <b>f</b>1 exf3 12 <b>x</b>f3 h6 13 <b>c</b>3 <d>7 14 <c>2 <c>7 15 <e>1 b5?! (15...<e>5 is better; now White has a tactical blow) 16 <f>! <f>4 17 <xf>4 <xf>4 18 <xc>xe7+ White has some initiative, but the

5 e4 dxe4 6 d5

This is the 'classical' treatment of the gambit line. A more modern approach to the position is 6 <b>c</b>4. This move is considered in the next game.

6...f5

Black has tried many moves here:

6...<b>d</b>6 and 6...<b>a</b>6 - Black voluntarily gives back the pawn to complete the development and to avoid the more critical lines.

6...<b>f</b>6 and 6...<b>f</b>5 - these are the other moves where Black tries to hold on to his gained material.

Still, we like the text move. The pawn structure is very solid, and the e4-pawn is protected for sure. Yes, Black is weakening his position a bit by pushing his f-pawn, especially the e6-square. But we think that the price of a pawn is worth it.

5.e4 dxe4 6.d5

This is the 'classical' treatment of the gambit line. A more modern approach to the position is 6...<b>c</b>4. This move is considered in the next game.

6...f5

Black has tried many moves here:

6...<b>d</b>6 and 6...<b>a</b>6 - Black voluntarily gives back the pawn to complete the development and to avoid the more critical lines.

6...<b>f</b>6 and 6...<b>f</b>5 - these are the other moves where Black tries to hold on to his gained material.

Still, we like the text move. The pawn structure is very solid, and the e4-pawn is protected for sure. Yes, Black is weakening his position a bit by pushing his f-pawn, especially the e6-square. But we think that the price of a pawn is worth it.
position is still unclear, Turner-Headlong, British League 1996.

b) 7 a5+ d7 with a further branch:

b1) 8 h3 seems to be the most dangerous move for Black: 8...a6 9 bxa6 w5+ 10 c3 a6? 11 f3 f6 12 0-0 c7? 13 g5 0-0 14 d6 e8 15 b3+ c4 16 xc4+ h8 17 f7+ xf7 18 xf7 and White should have won this game, Oskam-Euwe, Amsterdam 1920. Much better for Black, however, is the blockading move 12...d6 with approximately equal play.

b2) 8 a4 a6? (this move looks a bit eccentric; we suggest 8...d6 instead) 9 a6 bxa6 10 h3 d6 11 h5+ g6 12 c2 e7 13 e6 c8 14 b5+ with chances to both sides, Maes-Hoogeterp, Holland 1994.

b3) 8 xd7+ xd7 9 h3 d6 10 g5 a6! 11 0-0 f6 12 f3 0-0 13 e6 f7 14 fxe4 c4 15 gxe4 dxe4 16 g5 xe1+ 17 d1 f7 18 c4 e8 19 xc7 xc7 and Black hangs on to his extra pawn, Marshall-Spielmann, Vienna 1908.

c) 7 f3 d6 8 h3 d6 11 0-0 d7 10 c4 f6 11 a6 12 c2 e7. Now White sacrificed a piece with 13 0-0?! axb5 14 d5 e6 and after the further 15 g5 h5 16 b3 f8 17 g7+ xg7 18 xh6 xh6 19 gxe6 Black was better and eventually won, Marshall-Duras, San Sebastian 1911.

7...d6 8 a5+ f7 9 h3

White has tried other moves here, but without much luck:

a) 9 g6 xd6 xg6 10 a6 11 c2 f6 12 d6 e8 13 xg4 g4 14 d5 g8 15 0-0 w5 and there is no doubt about the black advantage, Wehmeier-Zolnierzowicz, Miedzybrodzie 1991.

b) 9 g2 (this square is not especially good for the knight) 9...d6 10 c4 a6 11 a4 e8 12 d2 e7 13 d5 c7 14 a4 b8 and Black is better, Seckic-Lekic, Cetinje 1993.

9...f6 10 c4

With the plan of 11 b5.

10...a6 11 a4

This was the last chance to give the check 11 g5+. The following line is possible: 11...g6 12 c6 x6 13 d6 xd6 x6 14 dxe6 e5 with better chances to Black due to his extra pawn.

11...h6 12 f3

There is no time to castle if White wants to open up the centre: 12 0-0 g5 13 xd6 xd6 14 f3 e3 and it is hard to prevent Black from consolidating his passed pawn with 15...f4 as 15 f4?? is rather embarrassing after 15...g4 – the knight is helplessly stuck on the edge of the board.

12 d2 isn’t any better: 11 h6 12 d2 g5 13 d6 xd6 14 0-0 d7 15 f3 and now Black opened up the White queenside with a typical pawn sacrifice: 15...b5! 16 axb5 e5 17 e2 axb5. After the further 18 d6 b6 19 c3 e8 20 d6 d7 21 d3 g6 Black was clearly better and soon won in Chatalbashev-Kosic, Sofia 1994.

12...f3

Another option is 12...g5 13 d6 xd6 14 fxe4 f4? (Polugaevsky). Black has good play on the dark squares in the centre after the knight manoeuvre ...h8-d7-e5. We tend to agree with him but, on the other hand, there is nothing wrong with the text move after which Black holds on to his extra pawn.

13 xf3 e8+ 14 e2

14...b6!?

This move is rather extravagant. More
natural is 14...g5 15 \(\text{xd6} \text{xd6} \), for instance 16 0-0-0 f4 and Black has a clear advantage.  
15 0-0 \(\text{a7} \) 16 \(\text{Wg3}!\)

Forcing Black to exchange on f4, when the b8-knight is unprotected. The Black forces are a bit uncoordinated.

16...\(\text{xf4} \) 17 \(\text{Wxf4} \) \(\text{bd7?!} \)

Alternatives are 17...\(\text{b7} \) and 17...\(\text{d7} \), but both moves look rather awkward.

18 \(\text{d3} \)

There is nothing wrong with 18 \(\text{Wxf5} \) either. White gains his pawn back. It is a question whether White should keep the lightsquared bishops on the board or not. After the exchange White does not achieve the desired control of the light squares, so maybe he should have avoided this and played 18 \(\text{Wxf5} \). Not good is 18...\(\text{e5} \) as a response because of the surprising 19 \(\text{Wh7?!} \), when White threatens both 20 \(\text{h5+} \) and 20 \(\text{xf6} \). Instead Black should play 18...\(\text{g8} \) with unclear play.

18...\(\text{e5} \) 19 \(\text{xf5} \) \(\text{xf5} \) 20 \(\text{Wxf5} \) \(\text{g8} \)
21 \(\text{f4} \) \(\text{f7} \)

22 \(\text{Wh3} \)

Another possibility is 22 \(\text{e6} \) \(\text{Wd6} \) 23 \(\text{a}1 \), but Black has the clever 23...\(\text{xd5?!} \) 24 \(\text{Wxe5} \) \(\text{xf1+} \) 25 \(\text{Wxf1} \) \(\text{Wxe5} \) 26 \(\text{exe5} \) \(\text{xc3} \) 27 \(\text{bxc3} \) \(\text{xf7} \) gaining back the sacrificed material. Still, chances are even in this rook endgame after 28 a5 \(\text{exe6} \) 29 \(\text{d5} \) \(\text{f6}+ \) 30 \(\text{e}2 \) \(\text{e}6 \) 31 c4 and White wins back his pawn.

22...\(\text{Wd6} \) 23 \(\text{a1} \) c4 24 \(\text{Wg3} \) \(\text{fe7} \) 25 \(\text{e4} \) \(\text{xe4} \) 26 \(\text{exe4} \) \(\text{c5}+ \) 27 \(\text{h1} \) \(\text{f8} \)
28 h3 \(\text{d3} \) 29 \(\text{Wf3}?! \)
30 \(\text{exe7} \) \(\text{Wxc7} \) 30 \(\text{f3} \) had to be played. Now Black makes use of the pressure along the f-file.

29...\(\text{ef7} \) 30 \(\text{Wg4} \) \(\text{Wd6} \) 31 g3 \(\text{Wxd5} \) 32 \(\text{Wxe6} \) \(\text{exe6} \) 33 \(\text{exe6} \) g5 0-1

**Game 41**

**Summerscale-Gershon**

Tel Aviv 1997

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \(\text{c3} \) c5 4 \(\text{cxd5} \) exd5 5 e4 dxe4 6 \(\text{c4}?! \) \(\text{c6}?! \)

6...\(\text{cxd5} \) is the principal answer to White’s ambitious play. As Hübner points out, the most solid move here for White is 7 \(\text{xe4} \), but that’s not what he came for when he played 6 \(\text{c4} \). The ambitious 7 \(\text{b3} \) (Hübner gives the move a question mark) has been played in four games so far. In the game Nadanian-Godena, Saint Vincent 2000 Black seemed to find the right medicine to this obviously infected line: 7...\(\text{f6} \) 8 \(\text{xf7}+ \) \(\text{e}7 \) 9 \(\text{d5}+ \) \(\text{xf7} \) 10 \(\text{c7}+ \) \(\text{g6} \) 11 \(\text{xa8} \) (11 \(\text{g3}+ \) \(\text{g4} \) 12 \(\text{xa8} \) \(\text{a6} \) 13 h3 \(\text{d6} \) does not help White either) 11...\(\text{a6} \) 12 \(\text{e2} \) \(\text{b4}+ \) 13 \(\text{f1} \) h6 and Black has the advantage. The game ended 14 a3 \(\text{c7} \) 15 \(\text{d2} \) \(\text{c5} \) 16 \(\text{g3}+ \) \(\text{h7} \) 17 \(\text{c1} \) e3 18 \(\text{b4} \) \(\text{c4} \) 19 \(\text{c7} \) \(\text{xb4} \) 20 axb4 \(\text{xf2} \) 21 \(\text{g1} \) d3 22 \(\text{f4} \) \(\text{xc7} \) 23 \(\text{xc7} \) d2 0-1.

7 d5

Other moves have been tried here:

a) 7 \(\text{ge2} \) \(\text{cxd4} \) 8 \(\text{xe4} \) \(\text{b4}+ \) 9 \(\text{f1} \) \(\text{f6} \) 10 \(\text{g5} \) 0-0 and Black is better, Vincent-Bouton, France 1996.

b) 7 \(\text{g4} \) \(\text{cxd4} \) (7...\(\text{xd4} \) protects the b5-square and thus prevents the following move) 8 \(\text{b5} \) \(\text{b4}+ \) 9 \(\text{f1} \) \(\text{f8} \) 10 a3 (10 \(\text{c7} \) \(\text{b8} \) 11 \(\text{b5} \) \(\text{a8} \) 12 \(\text{c7} \), with repetition of moves, is possible) 10...\(\text{e7} \) 11 h4 \(\text{xf6} \) 12 \(\text{c7} \) \(\text{b8} \) 13 \(\text{b5} \) \(\text{a8} \) 14 \(\text{c7} \) \(\text{b8} \) 15 \(\text{b5} \) \(\text{a8} \) and a draw was agreed in Williams-J.Cooper, British League 1996.

11 \(\text{g5} \) f6 12 \(\text{e3} \) b5 13 \(\text{Wd3} \)

117
Maybe 13 \textit{\texttt{Wc2}} is more precise as Black does not win a tempo with ...\textit{c5-c4}.

13...\textit{c4} 14 \textit{\texttt{Wd4 \texttt{We5}}} 15 \textit{\texttt{Af3}} \textit{\texttt{Wxd4}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Qxd4 f5}}

17 \textit{Qc3}

Another option for White is 17 \textit{Qg5}. A possible continuation is 17...\textit{Qf6} 18 0-0-0 \textit{h6} 19 \textit{Qge6 \texttt{Qxd5}} 20 \textit{\texttt{He1 \texttt{b4}}} 21 \textit{\texttt{Qd2 \texttt{Qf7}}} with very complicated play and chances for both sides.

17...\textit{\texttt{Bb4}}

Maybe Black should consider 17...\textit{a6} to keep the tension in the game. Instead Black now exchanges his dark-squared bishop.

18 0-0-0 \textit{\texttt{Qxc3}} 19 \textit{bxc3 \texttt{Qf6}} 20 \textit{\texttt{Af3}}

Protecting the d-pawn and preparing \texti{d4}.

20...0-0 21 \textit{\texttt{d4 \texttt{Qad8}}} 22 \textit{\texttt{He1 a5}}

Not 22...\textit{\texttt{Qxd5}} 23 \textit{\texttt{Qxg7 \texttt{Qxg7}}} 24 \textit{\texttt{Qxd5}} and Black has simply exchanged the wrong minor pieces. His bishop is now clearly inferior to the white knight, which has the good d4-square to operate from. White is better after, for example, 24...\textit{\texttt{Qc6}} 25 \textit{\texttt{Qxd8 \texttt{Qxd8}}} 26 \textit{\texttt{Qxd4 d7}} 27 \textit{\texttt{Qc7+}}.

23 \textit{\texttt{He7}}

Now White has the initiative.

23...\textit{\texttt{Qf7}} 24 \textit{\texttt{d6 \texttt{Qd5}}}?

24...\textit{Qe8} was a better defending move.

After the text move White could have achieved an advantage with 25 \textit{\texttt{Qc5}}! \textit{\texttt{Qxe7}} 26 \textit{\texttt{dxe7 \texttt{Qe8}}} 27 \textit{\texttt{Qxd7}}. On both 25...\textit{\texttt{Qxc3}} and 25...\textit{\texttt{Qf6}}, follows 26 \textit{\texttt{Qe5!}} with threats against both d7 and f7.

Instead White played the weaker... 25 \textit{\texttt{Qe5?}}

Now Black is slightly better after...

25...\textit{\texttt{Qxe7}} 26 \textit{\texttt{Qxf7 \texttt{Qxf7}}} 27 \textit{\texttt{dxe7 \texttt{He7}}} 28 \textit{\texttt{Qxg7 \texttt{Qg8}}} 29 \textit{\texttt{Qe5 \texttt{Qxg2}}} 30 \textit{\texttt{Qd6+ \texttt{Qe8}}} 31 \textit{\texttt{Qg3 f4}} 32 \textit{\texttt{Qxf4 \texttt{Qxf2}}}

Black has won a pawn and he has an active rook on the seventh rank, threatening to win a second. Still, White has some chances of saving the game as there are opposite-coloured bishops left on the board.

33 \textit{\texttt{Qe1+ \texttt{He7}}} 34 \textit{\texttt{Qd6 \texttt{Qf5}}} 35 \textit{\texttt{He7+ \texttt{Qg6}}} 36 \textit{\texttt{Qb7 \texttt{Qc2+}}} 37 \textit{\texttt{Qd1 \texttt{Qxc3}}} 38 \textit{\texttt{Qc7}}

That was pawn number two. White cannot get it back as 38 \textit{\texttt{Qxb5?}} is met by 38...\textit{\texttt{Qd3+}} and 39...\textit{\texttt{Qxd6}}.

38...\textit{\texttt{Qd3+}} 39 \textit{\texttt{Qc1 \texttt{Qd7}}} 40 \textit{\texttt{Qa7}}

40...\textit{\texttt{a4?!}}

This is somehow the turning point of the game. By placing the a-pawn on the same square as his bishop, Black definitively gives up the dark squares.

Better was 40...\textit{\texttt{Qh5!}}. White has no checks, so he has to exchange rooks as his bishop on c7 is pinned: 41 \textit{\texttt{Qb6 \texttt{Qxa7}}} 42 \textit{\texttt{Qxa7}}. But now Black activates his king: 42...\textit{\texttt{Qg4!}} 43 \textit{\texttt{Qb6 \texttt{Qh3}}} and Black has excellent winning chances. After 44 \textit{\texttt{Qxa5 \texttt{Qxh2}}} he has passed pawns on both sides of the board. Thus the a5-pawn is not to be touched and so Black still controls the dark
squares on the queenside.

41 \text{Ba6} + \text{g5} 42 \text{a5} \text{g4} 43 \text{b4} \text{d3}
44 \text{b6} \text{d5} 45 \text{d6} \text{e5} 46 \text{d4} + \text{e4}
47 \text{d6} \text{e6} 48 \text{b2} \text{f3}

Despite the static pawn formation on the queenside after \ldots a5-a4, Black still has considerable winning chances.

49 \text{c3} \text{g6} 50 \text{g3} \text{e3} 51 \text{d6} \text{g5}
52 \text{d1} \text{d3} 53 \text{g1} \text{f5} 54 \text{c7} \text{e4}
55 \text{g4} + \text{d5} 56 \text{f4} \text{g5} 57 \text{d4} +
\text{c5} 58 \text{d6} + \text{c6} 59 \text{g3} \text{g6} 60 \text{d8}
\text{e4} 61 \text{e8} \text{b1} 62 \text{b2} \text{f5} 63 \text{c3}
\text{f6} 64 \text{a8} \text{e6} 65 \text{b4} \text{f5} 66 \text{a6} +
\text{d7} 67 \text{b6} \text{c3}

Black has not made much progress the last twenty moves. At last he advances his passed pawn.

68 \text{xb5} \text{c2} 69 \text{b7} + ! \text{d8} 70 \text{c7}

The pawn is stopped!

70 \text{xa2} 71 \text{xc2} \text{b3} 72 \text{c7} \text{h5} 73
\text{c5} \text{xc5} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

Points to Remember

1) You are not likely to meet 5 dxc5 very much, as not many white players are keen to give up the initiative so early on in the game. That said, you should pay special attention to Games 38 and 39, so that you are ready just in case!

2) The line with 5 e4 is different to most Tarrasch lines in that White tries to attack from the offset. The lines are tricky and need to be studied, but Black is doing fine in a theoretical sense.
1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 ∆c3 c5 4 cxd5 cxd4

In general we recommend Black playing along the main lines in the Tarrasch Defence.

Still, the Hennig-Schara Gambit is a perfectly playable alternative, if you want to test White in different ways to the more common paths.

Besides this gambit line, Black only decides in which direction the opening shall develop when he chooses between one of the main lines 9...cxd4 or 9...c4. Here the move 4...cxd4 can serve as a good surprise weapon too.

There are, in fact, many white club players who avoid certain lines and move orders in the Tarrasch Defence, simply to avoid the Hennig-Schara Gambit! This is yet another good reason to know this particular line.

Here are two games, detailing the major ideas.

**Game 42**

*Azmaiparashvili-Marjanovic*

*Yerevan 1989*

1 c4 e6 2 ∆c3 d5 3 d4 c5 4 cxd5 cxd4 5 ∆a4+

In both the games we analyse in this chapter, White prefers this move instead of the other option 5 ∆xd4. If White plays 5 ∆xd4, after the further moves 5...∆c6 6 ∆d1 exd5 7 ∆xd5 ∆d7, we get exactly the same position as after Black’s seventh move in the text game.

The reason why White chooses this particular move order is to avoid the following line: 7...∆e6 8 ∆xd8+ ∆xd8.

This line gives Black good compensation for the sacrificed material. Here is a short summary of the possibilities arising from this position:

a) 9 e3 is the most played move. After 9...∆b4 10 ∆b5+ ∆e7 White has two interesting moves at his disposal

a1) 11 ∆a4 ∆c4 12 ∆gc2 b5 13 ∆d1 ∆d3+ 14 ∆f1 b4 15 ∆e4 f5 16 ∆g3 g6 is a critical position.
a11) 17  \( \text{c2} \)  \( \text{g7} \) 18 \( \text{xd3} \) and now Black can obtain equal chances with 18...\( \text{xd3} \) 19 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 20 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{hd8} \), Hennig-Benzinger, Germany 1929.

a12) Another possibility is 17 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c5?!} \) 18 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 19 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 20 \( \text{f2} \) and White has at last found a suitable square for the king and was better in Neurohr-Bohne, Hassloch 1999.

Instead of 17...\( \text{c5?!} \), a better move for Black was 17...\( \text{a6} \), for instance 18 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g7} \) and the position is very complicated.

a2) The other interesting move is 11 \( \text{f1} \). One of the main plans for Black now is to prevent White from developing his dark-squared bishop. White would very much like to play \( \text{f3} \) followed by \( \text{d2} \). One line is 11...\( \text{xf6} \) 12 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c2} \) 13 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{f5?!} \) (this seems illogical) 14 \( \text{d2} \) g5 15 \( \text{c1} \) h6?? (and this loses on the spot) 16 e4! \( \text{xe4} \) 17 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 18 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 19 \( \text{xf5+} \) \( \text{f6} \) 20 \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 21 \( \text{c2} \) 1-0 Smyslov-Estrin, Leningrad 1951. Still, even without the blunder 15...h6, White would be better.

Still to be tried is 13...\( \text{e4?!} \), attacking the d2-square and preventing White from developing his bishop. On 14 \( \text{e2} \) Black has the brilliant 14...\( \text{a3!!} \) 15 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xb1} \) 16 a3 \( \text{a2} \)!. The black knight is trapped but it’s hard to get at. On 14 \( \text{e2} \) (instead of 14 \( \text{e2} \)), Black plays 14...f5 with complex play.

b) 9 e4 a6 10 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 11 0-0-0? \( \text{xf2} \) and Black has regained his pawn back and has equalised, Fuchs-Wellna, Germany 1991. After 10...\( \text{c5} \) Black threatens to play 11...\( \text{xf2+} \) 12 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xd2} \). Still, White doesn’t necessarily have to give back the pawn, for instance: 11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 12 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d4} \) 13 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 14 \( \text{xe2} \) and White hangs on to his pawn.

c) 9 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e4} \) 10 \( \text{d1} \) looks rather strange: 10...\( \text{xf6} \) 11 h3? \( \text{xa2} \) 12 \( \text{xa2} \) \( \text{e4} \) 13 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 14 e3 \( \text{xf1} \) 15 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{c7} \) with a better endgame for Black, who has both the bishop pair and the better pawn structure, Havlickova-Hradil, Vsetin 1997. Better is 11 e3 \( \text{xa2} \) 12 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 13 \( \text{e1} \) a6 14 \( \text{xa2} \) \( \text{axb5} \) with unclear play.

d) 9 \( \text{g5?!} \) f6 10 \( \text{d2} \) (compared to the 9 \( \text{d2} \) line, White has here forced Black to play f7-f6) 10...\( \text{b4} \) 11 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{xa2} \) 12 \( \text{xa2} \) \( \text{xa2} \) 13 \( \text{e4} \) a6 14 \( \text{b5} \) d7 15 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 16 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 17 \( \text{e2?!} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 18 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 19 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 20 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 21 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{b5} \) 22 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e5} \) + with a draw by repetition of moves in Terpugov-Estrin, Moscow 1949.

5...\( \text{d7} \) 6 \( \text{xd4} \) exd5 7 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c6} \) 8 \( \text{g5} \)

The other main option 8 e3 is treated in the next game.

8...\( \text{xf6} \) 9 \( \text{wd2} \) h6!
Black immediately wants to get rid of the pinned knight and to fight for the initiative while White has not yet completed his development.

10 \textit{\textbf{c}4}

Other options:

a) 10 \textit{\textbf{c}xf6} \textit{\textbf{c}xg6} and now:

1) 11 \textit{\textbf{d}3} 0-0 0-0 12 \textit{\textbf{e}c}1 \textit{\textbf{b}4} 13 a3 \textit{\textbf{f}5} 14 \textit{\textbf{w}f4} \textit{\textbf{xc}3}+ 15 \textit{\textbf{b}xc3} (or 15 \textit{\textbf{xc}3}? \textit{\textbf{d}1}+! 16 \textit{\textbf{xd}1} \textit{\textbf{c}2}+ 17 \textit{\textbf{xc}2} \textit{\textbf{xf}4} and the black queen is better than the white rook and bishop in this position) 15...g5 16 \textit{\textbf{a}4} \textit{\textbf{he}8} 17 e3 \textit{\textbf{e}4} 18 \textit{\textbf{d}4} \textit{\textbf{b}8}, Michenka-Brandner, Trnava 1989. Black’s piece activity, especially the pressure against g2, gives Black good compensation for the sacrificed pawn.

2) 11 e3 (this move looks too slow) 11...0-0 0-0 12 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{g}4}. Here Black is already better as he wins the exchange. Still, the game is a classic, so we won’t spare the reader the rest: 13 \textit{\textbf{d}5} \textit{\textbf{xd}5} 14 \textit{\textbf{w}xd}5 \textit{\textbf{a}3}! 15 \textit{\textbf{wb}3} (15 \textit{\textbf{b}xa3} \textit{\textbf{d}8}) 15...\textit{\textbf{xd}1} 16 \textit{\textbf{xa}3} \textit{\textbf{xf}2} 17 \textit{\textbf{wd}3} \textit{\textbf{g}4} 18 \textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{xf}3} 19 \textit{\textbf{f}5}+ \textit{\textbf{b}8} 20 \textit{\textbf{w}b}3 \textit{\textbf{e}1}+ 21 \textit{\textbf{c}2} \textit{\textbf{e}8} 22 \textit{\textbf{g}3}+ \textit{\textbf{e}5}+ 23 \textit{\textbf{b}3} \textit{\textbf{wd}1}+ 24 \textit{\textbf{a}3} \textit{\textbf{e}5} 0-1 Pirc-Alekhnine, Bled 1931.

3) 11 \textit{\textbf{d}5} is the most critical line. As we have seen, other possibilities are less convincing. After 11...\textit{\textbf{wd}8} two white moves have been played in this position:

3a1) 12 e4 \textit{\textbf{e}6} 13 \textit{\textbf{b}5} \textit{\textbf{d}6} 14 \textit{\textbf{e}2} (14 \textit{\textbf{f}3}, to control both central squares d4 and e5, looks more natural) 14...0-0 15 0-0 \textit{\textbf{e}5} 16 \textit{\textbf{xd}1} a6 17 \textit{\textbf{d}c}3 \textit{\textbf{c}5} 18 \textit{\textbf{wd}8} (18 \textit{\textbf{f}4} is better, with complicated play) 18...\textit{\textbf{xd}8} 19 \textit{\textbf{xd}8}+ \textit{\textbf{xd}8} 20 \textit{\textbf{a}4} \textit{\textbf{d}3} and Black regains her pawn and is better due to her more active pieces, Johansson-S.Agrest, Skelleftea 2000.

3a2) 12 \textit{\textbf{d}d}1 \textit{\textbf{e}6} 13 a3 \textit{\textbf{e}7} 14 e4 0-0 15 \textit{\textbf{c}4} \textit{\textbf{e}5} 16 \textit{\textbf{a}2} \textit{\textbf{g}4} 17 \textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{h}4}+ 18 \textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{d}7} (Maybe 18...\textit{\textbf{h}5}!? with the point 19 \textit{\textbf{g}3}? \textit{\textbf{x}f3} 20 \textit{\textbf{w}e}2 \textit{\textbf{h}2}+ 21 \textit{\textbf{w}h}2 \textit{\textbf{xd}1} 22 \textit{\textbf{w}h}4 \textit{\textbf{c}2} and Black has some compensation as the rooks are strong in this position. In the game continuation White solves the problem with his kingside development easily.) 19 g3 \textit{\textbf{f}6} 20 \textit{\textbf{g}2} and White was clearly better in Gual Pascual-Rodriguez Vargas, Catalunya 1996.

b) 10 \textit{\textbf{c}e}3+ looks illogical, as the bishop would like to be on e6, whereas the white queen is not too well placed on e3. After 10...\textit{\textbf{e}6} 11 \textit{\textbf{d}1} \textit{\textbf{e}7} 12 \textit{\textbf{h}4} g5 13 \textit{\textbf{g}3} \textit{\textbf{b}4} Black has good compensation. The b2-pawn is threatened and ...\textit{\textbf{c}5} is still to come (Malajovich-Cranbourne, Acasusso 1991).

10...g5 11 \textit{\textbf{g}3} \textit{\textbf{a}5} 12 e3

12 0-0-0? was tried in Roumegous-Labarthe, Paris 1995. Play saw 12...\textit{\textbf{b}4} 13 \textit{\textbf{d}6} (White should concentrate on his development) 13...\textit{\textbf{xc}3} 14 \textit{\textbf{bxc}3} \textit{\textbf{e}4} 15 \textit{\textbf{a}b}4 \textit{\textbf{xd}2} 16 \textit{\textbf{xa}5} \textit{\textbf{e}4} and White resigned.

12...0-0-0 13 \textit{\textbf{f}3}

The rather strange move 13 \textit{\textbf{b}5} was played in Taimanov-Zagorovsky, Leningrad 1949. After 13...\textit{\textbf{xd}2}+ 14 \textit{\textbf{xd}2} \textit{\textbf{g}4}+ 15 \textit{\textbf{c}1} \textit{\textbf{b}4}+ 16 \textit{\textbf{d}c}3 \textit{\textbf{e}4} Black has the initiative and good compensation for the pawn.

13...\textit{\textbf{f}5}

The immediate 13...\textit{\textbf{b}4} seems logical too: the dark-squared bishop is going here anyway, so why not play it at once. The light-squared bishop is not necessarily going to f5; it may prefer g4 or e6.

On 14 \textit{\textbf{d}d}3 Black can now play 14...\textit{\textbf{e}6}!. The point is that Black avoids the exchange of the light-squared bishops and after, say, 15 0-0 he can continue with 15...\textit{\textbf{h}5}, obtaining equal chances as he creates counterplay on the kingside. Furthermore, after 14...\textit{\textbf{e}6} the move \textit{\textbf{d}d}4 is no longer possible like in the game continuation, as White would simply lose a pawn after the exchange on d4.

14 \textit{\textbf{d}d}4 \textit{\textbf{b}4}?! As Black has now placed his bishop on f5, a logical follow up would have been 14...\textit{\textbf{xd}4} 15 \textit{\textbf{exd}4} \textit{\textbf{c}5}, using the other bishop to put pressure against d4. After 16 \textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{xd}3} 17 \textit{\textbf{xd}3} \textit{\textbf{he}8}+ 18 \textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{xd}4} 19 \textit{\textbf{f}5}+ \textit{\textbf{e}6} Black has won his pawn back and the position is even.
15 ¤d3! ¤xd4 16 exd4 He8+ 17 ¤f1 He6

Of course not 17...¤xd4?? 18 ¤xf5! ¤xf5 19 ¤xd4. After the text move Black now threatens to capture on d4.

18 ¤c2

After 18 ¤xf5?! ¤xf5 White loses control of the light squares.

18...¤xd3+ 19 ¤xd3 ¤d5!

Black could also obtain a good position after 19...¤xc3! 20 bxc3 (Or 20 ¤c1 He4 21 bxc3 ¤xa2.) 20...¤e4 21 ¤c1 ¤xa2. Very bad for White is 21 c4? ¤d2+ 22 ¤g1 because of the beautiful 22...¤b3!!, and White loses due to the various threats 23...¤e1+, 23...¤xd4 and ...¤xd4+e2+.

20 h4!

With this move White wants to activate his rook on h1. If Black keeps the kingside closed with 20...g4, White just plays ¤g1 at some point, heading for h2.

20 ¤xd5 ¤xd5 21 ¤c1+ ¤c6 22 ¤xc6+ ¤xc6 is uncomfortable for White as he has not yet completed his development. The move ...¤c1 is threatened.

Another line is 20 ¤c1 ¤xc3 21 bxc3 ¤xa2 and like before (with the knight on e4 instead), Black has a good position.

20...¤xc3 21 bxc3 ¤xc3 22 ¤c1 ¤c6 23 hxg5 hxg5 24 ¤h7 ¤xd4 25 ¤xc6+ bxc6 26 ¤c4

The f-pawn is poisoned because of 26 ¤xf7 ¤xf2!, with threats on both e1, d3 and g3. Black is better after, for example, 27 ¤c2 ¤xg3 28 ¤g4+ ¤b8 29 ¤xg3+ ¤a8.

26...¤b5 27 ¤xb5 cxb5 28 ¤xf7 ¤d5

Black should be able to draw this endgame easily, but maybe he was in time trouble in the moves to come.

29 ¤e2 a5 30 ¤f3 ¤b2? 31 ¤c7+ ¤d8 32 ¤c2

Black now loses his a5-pawn.

32...¤a3 33 ¤c7+ ¤d7 34 ¤xa5 ¤d6?
35 ¤d2 ¤f5+ 36 ¤g4 ¤f4+

And now he has to sacrifice another pawn to avoid all the pieces being exchanged after 36...¤e5 37 ¤b4 ¤e6 38 ¤xd6+.

37 ¤xg5 ¤a4 38 ¤b6 ¤e6 39 ¤e2+ 1-0

The last threat that White had to avoid was 39...¤f4+.

---

20 h4!

With this move White wants to activate his rook on h1. If Black keeps the kingside closed with 20...g4, White just plays g1 at some point, heading for h2.

20 ¤xd5 ¤xd5 21 ¤c1+ ¤c6 22 ¤xc6+ ¤xc6 is uncomfortable for White as he has not yet completed his development. The move ...¤c1 is threatened.

Another line is 20 ¤c1 ¤xc3 21 bxc3 ¤xa2 and like before (with the knight on e4 instead), Black has a good position.

20...¤xc3 21 bxc3 ¤xc3 22 ¤c1 ¤c6 23 hxg5 hxg5 24 ¤h7 ¤xd4 25 ¤xc6+ bxc6 26 ¤c4

The f-pawn is poisoned because of 26 ¤xf7 ¤xf2!, with threats on both e1, d3 and g3. Black is better after, for example, 27 ¤c2 ¤xg3 28 ¤g4+ ¤b8 29 ¤xg3+ ¤a8.

26...¤b5 27 ¤xb5 cxb5 28 ¤xf7 ¤d5

Black should be able to draw this endgame easily, but maybe he was in time trouble in the moves to come.

29 ¤e2 a5 30 ¤f3 ¤b2? 31 ¤c7+ ¤d8 32 ¤c2

Black now loses his a5-pawn.

32...¤a3 33 ¤c7+ ¤d7 34 ¤xa5 ¤d6?
35 ¤d2 ¤f5+ 36 ¤g4 ¤f4+

And now he has to sacrifice another pawn to avoid all the pieces being exchanged after 36...¤e5 37 ¤b4 ¤e6 38 ¤xd6+.

37 ¤xg5 ¤a4 38 ¤b6 ¤e6 39 ¤e2+ 1-0

The last threat that White had to avoid was 39...¤f4+.
Meeting 1 d4

13...g4

This is a natural follow-up to Black’s previous move. Still, Black has another interesting possibility in this position: 13...b8!? The main idea behind this move is to remove the king from the centre. In the text game, Black’s problem is exactly that the king is far from safe on c8. Three moves have been played in reply to 13...b8:

a) 14 a3 g4 15 b4 b6 16 b5 cxd4 17 exd4 d6 18 c3 h8 19 c1 c7 20 g3 h5 21 d1 f5 22 g5 c8 23 b2 a5 24 a4 h6 25 h4 f4 and Black has created serious counterplay on the kingside, whereas the white attack is lagging, Andersen-Lie, Norway 1994.

b) 14 b4 cxd4 15 bxc5 cxd4+ 16 c6 g4?! (this move looks less forceful now; better is 17 c8 or 17...c5) 18 c4 c8 19 a1 20 c4 g4 21 cxd8+ cxd8 22 c6 c6 23 c4, Bukic-Truta, Slovenian Team Ch., 1994. White has the advantage as he has achieved several exchanges and still remains with a pawn up.

c) 14 b5 cxd4 15 exd4 cxd4 16 cxd4 a5 17 c4+ a8 18 c5 c5 19 cxf1 20 cxf1 g4 with an equal endgame in Kierzek-Treffert, Germany 1998.

14 b4?

14 b5 is mentioned by Petrosian and Suetin as giving White an edge. It does seem like a logical follow up to the previous move, putting pressure on c6. To avoid weakening the king position, Black has to exchange on d4, after which the c1–h6 diagonal is opened. After 14...cxd4 15 exd4 cxd4 White achieves a very strong attacking position with 16 c4! (this move keeps the king in the centre) 16...cxb5 17 c5, for instance 17...xf2+ 18 xf2xd1+ 19 cxd1 and Black cannot neutralise all the threats: xf7 mate!, c2 and d6+.

Instead White sacrifices his pawn back to complete his development.

14...xb4 15 b2 h5?

This is too hasty. A good prophylactic move was 15...b8!, leaving the half-open c-file, protecting the a7-pawn and preventing the following more or less forced moves:

16 c5 b8 17 a6

17...a5 is bad in view of 18 a3 c4 19 cxd4 and Black loses the a5-pawn.

18 c6+ c6 19 c6 f6 a6 20 c6+ a5 21 a5 b6 22 a5 b6 23 a4 f5

This seems rather desperate, but Black is running out of good moves.

24 d6+ d6 25 d6 d6 26 f3 d6 27 a6 28 a6 29 a6 d6 30 c5 31 c5 32 e4 c3 33 c3 c4 34 c4 c4 35 c4 c2 36 c2 c2 37 c2 c4 38 c4 c4 39 c4 c4 40 c4 e7 1-0

Points to Remember

1) White’s best line against the Hennig-Schara Gambit is 4 cxd5 cxd4 5 a4+ d7 6 xd4 exd5 7 xd5. This avoids the possibility of 5 xd4 c6! 6 d1 c5 7 xd5 c6! which offers Black good play for the pawn.

2) Technically speaking, the Hennig-Schara Gambit may not be strictly sound, but in practical terms it’s hard to play against and can be utilised as a good surprise weapon from time to time.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Tarrasch Defence:
3 \( \triangle f3 \) Systems

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \( \triangle f3 \) c5 4 cxd5 exd5

If White now plays 5 \( \triangle c3 \) and Black replies 5...\( \triangle c6 \), we transpose into the main lines. In this chapter we consider what happens if White avoids developing his queen-side knight in the first place. This is, in fact, a common move order, and Black should be aware of the differences in the positions arising.

We now consider two options for White, namely 5 \( \triangle g5 \) and 5 e3 \( \triangle b5+ \).

**Game 44**

**Vavruk-Potkin**

**Litohoto 1999**

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \( \triangle f3 \) c5 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \( \triangle g5 \)

White can play 5 g3 as well. Play usually develops with 5...\( \triangle c6 \) 6 \( \triangle g2 \) \( \triangle f6 \) 7 0-0 \( \triangle c7 \) and now 8 \( \triangle c3 \) 0-0 leads directly to the main line Tarrasch.

Still, White can choose between two other options besides 8 \( \triangle c3 \), namely 8 \( \triangle e3 \) and 8 dxc5 \( \triangle xc5 \) 9 \( \triangle bd2 \). Here is a short summary of the possibilities:

a) 8 \( \triangle e3 \) c4 9 \( \triangle e5 \) 0-0 10 b3 (This is the move that makes this particular line. The position has many similarities to the main line 9 \( \triangle g5 \) c4, but here White has not yet moved his knight on b1.) 10...\( \triangle xb3 \) (In the main line we generally do not recommend this exchange, but because of the differences here we think it's okay.) 11 \( \triangle xb3 \) \( \triangle d6 \).

White has played two moves in this position:

a1) 12 \( \triangle c3 \) \( \triangle xe5 \) 13 dxe5 \( \triangle xe5 \) 14 \( \triangle ad1 \) d4 15 \( \triangle xd4 \) \( \triangle xd4 \) 16 e3 \( \triangle e6 \) 17 \( \triangle wa3 \) \( \triangle c5 \) 18 \( \triangle xc5 \) \( \triangle c8 \) 19 \( \triangle b4 \) \( \triangle c4 \) 20 \( \triangle xc4 \) \( \triangle xc4 \) 21 \( \triangle fe1 \) \( \triangle ab8 \) with unclear play in Toshkov-Flueckiger, Geneva 1989.

Another possibility was the simple 14...\( \triangle xc3 \) 15 \( \triangle xc3 \) \( \triangle g4 \) 16 \( \triangle d2 \) \( \triangle e8 \). Black has gained a pawn, but White has some compensation as his pieces pressure against the black central pawn. Overall, the position is approximately equal.
a2) 12 \( \text{dxc6 bxc6 13 } \text{g5 h6 14 } \text{xf6} \) 
\( \text{wx}f6 15 \text{e3 } \text{a6!} \) (This is the reason why we play ...cxb3 in this line: the bishop has not yet moved from c8. On e6 it is passive, whereas it is active on the a6-f1 diagonal.) 16 \( \text{d1} \) 
\( \text{w}f5 17 \text{d2 } \text{ab8 and Black has an active position. The game A.Petrosian-Jelen, Ptuj 1993 continued 18 } \text{c3 } \text{b4} \) 
19 \( \text{xc6 } \text{e2} \) 
20 \( \text{xd5 } \text{xd5} \) 21 \( \text{xd5 } \text{xd1} \) 22 \( \text{xd1} \) with an interesting endgame and equal chances.

b) 8 \( \text{dxc5 } \text{xc5} \) 9 \( \text{bd2} \) (White wants to transfer the knight to b3 to gain full control of the d4-square. The disadvantage of the move is that White’s pressure against the isolated d5-pawn is weakened.) 9...0-0 10 \( \text{b3} \) (If the moves 10 a3 a5 are played, Black achieves good play as follows: 11 \( \text{b3 } \text{b6} \) 
12 \( \text{bd4 } \text{e8} \) 13 \( \text{e3 } \text{a4} \) 14 \( \text{c1 } \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{w}d3 \) h6 16 h3 \( \text{d4} \) 17 \( \text{h2 } \text{h5} \) 18 \( \text{cd1 } \) \( \text{a5!} \), Platonov-Dementiev, Riga 1970. Notice that this move is possible after the a-pawns have been pushed forward.) 10...\( \text{b6} \) 11 \( \text{bd4} \).

Here we recommend 11...\( \text{g4} \), fighting for the d4-square. After 12 \( \text{e3 } \text{e8} \) Black has a good position, as shown in the following games:

b1) 13 \( \text{e1 } \text{c8} \) 14 \( \text{a4 } \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{c2 } \text{e4} \) 
16 \( \text{b5 } \text{a5} \) 17 \( \text{med1 } \text{a6} \) 18 \( \text{b3 } \) \( \text{d8} \) 19 \( \text{fd4} \) and in this equal position the players decided to split the point, Minaya-Stanciu, Havana Olympiad 1966.

b2) 13 \( \text{dxc6 bxc6 14 } \text{d4 } \text{xd4} \) 15 
\( \text{xd4 } \text{c5} \) 16 \( \text{d3 } \text{b6} \) Here a draw was agreed in Miles-Nunn, London 1975, but in fact Black is better because of his strong central pawns.

Back to the main game after 5 \( \text{g5} \):

5...\( \text{e7} \) 6 \( \text{xe7 } \text{xe7} \) 7 \text{dxc5}

If White plays moves like 7 \( \text{c3} \) and 7 e3, play can develop along the 6 \( \text{g5} \) lines. The position after the text move is different, as Black does not have the move ...d5-d4, threatening the knight on c3.

7...\( \text{a6} \)

Black takes advantage of the fact that the queenside knights have not yet been developed.

8 \( \text{e3} \)

White has tried a number of other moves here:

a) 8 \( \text{c3} \) leads to the main game after 8...\( \text{dxc5} \) 9 e3 0-0. Another option for White is 9 g3, but it should not cause Black any troubles after, for example, 9...0-0. In the game Bosboom Lanchava-Nepine Leconte, Saint Vincent 1999, Black involved herself in some rather complicated play after 9...\( \text{g4} \) 10 \( \text{d4 } \text{xf3} \) 11 exf3 \( \text{e6} \) 12 \( \text{b5+ } \text{f8} \) 13 \( \text{b4 } \text{g8} \) 14 0-0 h5 15 \( \text{ad1} \) h4 16 g4 \( \text{h6} \) and reached an unclear position.

b) 8 \( \text{d4} \) 0-0 9 e3 \( \text{a5+} \) 10 \( \text{c3 } \text{b4} \) 11 
\( \text{c1 } \text{bc6} \) 12 \( \text{d2 } \text{xc5} \) 13 h3 \( \text{d8} \) 14 \( \text{b5} \) 
\( \text{b6} \) 15 \( \text{d3 } \text{f5} \) with equality, M.Hoffmann-Flueckiger, Swiss Team Ch., 1995.
c) 8 \textit{Wa}4+ \textit{Kd}7 9 \textit{Wa}3 \textit{Kc}8? 10 e3 (White can try to hold on to the pawn with 10 b4? Therefore we suggest Black should play the simple 9...\textit{Wc}7, with the idea 10 \textit{b}4! \textit{Wf}4 and Black wins his pawn back) 10...\textit{Oxc}5 (now the position is even) 11 \textit{Qc}3 0-0 12 \textit{Qe}2 \textit{De}4 13 0-0 \textit{Oxc}3 14 bxc3 \textit{a}6 15 \textit{Ed}1 \textit{Kc}7 16 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Ee}8 17 \textit{Kac}1 \textit{Wc}8 18 h3 \textit{Kc}5 19 \textit{Kf}3 \textit{Wc}7 20 \textit{Ed}3 \textit{Ee}4 21 \textit{Kc}1 \textit{h}6 22 \textit{Ed}2 \textit{Ec}8 23 \textit{Kb}2 and a draw was agreed in Iskusnyh-Bezgodov, Tula 1999.

8...\textit{Oxc}5 9 \textit{Qc}3

Another very logical continuation is to exchange another minor piece with 9 \textit{Qb}5+ \textit{Kd}7 10 \textit{Qxd}7+ \textit{Wxd}7. Play can develop as follows: 11 \textit{Qc}3 0-0 12 0-0 \textit{Ed}8 13 \textit{Qc}1 (This is far more critical than 13 \textit{We}2. For example 13...\textit{Qe}4 14 \textit{Qb}5 a6 15 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Ec}8 16 \textit{Kfd}1 \textit{Wc}7 17 \textit{Qe}1 \textit{Qc}6 18 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{Wxc}6 with equal play, Bagirov-Khenkin, Sevastopol 1986) 13...\textit{Bac}8 14 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qf}5 15 \textit{Qg}4 d4! (this loses a pawn with no real compensation) 16 exd4 \textit{Qxd}4 17 \textit{Qxd}4 \textit{Ed}4 18 \textit{Qxd}4 \textit{Qxd}4 19 \textit{Qb}5 \textit{Ed}4 20 \textit{Qxa}7 \textit{Ed}7 21 \textit{Kfd}1 \textit{g}6 22 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}6 23 \textit{Ed}8+ \textit{Qg}7 24 \textit{Qc}8 with a white advantage, Jovicic-Jovancic, Caorle 1988.

A more quiet continuation is preferable for Black: 14...\textit{b}6 (instead of 14...\textit{Qf}5) 15 \textit{Kfd}1 \textit{Qf}5. White has the superior pawn structure as usual, but the \textit{d}5-pawn is easy to protect. Besides, Black has good play on the light squares in centre. Overall, the position is equal.

9...0-0 10 \textit{Qe}2

Another move is 10 \textit{Qd}4, but it is not to convincing: 10...\textit{Wb}6 11 \textit{a}b1 \textit{Qg}6 12 \textit{g}3 \textit{Qg}4 13 \textit{Qc}2 \textit{Kh}3 14 \textit{Qf}1 \textit{Wh}6 and Black had a good position in Rashkovsky-Lputian, Yerevan 1984.

10...\textit{Wb}6 11 \textit{Wc}1

This move looks rather awkward. Alternatives include:

a) 11 \textit{Qxd}5 \textit{Qxd}5 12 \textit{Wxd}5 \textit{Wxb}2 13 \textit{Wd}4 \textit{Wc}2 leads to equal play.

b) 11 \textit{Wd}2 \textit{Qe}4 12 \textit{Qe}4 dxe4 13 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Wg}6 and White has problems on \textit{g}2 (14 0-0?? \textit{Kxh}3 wins the exchange).

11...\textit{Qg}4 12 0-0 \textit{Qac}8 13 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qxe}2 14 \textit{Qdx}e2 \textit{Qe}4 15 \textit{Kd}1 \textit{Kfd}8

The Black pieces are very harmoniously placed, whereas White has not yet completed his development.

16 \textit{Qd}3

16...\textit{Qg}6!?

This is the beginning of a very interesting series of moves, involving a pawn sacrifice.

17 \textit{Wd}1 \textit{Qxc}3 18 \textit{Qxc}3 \textit{d}4 19 \textit{Qa}4

Or 19 exd4 \textit{Wxb}2 20 \textit{Kb}1 \textit{Qa}3 21 \textit{Kb}3 \textit{Wc}6, with play for both sides.

19...\textit{Wc}6 20 \textit{Qxd}4

Not 20 exd4? \textit{Qd}4 21 \textit{Wg}3 \textit{Qxd}4!, with the point 22 \textit{Wxd}4 \textit{Qe}2+. After 21...\textit{Qxd}4 White loses his knight on \textit{a}4.

20...\textit{Qxd}4 21 \textit{Wxd}4 \textit{Qh}4!

21...\textit{Wc}1+ is nothing: 22 \textit{Wd}1 gives White a plus.

22 \textit{f}3

The only move. White is mated after 22 \textit{Wxb}4?? \textit{Wc}1+.

22...\textit{Qf}5 23 \textit{Kxa}7 \textit{Wc}2 24 \textit{e}4

The cool 24 \textit{Wxb}7 \textit{Qh}4 25 \textit{f}4 \textit{Qc}6 26 \textit{Wb}8+ \textit{Qc}8 27 \textit{Wb}7 \textit{Qc}6 leads to a repetition. Maybe White should have taken the draw here.

24...\textit{Qh}4 25 \textit{Wf}2 \textit{Wxf}2+ 26 \textit{Wxf}2 \textit{Qc}2+ 27 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qg}2+ 28 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{Qf}2 29 \textit{Qc}1 \textit{g}5

A very interesting endgame has arisen. White is a pawn up, but Black has the more
active pieces. Black’s plan is simply to capture the h2-pawn and then push his passed h-pawn. White, on the other hand, has to make use of his extra pawn on the queenside.

30 \( \text{Ec8} + \)

A better rook manoeuvre was 30 \( \text{Ec5} \) h6 31 \( \text{Ab5} \) (instead of \( \text{Ac1-c8-b8} \) as in the game). With the rook on b5, White also keeps an eye on the dangerous h-pawn. At the moment it has to protect its neighbour on g5.

30...\( \text{Ag7} \) 31 \( \text{Ab8} \) \( \text{Af4} + \) 32 \( \text{Ac4} \) \( \text{Ahxh2} \) 33 \( \text{Axh7} \) h5 34 \( \text{Ac3} \) h4 35 a4 h3 36 a5 \( \text{Ah1} \) 37 \( \text{Ad7} \)

White has lost the pawn race. He has to stop the h-pawn, which is an indication that he is on his way to losing.

37...\( \text{Ag1} \) 38 \( \text{Ad2} \) \( \text{Ag2} \) 39 \( \text{Ae2} \) h2 40 \( \text{Ag3} \) \( \text{Ee3} + \) 41 \( \text{Bb5} \) \( \text{Af1} ! \)

Black is winning as White has to sacrifice his rook to stop the h-pawn. If he could sacrifice the knight, maybe he would have had some chances of saving the game.

42 \( \text{Af5} + \) \( \text{Af6} \) 43 \( \text{Ae6} + \) \( \text{Ag5} \) 44 \( \text{Ah6} \) h1\( \text{W} \) 45 \( \text{Ahxh1} \) \( \text{Ahxh1} \) 46 a6 \( \text{Ad2} \) 47 a7 \( \text{Aa1} \) 48 \( \text{Ae7} \) \( \text{Axh3} \) 49 \( \text{Ac6} + \) \( \text{Axh4} \) 50 \( \text{Ab6} \) \( \text{Ad4} \) 0-1

Again we have reached the desired position from another move order.

6...\( \text{Cc6} \) 7 0-0

Another possibility is to attack c6 immediately with 7 \( \text{Ad5} \). After 7...\( \text{Cd7} \), three moves have been played in this position:

a) 8 \( \text{Wa4} \) \( \text{Dxe5} \) 9 dxe5 and in the game Callergard-Hurme, Espoo 1991 Black now played 9...\( \text{Ag4} ? \) and White was clearly better after the further 10 e6! \( \text{Ab5} \) 11 \( \text{Ab5+} \) \( \text{Ag7} \) 12 \( \text{Dxc5+} \) \( \text{Dxe6} \) 13 \( \text{Dd4} \). Instead Black can play 9...a6 10 \( \text{Dxd7+} \) \( \text{Dxd7} \) 11 \( \text{Af4} \) \( \text{Dd4} \) 12 \( \text{Dd2} \) \( \text{Dxd2} \) 13 \( \text{Dxd2} \) \( \text{Dxe7} \) with equal play.

b) 8 \( \text{Dxc6} \) \( \text{Dxc6} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{Dc7} \) 10 \( \text{Dd2} \) d6 11 \( \text{Dxd3} \) 0-0 12 b3 (White should have exchanged on c6) 12...\( \text{Ab5} \) 13 \( \text{Dd1} \). Now, instead of 13...c4 14 a4 \( \text{Ab6} \) 15 bxc4 \( \text{Dxc4} \) 16 \( \text{Aa3} \) \( \text{Aa3} \) 17 \( \text{Aa3} \) \( \text{Aa3} \) 18 \( \text{Dxc4} \) \( \text{Dxc4} \) with equal play in Berg-Blauert, Copenhagen 1992, Black can keep the tension in the centre and thereby obtain slightly better chances after 13...\( \text{Ae4} \) 14 \( \text{Ab2} \) \( \text{Df8} \).

c) After 8 \( \text{Dxd7} \) \( \text{Dxd7} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{Dd6} \) 10 dxc5 \( \text{Dxc5} \) 11 b3 0-0 12 \( \text{Dc3} \) a6 13 \( \text{Bxe6} \) \( \text{Bxc6} \) 14 \( \text{Bb2} \) \( \text{Bf8} \) 15 \( \text{Da4} \) \( \text{Aa7} \) 16 \( \text{Dc1} \) \( \text{Dd6} \) 17 \( \text{Dd4} \) \( \text{Dxd4} \) 18 \( \text{Dxd4} \) \( \text{Aa8} \) 19 \( \text{Dd1} \) \( \text{Dd3} \) the position is equal and the players agreed for a draw in Berg-Kindermann, Germany 1985. Instead of 9 0-0, the game Hernando Perttierra-Sanz, Alicante 1978 continued 9 dxc5 \( \text{Dxc5} \) 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \text{Dd2} \) a6 12 \( \text{Dd3} \) \( \text{Bd6} \) 13 \( \text{Df3} \) \( \text{Dfe8} \) 14 a3 \( \text{Dad8} \) 15 \( \text{Dxd4} \) \( \text{Dxd4} \) 16

\text{Game 45}

\text{Christiansen-Kaidanov}

\text{US Championship 1993}

1 c4 e6 2 \( \text{Df3} \) d5 3 e3 \( \text{Df6} \) 4 d4 c5 5
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exd4 exd4 17 a3h7+ dxa3 18 b3xd4 e4 and Black was better because of his piece activity and the passed pawn in the d-file. The game ended: 19 d3 c5 20 c3 d4 21 a3 f6 22 e2 e4 23 b3 a1 24 a1 d5 25 d1 b5 26 e1 e2 27 h4 xb2 28 b3 f6 29 e1 c3 30 e4 d3 31 g4+ f8 32 d1 d2 33 d2 f2 e3 34 f5 d6 35 e4 0-1.

7...d6

Black continues as in the 6 e3 line (see Chapter 5). If White plays d6, then play can in fact transpose into that line.

8 e2

After this move White can no longer return to lines we’ve already discussed.

8...d6 9 dxc5 a6c5 10 e6c6+ bxc6

Another move is 10...bxc6. Following 11 d6 d6 12 b3 0-0 13 b2 the position looks okay for Black, but in fact he has some problems as he cannot control all the squares c5, c6, e5 and f6. For instance:

a) 13...e4 14 a4 c7 15 b4 xf6 16 b5 d6 and Black has a damaged pawn structure.

b) 13...c7 14 c1 c7 15 d4 d7 16 e5.

c) 13...b7 14 a4 e4 15 c1 d7 16 c5.

In these last two lines White has the initiative and in all these lines White is slightly better.

11 b3 d6

Preventing 12 a3.

12 b2 g4

More precise is 12...0-0 as then Black can answer 13 b6f6 with 13...b6f6, not fearing the exchange sacrifice 13 axf6 bxf6 14 c5 d6 as his king is safe.

13 c1

White should play 13 c7f6! and now Black has to recapture with the g-pawn, as 13...b6f6? 14 b5c5 bxf3 15 cxf3 c1d4 16 c3 b2 17 cxd5 loses on the spot.

After 13...gxf6 14 d1 White is better. The bishop pair is not enough compensation for the damaged pawn structure in this position.

13...b6 14 c5 0-0 15 c5

15...g5 is met with 15...h5 16 b6f6 g6! and Black has protected h7. In the endgame arising after 17 b6 b6 18 b6 xf6 gxf6 19 b5 g3 a6 20 b4 a3, the black bishops are very strong.

15...a6 16 c5 c6 17 c1 e4 18 a3

Or 18 c1 e6, with a repetition?

18...a5 19 b5 g5 20 a6

On 20 b6f6 Black again replies 20...g6! with a good position.

After 20 a6 White now threatens 21 b4.

20...a8 21 c5 a4 22 f1 b6 23 c3 a8 24 a2 d7 25 d4 e5 26 d1 a8! 27 a3 c8

White threatened 28 d4.

28 g2 e2 6 29 d4 c8
Black protects the e6-square. Play is equal in this very tense position.
30 \(Wd1\)

White is planning the break b3-b4.
30...\(Wd7!\) 31 b4 \(xf8\)

Black cannot exchange on b4 because of the unprotected bishop on a6. The plan with 30...\(Wd7\) was to protect b5. Otherwise 32 b5 would have been possible.

32 bxa5 \(xc4\) 33 \(xc3\) \(xa3?!\)

There was no reason for Black to complicate things. After the text move all the queenside pawns are exchanged. Then the Black bishops lose a lot of strength in the position, as play is concentrated in the centre and on the kingside. Better was 33...bxa5! with unclear play.

34 \(xc1\) bxa5 35 \(xa5\) c4 36 \(c3\)

Yet another problem arises for Black in this position: after the a-file is cleared, his light squared bishop needs a suitable square.

36...\(xb1\)

White threatened 37 \(xc2\) to put pressure along the a-file.

37 \(xb1\) \(xf8\) 38 h3 \(e5\) 39 \(b6\) \(c4\)

After 39...b7 40 \(b3\) \(a8?!\), the corner is not exactly the ideal square for the bishop.

40 \(de6\) \(d6\) 41 \(wb1!\)

White now threatens 42 \(b7\). Black is in trouble here.

41...\(exe6?\)

The knight was poisoned. Better was 41...\(e7\), after which White plays 42 \(b4\) to exchange the dark-squared bishops. Then the threat of \(b7\) is even stronger.

42 \(xe6\) \(xe6\) 43 \(b4\) \(c6\)

Or:

a) 43...\(f7\) 44 \(xd6\) \(xd6\) 45 \(b4\) and White wins the exchange.

b) 43...\(f3+\) is refuted by 44 \(h1!\) \(e5\) 45 \(xd6\).

c) 43...\(d3!\) was the best try, but still not good enough: 44 \(a1\) \(c4\) 45 \(a8+\) \(f7\) 46 \(b7+\) \(g6\) 47 \(h8!\) \(xb4\) 48 \(xg7+\) \(f5\) 49 \(g4+\) \(c5\) 50 \(f4\) mate!

44 \(xd6\) \(xd6\) 45 \(wa1!\)

Black cannot prevent White's next move.

45...\(Wd7\) 46 \(wa8+\) 1-0

Black gave up in view of 46...\(d8\) 47 \(b8\).

White keeps the tension

Finally, we should briefly discuss the possibility White has of keeping the tension in the centre by not exchanging on d5.

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \(f3\) c5 4 e3 \(f6\)

Now White can transpose into a line considered earlier with 5 cxd5 exd5 6 \(b5+\), but White can also continue with...

5 \(c3\) \(c6\)

The position is completely symmetrical. If now White plays 6 cxd5 exd5 we get a position from the 6 e3 line.

Instead, White can avoid easing the tension in the centre and play either of the two options 6 a3 or 6 \(a3\).
a) 6 a3 cxd4 7 exd4 e7 and now:
a1) After 8 d3 dxc4 9 xc4 0-0 10 0-0 we get a well known position from the Panov-Botvinnik Attack in the Caro-Kann Defence. However, given that White has ‘lost’ a tempo with d3 and then xc4, this line is considered to be quite comfortable for Black.

a2) Another move for White here is 8 c5. White is planning to expand on the queen-side with b2-b4 at some time. Therefore we suggest 8...e4 9 c2 c3 10 xc3 a5! to prevent this. Black will follow up with ...0-0, ...d7 and ...b7-b6, achieving a good position.

b) 6 d3 dxc4 7 xc4 and Black has two good options here:
b1) 7...cxd4 8 exd4 e7 9 0-0 0-0, again with a position from the Panov-Botvinnik Attack in the Caro-Kann Defence. If White now plays 10 a3 we get exactly the same position as in the 6 a3 line above.

b2) Another interesting possibility is 7...a6. If now 8 a4 cxd4 9 exd4 e7 we get a position from the Queen’s Gambit Accepted (QGA), but here White used two moves to capture the pawn on c4, whereas he only uses one move in the QGA. It is no surprise that Black is doing well here with his extra tempo.

If White instead plays 8 0-0 b5 9 d3 b7, we again have a position similar to the QGA, but White has again lost a tempo.

Points to Remember

1) After 5 g5 e7 6 xe7 e7 White exchanges bishops but once again Black’s development is accelerated, leaving him with a reasonably comfortable position.

2) 5 e3 f6 6 b5+ is a tricky move order, but often it just leads back into the 6 e3 line studied in Chapter 5.
In this Chapter we will consider the main ways of White avoiding the Tarrasch after the opening moves 1 d4 d5

The Catalan Opening
One of the great things about playing the Tarrasch is that you do not have to think too much about how you want to counter the Catalan. You just play the Tarrasch! And if White does not want to transpose into the main lines, he must do something silly to avoid it. In most cases this will not happen, but below we shall look at a deviation.

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 £>f3 c5 4 g3

4...£tf6 5 &g2 &e7 6 0-0 0-0

Now White can transpose into normal Tarrasch lines with 7 cxd5 exd5. The one main deviation is

7 dxc5

but Black should not be any worse after

7...&xc5 8 a3 &c6 9 b4 &e7 10 &c2
&d7 11 cxd5 exd5 12 &b2 &c8 13 &c1
&e5

as in Marjanovic-Kosic, Tivat 1994.

The Trompovsky-Hodgson System
The Trompovsky is traditionally 1 d4 £}f6 2 jLg5, but even after l...d5 this move has become fashionable. Hodgson is the great champion of this idea, and in modern tournament chess this jLg5 move is more or less always related to Hodgson, even though he had nothing to do with the invention of the system. The same is the case with several other openings, so why not here?

Game 46
Anand-Karpov
Lausanne (8th matchgame) 1998

1 d4 d5 2 &g5

This Trompovsky-Hodgson system is actually quite difficult to meet, if you do not know what to do. Personally, we feel that the line we have chosen is the safest and easiest way to equality and, at the same time, also
one that requires only a few lines to be remembered.

2...h6 3 £h4 c6!

The whole problem with the black position is that his development is gravely disturbed. This move, preparing ...Wb6, removes the pin from the h4-d8 diagonal without any positional sacrifices. Not even time, as the early development of the bishop has exposed b2.

4 £f3

This is the main move, but as we shall see below it forces a weakening of the queenside. Also tested has been 4 e3 Wb6 5 Wc1. This does not sacrifice a pawn here, but it is still not very dangerous. After 5...£f5! 6 £f3 e6 7 c4 £c7 Black is close to being fully developed:

a) 8 £xe7 £xe7 9 £c3 £d7 10 £e2 0-0 and the knight of this opening, Julian Hodgson, agreed to a draw in Hodgson-Khalifman, Hastings 1995/96.

b) 8 £g3, avoiding the exchange, does not yield anything as well: 8...£f6 9 £c3 0-0 10 c5?! (this is probably not very good, as it gives Black the break with ...b7-b6 later, but if White doesn't play like this, then he has to accept that there is no chance of an advantage whatsoever) 10...£d8 11 h3 a5 12 £e2 £bd7 13 £e5 £xe5 14 £xe5 £d7 15 £g3 b6 16 cxb6 Wxb6 and the real question here is not if Black has equalised, but if he has taken over the initiative, Barsov-Hector, York 2000.

4...Wb6 5 b3

This is clearly the best move here. The gambit line 5 Wc1 g5 6 £g3 g4 is investigated in Game 48.

5...£f5 6 e3 £d7 7 £d3

This is the difference from 4 e3. Now White can recapture with the queen. Note that after 7 £e2 the bishop on f5 is the stronger of the two light-squared bishops, despite his pawn structure, and that 2...h6 is very beneficial for the bishop.

7...£xd3 8 £xd3 e6 9 c4 £e7!

This interesting move has not been attempted again at the top level. This is probably due to matters of taste more than something connected to the actual value of the move itself. Still, the main move 9...£c7 is our recommendation. It will be dealt with in the following game.

10 c5?!

Anand needed to win this game to stay in the match, so he was probably not too happy about the outcome of the opening. After 10 0-0 £f5 11 £bd2 £xh4 12 £xh4 £e7 13 £h3 the position is very level, but his chances to beat Karpov here are minimal.

10...Wa5+ 11 £ta3

11 £d2 £xd2+ 12 £xb2 £f5 leaves Black with a good endgame, with bishop against knight and a fight for the pawn structure on the dark squares.

11...b6!
Breaking up the pawn formation and eliminating all White’s ideas of an advantage. Probably this is why Anand sacrifices a pawn. 

12 b4??

But it is not a very good sacrifice at all. In a few moves it becomes clear that White has no compensation whatsoever. 12 cxb6 axb6 13 0-0 d5, with a slight black advantage, was more prudent.

12...Wxb4 13 0-0 d5 14 £c1

14 £b1 Wc5 does not obtain anything. It is hard to spot any compensation for White. Karpov now decides that there is even less for the second one offered.

14...bxc5 15 £b1 c4

15...Wc5 was also fine, but the text move is more solid.

16 £c2

16 £xb4 cxd3 17 £b7 £d6 is a winning endgame for Black — and he only needs a draw!

16...Wc5 17 £b7 £c6 18 £b1 £d6

The move ...£b8 is on its way. All in all, White is lost and the rest is just continuing for the sake of continuing.

19 e4 £hx4 20 £hx4 £b8 21 £xb8+ £xb8 22 exd5 cxd5 23 £g6!?

Otherwise black will castle! Still, the sacrifice is hopeless.

23...fxg6 24 £xg6+ £d8

Going to the safe side, although even 24...£e8 was good enough for the full point.

25 £xg7 £e8

26 £xh6 £a5 27 £g5+ £c8 28 £g6 £f8 29 £c1 £b6 30 £e2 £e5 31 £h5 £f6 32 £f1 £h8 0-1

And White decided to call it a day.

Game 47

Morozevich-Kramnik

Astana 2001

1 d4 d5 2 £g5 c6 3 £f3 h6 4 £h4 £b6 5 £b3 £f5 6 e3 £c6 7 £d3 £xd3 8 £xd3 £e7

As said before, this is the standard move in this position (never mind that the Anand-Karpov game had 8...£d7 first; the move order does not make any difference). After the exchange of the bishops White’s small space advantage loses its importance, as there are only a few minor pieces needing squares. 9 £xe7 £xe7 10 c4 £d7 11 £c3 0-0 12 0-0

12...Wc6!

This is the right move here, putting pressure on c4 and preparing ...£c8 and ...£d8.

13 £fd1

White must be careful how he decides to develop his pieces. In the following game White became too optimistic and ended up with a large amount of weaknesses: 13 a4 £fd8 14 £fd1 £ac8 15 a5!? (it seems that the pawn is only weak here) 15...c5 16 £b5 £c6 17 £c3 cxd4 18 exd4 £f6 19 £e1 £e4 20 h3 dxc4 21 bxc4 £d6 (Black has more than
equalised. The pawns on d4, c4 and a5 are all a little bit weak. Now Rozentalis goes heavily astray.) 22 d5 $\text{c}x\text{c}4! 23 \text{dxc}6 \text{a}x\text{d}1 24 \text{w}x\text{d}1 \text{w}x\text{b}5 25 \text{c}7 (25 \text{c}xb7 w\text{b}7 is clearly better for Black, but still it was the best) 25...w\text{e}8 26 \text{w}d4 \text{a}x\text{d}7 27 w\text{c}a7 w\text{c}6 28 \text{b}1 w\text{h}7 29 \text{w}a8 w\text{d}5 30 \text{c}1 \text{c}5 31 w\text{e}8? \text{c}d6! 0-1. Rozentalis-Sulypa, Bad Wiessee 1999. Perhaps Rozentalis overlooked 32 $\text{c}x\text{c}5 \text{w}d1+. 13...f\text{d}8

Okay, so White needs to be less ambitious. The same goes for Black. The following game illustrates how badly things can go if he overstretches his bow: 13...f\text{b}6?! 14 e\text{c}1 dxc4 15 w\text{f}1! (White has no problems in regaining his pawn, and Black is not ready to make a counterblow in the centre) 15...d7 (15...cxb3 16 w\text{a}6 bxa6 17 axb3 is an extra pawn for Black, but it is very likely that he will lose all the pawns on the queenside, and perhaps get the b3-pawn in return. Then he would be a pawn down.) 16 bxc4 c5 17 d5 \text{a}d8 18 a\text{b}1 exd5 19 cxd5 w\text{f}1+ 20 \text{w}x\text{f}1 b6 21 a4 f5 22 a5 with a clear edge to White, Hodgson-Adianto, Amsterdam 1996. 14 e\text{b}1

21...b5!

This move was probably also a surprise for Morozevich. Now Black wins.
22 e\text{e}5 \text{e}4 23 \text{d}3 \text{d}2 24 \text{c}d8+ \text{c}d8 25 \text{e}d1? 26 \text{w}d1 \text{w}d1 27 \text{w}f3 c6 28 d4 exd5 29 \text{d}xe6 \text{f}5! and Black wins.

21...b5!

28 \text{h}d7 \text{w}c1 is lethal.

Aimed against the only active plan White has, the advance c4-c5. Also, after a move like e3-e4, then ...c6-c5 becomes very interesting. Well timed, of course!
15 w\text{f}1 \text{e}c8

Black has equalised and is maybe even very minimally better as he is the only one who has the power to change the position.
16 \text{d}2 \text{f}6 17 \text{e}5 dxc4!

The difference from the Adianto game above is clear. After 18 bxc4 c5! White does not have 19 d5, but will have to suffer with two loose pawns hanging.
18 \text{c}c4 \text{f}d5 19 \text{c}c2 \text{c}c5 20 \text{c}c5

Black now clearly has the advantage as White has weaknesses on d4 and a2. It is remarkable to see how this kind of simple chess can knock over a 'top five' player.

21 dxc5?!

Better was 21 \text{d}3.
This gambit line has effectively stopped with the outcome of the opening in this game. The verdict is that White cannot even count on equality.

5 \( \text{wc1?} \)!

5...g5! 6 \( \text{g3 g4} \)

 Winning the d4-pawn, but of course White has some development to compensate for the pawn.

7 \( \text{e5 wd4} \) 8 c4!

 Putting the black position under immediate pressure. The less direct 8 \( \text{ki2} \) is investigated in the following game.

8...\( \text{g7} \) 9 e3 \( \text{c5} \) 10 \( \text{d2 d7} \) 11 \( \text{d3 wb6} \) 12 a4 \( \text{c5} \) 13 cxd5 \( \text{xd3}+ \) 14 \( \text{xd3} \)

14...cxd5

14...\( \text{xb2} \) might look promising at first sight, but after 15 a5! \( \text{b4} \) 16 \( \text{b1 d6} \) 17 \( \text{a4! xa4} \) 18 \( \text{xb2 xa5} \) 19 d6 Hodgson gained a strong initiative against Bogdan Lalic at the 1999 British Championship.

15 \( \text{b5+ f8} \) 16 0-0

16...\( \text{f5!} \)

 This was actually the new move! It seems logical to develop this piece, but still one game had been played with 16...a6 17 e4! \( \text{c6} \) 18 cxd5 \( \text{xd5} \) 19 \( \text{c4} \), where the players agreed a draw in Hodgson-Krasenkow, Germany 1998. Hodgson's decision to repeat this line for the second time suggests that he had something prepared.

17 \( \text{c7 g6} \) 18 \( \text{c5} \)

 White has sacrificed a pawn but has a slight plus in development. Only he is not particularly well organised and Black does not have any great weaknesses that can be exploited.

18...\( \text{f6} \) 19 a5 a6 20 \( \text{a4 e8} \) 21 \( \text{f4?!} \)

 White is gambling everything he owns on a quick successful attack before the black king creeps into safety and the rook on h8 gets into play. Unfortunately, it is not very good so he should have taken the safer path with 21 \( \text{xe8 xe8} \) 22 \( \text{xd5 xb2} \) 23 \( \text{a2! c6} \) 24 \( \text{xb7 f6} \), where Black has a promising position with the better co-ordination and the two bishops, but no material advantage.

21...\( \text{xb2} \) 22 \( \text{ab1?} \)

 Walking the plank. After 22 \( \text{a2 g7} \) 23 \( \text{xd5 e6} \) 24 \( \text{xe6 xe6} \) Black is only
somewhat better, as he still needs to solve his problems with development.

22...£c8 23 Wxd5 £xb1 24 Wxb7 £c1?!

Even safer was 24...£f5 25 Wxb2 £f6, when the compensation is nowhere to be seen.

25 £xc1 £xc1 26 £xb1 £g7 27 £e5+ £f6 28 Wxe7

White has succeeded in establishing some threats. Next, perhaps, is £a4-c2?!

28...£b2!!

No way, mister!

29 £c2

Oh yes!

29...£c8!

Oh no!!

30 £c3

Or 30 £xb2 £xc2 and it’s all over.

30...£xc2

This is possible now that the rook is on the other side of the king.

31 Wxf6+ £f8 32 Wxh6+

32 Wh8+ £e7 33 Wf6+ £e8 34 Wh8+ £d7 is another way to lose for White.

32...£e8 33 h4 £xc3 34 £f4 £g6 0-1

Hodgson had had enough.

Game 49
Djurhuus-Borge
Reykjavik 1996

1 d4 d5 2 £g5 c6 3 £f3 h6 4 £h4 £b6!
5 £c1?! g5 6 £g3 g4 7 £e5

15 f3

Tisdall finds that White could have offered more resistance with 15 b4, but to us it looks very dangerous as only the white king will get exposed. Tisdall himself delivers a good path for Black to follow: 15...d4! 16 bxc5 £xc5 17 cxd4 exd4 18 £f4 £f5 and Black will follow up with ...£c8. What should White do? It is hard to see how he should
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develop his kingside properly.

15...\textit{e}6 16 \textit{f}2 0-0-0 17 \textit{e}c2 \textit{b}8 18 0-0-0 \textit{d}7 19 \textit{b}1 \textit{h}6!

This is all the difference in the position. This bishop is controlling a lot of very important squares in White's camp.

20 e4

Or 20 e3 c4! and the pawn becomes both pinned and a target.

20...d4 21 c4?

21 \textit{c}4 seems to be stronger. At least then White is getting a piece into play. Still, Black is much better after 21...\textit{c}7 22 \textit{d}3 (22 \textit{a}3? is mentioned by Tisdall, but 22...\textit{xc}3! wins a pawn on the spot, as 23 bxc3? \textit{xd}1+ 24 \textit{xd}1 \textit{d}8, followed by ...\textit{e}d2, must win quite quickly) 22...\textit{hg}8 23 g3 b5 (23...\textit{c}6 is also a clear advantage to Black and is perhaps simpler) 24 \textit{a}3 c4 25 \textit{xc}3! cxd3 26 \textit{xc}7+ \textit{xc}7 27 d5 \textit{d}7 28 \textit{xd}3 and White has some play for the piece, although hardly enough.

21...\textit{hg}8 22 \textit{g}1 \textit{c}6 23 a3

There was nothing left for White to do after the weakening of b4. After 23 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}4 24 \textit{e}2 d3 25 \textit{e}1 \textit{a}6 26 a3 \textit{xc}4 Black is winning.

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

23...\textit{xe}3! 24 \textit{xe}3

24 \textit{b}3 \textit{xf}2 25 \textit{xf}2 \textit{xb}3 is easy to understand.

24...\textit{dxe}3 25 \textit{b}3 \textit{xd}1+ 26 \textit{xd}1 \textit{d}8

27 \textit{wc}2 \textit{d}4 28 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4!

28...\textit{exd}4 would prevent the intrusion of the rook.

29 \textit{wc}3

This loses on the spot, but it's a rather bleak endgame after 29 \textit{d}d3 \textit{wd}6 30 \textit{ce}2 \textit{xd}2 31 \textit{d}1 \textit{xc}2! (Tisdall somehow missed this in his annotations but Fritz did not!). After \textit{xd}6 \textit{xe}2 33 \textit{xe}6 \textit{xc}2 the e-pawn is quite strong. Actually, it is queening: 29 \textit{cc}1 \textit{a}6, followed by ...\textit{xc}4.

29...\textit{xd}1+ 0-1

As the next move is 30...e2, winning about a rook, White chose to end his misery right here by resigning.

The Torre Attack

Again we are talking about a hybrid system. The main Torre Attack arises after 1 d4 \textit{f}6 2 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}6 (or 2...g6) and then 3 \textit{g}5. Here it comes about a bit differently and is completely harmless.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 50}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Nikolic-Piket}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{Sarajevo 1998.}
\end{center}

1 \textit{xf}3 d5 2 d4 e6 3 \textit{g}5

This move enters some kind of a Torre Attack, but in a very peaceful variation. Black equalises easily.

3...\textit{e}7!

There is no reason to enter a pin.

4 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7

4...\textit{xe}7 is equally good here. It is a matter of taste.

5 e3

Or 5 \textit{bd}2 0-0 6 \textit{e}4? (If White does not play this there are no chances of an advantage. After 6 e3 b6 7 \textit{d}3 c5 8 c3 \textit{a}6 9 \textit{xa}6 \textit{xa}6 10 0-0 \textit{c}8 Black had equalised in Unkelbach-Becker, Sailauf 1992) 6...\textit{dxe}4 7 \textit{dxe}4 \textit{bc}6 8 c3 \textit{d}5 9 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}8 10 \textit{wd}2 e5 with complete equality in Stefanova-Godena, Cannes 1996.

5...0-0 6 c4 \textit{c}5!

This solves all possible problems at once.

7 \textit{dxc}5
There are no paths to an advantage as Avrukh has shown:

a) 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 e4 (8 c3 c3 9 bxc3 a5 10 d2 c6 11 c3 cxd4 12 cxd4 b6 is equal. These endgames are typically not dangerous for Black at all.) 8...f6 9 c3 (the White pawns would only become exposed after 9 e5?! d7 10 d5 a5+ 11 c3 xc5 12 d6 c6) 9...cxd4 10 xd4 c5 12 f3 c6 and the position is truly even.

b) 7 c3!? cxd4 8 exd4 b6 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 d3 b7 12 0-0 with mutual chances.

7...a5+ 8 h3 dxc4 9 xc4

The position is also equal after 9 d4 d8 10 xc4 a6 11 a4 xc5 12 c2 d7.

9...xc5 10 d4

10...a5!

Black should be careful. After the less accurate 10...xd4 11 xd4 bc6 12 xc6 xc6 13 d1 b6 14 b5 he has some problems developing freely. After the text move everything is fine.

11 e5

This is very persistent, but it does not lead to an advantage.

11...xe5 12 xe5 d7!

Not 12...bc6, transposing to the note to Black’s tenth move.

13 xd7

13 f3 f6 14 d1 b6 is equal as well.

13...xd7 14 e2 ac8 15 b3 fd8 16 xd1 f8 17 h4 h6 18 ac1 e8 19 xdx8 xdx8 20 a3 ½-½.

The players decided that nothing had nor would happen.

The London System

Game 51
Kovacevic-Vaganian
Hastings 1982/83

1 d4 e6 2 c3 d5 3 f4

The London System, also known as the Old Man’s Bad Habit. Not dangerous and not very interesting.

3...d6!

The simplest way of equalising. It has already been done!

4 e3

This is the only slightly interesting move here. The alternatives are:

a) 4 g3 f6 5 bd2 bd7 6 e3 xg3 7 hgx3 c5 8 c3 wc7 9 d3 h6 10 c1 e5 11 dxe5 xe5 12 xex5 xe5 13 a4+ d7 14 b5 w6 15 c4 dxc4 16 xc4 0-0 17 0-0 and a draw was agreed in Sharif-Apicella, Chambery 1994.

b) 4 xd6 xd6 (4...xd6 is very solid and completely equal. The only reason to choose the text move is because there is a threat.) 5 e3? (This sacrifice is probably not justified. The position is too closed and Black
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has no weaknesses.) 5...b4+ 6 Qbd2 cxb2 7 Axb3 Qxb3 8 0-0 Qbd7 9 we2 a3 10 c4 we7 11 Axc1 0-0 and it is very hard to imagine that White has any compensation for his sacrificed pawn, Schaefer-Gasthofer, Schwaebisch Gumuid 1999. Black won the game in only 25 moves.

4...Qxf4 5 exf4 Qd6 6 Qd2

Or 6 g3 Qb4+.

6...Qf6 7 Qc3 a6 8 Axd3 b6 9 0-0 0-0 10 Axf1 c5

Black has equalised.

11 Qe5 Qc6

11...cxd4 12 Qe2 would give White a nice knight on d4.

12 Qxc6 Qxc6 13 We3

This illustrates how little control White has over the dark squares in his own position.

13...Qb7 14 Axd1 Qfe8 15 a3 Qg4? Taking some space.

16 Wh3 f5

The idea.

17 Qb1 Qd6 18 g3

18...Qc6!

The bad bishop becomes good, or exchanged.

19 c3 h5 20 Qf1 Axd3 21 Qxd3 c4 22 Qc2 b5 23 Qd2 a5

Black already has the advantage. The rest of the game has some similarity with a boxing match where one of the boxers has longer arms. If we did not know, we would never have guessed that White was rated ten Elo points more than Black here, and that both players were in the world's top 25 at the time this was played!

24 Aa1 Qf6 25 Qf3 Aa6 26 Qe5 Qd7 27 Qxd7 Qxd7 28 Aa5 Ac8 29 Aa1 g6 30 h3 h5 31 g4 Qxg4 32 hxg4 Qf7 33 Qe2 Aa8 34 f3 Aa6 35 Qg2 Qc8 36 Qg3 Qh8

Preparing the lethal invasion of White's position.

37 Qg2 Ah7 38 Ac5 Aa6 39 Qf1 Qb6 40 Qg2 Qe7 41 g5

This does not help White in any way, but he should count on ...g5!? coming at any time.

41...Ah4 42 Aa1 Qd7 43 Aa6 Aa1 Ac6 44 Qf1 Ah5 45 Ah1 Ac8 46 Aa2 Ac4

White is finished.

47 Qg2 Aa7 48 Qg3 Wh2+ 49 Qxh2 Ah2+ 50 Qg3 Axf4 51 Qd6 52 Qb3 b4 53 cxb4 c3 54 Qa5 c2 55 Ac1 Qc6 56 b4 e5+ 57 dxe5 d4 58 a4 d3 59 b5+ Qb7 60 a6+ Qa7 61 Ah1 Ah2 62 Ac1 d2 63 Ac2 Ah4+ 64 Qg3 d1Ah 65 Ac7+ Qb8 66 Aa7+ Ac8 67 Ah4 Qxf3 0-1

The Colle System

The Colle System is very popular in some places amongst players who want to avoid theory. Well, when you avoid theory you also avoid critical positions. Black has nothing to
doubt and nothing to fear here.

**Game 52**

**Becq-A. Sokolov**

**Metz 2001**

1 d4 d5 2...f3 e6 3 e3

3...f6 4 d3 b6 5 0-0 b7 6 ff3

6 c4, which is a bit more ambitious, but not necessarily better, is considered in the next game.

6...c5 7 c3 ff7!

This is the most elastic set-up. The knight should keep an eye on both c5 and f6.

8 b3?!

This is rather passive. Another possibility is 8 f2 e7 9 e4 dxe4 10 fxe4 0-0 11 d1 f7 12 dxc5 fxc5 13 fxc5 fxc5 14 h3 h6 15 f3 fed8, which was completely equal in Haag-Gofshtein, Germany 1997.

8...f6 9 f2 0-0 10 f2 e5 11 dxe5 fxe5 12 fxe5 fxe5 13 ff3

White cannot play 13 e4 due to 13...f4 14 fxe4 dxe4 15 fxe4 fxe2+ 16 fh2 wh4+ 17 g1 fxe4 with advantage to Black.

13...f7 14 ffd1?!

But this is too passive. Necessary was 14 c4! dxc4 15 fxc4 with equality. Black can now create an interesting position with 15...f6!? 16 f5 f7 17 f4! a6 18 a4, where both players have chances for a full point.

14...f8 15 ffd1

Now White should definitely avoid 15 c4 d4!, when the black bishops come to power.

15...f6

Threatening a potential ...f5-d4!? White thus decides to exchange his good bishop. Probably something like 16 h3!? was more sound.

16 f6 f6 17 b5 fad8 18 fxc6 fxc6 19 f3 b5!

Black is now establishing c3 as a permanent weakness. This also reflects on the bishop on b2, which really looks pathetic.

20 f5 c4 21 f4 f6 22 f2 f4 23 fxc4 fxc4 24 fdd1 f6

Black is establishing some threats and is potentially starting a kingside attack. Now White self-destructs.

25 f4??

25...ff2!
Very simple.

26 axd5

Or 26 axf2 axf3+ 27 axf1 axe2+ 28 ag1 and now the simple 28...axb2 with two extra pawns.

26...axe3 0-1

White resigned in view of the upcoming smothered mate.

---

Game 53

Yusupov-Ivanchuk

Linares 1992

1 d4 df6 2 c4 e6 3 df3 b6 4 e3 ib7 5 
f3 d5 6 0-0 dxc4?! 7 bx c4 a6

Valery Salov used the same system to beat Alexander Khalifman in the final game of their Candidates match in 1994. It is only now when we are writing this book that we realise the reason why Ivanchuk was commending the black opening ideas so heavily in his annotations. He had invented it himself!

---

8 dc3?!

Or 8 wc2 bd7 and now:

a) 9 ad1 c5 10 dc3 wc7 11 d5 exd5 12

x d5 axd5 13 axd5 axd5 14 axd5 df6

(14...ae7 15 e4 0-0? 16 af4! was Franco Ocampo-Langeweg, Zragoza 1995) and Black is doing okay. Note that 15 ef5+ ae7 does not harm Black at all.

b) 9 a4 c5 10 dc3 ad6 11 ad1 0-0 12 b3

(12 h3 wc7 13 d5 exd5 14 axd5 axd5 15

x d5 16 axd5 17 c4 18

x d2 14 with an advantage for Black was Dunnington-Legky, Le Touquet 1995)

12...cxd4 13 exd4 ef8 14 ef5 ed5 with a slight advantage for Black in Khalifman-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1994. The full game is extensively annotated in Jacob’s Exelling at Chess.

8...b5 9 1 d3?! c5 10 a4?!

10 dxc5 x c5 11 b3 1d7 12 b2 with equal play was more prudent.

10...b4 11 1e2 eb7 12 b3?!

12 eg3 was better. The bishop has no business on b2 and thus the text move only weakens c3.

12...cxd4 13 1fxd4 e5 14 ef5?!

This is an attempt to avoid getting into a bad position. Only it cannot be avoided! 14 oc2 a5 15 ab2 ac5 illustrates very well the failed white opening strategy. Look at the knight at c2!

14...g6 15 1fg3 h5 16 f3 ac5 17 1h1

wc7 18 eg1 0-0

Black has a winning positional advantage. He is fully developed and fully mobilised. It is hard to imagine a better co-ordination of Black’s pieces, while it is hard to imagine a worse one for White.

19 1h3 fd8 20 wc2 1a7 21 1d2 a5

22 1f2 1d5

23 e4

The pawn could not be saved anymore. After 23 1c4 xc4 24 wc4 ac8 25 wc2
Following ...\textit{e}6, even the passive 26 \textit{e}ab1 does not help.

\textit{\textbf{23...\textit{x}xb3 24 \textit{g}g5 \textit{f}f8 25 \textit{w}b2 \textit{e}e6 26 \textit{w}xe5 \textit{h}h7 27 \textit{d}ad1 \textit{x}xg5 28 \textit{w}xg5 \textit{d}d5! 29 \textit{w}xe7 \textit{axe}7 30 \textit{b}b5 \textit{h}4 31 \textit{e}e2 \textit{x}xf2 32 \textit{e}xd8+ \textit{e}xd8 33 \textit{a}xf2 \textit{a}d1+ 34 \textit{g}g1 \textit{c}c8 35 \textit{h}h3 \textit{a}d6 36 \textit{a}a6 \textit{a}c4 0-1}}

The Richter-Veresov Opening

\textbf{1 d4 d5 2 \textit{c}c3}

We could hardly imagine a better day than when an opponent finally decides to play like this. The move is utterly stupid and does not fit with 1 d4. The c-pawn should be in front of the knight, not behind it.

\textbf{5 dxc5}

The alternative is 5 e4 cxd4 and now:

\textit{\textbf{a}) 6 \textit{g}g5 dxc3 7 \textit{e}e4 dxe4 8 fxe4 \textit{g}g6 9 \textit{f}f3 \textit{h}h4+ 10 \textit{g}g3 \textit{h}h6 11 \textit{d}h3 \textit{e}e7 12 d5 0-0 13 \textit{e}e4 \textit{c}c5 14 \textit{a}a2 \textit{d}d7 with an advantage to Black. Note that this is not the world-class player Lajos Portisch, but merely someone hiding under his name.}

\textit{\textbf{b}) 6 \textit{w}xd4 e5 7 \textit{a}a4 d4 8 \textit{x}d5 \textit{e}e7 9 \textit{g}g2 \textit{f}f6 10 \textit{d}d2 \textit{d}d6 11 \textit{g}g3 \textit{e}e6 12 \textit{c}c4 \textit{a}a6 13 \textit{a}a3 \textit{a}a5 15 \textit{a}a3 \textit{e}e7 looks a tiny bit better for Black, but White still has the two bishops to compensate for his structural problems, Kuijf-Hoeksema, Holland 1996) 12\textit{b}b6 13 \textit{a}a4 \textit{c}c7 14 \textit{g}g3 \textit{e}e8 15 \textit{c}c4 \textit{e}e6 16 \textit{a}a5 \textit{d}d7 17 \textit{a}a2 \textit{d}d8 18 \textit{e}e1 \textit{b}b6 with equality in Bellon Lopez-Keene, Dortmund 1980.}

\textbf{5...\textit{w}a5 6 \textit{a}xf6 \textit{a}xf6 7 \textit{w}d4 e5!}

This move takes advantage of the two bishops and quick development. White was threatening 8 b4, so it was also somewhat forced.

\textbf{8 \textit{w}xe5+ \textit{e}e6 9 \textit{e}e4}

White has also attempted 9 e3 \textit{g}g5 10 \textit{b}b5+ \textit{h}h8 11 \textit{g}ge2 a6 12 \textit{d}d3 \textit{e}e8 13 0-0 \textit{d}d7 14 \textit{g}g3 \textit{xc}c5 15 \textit{h}h1 g6 16 f4 \textit{g}g7
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17  f5  wb6  18  xf4  (18  xd1 seems to be better, but this is not a move anybody would like to play) 18...xf4  19  xf4 (Przewoznik-Tomaszewski, Polish Ch., 1980) and now Black could have gained something like a winning advantage with 19...wb2!  20  d2  b5  21  ab1  wa3.  

9...xc5  

10  b5+?  

It is quite funny that White’s position seems to be impossible to defend after this innocent check, but just wait and see.  

The other option is 10 0-0-0 0-0-0 11  exd5  xf4  12  xd5  xd5  13  g3  e6, with more or less equality, if Black is not a tiny bit better.

10...xf8  11  0-0-0  e3+  12  b1  d4  

Preparing the winning invasion on the a-file.  

18  xd4  

18  c4 does not help either: 18...b5!  19  xb5  axb4  20  c4  xc2!  21  a1  d3 and White is getting mated.

18...xb4  19  c4  xd4  20  xd4  

Game 55  

Reynolds-Nunn  
London 1987  

This is a famous game from a simultaneous display in London, where Burt Reynolds participated! Actually that’s a lie, but this line is so hopeless that we are trying everything to make it interesting!  

1  d4  xf6  2  c3  d5  3  g5  bd7  4  f3  h6  5  h4  e6  6  e4?!  

The aggressive gambit line, which is totally unconvincing.  

Possible, of course, is 6  e3 but then we would definitely agree with Korchnoi: ‘When you are content with playing openings like this, you do not need to study opening theory.’  

5...h6  6  h4  g5  7  g3  xe4  8  xe4  dxe4  9  e5
Other Systems after 1 d4 d5

9...±g7
9...Dxe5? would be too premature: 10 Dxe5 f6 11 Wh5+ Cc7 12 Wh6! fxe5 13 dxe5 and White wins due to 14 Wf6+.

10 h4?!
After this White is worse in as many ways as we have found games. But Black does not have anything to fear from 10 We2?! £}xe5 11 dxe5 Wxdl+ 12 Sxdl i.d7, although White is already worse.

10...£xe5 11 £xe5
Also possible (and maybe even stronger) is 11 dxe5 Wxd1+ 12 £xd1 £d7, although White is already worse.

11...∆xe5
Or 11...f6? 12 £g3 (12 Wh5+ Cc7 13 and White resigned in Shagalovich-Shamkovich, Grozny 1969.

12 dxe5 £d7 13 Wg4?
After this move White always has problems. The alternatives are:
 a) 13 Wd2? gxh4 14 Wb4 £c6 15 £b5 Wd5 16 £xc6+ bxc6 17 £xb4 £c3 18 fxe3 0-0-0 19 £c4 £xc4 20 £xc4 £g8 with a better endgame for Black, which White did not defend very well in Mestrovic-Bobotsov, Sarajevo 1971.

 b) 13 Wd4! might still keep some kind of balance after 13...£c6! 14 Wxd8+ £xd8 15 hxg5 £d5 16 gxh6 (16 £xh6 £xh6 17 gxh6 £xe5 18 £e2 £f7 is easier for Black, as he has no displaced rook on h8 to take care of) 16...£xe5, with an unclear game.

13...We7?!
This is the first time we really disagree with Black’s play. Better was 13...£c6! 14 hxg5 (14 £d1 Wf7 15 hxg5 £b4+ 16 £d2 £xb2 17 gxh6 £a1+ 18 £d1 £c3 19 £d2 £d8 20 £e2 £xd2 21 £xd2 £a1+ 22 £d1 £xe5 gives a great advantage to Black)
14...\( \textit{d4} \) 15 \( \textit{c3} \text{ \textit{xe5}} \) 16 0-0-0 \( \textit{e7} \) 17 \( \textit{h6} \text{ \textit{xe6}} \) 18 \( \textit{gxh6} \text{ \textit{h8}} \) 19 \( \textit{h4}+ \text{ \textit{f6}} \) 20 \( \textit{g3} \textit{e5} \) and Black was a pawn up in Muratov-Kiselev, Moscow 1988.

14 0-0-0
14 \( \textit{xe4} \text{ \textit{c6}}! \) 15 \( \textit{d4} \text{ \textit{d8}} \) 16 \( \textit{c3} \textit{g4} \) gave Black a clear advantage in Hector-Simon, Naestved 1988.

14...0-0-0 15 \( \textit{xe4} \text{ \textit{c6}} \) 16 \( \textit{xd8}+ \text{ \textit{xd8}} \) 17 \( \textit{e3} \textit{g4}! \) Black is still a tiny bit better here. Now White goes astray.

18 \( \textit{xa7}?! \)
18 \( f4! \textit{b4} \) 19 \( \textit{xe4} \text{ \textit{a4}} \) 20 \( \textit{e4} \) 21 \( \textit{xc3} \textit{g8} \) 22 \( \textit{c5}! \) b6 23 \( \textit{f2} \) seems to hold the pieces together, even though it is still Black who is dictating.

18...\( \textit{g5}+ \) 19 \( \textit{e3} \textit{d4}! \) 20 \( \textit{xg5} \textit{hxg5} \) 21 \( f3 \textit{d5} \) 22 \( f4 \textit{xf4} \) 23 \( \textit{xh4} \textit{f3}! \) 24 \( \textit{h5}?! \)
This meets an immediate end. Better was 24 \( \textit{gxf3} \textit{xe5} \) 25 \( \textit{d3} \textit{xf3} \) 26 \( \textit{f4} \textit{h5} \) 27 \( a4 \), with a pawn deficit in a difficult, but not completely lost, endgame.

24...\( \textit{d8}! \)
Black now avoids parting with the \( f \)-pawn, after which White is defenceless.

25 \( \textit{h2} \)
This looks silly, but look at some of the alternatives:
  a) 25 \( \textit{gxf3} \textit{xf3} \) and White cannot defend the mate on \( d1 \).
  b) 25 \( \textit{e5} \textit{h8}! \), followed by ...\( \textit{h1} \) and the \( f \)-pawn wins the game.

25...\( \textit{g8} \) 26 \( \textit{g3} \)
Or 26 \( \textit{gxf3} \textit{g1} \) 27 \( \textit{f2} \textit{b5} \) and Black wins.

26...\( \textit{xg3} \) 27 \( \textit{d2} \textit{g1} \) 28 \( \textit{e1} \)
After 28 \( \textit{f2} \textit{g5} \) another pawn falls.

28...\( \textit{b5} \) 29 \( \textit{f2} \textit{e2} \) 30 \( \textit{c4} \textit{c5} \) 31 \( \textit{a3} \textit{b6} \)
32 \( \textit{b4} \textit{c7} \) 0-1
White will soon be in zugzwang.

Points to Remember

1) One of the advantages of playing the Tarrasch is that you don’t have to learn another defence to the Catalan. Just the normal Tarrasch moves are good enough.

2) The line 1 \( \textit{d4} \textit{d5} \) 2 \( \textit{g5} \) is deceptive and better than it looks. Pay particular note to the gambit lines discussed in Games 48 and 49.

3) The Torre Attack, London System and Colle are all playable openings, but are too quiet to really cause Black any problems, especially when Black adopts the move orders suggested in this chapter.
The Reti has never been an opening of lengthy theoretical battles based on great amount of home analysis. Probably it never will. Anyway, the right way to approach this opening is actually just going through a few model games, and trying to implement the same plans in your own games. This was the method Jacob used after having a lot of bad losses in this opening. As a result, his 2/3 in the 2000/01 season of the Danish first division (against higher rated opponents) was based only upon a bad blunder in one of the games, otherwise 3/3 was a real possibility.

We believe that what works for us will most likely also work for you. So this chapter will be nothing else but a few instructive games with annotations based on positional observations. We are sure that if you remember where the pieces belong in this system, you will never have to be afraid of it again...

We begin this chapter by looking at what happens when White pushes with e2-e4.

**Game 56**

**Vaganian-Kramnik**  
*Novgorod 1995.*

Our first game is by the absolute idol for administrating the black pieces in this system.

1 \( \text{\&} \text{f3} \)

The World Champion has a magnificent score with Black and has only lost a blitz game or two. His handling of the position is based on his usual positional simplicity and is not too difficult to learn. Of course, his sense for nuances will always be far better than anyone this book can help, but let's forget about that for a while.

1 \( \text{\&} \text{f3} \) d5 2 g3 \( e \text{g4} \)

3 \( \text{\&} g2 \)

This is the natural and best move. An important alternative to be aware of is the apparently more aggressive 3 \( \text{\&} \text{e5}? \). Only this is something Black should never fear at all. White might be winning a tempo by hitting the bishop, but it is clearly misused. The knight on e5 is not well placed and can easily
be exchanged with ...\( \text{\textit{Q}}b8\text{-}d7 \). As the knight on \( f3 \) is the only white piece that is fighting for the control over the centre, Black gets to develop more freely, and thus equalises easily. Sometimes this can even be followed by ...h7-h5-h4, with a storm on the kingside, as the main defender is no longer there.

The game Uffelmann-Dreev, Bad Wiessee 1998 continued 3...\( \text{\textit{Q}}f5 \) 4 c4 \( \text{\textit{Q}}d7 \)! (Dreev quickly liquidates the white knight. Black is already leading in development on move four!) 5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}x d7 \text{\textit{W}}x d7 \) 6 \( \text{\textit{W}}b3 \)? (This move is doing little good for the white position. Still, it is easy to understand why he went astray. After the normal 6 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g2 \) Black should use the momentum and play 6...\( \text{\textit{Q}}e4 \), further weakening the white kingside. After 7 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xe4 \text{\textit{d}}xe4 \) 8 \( \text{\textit{Q}}c3 \text{\textit{Q}}f6 \) his position is slightly preferable.) 6...\( \text{\textit{W}}c6 \) 7 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g2 \)? (This just loses a pawn to a developing move. The only move left was 7 \( \text{\textit{W}}b5 \), but after 7...\( \text{\textit{W}}xb5 \) 8 \( \text{\textit{c}}xb5 \) e5 we are sure that most people would prefer to be Black.) 7...0-0-0! (the pin on the c-file costs White a pawn) 8 \( \text{\textit{Q}}c3 \text{\textit{d}}xe4 \) 9 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xe4 \text{\textit{d}}xe4 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xe4 \text{\textit{b}}xa2 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{Q}}a2 \) a6 12 b4 c6 and Black went on to win the game thanks to his extra pawn.

3...\( \text{\textit{Q}}d7 \)

This is the logical way of developing. White does not have time to attack the black position with \( c2\text{-}c4 \), combined with \( \text{\textit{Q}}c3\text{-}c5 \), \( \text{\textit{W}}d1\text{-}a4+ \) and \( g3\text{-}g4 \), which sometimes can prove very dangerous. This is because Black does not waste time on ...\( \text{\textit{Q}}g8\text{-}f6 \) before taking control of the e5-square.

4 0-0 c6 5 d3 \( \text{\textit{Q}}gf6 \) 6 \( \text{\textit{Q}}bd2 \) e5

Some systems include ...c7-e6 here, but this is not really necessary. Anyone who has ever been on the end of e4-e5 in these type of positions will do anything not to experience it again. The problem is that the knight on \( f6 \) has nowhere safe to go.

7 e4 \( \text{\textit{d}}xe4 \)

Immediately clarifying the situation in the centre. This should be played on auto pilot as it clearly favours Black. He has not yet completed the development of his kingside and thus does not want to allow the position to be opened.

8 \( \text{\textit{d}}xe4 \)

8 \( \text{\textit{d}}xe4 \) is less dangerous. Black should not allow the e-file to be opened but exchange the knights and proceed with business as usual. The reason why Black should welcome this exchange is that the knight on \( f6 \) actually isn't very well placed at all, once the centre has been closed. Black usually wants to play ...f7-f6 to reinforce his centre and to allow the g4-bishop to come home via h5 and f7.

8...\( \text{\textit{Q}}e7 \)!

This is the right place for the bishop in our opinion. It might look more ambitious to play 8...\( \text{\textit{Q}}c5 \) as in, for instance, Ivkov-Marovic, Yugoslavia 1972, or 8...\( \text{\textit{Q}}d6 \) as in many games, but in fact the bishop is doing very little on any of these squares. Yet the knights need \( c5 \) for all kinds of manoeuvring and the bishop is just exposed on \( d6 \). So, all in all, \( c7 \) is the right square for the bishop without immediate prospects, as it will not be in the way!

9 h3 \( \text{\textit{a}}h5 \) 10 b3

Here there are some alternatives:

a) 10 \( \text{\textit{W}}e2 \) 0-0 11 a4 a5 12 \( \text{\textit{Q}}c4 \) \( \text{\textit{W}}c7 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{Q}}d2 \) \( \text{\textit{K}}f8 \) (13...\( \text{\textit{K}}d8 \)? might be better – see the discussion below) 14 \( \text{\textit{W}}e1 \) b6 was completely equal in the game Hartoch-Brenninkmeijer, Wijk an Zee 1987.
b) 10 \( \text{We}1 \) will be featured in the next game.

10...0-0 11 \( \text{Ab}2 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \) 12 c4!?

This is a very double-edged move. It does take control over a lot of squares on the queenside and helps the expansion there, but it also considerably weakens the d3- and d4-squares. 12 a3 was more relaxed.

12...a5

Fighting for the control over the dark squares on the queenside.

13 a3 \( \text{Af}d8! ? \)

Here the natural alternative is 13...\( \text{Af}e8 \) with equality, according to Kramnik. The idea is to overprotect e5 and then take it from there. Black normally plays ...\( \text{Ae}7\text{-f}8 \) and thus frees his knights.

Still, we prefer the move Kramnik actually chose, as ...f7-f6 is a more solid way of protecting e5 and the rook is better placed on the d-file.

14 \( \text{Wc}2 \) \( \text{Af}e8 \)

This is the main idea. The knight comes to d6 and puts pressure on the white centre.

15 \( \text{Ac}3 \)

White is proceeding with his plans on the queenside.

15...f6 16 b4

16 \( \text{Ah}4 \) would be inaccurate, even though the knight does want to go to f5. Black then has time to play 16...\( \text{Ac}5 \), pointing at both d3 and d4 (via e6).

16...\( \text{Dd}6 \) 17 \( \text{Af}c1 \)

White realises that he needs to overprotect his centre.

A blind advance with 17 c5 \( \text{Db}5 \) 18 \( \text{Ab}2 \) axb4 19 axb4 \( \text{Af}8 \) would not give Black any serious problems, as all his pieces are well placed. Notice that e7-bishop e7 is fine, as ...b7-b6 will be a constant threat.

17 bxa5 might win a pawn for the time being, but the wreckage suffered by the white queenside is just too big to be tolerated. Black will get a firm knight on c5 and develop pressure against c4, a5 and, potentially, a3. All in all, Black has nothing to fear.

17...\( \text{Af}7 \) 18 \( \text{Af}1 \)

Once again 18 c5 is nothing to fear.

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

18...c5!? immediately is an alternative, as it turns out that White has the most benefit of the open a-file.

19 \( \text{Ax}b4 \)

19...\( \text{Cf}5! ? \)

19...\( \text{Af}8 \), followed by ...\( \text{Ad}6 \), was also fine but Kramnik decides to change the structure. Actually we would not recommend following Kramnik’s footsteps here, unless you are very familiar with closed positions in general. We feel that the position should be equal no matter what you play, so let your strengths and tastes lead you.

20 b5!?

Closing the position. As Black seems to have the best ways of manoeuvring his pieces around, this decision can easily be questioned.

The alternative 20 \( \text{Ah}4 \) cxb4 21 \( \text{Ax}b4 \) \( \text{Af}5! ? \) 22 \( \text{Ax}e7 \) \( \text{Ad}e7 \) is considered equal by Kramnik, but we already prefer Black’s position. The c-pawn seems to be weaker than the b-pawn. Still, this is a minor difference.

20...\( \text{Af}8 \) 21 \( \text{Ah}4 \) \( \text{Ax}a1 \) 22 \( \text{Ax}a1 \) \( \text{Wd}7 \! \)

Kramnik likes this move for a good reason. White would like to play 23 \( \text{Ag}2 \), but now he has to prepare it with 23 \( \text{Wh}2 \), as the h-pawn would otherwise be hanging. Of the two moves, ...\( \text{Wd}7 \) is the most important, coming from the inactive c7-square to con-
trol the d-file and the c8-h3 diagonal.

23 \((g5?!

This is an inaccuracy, as it wastes time exchanging one of Black's pieces. Better was 23 \((h2 with equality.

23...\((e6!

Forcing the exchange (or the weakening g3-g4, exposing f4) as h3 is hanging once again.

24 \((xd6?!

This is the wrong exchange.

24 g4?! is dangerous. The following line is an indication: 24...\((g6 25 \((e3 h5 26 f3 \((f8

27 \((d5 hxg4 28 hxg4 \((xg4 29 ffxg4 \((xg4+ 30 \((g2 \((h4 with a dangerous attack. Black is probably already clearly better.

24 \((xe7+, however, was better. After 24...\((xe7 25 \((h2 \((f7 26 \((d3 \((e6 Black is well placed, but White has some advantages in having the dark-squared bishop. Kramnik thinks Black is a little bit better. This seems sensible to us as well.

24...\((xd6

The wrong recapture. After 24...\((xd6! White would not get the chance to improve his bishop with a tempo as in the game. Still, the move chosen also has some advantages. The bishop comes to the queenside where it contributes more to the overall struggle.

25 h4 \((f7 26 \((h2 \((e6 27 \((h3

This pin could have been avoided.

27...\((e7 28 \((g2

White cannot stop the black knight from reaching d4. After 28 \((xe6 \((xe6 29 \((b2 \((f7 30 \((a4 g5! the white king is terribly exposed.

28...\((d4

Black has won the first half of the middlegame battle, which finishes here. But his advantage is not so great. White also has his plusses: the a-file and a well placed bishop on h3.

29 \((d1 \((c7!

The bishop is going to b6 from where it controls c5 and a7. Just as important is that it will wait eagerly to enter the game once again via a5.

30 \((a7

It is difficult to see what White obtains with this move, but Vaganian was slowly drifting into time trouble around here.

30...\((b6 31 \((a4

31...g6?

Kramnik believes he has lots of time, but actually he should have reacted quickly here with 31...\((d6!, pinning down the white pieces. After 32 \((f1? \((xb5 Black wins a pawn, and after 32 \((a1? \((e2!, even more.

32 \((a1 \((g7?

Again Black is missing the momentum. After 32...\((e2! he would still be causing a lot of problems for White. Now White successfully untangles his last badly placed piece and the position becomes unclear.

33 \((f1! \((e2!

Black needs to get his pieces going or he
will not be well placed in a few moves time.

34 \textit{\texttt{b2}}

White needs to avoid this exchange, as otherwise Black will take over the control of the dark squares. After 34 \textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{xc3}} 35 \textit{\texttt{xc3}} \textit{\texttt{d4}} 36 \textit{\texttt{d5}} \textit{\texttt{xd5}} 37 \textit{\texttt{exd5}} \textit{\texttt{f5}} Black will be slightly better as he has some aggressive ideas on the kingside.

34...\texttt{d6}

35 \textit{\texttt{wb1}}!

Preventing the invasion on \texttt{d3} from costing a pawn. An interesting line is 35 \textit{\texttt{e3}} \textit{\texttt{d3}}! 36 \textit{\texttt{a3}} \textit{\texttt{xe4}}+ 37 \textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{f4}}+ 38 \textit{\texttt{xf4}} \textit{\texttt{d2}}+ 39 \textit{\texttt{g1}} \textit{\texttt{xf4}} and Black more or less has a winning attack.

35...\texttt{d1}

35...\texttt{d3} was better as White now has an extra option.

36 \textit{\texttt{xd1}} \textit{\texttt{xd1}} 37 \textit{\texttt{e3}}?!

This move is natural, but not the best. White should have played 37 \textit{\texttt{g4!}}, pinning the knight to the rook. The position is still more or less equal after 37...\texttt{e1}, but it would be more uncomfortable for Black.

37...\texttt{g1}+ 38 \texttt{h2} \texttt{a1} 39 \texttt{a2}?

This is clearly a time trouble move. The rook is very much exposed on \texttt{a2} because of the bishop on \texttt{f7}. 39 \texttt{a1} was called for.

39...\texttt{d4}!

Planning ...\texttt{xb5}.

40 \texttt{c8}?

More or less losing by force. White had to find 40 \texttt{d5}! \texttt{f3}+ 41 \texttt{g2} \texttt{e1}+ 42 \texttt{h2}

\texttt{f3}+ 43 \texttt{g2} and now Black can take a draw or continue with 43...\texttt{xd5} 44 \texttt{exd5} \texttt{d2} 45 \texttt{xe5} \texttt{xc4} 46 \texttt{f4} with a complicated position, where White's superior pieces and two bishops should compensate for the pawn.

40...\texttt{f3}+!

Attacking the root instead of the crown. After 40...\texttt{xb5}? 41 \texttt{xb7} \texttt{d6} 42 \texttt{d5} White would emerge unharmed.

41 \texttt{g2} \texttt{d2}

White is now in serious difficulties. Both \texttt{c4} and \texttt{e4} are weak and his pieces are a bit misplaced.

42 \texttt{xb7}

42 \texttt{xe5} \texttt{xc4} 43 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{xc4} 44 \texttt{b2} \texttt{d3}! 45 \texttt{xb1} \texttt{xb1} 46 \texttt{c3} \texttt{xe4}+ 47 \texttt{f3} \texttt{d5} would give Black excellent winning chances in the endgame.

42 \texttt{d5} loses to 42...\texttt{xc4} 43 \texttt{c3} \texttt{d6}!

42...\texttt{xc4} 43 \texttt{d5}?

This loses. White would still have some slim chances of survival after 43 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{xc4} 44 \texttt{a6} \texttt{xb2} 45 \texttt{xb6} \texttt{xb5} 46 \texttt{xb5} \texttt{xb5} and a black win is not guaranteed.

43...\texttt{xb2}!

43...\texttt{xd5}? 44 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xb2} 45 \texttt{a6} would give White a chance to create some dangerous counterplay against the black king. But, of course, this is not called for.

44 \texttt{xb2} \texttt{xd5}! 45 \texttt{c2} \texttt{e3}+ 46 \texttt{f6} \texttt{e3}

47 \texttt{xb7} 47 \texttt{d2}

Or 47 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f7} and the d-file is closed. Later on ...\texttt{f6-f5} will decide the game.
Meeting 1  d4

47...\(\text{\textmd{g}4\text{e}4\text{+}}\)  48 \(\text{\textmd{d}f2\text{c}4\text{ 49 \textmd{d}d7+\text{h}h6}}\)  0-1

White resigned. He might win the bishop after 50 \(\text{\textmd{d}d6\text{c}3\text{ 51 \textmd{d}xb6}}\) but he will not be able to stop the c-pawn after 51...c2

What was very noticeable about this game was both the manoeuvre \(...\text{\textmd{g}4\text{h}5-f7}\) and the knight manoeuvres. To remember the patterns of \(...\text{\textmd{d}d7-c5, followed by \text{\textmd{f}6-d7-f8,}}\) is important as well.

In the following game we shall see how the knights can be used on important squares on the queenside, and also that it is not a catastrophe at all if White succeeds in exchanging f3-knight for the g4-bishop. Even though we prefer the plan used by Kramnik in the game above, we shall see that this is not always possible.

**Game 57**

King-Yusupov

German Bundesliga 1994

1 \(g3\text{ d}5\) 2 \(\text{\textmd{g}g2\text{f}f6}\)

Here we would have preferred 2...c6, but all these move orders are most often not important. Only 2...\(\text{\textmd{g}4}\) is not a good idea. Then 3 c4! would highlight the sudden weakness in the diagonal from g2 over d5 to b7. 4 \(\text{\textmd{b}b3}\) would be a natural follow-up, with pressure against both d5 and b7.

3 \(d3\text{ c}6\) 4 \(\text{\textmd{f}f3}\)

4 \(f4\text{ g}6\) 5 \(\text{\textmd{b}b3\text{b}b6}\) is an interesting way to meet the reversed Dutch. Now White has no easy way to continue his development. The idea is well known from positions with reversed colours, where Black (here White) often plays ...d7-d5 in one go. If White plays d3-d4 here, he has definitely lost the advantage of the first move.

4...\(\text{\textmd{g}4}\) 5 \(\text{\textmd{b}b2\text{d}d7}\) 6 \(h3\text{ h}h5\) 7 0-0 e5 8 \(e4\text{ dxe4}\) 9 dxe4 \(\text{e}e7\) 10 \(\text{\textmd{e}e1\text{0-0}}\) 11 \(\text{\textmd{h}h4}\)!

White is (in the long run) 'winning' one of the bishops. But it does take some time and increases the structural stability in Black’s kingside.

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

Black does not want to play \(...\text{\textmd{c}5}\) (the knight’s square) or let White exchange the dark-squared bishop.

12 \(\text{\textmd{f}f5}\)

12 \(g4\) would not be a good idea, as after 12...\(\text{\textmd{g}6}\) 13 \(\text{\textmd{\dd}x\text{\textmd{g}6}\text{hxg6}}\) White has lost control over the glorious f5-square and Black can eye the chance for \(...\text{\textmd{d}d7-f8}\) controlling f4 (please remember this manoeuvre – it is very important).

12...\(\text{\textmd{f}f8}\) 13 \(a4\text{c}5\) 14 \(\text{\textmd{c}c4}\)

White has to develop his bishop this way now. If he plays 14 b3 then Black should counter 14...\(\text{\textmd{g}6}\), with the hidden threat of 15 \(\text{\textmd{b}2\text{c}cxe4}\) and Black wins a pawn.

14...\(b5\)!

Black is slightly better developed and decides to force the events before this becomes just a memory. White’s next move, if he is left to his own devices, will most be \(\text{\textmd{c}c1-g5}\) followed by \(\text{\textmd{a}a1-d1}\).

15 \(\text{\textmd{a}a5}\text{bxa4}\) 16 \(\text{\textmd{\dd}x\text{\textmd{c}6}\text{d}d7}\) does nothing to solve White’s problems. On the contrary, it opens up both the b- and the c-file for pressure against the white queenside.

15...\(\text{\textmd{c}xb5}\) 16 \(\text{\textmd{a}a5\text{e}e6}\) 17 \(\text{\textmd{e}e3\text{\textmd{c}c7}\text{18 \text{\textmd{w}b}1}}\)

Black has been rather successful in the opening stages. He is well developed and has
good squares for his pieces. Still, White also has positive aspects in his position. The knight on f5 and the bishop on e3 are both well placed. Probably now Black should play solidly with 18...\textit{c}c5 with equality. Instead he manoeuvres around a bit.

18...\textit{c}c5 19 f3 \textit{g}g6 20 \textit{h}h4 \textit{a}a4 21 \textit{b}b3 \textit{ed}8 22 \textit{x}xg6 \textit{hx}g6 23 c3 \textit{d}d7 24 \textit{wc}2

24 f4! was a stronger move here. Black has moved his pieces towards the queenside and thus weakened his king’s position. Still, White is only very slightly better, if better at all. 24...\textit{d}dc5 25 \textit{dc}1 is a possible continuation. The white pieces might look a little silly, but if he succeeds in pushing back the Black pieces, then they will instantly grow to glory.

24...\textit{db}6 25 \textit{ae}1 \textit{cc}4 26 \textit{ac}1 a5 27 \textit{h}h1 \textit{ax}b2!

White’s procrastination is dutifully punished with this little tactical trick.

28 \textit{xb}2 a4 29 \textit{c}c1 \textit{ax}b3 30 \textit{xb}3 \textit{d}d2!

Rather solid. It quickly turns out that White cannot get rid of the annoying rook on the second rank without costs.

30...\textit{a}a3?! is an interesting suggestion by \textit{Frit}. The main idea is to take control over the dark squares deep into White’s position. Probably Black has a slight pull but no more than that.

31 \textit{xd}2 \textit{xd}2 32 \textit{d}d1 \textit{aa}2 33 \textit{xd}2 \textit{xd}2 34 \textit{f}f4?

White is forced to go for variations like 34 \textit{xb}5 \textit{xc}3 35 \textit{c}c8 \textit{wc}2 36 \textit{g}g1 \textit{wc}3, which is uncomfortable, but not lost. This desperado attack is easily beaten back.

34...\textit{xf}4 35 \textit{e}5?

35 gxf4 was better, even though White is suffering after 35...\textit{c}c6!, with a kind of indirect zugzwang. ‘Do nothing’ moves like 36 \textit{e}e1 run into 36...\textit{d}d3!, and notice that 37 \textit{e}e1 b4 is not of much help.

35...\textit{fxg}3 36 e6 \textit{we}5!

A nice move, which takes advantage of white’s rampaged kingside.

37 \textit{exf}7+ \textit{wh}7 38 \textit{wb}1

White has no sufficient defence. One line of action is 38 \textit{d}d1 \textit{wc}3 39 \textit{g}g1 \textit{xc}2 40 \textit{xc}2 \textit{wf}1+ 41 \textit{g}g2 \textit{we}2 42 \textit{xc}2 \textit{we}3 43 \textit{h}h3 mate.

38...\textit{xc}2! 39 \textit{xc}2 \textit{we}2+ 40 \textit{xc}3 \textit{d}d6+ 0-1

White resigned due to 41 \textit{f}f4 \textit{we}3+

We have an idea that the sublime play by Kramnik in the first game in this chapter was partly inspired by the experiences from the following game, where he plays the opening less convincingly, but later plays some of the best chess he has ever played.

\textbf{Game 58}

\textbf{Sturua-Kramnik}

\textit{Moscow 1992}

As said above, the opening phase of this game is not as well played by Kramnik as the first game in this chapter, and should therefore not be duplicated without some hesitation. Still, it does show some excellent manoeuvring once the middlegame arises, and can for this reason still give us a lot of useful inspiration.

1 \textit{df}3 \textit{d}5 2 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}6

As written above, we prefer the move order with 2...\textit{g}4, as Kramnik later did himself.

3 \textit{g}2 \textit{g}4 4 0-0 \textit{d}d7 5 d3 \textit{gf}6 6
Black should play 7...dxe4!.
8 h3 hxh5 9 b3?!
9 ...e1 was more dangerous for the black set-up. Now he has time to develop freely. Basically, we do not find b2-b3 especially dangerous in the e2-e4 lines of the Reti.
9...0-0 10 b2 e8
10...e7, followed by ...g8-d8, would be more in the spirit we want to pursue.
11 e1?

Here the rook is not badly placed, but the queen is misplaced on d1. Once Black plays ...g8-d8, White will have to go to e2 with the queen. But it is not optimal to remain on the diagonal h5-d1, as ...d7-c5(f8)-e6-d4 will be harder to meet.
11...a5!

With the idea of ...a5-a4, this move activates the rook directly.
12 a3
White will not accept ...a5-a4, which can now be met with b3-b4. If he had played 12 a4 he would have to accept ...d6-b4 at a later time, which might force him to play c2-c3, after which both b3 and d3 would be weaknesses. Still, now Black has the chance of advancing on the queenside. So both moves have good sides and bad sides.
12...b5!? 13 f1?!

13 a4, trying to create a weakness on the queenside, is met with 13...bxa4 14 xa4 b4!? when White will have to decide between accepting the bishop here (not very likely), and playing 15 c3 c8 16 c2 c5 when Black is better already. Still, after the text move Black wins some important tempi.
13...dxe4 14 dxe4 c5 15 1d2

There are no other moves.
15...e7 16 e1

It's now becomes apparent that White should not have played 11 e1. Kramnik suggests another solution to the problem of the queen: 16 e2!? e6 17 f1 and White is only slightly worse.
16...f7!?
The other knight is now joining the action. Black is also close to playing ...f7-f6 to bring his bishop into action. After 12 a3 White has some weaknesses on the light squares in his pawn formation, of which Black is now taking advantage.
17 h4 e6

White can now prevent the knight from coming to d4 by playing c2-c3, but this will cost something positionally after ...d7-c5 comes and hits at the weak d3-square. Please note this manoeuvre! This is the standard idea we want to propagandise here. This and ...f7-f6. This is more or less all you need to know.
18 df3

This move is not so aesthetic either. Better was 18 f1 with some disadvantage.
18...f6 19 f5 c8 20 e3?

This move is, of course, completely use-
less. One only has to look at it. Still, we must remember that Sturua has been under some pressure almost from the start, and has not been successful in finding any kind of release. 20  vide3  f7 21 a4, with the idea of axb5 followed by  d5, was suggested by Kramnik and makes good sense. He still thinks that Black is somewhat better, but at least White is playing useful moves. Still, we often see this in practical play. White is under some pressure and fails to solve his problems. The constant pressure then eventually induces him to make an obviously stupid move, trying to solve more problems than he really needs to. Here White was overprotecting f3 too soon.

20...f7

Black is threatening to play ...g7-g6 and ...f8-h6.

21 1e1

Better was 21 e2, when White can meet 21...g6 with 22 h6+, with a playable position. Of course, Black would search for something more natural and remain in a very promising position.

Now the position is very close to being positionally winning.

21...g6 22 e5h4 c5!

With no knights closer than three days travel to d5, Black seizes the moment and brings his knight to d4.

23 f1

Probably there was more resistance in 23 c3!? even though Black still gains some good squares with 23...c4! 24 b4 b6. Note than in some positions Black might play ...e6-d4 no matter what, as cxd4 would create two dangerous passed pawns. Still, this is only sometimes.

23...d4 24 d1 a8d8

The last piece enters the centre. The beauty of Kramnik’s games is that all his pieces co-ordinate beautifully.

25 d4

25 d2 b6!, with moves like ...h6 and c5-c4 coming, is equally hopeless.

25...xd4 26 e1 c6 27 f3

27 a4 bxa4 28 bxa4 b4 wins material, as after 29 b5 c6 the h3-pawn is hanging.

27...e5 28 d3?

The final mistake. After 28 d2 the pieces are still holding. In the long run, however, the structure is very poor and a player like Kramnik, even in his teens, would not fail.

28...xd3

Black does not let the opportunity go away. With the capture of this bishop, the light squares on the queenside will collapse and, with them, all of White’s position.

29 xd3

Or 29 cxd3 e6 and there is nothing left to say.

29...a4

Putting additional pressure on the light squares.

30 d2 h6

All the pieces now flow to their ideal squares.

31 h2 c8 32 a1

Black now has a winning combination based on the accumulation of all his positional advantages.

32...c4!! 33 bxc4 bxc4 34 xc4

34 e2 c3 35 xc3 dxc3 and the exchange is lost as well.

34...x1

34...xc4! is easily winning as well.

35 a5
Meeting 1 d4

Or 35 Qa5 Wxc2 36 Wxc2 Hxc2 37 Hxc1 Hb8, followed by ...Hb8-b5!, trapping the white knight.
35...Wxc2 36 Wf3 Hxb2 0-1

Game 59
Speelman-Short
British Ch., Torquay 1998

1 Qf3 d5 2 g3 Qg4 3 Qg2 Qd7 4 d4?!

This system always make us smile. We do not feel that this version of the Catalan, where the bishop is on g4 instead of on c8, can ever pose Black any problems. Still, it is a quite popular system among certain types of positional players. But, as Short illustrates in this game, Black does not have a lot to fear.

4...e6 5 0-0 Qgf6 6 c4 c6

Black should not be afraid of winning a pawn after 7 Qc3 with 7...dxc4! One game continued 8 a4 a5 9 e4 Qb4 10 Qe1 0-0 11 Qg5 h6 12 f4 Qe8 13 Qc2 Qh5 14 Qad1 Qb6 15 h3 Qac8 16 g4 Qg6 17 Qe5 Qxe5 18 dx5 Qd5 and Black was already winning, Schoehl-Dobosz, Goerlitz 1998.

Another main line is 7 b3 but Black should not be scared: 7...Qd6 8 Qb2 0-0 9 Qbd2 Qe7 10 Qe5 Qf5 11 Qxd7 Qxd7 12 f3 Qg6 13 e4 dx4 14 Qxe4 Qe7 with equality in Vladimirov-Illescas, Logrono 1991.

7...Wb6!

The pawn can also be protected more passively from c8, but this exchange is very desirable for Black.

8 Qc3 Qe7 9 Qe1?!

This move is slow, as is the following exchange of queens. The only true attempt to do Black some harm comes from 9 c5!? Wxa6 (9...Wxb3?! also makes a lot of sense. Who would claim that White is truly better after 10 axb3 Qxf3 11 Qxf3 e5 12 c3?) 10 Qf4 b6 11 cxb6 axb6 12 h3 Qh5 13 g4 Qg6 14 Dh4 0-0 15 Qxg6 hxg6 16 a4 Qfc8 with equality in Jirovsky-Shabanov, Pardubice 1998.

9...0-0

10 Wxb6

This is very strange, but probably White feared ...Qxf3.

10 e4 is also not so tempting, as Black is doing very nicely after 10...Wxb3 11 axb3 Qxe4 12 Qxe4 dx4 13 Qxe4 Qf5.

10...axb6 11 cxd5

This exchange also seems to benefit only Black. After the solid 11 b3 Qb4 12 Qb2 Qe4 13 Qec1 the position remains equal.

11...exd5 12 e4?!

Only after this move is White really worse. We find it hard to understand that a great player like Speelman wants to first exchange queens and then enter a position with an isolated pawn. The following moves also suggest that it was not his day at all.

12...Qxe4 13 Qe5

This might seem strange, but Black also has a very nice position after the alternatives:
a) 13 \( \text{Qxe4 fxe8!} \) 14 \( \text{Qd2} \) (14 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 15 \( \text{Qf4 xe1+} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe1} \) \( \text{Qxc3} \) 17 \( \text{bxc3 a3} \) 18 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) would give Black the advantage of a pawn) 14...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 15 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 16 a3 \( \text{Qd5} \).

b) 13 \( \text{Qg5 fxe8} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe4} \) b5. 13...\( \text{Qxe5} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qd5} \)

\[ \text{Game 60} \]

**Adams-Bareev**

_Hastings 1991/92_

1 \( \text{Qf3} \) d5 2 g3 c6 3 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{g4} \) Again there are some move-order issues...

4 c4

This might come about in many different ways and is, in our opinion, the most uncomfortable to meet with Black. Still, it should never give Black theoretical problems. The only slightly dangerous option here is 4 b3?, which is considered in the next game.

4...e6 5 0-0 \( \text{Qf6} \) 6 d3

White has some other main options here:

a) 6 \( \text{Qe5} \) (this does not give a lot of chances for an advantage, as the knight will simply be exchanged) 6...\( \text{Qh5} \) 7 d4 \( \text{Qbd7} \) (now...\( \text{Qxe5} \) followed by \( \text{Qfd7} \) will continue to be something White must take seriously) 8 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 9 \( \text{Qb6} \) (9 cxd5! is just plain silly, as Black soon will be positionally winning in the following way: 9...\( \text{Qxe5} \) 10 dxe5 \( \text{Qxd5} \) 11 \( \text{Qc2} \) 0-0 12 h3 \( \text{Qa5} \) 13 \( \text{Qxd5} \) cxd5 14 g4 \( \text{Qg6} \) 15 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qac8} \) 16 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qc4} \) 17 \( \text{Qfc1} \) b5 and White does not have a chance to keep his pieces together, Romanishin-Karpov, Moscow 1983) 9...\( \text{Qb6} \) 10 \( \text{Qxd7} \) \( \text{Qxd7} \) 11 e4 \( \text{Qxe4} \) 12 \( \text{Qxe4} \) 0-0 0-0 13 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 14 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 15 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 17 d5 \( \text{Qe5} \) 18 \( \text{Qg2} \) cxd5 19 cxd5 \( \text{Qxd5} \) 20 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qad8} \) 21 \( \text{Qxb7} \) \( \text{Qxb2} \) 22 \( \text{Qbab1} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 23 \( \text{Qxb3} \) with a draw to come in Romanishin-Larsen, Lone Pine 1981.

b) 6 cxd5 (The reason why this is usually delayed, as in the main game, is because of b8-knight. Now it will be allowed to come to the superior square c6 instead of d7. White only allows this because he has an agenda.) 6...cxd5 (6...cxd5! is also interesting, and is another way to play the position) 7 \( \text{Qb3} \)
The bishop will not be very strong now, as Black takes control over a lot of central squares. Also, the black pawn structure is very solid on the light squares, and can take the disappearance of this bishop.) 8...\textit{x}f3 \textit{d}d7 9 d\textit{c}3 d\textit{c}6 10 d\textit{g}2 d\textit{e}7 11 d\textit{d}3 0-0 12 \textit{x}d2 \textit{d}d8 13 \textit{d}f1 \textit{d}f8 with equality in Anastasian-Seirawan, Groningen 1997.

c) 6 b3, which is the most dangerous option, is investigated in the next game through transposition.

6...\textit{bd}7 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}7 9 \textit{wb}3

Alternatively:

a) 9 a3 0-0 10 b4 (seems aggressive, but Black is soon in good shape after...) 10...a5 11 b5 \textit{x}d6! 12 \textit{b}2 \textit{e}7, with a good position for Black, Loginov-Almasi, Budapest 1996.

b) 9 h3 \textit{h}5 10 \textit{f}4 (White wants to invade the black position through the c-file but, as we shall see, this is not really dangerous) 10...0-0 11 \textit{e}1 a6 12 \textit{a}4 \textit{e}8 13 \textit{e}5 \textit{x}e5 14 \textit{x}e5 \textit{f}6 15 \textit{x}e6 \textit{xf}6 16 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}6 17 \textit{c}2 \textit{ac}8 with equality in Dizdarevic-Almasi, Pula 1996.

\textbf{11...0-0!}

Black has already solved his opening problems. His lead in development and the difficult route home for the white queen fully compensates for the soon-to-be sacrificed pawn.

\textbf{10 \textit{e}3}

The immediate 10 \textit{xb}7? does not work due to 10...\textit{xc}5 11 \textit{c}6 \textit{c}8 12 \textit{b}5 a6 and the queen has nowhere nice to go.

\textbf{10...\textit{x}f3! 11 \textit{ef}3}

Black also has no problems after 11 \textit{x}f3 \textit{d}5. Now White is forced to play 12 d4! \textit{x}f3+ with equality, as 12 \textit{g}2 d4 13 \textit{f}4 \textit{g}6 14 \textit{e}4 \textit{xf}4 15 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{f}6 16 gxf4 \textit{d}6 leaves him chronically weak on the dark squares.

\textbf{11...\textit{c}5!}

Black has to remain active or the advantage of the two bishops will start to count eventually. After 11...b6 12 d4 White is a little better structurally. The d-pawn is not a real weakness since it is very hard to attack it.

\textbf{12 \textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5 13 \textit{wb}7! \textit{a}5!}

Black is not rushing to lay his trump cards, but instead relies on his strong pressure on the dark squares to count for some time.

The attempt to trap the queen with 13...\textit{xb}8 14 \textit{a}6 \textit{d}7 (or 14...\textit{xb}2 15 \textit{a}4 \textit{c}2 16 \textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5 17 \textit{xa}7 and White has an enormous advantage) 15 \textit{ab}1 \textit{b}4 fails to 16 b3!, as pointed out by Bareev. Black cannot even regain his pawn, as he loses the exchange after 16...\textit{db}8 17 \textit{a}3 \textit{d}6 18 \textit{e}2 \textit{d}4? 19 \textit{wb}2 \textit{xb}6 20 \textit{wc}2!.

\textbf{14 \textit{wb}3?}

An understandable retreat, but now Black's active pieces will be able to reach their full potential.

Forced was 14 \textit{d}5, which leads to equality after 14...\textit{xb}5 15 \textit{xb}5 \textit{ab}8 16 a4 a6 17 d4! \textit{b}6 18 a5! axb5 (18...\textit{d}8 19 \textit{a}7! \textit{xb}2 20 \textit{d}6 is no worse for White; the knight is completely dominating the bishop and a6 might be a little weak) 19 axb6 \textit{xb}6.

\textbf{14...\textit{d}4!}

The pressure on c3 and b2 is now impossible to meet.

\textbf{15 \textit{fc}1 \textit{ab}8 16 \textit{wc}2 \textit{fc}8 17 \textit{ab}1 \textit{g}6 18 \textit{f}1}

This just illustrates how terribly wrong the white strategy has been. Even though he has a pawn more, he is in such a bad shape as this bishop illustrates.

\textbf{18...\textit{g}7 19 \textit{h}4 \textit{h}6}

158
Black is in no hurry. White cannot improve his position but he can!

20 \( \text{Wd2?} \)

This loses by force. 20 \( \text{e2} \) was better, but White is still in trouble.

20...\( \text{xc3} \) 21 bxc3 \( \text{xb1} \) 22 \( \text{xb1} \) d4!

This passed pawn is too strong for White to control.

23 \( \text{wc2} \) dxc3 24 \( \text{d5} \) a3 \( \text{e7}! \)

An elegant way to finish the game. Black would like to play \( ...\text{a5-a4xb3} \), followed by \( ...\text{c3-c2} \). He will have to use a tempo moving the queen first to avoid \( \text{b3-b2+} \) followed by \( \text{b2-c1} \), but he does not want to give White time to play the manoeuvre \( \text{f1-e2-d1} \), preventing the trick. Thus he threatens to play \( ...\text{e7-f5-d4} \) first and this occupies the white bishop.

26 \( \text{h3} \) a4!

With the idea of \( ...\text{g7-f8} \).

27 h5 \( \text{gxh5} \) 28 f4 \( \text{f8} \) 29 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 30 \( \text{wb3} \) c2 0-1

The system to be investigated in the last few games is the one we consider the most uncomfortable to meet. Even though Black is doing fine at the top level and the variation is not to be considered theoretically dangerous for Black, it is still very difficult to handle the black pieces in a satisfactory way. First of all, there is the danger of losing the control over the e5-square, as in the following example:

12...\( \text{xe5} \) 13 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d6} \) 14 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \)
15 d4  e5 16 c5  c7 17 b4

The piece configuration now favours White, as Black has the main part of his pawn structure on the light squares. As we shall see, White was able to convert his advantage into a full point.

17...e5 18 b3  axb4 19 axb4  e4

19...exd4 20  xd4 would give White a very strong knight.

20  d2  h6 21  x8  x8  22  a1

White has a solid plus, which he makes count in the rest of the game. This is the type of position we are warning you about. There is nothing worse in life than losing like this!!

25...e6 26 f3  b8  27  b2  g8  28

wa1  w8  29 wa5  wa5  30 bx5  f8  31

f2  e7  32 fxe4  dx e4  33 h3  d8  34

g1  c7  35 e3  b8  36 c2  a7  37

fl  d5  38 e2  e6  39 g4  d5  40

f1  e6  41 d3  e7  42 c4  e6  43

f1  d7  44 e1  e6  45 f2  b8  46

g2  d5  47 f5  g8  48 d6  d6  49

g3  a7  50 f1  e6  51 f2  d5  52

e2  e6  53 e1  d5  54 d2  f6

55  c4!

Exploiting all the weaknesses on the light squares by exchanging the bishop at the right moment.

55...b8  56  xe6  fxe6  57  f7  g8  58

d8  a7  59  xe6  a6  60  d8  f6  61

f7  g8  62  c3  xa5  63  d6  f6  64

xb7+  a4  65  d8  1-0

Scary stuff, right? Well, let us see what can be done against this set-up.

Game 62
Pigusov-Salov
Biel 1993

1  f3  d5  2 g3  c6  3  g2  g4  4 b3  d7

5  b2  gf6  6 c4

As we remember from Vaganian-Kramnik above, e2-e4 does not go particularly well with the bishop on b2.

6...e6  0-0  0-6d6  8  d3

This is the main line, but White also has other options:

a)  8  cxd5  exd5? (8...cxd5 is perfectly playable, but with the knight on d7 this is not altogether logical) 9  d4  0-0  10  h3  h5  11  d3  e8  12  e1  c5  13  a3  a5  14  ac2

ag6 and we already prefer the black position, even though it must be said to be rather unclear, Cabezas Ayala-Korneev, Navalmoral 1999.

b)  8  d4 has a lot in common with 4  d4?, but here the bishop is on b2 and White is supporting his c-pawn with the b-pawn:

8...0-0  9  a3

This is not the most logical move. The alternatives are:

a)  9  c3  a6 (to be able to play ...cxd5
without having to worry about $\text{Qc3-b5}$ 10 $\text{Wc2 We7}$ 11 e3 $\text{xa3}$ 12 $\text{xa3}$ $\text{xa3}$ 13 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{h5}$ 14 d4 $\text{g6}$ and Black has equalised, Spassky-Andersson, Linares 1983.

b) 9 $\text{Qbd2}$ is considered in the next game.

9...$\text{Ee8}$

Black is preparing ...e6-e5.

We also like 9...$\text{We7}$ here, while ...a5 is a good option too: 10 $\text{Qc2}$ a4 11 h3 $\text{h5}$ 12 $\text{c3}$ $\text{We7}$ 13 $\text{cxd5}$ $\text{cd5}$ 14 $\text{Qd4}$ $\text{axb3}$ 15 $\text{axb3}$ $\text{Lb4}$ and Black is by no means worse, Piket-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 1998.

All in all, there are a lot of moves are good here. We have chosen 9...$\text{Ee8}$ because of the solid effort by Salov in this game. Remember, the important thing in these lines is not remembering theory, but having a good feeling for where the pieces belong.

10 $\text{Qc2}$ a5 11 a3

11...$\text{h5}$?

A useful waiting move which is worth remembering. White sometimes wants to chase the bishop with h2-h3 followed by g3-g4 or with $\text{Qf3-e5}$. Now White has achieved his desire with $\text{Qb1-a3-c2}$, but it is not too intimidating.

12 b4 $\text{a8}$

Black is preparing to meet c4-c5 with ...b7-b6, breaking up the queenside.

13 $\text{cxd5}$

White is running out of reasonable ways to improve his position. After 13 b5 $\text{cxb5}$ 14 $\text{cxb5}$ a4! the b-pawn has just become a weakness.

13 $\text{Qe5}$? does not work here due to 13...$\text{Qxe5}$ 14 $\text{Qxe5}$ $\text{dxc4}$ and Black has won material.

13...$\text{cxd5}$

The logical recapture. After 13...$\text{cxd5}$ 14 $\text{Qd4}$ White has ideas with b4-b5 that might undermine the d5-pawn.

14 $\text{Wd2}$ $\text{b6}$?

Black has already equalised. Now he goes for an adventure in the hope for gaining winning chances. A quest that will be rewarded.

15 $\text{bxa5}$ $\text{Qa4}$ 16 $\text{zb1}$ $\text{Qd7}$?

Black is taking precautions. 16...$\text{Wxa5}$ 17 $\text{Wxa5}$ $\text{xaxa5}$ 18 $\text{xf6}$ $\text{gxf6}$ 19 $\text{xb7}$ would not give Black enough for the pawn.

17 $\text{xc3}$!

Opening the b-file. If White did nothing he would just sit back with a few weaknesses and nothing to show for them.

17...$\text{xc3}$ 18 $\text{xc3}$ $\text{xa5}$ 19 $\text{xa5}$ $\text{xa5}$ 20 $\text{xb7}$ $\text{c5}$ 21 $\text{b4}$?

This is a very unfortunate square for the rook. Necessary was 21 $\text{Cc7}$!, keeping the rook on the seventh rank and also keeping the balance.

21...$\text{xc8}$?

Aiming at the c2-knight and thus also the dark squares on the queenside.

22 $\text{g4}$?
posals: 22 bbc2 b a4 23 b ba2 c c3 wins. So does 22 c cd4 c xd3! and 22 c fd4 c xe2! 23 c xe2 c xd3. White’s only move was 22 c c c1 which, it must be said, looks very silly and is therefore also hard to find.

22...b a6!

A nice little move, winning back the pawn without easing the pressure. 22...c xd3?! 23 exd3 c xc2 24 b b 8! would give White a reasonable position. Black should probably refrain from 24...c xg4?! 25 e e 5 c xa 3 26 c ab1 c f 5 27 c d 7, as White has some attacking possibilities, even though he is running short of pawns.

23 b b2 c xg 4 24 h 3 c h 5 25 d 4

White is forced to prevent the manoeuvre ...b a6-c 5-a 4-c 3, which would hurt him badly. 25...c g 6 26 c fe1 c c 7 27 a 4 c e 8?!

Not the most killing. Better was 27...c ca 8! 28 b ba2 c b 5 and White has no way of avoiding losing a pawn for no compensation at all.

28 e 3 d d 6 29 c f 1 c ca 8 30 b ba2 c e 4 31 c d 3 b b 8 32 c x e 4

Otherwise ...b c 3 would win on the spot.

32...c x e 4 33 c f 1 g 5 34 c e 2 c f 5

The two bishops are enough for a long term victory anyway, so Black should not be bothered by his small slip earlier.

35 c f 3 f 6 36 h 4 g 4 37 c fe1 c b 3 38 c g 2 c d 6

39 h 5?!

The pawn just gets weaker here.
a) 10 \textit{W}c2 e5 11 h3 \textit{dx}f3 12 \textit{dx}f3 \textit{xf}8 13 e3!? (in order to meet ...e5-e4 with dxe4 and \textit{xf}3-d4 without allowing ...e4-e3, which would wreck the king’s position completely) 13...\textit{xa}3! 14 \textit{xa}3 \textit{xa}3 15 cxd5 \textit{xd}5 16 \textit{fd}1 a5 with very close to equality in Timman-Karpov, Jakarta 1993.

b) 10 a3 a5 11 \textit{W}c2 e5 12 e3!? (12 c4 dxe4 13 dxe4 \textit{fd}8 is not dangerous for Black – see the Vaganian-Kramnik game earlier in this chapter) and now:

b1) 12...e4? 13 dxe4 dxe4 14 \textit{fd}4 \textit{fe}8 15 h3 \textit{h}5 (15...\textit{e}6 16 \textit{xe}4) 16 \textit{f}5 \textit{e}6 17 \textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 18 \textit{xe}4 and White wins a pawn.

b2) 12...h6 13 \textit{fe}1 \textit{we}6? gave White an advantage in Podzielny-Dautov, Dortmund 1992, as the queen is very poorly placed on e6 and the idea of ...\textit{g}4-h3 is a waste of time and effort. After the more logical 13...\textit{fe}8?! the position seems fine for Black.

b3) 12...\textit{fe}8? also makes a lot of sense.

10...\textit{h}5 11 a3 a5 12 \textit{W}c2 \textit{fe}8 13 e3 \textit{h}6 14 \textit{h}4

14...\textit{f}8

This seems a little passive. Probably Black was best off with the aggressive 14...g5! 15 \textit{hf}3 e5 with a complicated position. We presume that his lead in development will compensate for the weakening of the kingside. 16 h4 g4 17 \textit{h}2 \textit{g}6 does not intimidate us in the least.

15 f4

This was the idea. Not 15 g4? \textit{xf}4! and Black wins a pawn.

15...\textit{g}6 16 \textit{xf}6?!

This is not so critical. Black had a little space problem with the knights. Probably the position was completely equal after 16 \textit{hf}3 \textit{xf}3 17 \textit{xf}3 e5 18 fxe5 \textit{xe}5 19 \textit{d}4 g6, but it is obvious that White has more dynamic opportunities here.

16...\textit{xf}6 17 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}7 18 e4 dxe4 19 dxe4 \textit{f}6 20 \textit{e}5 \textit{h}7

The bishop on h7 looks bad at first sight, but then one realises that e4 and a3 are actually quite difficult to protect simultaneously. We are certain that White had overestimated the scope of his aggressive opportunities here.

21 \textit{we}2 \textit{c}5+ 22 \textit{h}2 \textit{ed}8

White cannot prevent ...\textit{c}5-d4 with a positional plus in normal fashion. On 23 \textit{fd}1 comes 23...\textit{xd}1! and any recapture loses a pawn.

23 \textit{g}4?!

23 \textit{fe}1 \textit{d}4 24 \textit{ad}1 \textit{xb}2 25 \textit{xd}8+ \textit{xd}8 26 \textit{xb}2 c5, with a small advantage for Black, was a possibility.

23...\textit{xe}4

The other capture was also good: 23...\textit{xf}4? 24 \textit{xf}4 \textit{d}4 25 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 26 \textit{fd}1 \textit{xd}1 27 \textit{xd}1 e5 is quite strong, yet it is easy to understand the decision behind the text move, which does win a pawn.

24 \textit{xe}4?
This is just bad resistance. Forced was 24 $d1! f5 25 $e5 $xd1 26 $xd1 $d8 with a very difficult ending. Still, White has some chances as Black’s pieces are not so well coordinated.

The forced line offers nothing but pain.

24...$xe4 25 $xg7

25 $xe4 $d2+ 26 $h1 $xb2 is just a pawn without any excuses.

25...$xg7 26 $xe4 f5 27 $e5+

27...$g6?! This gives White a chance to fight on. Better was 27...$h7! 28 $f6+ (28 $e3 $d4 29 $xf5 $xe5 30 $xe7 $xa1 and it’s over) 28...$g6 29 g4 (or 29 $ad1 $b6) 29...$xf6 30 $xc5 $xg4 and Black has some extra pawns for which there is no compensation.

28 $ae1?

Now all hope is lost. Better was 28 $e3 $d6 29 $g2 $xe5 30 $xe5 $d2, when Black only has a very clear edge. Still, it is easy to understand Andrew Ledger’s decision, which shoots all the remaining bullets at the king. We suspect time trouble was involved.

28...$d2+ 29 $e2 $xe2+ 30 $xe2 $xg4 31 $xg4+ $h7 32 f5 $g8 33 $e4 $xf5 34 $xf5+ $h8 35 $h5 $g5 0-1.

Points to Remember

1) The Reti is a well respected opening and has to be taken seriously as it’s actually quite popular.

2) In the recommended lines with ...$g4 it’s more important to have a good feeling where the pieces should go, rather than trying to learn the variations in parrot fashion.

3) An excellent role model for Black in this line is the World Champion Vladimir Kramnik. Pay special attention to his games in this chapter.
Here we will consider unusual first moves and how to deal with them. Note that 1 e4 requires a book of its own. It's called Meeting 1 e4, is written by Alexander Raetsky and will be published at the same time as this book.

The Grob-Basman Opening

1 g4!? 

Not as bad as it looks – that would be a crime. Still, Black should equalise easily.

2 g2 c6! 3 h3 e5 is just a transposition.

2...e5 3 g2 c6!

This prevents all the tricks with c2-c4 and counterplay on the g2-b7 diagonal – the only reason for White to play this system.

4 d4

This is the serious move. Other ideas have been tested, but none with too much conviction. Here is one example: 4 d3 Qc7 5 g5? Wb6 6 b3 Qg6 7 d3 a5 8 0-0 h5 and Black was already winning in Yanez-Sutovsky, Benasque 1996.

4...e4 5 c4 Qd6 6 Qc3 Qe7 7 Wb3 Qa6!? 

Somehow this move attracts us over the alternative 7...h6.

8 g5 f6! 9 d2 Wb6
Meeting 1 d4

Black has completely equalised at this point and eventually won the game.

**The Sokolsky Opening**

1 b4!?

1 b4 e5 2 £b2 £xb4 3 £xe5 0-0 5 £tf3

In *ECO* this move over 5 £b2 is to blame for the outcome of the black opening. As we shall see, there can hardly be said to be any other difference between these two moves other than transposition.

5...£e8 6 e3 £f8?!

An interesting concept of meeting the opponent’s strong bishop on his diagonal.

7 £e2 g6 8 0-0 £g7 9 £b2 c5!

This move is played to gain maximum influence in the centre. Now White, with his next two moves, reacts a bit passively and Black takes over the initiative.

10 £c3

10 d4, with the possibility of 11 d5, was probably better.

10...£c6 11 £b1?! d5 12 £xd5 £xd5

13 cxd5 £xd5 14 £xg7 £xg7

Black is already close to being better.

15 d4?

After this move White has serious problems with the d-pawn and ends up in a difficult endgame without Black having to make any real effort.

15...cxd4 16 £xd4 £xd4 17 exd4 £f5 18 £f3 £e4 19 £xe4 £xe4 20 £b3 £xb3 21 £xb3 b6 22 £d3 £e2 23 £c1?!

White is trying to become active for the sake of a pawn, but this is useless. The only slim chance of a successful defence was linked to 23 a3.

**Game 65**

**Volke-Vaganian**

*German Bundesliga 1994*

1 b4 e5 2 £b2 £xb4 3 £xe5 £f6 4 c4 0-0 5 £f3

In *ECO* this move over 5 £b2 is to blame for the outcome of the black opening. As we shall see, there can hardly be said to be any other difference between these two moves other than transposition.

5...£e8 6 e3 £f8?!

An interesting concept of meeting the opponent’s strong bishop on his diagonal.

7 £e2 g6 8 0-0 £g7 9 £b2 c5!

This move is played to gain maximum influence in the centre. Now White, with his next two moves, reacts a bit passively and Black takes over the initiative.

10 £c3

10 d4, with the possibility of 11 d5, was probably better.

10...£c6 11 £b1?! d5 12 £xd5 £xd5

23...£c8!

A nice shot to finish the game.

24 £f1 £xc1+ 25 £xe2 £c2+

The pawn ending would lose easily because of the possibility of the outside passed pawn. The rook ending is hopeless.

26 £e3 £xa2 27 d5 £f8 28 £c3 £e7 29 £c7+ £f6 30 g4 £a3+ 31 £e4 £a4+ 32 £f3 £g5 33 £d6 £a5 34 £d7 £e7 35 £d8w+ £xd8 36 £xh7 £b4 37 h4 £h6 38 h5 a4 39 £a7 £e8 40 £a8+ £e7 41 £g3 £b3+ 42 £g2 a3 0-1

**The Nimzowitsch-Larsen Opening**

The Nimzowitsch-Larsen Opening is normally not considered very dangerous for Black. Actually Bent Larsen employed it in the 1960s because players were underestimating it and considering it to be directly bad.
His line of thought was that people were more prepared for full combat with a world-class player, when they believed they had the advantage. These days we know that it should just be equal.

1 b3

1 d5 2 b3 is an advanced form of the Nimzowitsch-Larsen Opening, where Black does not have the choice of 1...e5 at his disposal. Luckily we do not care: 2...d5 3 b3 e6 4 c4 e5 5 d3 0-0 6 cxd5 exd5 (6 cxd5 is also possible; Black is, of course, no worse at all here) 7 e3 c6 8 0-0 a6 9 a3 d6 10 cxd5 cxd5 (9 cxd5 is also possible; Black is, of course, no worse at all here) 11 a4 c4 12 b4 b6 13 a5 a5 14 c2 c8 15 f3 g7 was equal in Piket-Kramnik, Wijk aan Zee 1999.

1 b3 d5 2 b3 is an advanced form of the Nimzowitsch-Larsen Opening, where Black does not have the choice of 1...e5 at his disposal. Luckily we do not care: 2...d5 3 b3 d5 4 e3 c6 5 c4 e6 6 c3 g2 d7 7 e3 d6 8 d3 0-0 9 cxd5 exd5 (9 cxd5 is also possible; Black is, of course, no worse at all here) 10 b2 e8 11 d4 xe2 12 wxe2 g6 13 a5 c6 14 e2 f8 15 f3 g7 was equal in Piket-Kramnik, Wijk aan Zee 1999.

This is it. We simply take our anti-Reti setup and use it against the Nimzowitsch-Larsen as well. It is just as good as any other way of playing, and the development of the pieces is easy.

4 f4

4 f3 would be similar to the Piket-Kramnik game above.

4...d5 5 e2

This is the difference from the Bird variations considered in this chapter, even though a transposition is possible in some tangled way. If White had wanted to fight for the advantage, he should have played 5 g3 d6 6 h3 xxf3 7 wxf3, when he has the two bishops and some pressure on the long diagonal. Still, after 7...c7! 8 g4 e5 Black looks fine to us.

5...xe2 6 wxe2 d6 7 f3 e6 8 0-0 d6 9 e5!

After this move Black takes over the initiative. White is simply using two moves in order to exchange the knight on d7. Black will take over the control of e5 and create a strong centre.

Better is 9 d3 with equality.

9...c7 10 xfd7

What now?

10...xd7!

This pawn sacrifice has a funny story attached to it: The game was played at an old Soviet holiday residence deep inside Belarus. Ten players had taken the trip from Denmark to the east to play these tournaments. The other Dane in this IM-tournament told Jacob that his opponent was the unrated player of the tournament. Jacob then decided to sacrifice a pawn and get the game over with as soon as possible. Of course, there was nothing unrated about Kramnik’s later second. But this tournament had a lot of future great players hidden behind the letters unknown for Danes (Rustemov and Fedorov.
were among the players in the tournament).

Besides from being a good way to beat an unrated player, the sacrifice is also justified by opening a file down to a king, only defended by the queen.

11 $xg7

Maybe 11 d4!? is better. Still, Black is already doing well.

11... $g8 12 $b2 0-0-0 13 c4 dxc4!

With the idea of 14 bxc4 e5! with an attack on the kingside. 13...e5 14 cxd5! was, of course, not the right path.

14 $a3!?

White realises that he will soon be lost if he does not develop his pieces. If Black now plays 14...cxb3 he regains his pawn, but after both the prudent 15 axb3 and the more direct 15 $c4!? White would be ready to start an initiative against the black king's position. Therefore Black plays...

14...$xa3! 15 $xa3

White now has no logical way to proceed.

16 bxc4?!

This is still very slow. Better was 16 $b2! $e4 17 $ad1, even though Black keeps the advantage with 17...$g6, with serious threats against the white king.

16...$a5 17 $c1 $g6 18 d3 $dg8 19 g3 h5 20 $b2 $g4 21 $h1 h4 22 h3?

After 22 gxh4 $h5 23 $g1 $xh4 24 $g2 White would still be able to put up a good fight. Now it is all over.

22...$xe3!

22...hxg3!? was also interesting, but this just wins on the spot.

23 g4

White sacrifices an exchange to avoid 23 $xe3 $xg3 24 $f3 $f5!, after which he can only prevent mate by losing his queen. The rest of the game is purely technical, and a very young Jacob Aagaard takes his time, but still he never lets the goal get out of sight.

23...$xf1 24 $xf1 $d8 25 $c2 $c5 26 d4 $d6 27 c5 $d5+ 28 $h2 $g8 29 a4 $d7 30 a5 a6 31 $a1 f6 32 $f2 $e7 33 $f1 $d8 34 $f2 f5 35 $g5 $xa5 36 $d5 exd5 37 $e5 $b4 38 $g1 $c4 39 $g6 d4 40 $xh4 $xe5 41 fxe5 $e2+ 42 $h1 $xe5 43 $e1 $d5+ 44 $h2 d3 45 $e7 $wa2+ 46 $g3 $xg6+ 47 $f1 $wd5+ 48 $e3 $xc5+ 49 $f3 $wd5+ 50 $e3 $e6+ 51 $xe6 $xe6+ 52 $xd3 $e4+ 53 $xe4 $xe4+ 54 $xe4 $d7 55 $f5 a5 0-1

Bird’s Opening

1 f4

Against the Bird we have chosen a line to maintain a coherence with our Anti-Reti system. We also think it gives Black good chances against this somewhat underrated opening. The reason why we did not consider the gambit with 1...e5!? is that White can reply with 2 e4!? transposing to a King’s Gambit. If you want to investigate this we

### Bird’s Opening

1 f4

- Against the Bird we have chosen a line to maintain a coherence with our Anti-Reti system. We also think it gives Black good chances against this somewhat underrated opening. The reason why we did not consider the gambit with 1...e5!? is that White can reply with 2 e4!? transposing to a King’s Gambit. If you want to investigate this we
can assure you that the gambit line is no worse than any other system against the Bird.

**Game 67**

**Conquest-Luther**

**Olot 1994**

1 f4 d5 2 ∆f3 ∆g4!? 3 e3

This is the serious move. 3 d4 ∆d7 4 ∆bd2 e6 5 g3 ∆h6 6 ∆d3 ∆f5 7 ∆e2 c6 8 0-0 ∆f6 9 gxf2 ∆d6 10 c4 ∆f5 11 ∆xf5 exf5 gave equality in Pirc-Barcza, Belgrade 1954.

3...∆d7

This is not very dangerous for Black, to put it mildly. The alternatives are:

a) 4 c4?! (White is not leading in development and should try to develop before opening the centre) 4...e5! 5 fxe5 (5 h3 ∆xf3 6 gxf3 e4 7 g2 dxc4 8 ∆xc4 ∆c5 would leave Black with the advantage) 5...∆xe5 6 ∆xd5 ∆xd5 7 ∆e2 ∆d3+ 8 ∆f1 ∆f6 9 ∆d6 10 h3 ∆f5 11 ∆d4 ∆g6 12 ∆f3 c5 with a clear advantage to Black, Pytel-Ornstein, Le Havre 1977.

b) 4 h3! is the critical approach and the only thing Black should fear: 4...∆xf3 5 gxf3 ∆g6 5...e6? is worthy of consideration. The key idea is to delay the development of the g8-knight to f6, so that it cannot be kicked away at once by g4-g5.) 6 g4 (This is the only reasonable way to proceed. Weak is 6 d3?! e5 7 e4 dxe4 8 dxe4 ∆b4+ 9 ∆c3 0-0 10 ∆d3 ∆c5 11 fxe5 ∆fxe4 with advantage to Black in Raurell-Comas Fabrego, Olot 1994.) 6...e6 7 d3 (7 g5 ∆e4 8 d3 ∆d6 with an unclear game was another option) 7...∆b4+? (trying to disturb the white development as much as possible) 8 c3 ∆d6 9 e4 (White hopes to build strong pawn chain and even open up the position a bit for his bishops) 9...dxe4 10 dxe4 e5 11 g5 ∆g8 12 f5 h6 (12...∆e7!? has been suggested, with the idea of 0-0-0; the line 13 ∆e3 ∆c5 14 ∆d2 h6!? is good for Black) 13 h4

4 ∆e2

and now:

b1) 13...hxg5 14 hxg5 ∆xh1 15 ∆xh1 ∆e7 16 ∆c4 ∆b6 17 ∆b3 0-0-0 18 ∆h8 would ensure White of an advantage, although it's not too crushing.

b2) Best is probably 13...∆e7?!, with the idea of 0-0-0, after which a normal game would be waiting ahead.

b3) In Danielsen-Luther, Schwerin 1999 Black played 13...∆e7?!. This is a fatal mistake and also a very weird move to make. The bishop was already developed; what Black needed to do was to finish his development, not start over! After 14 ∆h5! Black was in serious trouble. The rook on h8 and knight on g8 are virtually trapped in the corner.

4...∆g6

An alternatively, which is probably just a transposition in most cases, is 4...e6 5 0-0 ∆d6 6 c4 (Larsen-Barcza, Zurich 1959). Now Larsen thinks that 6...∆g6! would se-
cure Black equality.

5 d4

White chooses to transpose into a Stonewall-like position, to avoid ...e7-e5. There are other moves in the position:

a) 5 ∆c3 e6 6 0-0 ∆d6 7 b3 0-0 8 b2 c6 9 ∆d4 ∆xe2 10 ∆xe2 w7 11 a4 Ac8 12 Ac3 c5 13 Ac3 Ac4 14 ∆xe4 dx4 15 Ac5 f5 16 Ac4 Ab8 17 d3 exd3 18 wxd3 Ac8 was fine for Black in Kristiansen-Berg, Denmark 1992.

b) 5 b3 can be met with 5...xf3!? 6 xf3 e5 with equality.

5...e6 6 0-0 c5 7 Ac3 Ad6 8 a4?!

This move is utterly useless and only creates weaknesses on the queenside. We will not try to use our special powers to guess why a Grandmaster would play like this. But still, Black was not worse at all.

8...0-0 9 h3 xf3 10 xf3 a6 11 g3

11 g4?! makes more sense. Where is White expecting his play to come from if he does not do anything active on the kingside?

11...wc7 12 Ac2 Ac8 13 Nh2 Ab6! 14 Ac2

14 b3 cxd4 15 exd4 Ac4 16 Ac2 Acxd2 17 wxd2 wxd2 18 b4 Ac1 Ac3 20 Ac1 Ac8 is just a pawn up for Black.

14...cxd4 15 exd4 Ab4!

Putting additional pressure on the weak squares around c4 and b2.

16 Ac2

How should Black exploit his advantages?

16...wc4! 17 we2

17 Ac1 wxd4 is very simple.

17...Ac3!

17...wxd4?? 18 Ac3 is very simple as well.

18 wxc4 wxc4 19 Ac3 wfc8!

The pawns will not run away so Black is just putting additional pressure on the white queenside.

20 Ac5

Not the toughest defence, but even after 20 a5 Ac4! 21 Ac4 Ac4 everything is collapsing.

20...Ac2

Black has won a pawn and soon wins the game as well.

21 b3 Ac2+ 22 Ac2 Ac2 23 g4 Ac4

24 Ac4 dx4 25 d5 exd5 26 Ac2 b6 27 Ac4 a5 28 Ac7 Ac8 29 Ac2 Ac5 30 g5

The rook endgame holds no relief as well: 30 Ac6 gxf6 31 Ac5 e3 32 Ac1 e2 33 Ac1 Ac3 and everything is broken.

30...e3 31 Ac4 Ac5 32 f5 Ac5 33 f6 e2

34 Ac1 gx6 35 gx6 Ac6 0-1

The English Opening

1 c4

Of course it is a little bit fresh of us to put the English opening here. We are just pretending not to be old enough to consider it serious at all! That is actually not quite the truth, as Esben has been playing the English for as long as he can remember.
We propose to meet the English the following way:

On 1 c4 play 1...e6 2 d4 f6. Normally people here play 3 g3 d5, but they can, of course, also transpose back to the Tarrasch with 3 d4 c5. The following games give a good insight into how the position should be played.

**Game 68**

**Salov-Timman**

Sanghi Nagar 1994.

1 d3 f3 2 c4 e6 3 g3 d5 4 g2

4...dxc4 5 a4+ bbd7 6 wxc4 a6

**7 d3**

This is not very successful, but we find it hard to believe that Black should be in any kind of trouble here. The alternatives are:

a) 7 wxc2 c5 and now:
   a1) 8 xc3 xa7 9 0-0 b6 (This is more solid than 9...b5 10 a4!, when White will re-group his knight from c3 to c4 via b1 and d2. After the text move Black should be quite safe.) 10 d4 b7 11 dxc5 xc5 12 a3 0-0 13 b4 and a draw was agreed, Szekely-Karlovy, Pernik 1984.

a2) 8 0-0 xa7 9 d3 (this is not very dangerous) 9...e7 10 xc3 b6 11 b3 b7 12 b2 0-0 13 ac1 d4! (eliminating the slight pressure on the b2-g7 diagonal) 14 h3 gc5 15 exe5 exe5 16 ec4 ec6 17 ac3 f5 18 ad2 af6 19 ec4 xc3 20 wc3 ad4 and Black was already much better in Wegerle-Aagaard, Pardubice 2000.

b) 7 wb3 bb8 8 0-0 b5 9 d4 b7 10 af4 d5 11 dc3 xf4 12 gxf4 c5 13 d5 c4 with full equality in Höffmann-Unzicker, Germany 1996.

c) 7 0-0?! is clearly not very dangerous. Now Black is allowed to develop freely without having to think of ...a8-b8 or any other things along those lines: 7...b5 8 wc2 (8 wc6 bb8, followed by ...b7, is only in Black’s interest) 8...b7 9 b3 c5 10 b2 d7 11 d3 0-0 12 a4!? (This only weakens b4. Better was 12 bd2 c8 with complete equality.) 12...d5 and Black was slightly better in Gulko-Aleksandrov, Groningen 1997.

7...b5 8 wc6 bb8 9 af4 d5 10 f5
d7 11 xex7 xex7 12 0-0 b7 13 wc2

0-0 14 a4

14 e4? d4 15 wxc7 ecx8 would only favour Black.

14...c5

Black has already equalised.

15 axb5 axb5 16 dc3 fc8 17 a5

The pawn on b5 was indirectly protected. After 17 axb5?? db4 Black wins a piece with 18 wc4 d5!.

17...xc3 18 xc3

18 bxc3 b4 would give Black a passed pawn and chances to fight for an advantage in the position.

18...b4
This is probably not the best move. After 18...c6? there is no reason why Black should be any worse. Now White gains a slight pull due to his control over the light squares. Please remember how the c4-square is a positional key factor in these kinds of positions.

19 Wc2 Wd8 20 Bb5! Wc7 21 Ac1 Wc6
22 Ab5 Wb6 23 Aa1 h6 24 Ad2 Axg2
25 Bxg2 Ab8 26 Ac4

This is a bit too stereotypical. Better was 26 Ac4! Wc6+ 27 Wc4 Wd5 28 Ac4, as suggested by Salov himself. Here the white queen is active. In the game it is a bit hidden away on c2.

26...Wc6+

27 e4!?

27 Kg1 is more normal. Now Black has a key square as well.

27...Aa1 28 Axa1 Aa8 29 Ac1 Ad8 30 We2 Ab6 31 Ae5!?

White is taking some chances here. Both 31 We3 and 31 Axb6 Wxb6 32 We3 Ad4 33 Ac4 are completely equal. But as this was a match Salov seems to have been very keen on playing the endgame after the great success he had there against Alexander Khalifman in his preceding match (see Jacob's Ex-celling at Chess where this match is analysed in great detail).

31...Wd6 32 Wh5 Ad8

Black could win a pawn with 32...g6? but after 33 Axf6 Wxf4 34 Ae4 Wxe4+ 35 Kg1 only White has any reason to be happy about the exchange.

33 b3

33 Aa1, to activate the rook, was stronger according to Salov.

33...f5! 34 Ag6 Ae7

35 Af4

Again White does not choose the best move. After 35 We2! the position was still very unclear. Now White is sliding towards an inferior position and it is no surprise when his next move is an outright mistake, putting him immediately in a somewhat difficult position.

35...e5 36 Ag6?

36 Ag6 fxe4 37 Aexe5 Ac7 38 Ag6 Ae6 39 Af4 Ae5 40 We2 would still have kept everything together. Now this will not be possible.

36...Af6 37 We8+ Ah7 38 Ah5 Ab8 39 Ab5 Ad7

Black is saving his tactics for use later on in the game. There was no immediate win as the following line suggests: 39...fxe4 40 dxe4 Axf2+ 41 Axf2 Wd2+ 42 Ah3 Wxc1 43 Axg7? - Salov.

40 Aa1 fxe4 41 Aa7

Forced, as 41 dxe4 Ad4 is hitting everything!

41...Af7 42 Wc4 Ag6 43 Wxe4

It seems that White has survived all his troubles, but Black still has a brilliant resource!
43...c4!!

This move takes advantage of the weaknesses in the white position – the queenside and the 'lost' knight on h5.

According to Salov, 43...\textit{Wxe4+} 44 \textit{dxe4} c4 does not work quite as well, as White has 45 bxc4 b3 46 \textit{Bb7} \textit{Dc5} 47 \textit{Bxf7} b2 48 \textit{Bxf7}+ \textit{Bh8} 49 \textit{Be7} b1\textit{W} (49...\textit{Bf8} 50 \textit{Be8+} \textit{Bf7} 51 \textit{Bb8} speaks for itself) 50 \textit{Df6} and Black is forced to enter a lost knight endgame with 50...\textit{Bb7} to prevent the mate. Still, 45...\textit{Bg6}! is a strong improvement and might still win.

44 \textit{Wxg6+}

44 bxc4 \textit{Dc5} and all White pieces are hanging.

44...\textit{Bxg6} 45 dxc4 \textit{Bxh5} 46 \textit{Ba5} \textit{Bg6} 47 f3 \textit{f6} 48 \textit{Bb5} \textit{Bf8} 49 \textit{Bxb4}

49...\textit{Bb8}?

This is a truly terrible move. If Black had played actively with his rook with 49...\textit{Ba8}, followed by...\textit{Ba8-a2-b2}, then White would soon lose all his pawns. Now the position is not even winning any more!

50 \textit{Bxb8} \textit{Bxb8} 51 b4 \textit{Bc6} 52 b5 \textit{Ba5} 53 c5 \textit{Be6} 54 \textit{Bf2} \textit{Bb3} 55 \textit{c6} \textit{Bd6} 56 \textit{Be3} \textit{Bd4} 57 b6 \textit{Bxc6}

57...\textit{Bxc6} 58 \textit{Be4} \textit{Bxb6} 59 f4 \textit{Bc5} 60 \textit{Bxe5} does not seem to give Black any winning chances.

58 \textit{Be4}?

A remarkable decision. Now there is a potential fork on c5, something Salov seems to have overlooked. The 'pawn endgame' with 58 f4! would have secured a draw according to Timman. Getting older includes believing such statements when you are writing an openings book, so we will not investigate if he is right or not!

58...\textit{Bb6} 59 b7

59 f4 \textit{Bb8}!! 60 \textit{fxe5} \textit{Bd7} and Black wins – Salov.

59...\textit{Bb8} 60 f4 \textit{Be7} 61 \textit{Be3} e4!

Passed pawns – you cannot live with them and you cannot take them!

62 \textit{Be4} h5 63 h3 \textit{Bf5} 64 \textit{Be3} g6 65 \textit{g4+} hxg4 66 hxg4+ \textit{Bxg4} 67 \textit{Bxe4} \textit{Bc5}+ 0-1

\textbf{Game 69}

\textit{Timman-Spassky}

\textit{Sochi 1973}

1 \textit{Bf3} d5 2 c4 e6 3 g3 \textit{Be7} 4 \textit{Bg2}

4 b3 is the line we are discussing here. Only in this game the moves came in another order.

4...\textit{Be7}

4...\textit{dxc4} is our main suggestion in this position.

5 0-0 0-0 6 b3

6 d4 can be met with 6...c5!, with a transposition to the Tarrasch after 7 cxd5 exd5.

6...\textit{c5} 7 e3 \textit{Bc6} 8 \textit{Bb2} b6 9 \textit{Be3}

9 \textit{Bb2} dxc4 10 bxc4 \textit{Bb7} is a transposition as White has no better than 11 \textit{Bc3}.

\textbf{173}
Meeting 1 d4

9...dxc4 10 bxc4 b7 11 e2 c7 12 d3

12 b5!? does not lead to any White advantage: 12 w8c8 13 a1 a6 14 xf6 axb5 15 xe7 xe7 16 cxb5 a2 with approximately equality in Geller-Smejkal, Biel 1976.

12...ad8 13 ad1 a6 14 g5 a7!

This move is important. Black already has good control over the centre and now prepares ...b6-b5.

15 f4?! White starts an active plan on the kingside that never amounts to anything. Better was 15 xxb7 wxb7 16 a4 with equality.

15...xg2 16 xg2 b5 17 g1 b4 18 b1

18 c4 xe4 19 xe4 f5 20 e5 wb6 21 c2 c6 is already better for Black.

18 c6 19 d2 a5

Black is already slightly better due to his distant pawn majority.

20 g4 wd7 21 d4 xe4 22 dxe4 22 xe4 f5! is also better for Black.

22 w7 23 f3 a4 24 g5

24 xd1!

By eliminating all the rooks, Black prevents himself from getting mated. Now his advantage on the queenside is the most important thing in the position. The rest of the game is brilliant manoeuvring and exploitation of a small advantage.

25 xd1 xd8 26 h4 a5 27 xd8+ xd8 28 wc2 a3 29 a1 f6 30 f2 f7 31 e2 wb8 32 d2 wb7 33 wd3 h6 34 gh6 gh6 35 f2 e8 36 wc2 wd7 37 f5 e5 38 e2 d8 39 wd1 f8 40 wg1 w17 41 c3 wh5

Black's advantage has increased from minor to major. Now White cracks.

42 Wh2?

And now it is all over.

42...w11! 43 xe5 fxe5 0-1

Points to remember

1) Despite us placing it last on the list, the line that you come up against most from this chapter is the English Opening. Sometimes this can simply transpose into a main line of the Tarrasch, but Games 68-69 show other options for White.

2) Out of the other openings, the most important are the Bird and the Nimzowitsch-Larsen. Against both of these Black can adopt a similar development as against the Reti, with an early g4.
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Are you tired of defending passive or difficult positions with Black? Fed up with having to learn many different defences to all of White's attacks? Then this book is the answer to your problems! Jacob Aagaard and Esben Lund provide an all-in-one solution to the popular opening move 1 d4 and other White systems that do not involve 1 e4. The lines suggested are based around the Tarrasch Defence (1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 c5). They are easy to learn and fun to play whilst also promising the black player dynamic counterplay.

This book is especially useful for players who have neither the time nor inclination to learn reams of the latest opening theory. Throughout this work, the authors delve into the strategies, ideas and tactics for Black, while also showing the possible traps and pitfalls.

- All possible white openings without 1 e4 are covered
- Written by a battle-hardened expert
- Ideal for club and tournament players

Jacob Aagaard is a strong International Master from Denmark who has carved out a deserved reputation as a diligent and outspoken chess author. His earlier opening works, such as Dutch Stonewall, have been widely admired for the clarity of their approach.

Esben Lund is a young Danish international who is well respected as an opening theorist.